



Episode 915: Southern Monuments Removed, Others Under Attack

Guest: Larry Beane & Brion McClanahan

WOODS: Pastor Larry Beane, let's start with you. Just give us the background of just the facts on the ground: what has happened and how swiftly it's happened in New Orleans recently.

BEANE: Sure. There are four monuments; three of them are Confederate monuments and one of them was a monument that remembered an incident that happened during Reconstruction, an incident of violence that happened during Reconstruction. These four monuments, they've obviously been around for a century or more, and two years ago, the mayor, Mitch Landrieu, mayor of New Orleans, decided that it would be his legacy to remove these four monuments. New Orleans is a city of monuments. There are monuments everywhere. It's a 300-year-old city. There's incredible history here. We've been under six flags at one time or another. But he singled out these and labeled them as white supremacist monuments and decided that they needed to go. He worked in conjunction with an organization called Take 'Em Down NOLA, which is headed up by a socialist who wants to basically rewrite all of New Orleans' history. And there's another radical group called Antifa, which have been involved in the strife out in Berkeley.

But the city council voted with only one dissenter to do this, and there was no vote by the people or anything, and this has caused unbelievable tension, division, hostility in a city that was really – I mean, I've lived all over the country, and New Orleans has been the most peaceful place where races freely associated, got along great. We treat each other like family. There's love and harmony. And almost overnight, it's become a hotbed. It's become a place of suspicion, of division, of hatred, and all because the mayor just out of the blue decided these four monuments had to go.

These are beloved landmarks that mark important places in our city. Even people who don't like history, everybody knows these places. These are where, you know, you give directions. These are sites that people see when they participate in Mardi Gras. They've been here forever. People grew up – I met a lady who had her picture taken from ages 1 to 16 on the 16 steps leading up to the Lee monument. Every year, the family would go back and take another picture. These are big parts of people's lives, and now you're being forced to say either you're for the monuments or you're against the monuments, and if you're on the other side of other people, you're vilified. And it's just terrible. There's been nothing good come from this.

WOODS: Okay, Brion, let me talk to you for a minute. Let's leave Robert E. Lee for a separate discussion. What I want to know is how do you answer people who say we have to take the monuments down because – you know what I'm going to say, don't you? In fact, I'm not even going to finish. I'm not even going to finish the question. I want you to answer a question I didn't even ask you. Go ahead. How do you answer that question.

MCCLANAHAN: Right, so we have to take them down for a variety of reasons, all having to do with the fact that these monuments are tied to white supremacy or the legacy of slavery, right? They're all about slavery. So I mean, when you look at that particular question and how do you answer that, it's a very powerful question nowadays because it's so charged.

But when you look at these monuments all over the South – and I actually had somebody the other day say on social media that, Well, these things are all about white supremacy. They were erected because the people of the South wanted to show that whites still ruled the South. And my response to that was, Read the monuments themselves. Where can you find one document – one document – that actually says that all of these monuments were erected because what these people in the South wanted to do was create a monument that would say what we're trying to do is keep black people in their place? You can't find it. It doesn't exist.

And so these monuments were erected in honor of the soldiers who had fought in the war, and even mainstream historians like James McPherson have come out and said, Look, the Confederate soldier was not fighting for slavery. He was actually fighting against slavery: his own enslavement to the general government. So across the board, you find that these monuments were there in honor of men who died, 250,000 who died fighting for independence. And so that's why these things were created. They had nothing to do with slavery or white supremacy or any of these other things that are there, but of course that contextualization that they like to say – they like to contextualize these monuments and say it's all about slavery and these things are a reminder of slavery.

Well, to the people that erected those monuments, they're all about loved ones – fathers, brothers, uncles who had died in the way, and they wanted to show that these people were going to be remembered because that was a very powerful image in the South at the time, and it still is for many people today. But unfortunately, it's been distorted to a point where we're just trying to rewrite history and whitewash, take these things down because they offend somebody. I find it hard to believe that could ever be the case, but obviously that's what some people think.

WOODS: All right, I get that, but let me try to imagine myself as somebody who is, let's say, not an ideologue. I mean, the ideologues have their own agenda and it does not stop with Confederate monuments. Let's imagine, though, that I'm just a reasonable person. I don't know a whole lot of history; I'm just a reasonable person and I'm black and I feel like every time I go by one of these monuments, I know – yes, I get that people want to honor their dead, but those people, what were they fighting for? They were fighting for a system – they were seceding from the Union and taking me with them, and I had no voice in that, and they were perpetuating a system that enslaved me and my ancestors. Why would I tip my hat to this monument? Why would I

not be creeped out by this monument? Maybe Pastor Larry Beane could say something about that.

BEANE: Well, actually, until Mitch Landrieu made this an issue, that really wasn't the case at all. Again, New Orleans is a place of diversity and tolerance. It's been compared to a gumbo. In a gumbo, you have all these various ingredients. And it just wasn't an issue. I mean, these symbols, Dr. McClanahan mentioned the context. There's also an underlying context, these symbols, these statues and monuments were put up after the war and after Reconstruction. These were reunification symbols too. I mean, when they dedicated the Lee statue, everybody came out. You had veterans that wore the blue, veterans that wore the gray. It was a way for everybody to reunite. And the Confederate heritage was sort of brought into the larger American context of the larger American experience. And that's called tolerance.

And you know, I may not have any particular ties to Martin Luther King or to the black experience, but I can appreciate that they're my fellow Americans and they have a perspective, and I should be tolerant and respectful of things that they consider dear to them. That's what tolerance is. And the same should go the other way. I mean, our ancestors fought for this country when their country was invaded, when their homes were invaded, when they felt that it was their duty to do so. We honor them for that.

But today we live in a modern, reunified, multiracial context, and we either have to learn to get along and be tolerant, or we are always going to be at each other's throats. And like I told the media when they asked me about it, I said we need to build more monuments, not tear down monuments. When you tear down monuments, you're basically telling the people of the South, "You don't count. Your ancestor are evil. You're a second-class citizen." Nobody should be at the back of the bus. Let's build more monuments for more different people and honor all of our history.

And that's been the New Orleans way in our 300 years. That has been our way. We have Spanish heritage, French heritage, American heritage, and we all found a way to honor everybody until now. It's like now we have a scapegoat. It's like Nazi Germany and we've found our Jews to blame, and it's very frightening and I've seen the violence up-close, personal, and it's terrible. It has ripped apart the fabric of our once really harmonious, beautiful city. We went through Hurricane Katrina not long ago, and we got through it together. And Mitch Landrieu and the city council and these radicals have destroyed that fabric of our social culture here, and it's really terrible.

WOODS: I want to ask you another question, actually, because you're on the scene. You wrote something that contrasted two different crowds of people who would come while – I guess was it while the monuments were actually being taken down or close to that? And there was the one group that wanted them taken down and the one that didn't, and the contrast could not have been greater.

BEANE: Yeah, the same Antifa people that are in Berkeley, they sent groups of people to New Orleans and working with local monument opponents, some of whom are extremely radical and violent. And what started all of this was a lady named Arlene Barnum, who is a black lady from Oklahoma and she loves her Confederate heritage, and she came because she was quite upset at the Davis statue being threatened for destruction. She has a particular affection for President Davis as the

president of the Confederacy. And this wonderful lady, she's in her 60s, she's an Army veteran. She came and started a little candlelight vigil.

And what was amazing about it was it was so against the narrative. We had this multiracial, sort of multicultural group of people who said for various reasons, Let's not tear down our history. Let's keep our history. Let's honor the past. And people started coming.

And then what happened was the Antifa people then started assembling as well, and on May Day there was an attack. And the pictures are iconic. You have these white college students attacking black people in the name of racial tolerance. I mean, it's absolutely Orwellian. You can't make this stuff up. It is really, really bizarre. The only racial epithets I heard came from the other side of the barricades from the people who want to remove the monuments hurling racial epithets at the people on the other side of the barricades who were in favor of keeping the monuments. It didn't go the other way. Absolutely not.

And the media doesn't report this at all. It's absolutely shameful. Both the local media and the *New York Times* article. I mean, it was just laughable, because I was there. I saw everything that happened, and the way they report it, you wonder if they were even there at all. Did they just have some boiler plat text and they just fill in with a few buzz words?

But the behavior of the anti-monument people, they were violent. One of them maced a woman in a wheelchair. I had a veteran who was really upset; I had to calm him down. He had a U.S. flag burned and thrown in his face. They were throwing glass bottles. And the police for the most part would not step in until it looked like it was going to become an absolute riot. And they should have stepped in much sooner, but apparently they were under orders from above to stand down and to just sort of let this ferment. And that way, then they could turn around and say, You see how violent these monuments are? Do you see how horrible this is?

We did not have this kind of hatred and division and violence between factions of people who have different heritages in the city. We didn't have that before this campaign by the mayor.

WOODS: Brion, do you want to comment on this before we go on?

MCCLANAHAN: Sure. I think the important point to point out in all of this is that it's really about political power. It has nothing to do with history at all. I mean, this is all about control. And of course, Landrieu is interested in power in New Orleans and votes. That's what this all comes down to. It doesn't matter where you're talking about. It comes down to controlling the narrative. It's a cultural war to try to eradicate not just Confederate monuments, which really are the low-hanging fruit, but as you said at the beginning, this is going to go on. It's going to go on to other things. Even, from what I understand – and the pastor could talk about this – the Joan of Arc statute was attacked.

WOODS: Yeah, what sense does that make? Joan of Arc?

BEANE: And it's a beautiful, beautiful monument too. It's really just horrific.

MCCLANAHAN: So you have this cultural crusade against not just Confederate symbols, but it's going to be against Western civilization. And where does it stop? I mean, the leader of the Take 'Em Down NOLA has already said he wants the George Washington statue at the public library there taken down. They're going after the Andrew Jackson statue. So it's not just Confederate statues that are going to come under attack; it's everything.

And so where do you draw a line? Where do Americans draw a line? The only thing I can say about that is that I think that eventually the left will overplay their hand and that Americans probably will stand up and say, Wait a second, we're allowing you to take down these Confederate things because maybe we could see a point there, but when you go after George Washington, we're going to have to say no. Or when you go after Thomas Jefferson, we're going to have to say no. I would hope that would happen, though I'm not certain it's going to. But I think that — I do have some hope that that will be the case.

WOODS: Well, let's say a word about Robert E. Lee, because there's a Lee statue that's been taken down; there's another one in Virginia where they're talking about it. Now, Lee is one of these people, when you look at historians, they by and large like him. And I'm not a huge Winston Churchill fan, but he did say, "Lee was the noblest American who had ever lived." But not good enough for the fine citizens of New Orleans, the Antifa there. "The noblest American who had ever lived." I mean, you have all these testimonies from all these different people about Lee, but apparently he's so reprehensible all of a sudden that his statue has to be taken down. Brion, give us a master class on Lee in the next three to five minutes, if you can do that.

MCCLANAHAN: Okay, sure. Well, as you said, Robert E. Lee was recognized as one of the greatest Americans in American history, even all over the North. There was a calendar in my parents' house for years from my father's birth year, and it was from a Northern insurance company and it had Robert E. Lee's birthday on there in January as this great day we should all celebrate. So everyone recognized Lee as a great American, as the symbol of what America was. And so here you have Robert E. Lee, a man who's married to George Washington's granddaughter, essentially. And he marries into this family and he believes Washington is history is hero. And you have an image of Lee as being kind of in this tradition of the Washington symbol of America, so he is recognized as the best soldier in the United States Army. Winfield Scott actually wanted him to command the United States' forces in the war, but he turned that down because he said he can't fight against his own people in Virginia.

So he goes out, joins the Confederate Army, does a great job in the war. Now, I'm going to talk about the other side of that here in a minute, but he does a great job in the war, actually keeps the army in the field, which is what Washington wanted to do in the American War for Independence, and prolongs the war and actually almost allows the Confederacy to win.

Now, of course he loses, and he surrenders with dignity. It's said that on the day of the surrender at Appomattox, he was finely dressed. Grant shows up disheveled, sloppy, probably drunk, because that's what Grant was. And so he surrenders the army and

goes back to Virginia and then refuses to really engage in anything after the war that would be seen as overtly partisan. He accepted surrender, he accepted defeat, and became president at Washington University, which is now Washington and Lee University, and really lived out his life saying that what we should do is accept our defeat and live in the Union again. And so he was a symbol to many people, as the pastor says, of reconciliation. He said we should come back together, we should join hands again. This should be what the Union was about. We lost and let's remember that there were good men on both sides of the conflict.

Well, that was the way that people thought about Lee for several generations, and as statues went up and people joined hands around these Lee statues, both Union and Confederate veterans, they recognized that he was a great man, a great American. He should be respected.

Now, that started to change really when you got to the 1950s and '60s. And the most recent that I can point to with a problem with this is Elizabeth Brown Pryor's *Reading the Man*. And I call it "Misreading the Man," because what she did was find a treasure trove of Lee letters, and she tried to create this new image, craft this new image of Lee as a man who really shouldn't be revered at all. And what's ironic about Pryor, just kind of on a side note, she was actually killed in a car wreck about, I think it was a year or two ago, on the day – I want to say it was either the day of the surrender of Appomattox – but I mean, she really despised Lee.

And she had this – she seems to have believed that he was a guy that was actually more of a coward. He really believed ardently in slavery, because it was always seen as Lee was against slavery; he wasn't a guy that really supported the institution at all. In fact, when he had the chance to free slaves, he did so. But her position was that no, no, no, he actually believed fundamentally in slavery. He was not a very honorable man. Other members of his family decided to stay with the Union, but Lee bucked that trend, and this was a decision that was easily made and it wasn't something he had to wrestle over like it's often been portrayed, he wrestled over the decision to leave the Union. This was something that he did freely. He didn't really care what his family thought. He actually had a foot fetish.

And these are the kinds of things she's writing about in this book, and so she's trying to give you a completely different perspective on Lee, that he was actually this white supremacist, this guy who loved slavery and hated the Union. And she's bashing the Douglas Southall Freeman perspective of Lee as this noble American.

And I guess you would have to take these letters and look at them out of context to do that. I actually did a whole review of the book on YouTube, where I attacked her various positions based on other evidence. And so Lee has become now the bad guy of American rather than this great American, this real American hero, which is what he was, a man who was fighting for the principles of self-determination. He reluctantly fought against the Union, a Union he actually loved. He was against nullification when he was younger. He really wasn't for secession when he was younger. So he really was this more moderate conservative American who preferred a Declaration of Independence to an Ordinance of Secession. He viewed the war in that way. This was a war for independence, and they just lost.

So I think that when you look at Lee – and he was a Christian gentleman, an honorable man all throughout his life, to tear down that statue is to tear down a real iconic American, what it meant to be an American all the way up for the first 80 years of American history, and even the next 100 years after that, close to 100 years after that. People thought of Lee in a different way. It's just unfortunate that Lee has been trashed the way he has, because he really was a symbol of what America was and the American tradition was.

WOODS: You know what's so interesting to me is that you get these testimonies about the character of Lee from Dwight Eisenhower, from JFK, from Lyndon Johnson, from Gerald Ford, who officially I guess restored his citizenship or pardoned him or whatever. And Jimmy Carter. *Jimmy Carter*. So in other words, it's so hard to keep up with the left. So now Jimmy Carter's not acceptable anymore. Now you can't have the same opinions that freaking Jimmy Carter had. That's now not acceptable. So who knows – 50 years from now, who knows what we're even going to be allowed to say?

MCCLANAHAN: Right. I mean, I think that's coming. I made a point – for years, the green flag in Ireland was illegal, but people still had it. And then later on, now you can fly this thing openly and it's not illegal anymore, but I think that's going to come. And there could come a time, because as you said, people on the left, like JFK and Jimmy Carter – I mean, take your pick of leftists who loved Robert E. Lee, now those people are not really good leftists anymore. They're not good progressives. So where are we going to go with the politically correct attacks on Western civilization and American heroes? And at one point, are these things actually going to be illegal? Are you going to be arrested for having a Confederate flag? Is it going to get to that? It's scary when you think about it. It really is French Revolution-type stuff that's going on. And where does it end? I don't know.

WOODS: I want to ask the pastor a question in just a minute, but I've gone on this sort of rant once in a while that people have benefitted from, I think, where I say – first of all, I'm Northern-born. I live in Florida now, but you know, Florida's a lot of transplants, so Florida's kind of hard to count these days. But I lived in Alabama for four years when I was at the Mises Institute, but basically I'm a Northerner through and through. And the only state in the Union where I've ever really felt totally at home – you're going to have to block your ears for this, Brion – is Massachusetts, I'm sorry to say. That is the only state where I truly, really feel like I'm at home.

But all the same, I just try to put myself in the position of somebody in the South in the 1860s. And with Northern armies coming down into my state, what am I supposed to do? What would I be expected to do, especially when I know that there's a war going on? What happens during war? Well, invading armies come in and attack you. And they can also wreak havoc on civilian populations, on private property, on the normal warp and woof of life, if I may say that.

And therefore, what would I do as a sane person, if not fight back against this? I don't understand what I would be expected to do by a modern leftist. Was I expected to stand up and say, "Oh, good Union officer, sir, why, I deserve the scourge you are about to impart upon my land. I deserve to have my children starve to death or my wife have to eat rats for dinner. Why, I deserve all that because why? Well, because of decisions made by a government I have no control over. Why, please, kill me, burn all

the buildings, leave everything destroyed, and I will sit back and do nothing." Nobody in his right mind has ever even dreamed of saying anything like that. You would pick up a gun and shoot that guy in the head. That is what you would do if you're not completely crazy. So anybody would do that.

MCCLANAHAN: Right.

WOODS: In other words, people suffered. And when they did that, when they fought so that their families wouldn't be killed, when they did that, they made tremendous sacrifices. It was awful. Very, very hard for us to imagine how terrible it was. And so what we're simply saying is those people ought to be allowed to honor their ancestors who made that sacrifice. And when you read their letters – which, you mentioned James McPherson before. James McPherson notes that they're all talking about the Union, secession, constitutionalism, the Founding Fathers. By and large, they are not talking about slavery and "I can't wait till we can oppress blacks even more." They're not speaking the way the left-wing cartoon thinks they're speaking. We have the letters. We have the diaries. We know what they're talking about. They made sacrifices for these causes. The defeated people ought to be able to honor the people and the symbols of their defeated cause in this case. It just seems – just leave them in peace.

MCCLANAHAN: Sure, and I think there's a couple things you point out there. Number one, you said it's a cartoon story. It is. I mean, the story of the war now is a cartoon. You look at Prager University, put little things out that use little cartoons, that's exactly what people want. It's a cartoon image of what the war was. But what you're saying about the destruction of the South during the war, that's actually contested. There are historians who come out and try to write books: well, it really wasn't that bad. They didn't really do these things. Of course, there's documented evidence that it was that bad.

And the funny thing is about the civilian population, of course you just had this horrible movie, *The Free State of Jones*, which is completely inaccurate. But the funny thing was the people that often were more partisan in terms of getting people out to fight than anyone else were the women. They brought rebuke on the men if they didn't go up and go and sign up and fight in the war. "Well, you're not going to talk to me if you don't sign up." I mean, what good Southerner doesn't sign up to go fight the Yankees? The women were more ardent Confederates than the men most of the time. And they were the ones who were suffering the most, who couldn't get food, who didn't have access to things they had before the war. The suffering that these people went through was actually greater than it was during the American War for Independence.

And the other thing that people don't realize is that it wasn't necessarily the governments that seceded; it was the people of the South in convention in larger, crushing majorities than what supported the American War for Independence. So this was the popular will of the South. And so you're going to say now, as these monuments went up, which were put up by their children and then in some cases their grandchildren, what they were doing – and in some cases, the people themselves – they're honoring what the people of the South did in popularly elected conventions in seceding. The monument here in Columbus, Georgia right across the river where I live

says this was for the sovereignty of the states. It's actually on the monument. If you want to know what these monuments were about, just read the inscriptions. It doesn't require you to have a PhD in history. Just go up and read the things. This is what they said it was for.

And on none of them do they ever say, "You know what? My brother was gutted by a cannonball because he wanted to keep slaves." You're never going to find that. It's not there. And you look at these horrible pictures of a guy with his arm blown off and his guts hanging out on the battlefield. Yeah, right, that guy went through that just so he could own some people. It boggles the imagination why you would think that was the case, but people believe it because they get the cartoon version of American history.

WOODS: Pastor, we've said a lot and I haven't given you a chance to speak, so do you want to jump in?

BEANE: Yeah, I wanted to build on what you said, Tom, about people fighting because they were under attack. I made an analogy with someone once, and I might have made a little progress with him; I don't know. But the point is that, for instance, today in year 2017, I'm opposed to abortion. I believe it's a holocaust. I believe we've had nearly 60 million souls murdered by decree from part of our federal government that allowed that to happen, and it's allowing it to continue to happen. I see that as a scourge just as horrific as an abolitionist would view slavery, and there are a lot of people who feel this way.

Yet nevertheless, it doesn't mean I can't love America. It doesn't mean that if an ISIS army invaded us and started shutting down abortion clinics in their wake, it doesn't mean I still wouldn't fight them. I would defend my country. I wouldn't just say, "Go ahead and slit my wife's throat because you're against abortion." This makes absolutely no sense at all. When you're invaded, you fight back.

And the other thing that I wanted to point out, there's an Orwellian end to this. Dr. McClanahan's right about, you know, just read the monuments. When they take the monuments down, you can't read them. You can't ponder that, Hey, maybe this Jefferson Davis was standing up against tyranny. You can't read what their reasons are. And this is a revolutionary tactic to get rid of the history, to change the history books, to burn the books, to flatten the monuments. There's a quote from 1984, I love this quote: "One could not learn history from architecture anymore than one could learn it from books. Statues, inscriptions, memorial stones, the names of streets, anything that might throw light upon the past had been systematically altered." And that's what we're seeing here. There is a narrative that's being foisted upon young people, and it's a narrative of ignorance.

General Beauregard after the war was one of the leading advocates for black civil rights. He was fighting for school integration in the 1870s. And yet I ask people, "Have you read a biography of General Beauregard or General Lee?" No. "Have you read an article about these men?" No. "Have you even looked up Wikipedia on P.G.T. Beauregard or Robert E. Lee or Jefferson Davis?" No. And all they could do is say, "Slavery, slavery, slavery." It was like that video you did a few years back of the interview with the zombie, pointing and saying, "Slavery," and, "Neoconfederate," over

and over again. There's a King James Version passage of Scripture that refers to willful ignorance, and that's what this is. It's willful ignorance.

And it's frightening, because it isn't going to stop here. This is indeed the low-hanging fruit, but they've made it abundantly clear they're coming after Washington, they're coming after Jefferson, they're coming after the U.S. flag, they're coming after any and all reminders of Western civilization, because that's really the goal, and they've been open about saying so.

WOODS: I want to – even though it's a bit off track here, I want to ask Brion if he could take a couple minutes to answer the "the South started the war" argument, because I had a guest on a couple episodes ago who just casually made that point, and that's what I think most Americans think: the South fired on Fort Sumter.

And by the way, it seems to be – it's probably not just an American thing, but it seems to be common among Americans to think if somebody starts a war – now, I'm not saying the South started it, but even if we concede that, let's say – they seem to think that they deserve whatever happens to them after that. So if you were to say maybe there shouldn't have been the atomic bombings on those two Japanese cities, it would be, Well, they started it. But you weren't raised to believe that about how you would treat people in your own life. Even if somebody called you a name, you wouldn't think you could burn his house down and say, "Well, he started it." There would be some sense that that's not right, especially since the civilians in those cities certainly didn't start anything. They're not responsible. So there's this view that, Look, the South started it, they deserve everything they got, and they certainly don't deserve to be honored.

Now, having said all that, the basic question is: did the South start it, Brion McClanahan?

MCCLANAHAN: No, I would say not. Now, of course, most people don't realize that. They think just because the Confederate battery opened up there in South Carolina on Fort Sumter, that was starting the war. In fact, the war started when Lincoln decided to provision Fort Sumter and refused to negotiate with Southern commissioners who had gone there to purchase the property. So South Carolina secedes, again, through a popularly elected convention by – basically unanimous. They said, We're out of the Union. And that's the same thing that happened when you look at 1776.

So in 1776, when the British had occupied – and allow me to use Massachusetts. When the British were trying to reprovision troops in Boston Harbor or in Boston itself, would the American colonists at that point have said, *Well, you know, we're just going to let them do that because that's their stuff They can do that. They say they own that property right there, so we're just going to let it happen. Forget about defending ourselves at Breed's Hill or Bunker Hill. We're not going to do that. We're not going to try to kick the British out of our territory – this is what they say is ours – because they say that's theirs, so we're just going to be good guys and let them have the fort there?* Of course that's not going to happen.

So South Carolina has said, *This is our sovereign territory, we've seceded from the Union, we're no longer a part of the United States, and by having United States troop*

here, you are actually in an act of war because you're occupying property that's ours. But you know what? We'll be good guys about it and we'll send commissioners to Washington, D.C., and we'll try to buy the stuff from you.

So these guys show up in Washington — and this is documented. William H. Seward, as Secretary of State, refused to meet with these guys. He was actually pretending he was sick. And this was coming essentially from the top down. Lincoln was working with Seward, saying, Don't meet with these guys, we're not going to do anything about that. And so Lincoln starts polling his cabinet as soon as he takes office, within the first week: I want to provision at Fort Sumter. Now, the only person who agreed with him at that point was the postmaster general. I mean, that's a ringing endorsement there. His military advisor, Winfield Scott, said don't do it, you're going to start war. If you provision the fort, that's going to be viewed as an act of aggression, particularly when you send a ship that's armed. And you're basically starting the war at that point. And Lincoln ignored Scott and, in fact, sacked him, said, Well, you don't need to be here anymore. You're fired.

And eventually, by the end of March, the cabinet finally gives in and says, Okay, we'll agree to provision the fort. So Lincoln knew exactly what he was doing. In fact, he wrote the letter that was sent to the governor of South Carolina that said, We're going to provision the fort. He didn't sign it, but he wrote it. And not only that, he had a conversation one of his political advisors after the event. He said, Look, what happened is exactly what I wanted to happen. The South fired on Fort Sumter, and that had the desired effect, which was war.

So who actually started the war? Lincoln did by provisioning the fort. If he had just let it go and said, Okay, we're going to withdraw the troops out of that fort, we're going to negotiate here, he could have stopped the war in 1861, yet he chose not to do so. And I think that's the great tragedy of the entire event, is that this myth of Abraham Lincoln wanting to avoid war, he didn't want to avoid war. He wanted to war. And that's exactly what we got. So South Carolina did fire the first shot, so to speak, but Lincoln actually started the war by sending in the Navy to provision the fort, and I think that's the lost history of the whole event.

WOODS: All right, I'm going to give each of you a chance to say anything you haven't been able to say. Now, I was just seeing footage of the Lee statue being taken down. And I don't know, it just seems to me that if — it's just shocking. Especially because it so obviously points to something well beyond this. Anybody who thinks, Well, we're just very sensitive souls who are deeply offended by anything that smacks of oppression — it's a highly selective offense that they take. They're more offended by this than they are by the actual, ongoing war in Yemen, which none of them even know about. There are actual atrocities going on in the world, do not ruffle their feathers one bit, but a statue that Jimmy Carter had no problem with is suddenly — And once you take this statue down, what's going to be the excuse then? Well, let's see. Our cities are still a basket case. The test scores are still terrible. What's going to be the excuse then? It's annoying to me. All right, Pastor Larry Beane, final words here.

BEANE: Well, again, these monuments were erected really as symbols of honor to ancestors, to veterans who fought in a war, and they really did serve as salve, as sort

of ways to reunite the country. The veterans themselves had joint reunions with the blue and the gray. These men understood that they did their duty. They also understood that the country had to reunite. And the leaders of the South who led the military and government of the Confederacy also became leaders of reunification, and you can imagine how horrible it would have been had they not.

And so the country came together. The Southern history became part of American history. In fact, in 1958, Congress passed a law that says all Confederate states' veterans are to be considered United States veterans in a reunited country. All their graves, all of their symbols are exactly the same as United States veterans. So ripping a monument down to General Lee would be the equivalent of ripping a monument down to General Grant or to any American military leader or even a private soldier that served honorably. There are these kinds of monuments all across the South on courthouses, and they're all targeted now.

But again, that is absolutely true what Brion said, that this is not where it's going to stop, because they want all of American history. They want to rewrite it all. And I think that — I'm hoping that people will finally wake up out of their stupor. You know, the bread and circuses, the idea that we're just going to go around and be entertained all day and start defending their history because if you're a people without a history, you don't have a future. It's another classic line from George Orwell about controlling the past, controlling the present, and controlling the future. And there are different historiographies. There are different perspectives. But you have to tell all the perspectives. You can't just single out one perspective and throw it in the memory hole, to use another Orwellian term.

So I really do hope that this is a catalyst for people to sort of wake up, to sort of educate themselves, and to develop a new sense of tolerance that embraces the idea that yeah, we can disagree, but let people honor their history. Let's — if we don't coexist, we will be in a literal civil war. We will be fighting each other in the streets. And I saw a little glimpse of it in New Orleans. Believe me. It's ugly. You don't want that to happen in your city. You don't want it to happen across the United States. But unless good people stand up and start saying no to this, it will happen, and I pray that we don't have bloodshed and violence.

WOODS: Brion?

MCCLANAHAN: Well, sure, I think your point about selective outrage is spot on. There's actually real slavery going on in the world today and no one talks about that. So we're talking about slavery that ended 150 years ago, but somehow that still hurts my feelings, whereas when every time you go and eat a Hershey bar, those cocoa beans were harvested by slaves. So should we stamp a big trigger warning on the Hershey bar, "Made with slave labor"? Or every time you pick up your iPhone, when the Chinese workers who made that thing are hardly paid anything, they're basically slave labor, should we have a big stamp on the back of the iPhone, "Made with slave labor"? How about all the other images of slavery that are out there around the United States?

Or should we contextualize every monument with some type of — I mean, the Lincoln Memorial. Lincoln never said that white people and black people were equal. Should

be put that on the monument? Should we do this? Should we take down the John Witherspoon monument there at Princeton because John Witherspoon owned slaves? So should these things happen? I guess for me, if that was the case, if we were going to go and we're going to say we're going to go across the board and we're going to put signs up for everything that ever had to do with slavery or "white supremacy," whatever it was. But that's not the case. They're picking the low-hanging fruit. I think they are going to go on to the other things, but it's going to take some time. And it's hypocrisy.

I think at the end of the day, what the left really wants is for American history to start in 1970. Or maybe 1975. Because everything before that was bad, and so if we can just get rid of all of that, somehow we can have this wonderful leftist utopia where all of our views are paramount and anyone that doesn't agree with us can just be pushed aside. If you get off, as you famously say, that 3x5 index card of allowable opinion, I mean, you're going to be shunned, ostracized in society. So I think that's the ultimate goal.

And unfortunately, if a bunch of stupid people – and I hate to say that, but there are stupid people on social media and other places who are completely unaware of anything other than just platitudes and talking points that the left puts out about monument symbols or American history. I actually had somebody the other day who said Andrew Jackson killed people for fun. Now, I have never seen any – Andrew Jackson's not a great guy, but I've never seen anything where he said, Look, I kill people just for fun. So you have these statements being made, and they have no conception of American history, and I think that's where all this is coming from.

And it's going to get worse as these things get taken down or destroyed or real American history is just not even consumed anymore; it's just whatever they can get on social media, on their Twitter account or Facebook or SnapChat, whatever it is. That's what they think American history is. And I think that, as the pastor said, the riots there in New Orleans show that. You have white college students beating up African Americans who are there supporting this monument. So you can't make this stuff up. It's just crazy what's going on. It's completely reversed from what you'd think it would be. And unfortunately, that's the world in which we live.

WOODS: All right, and with that, we're going to wrap up for today. My thanks to Pastor Larry Beane and Brion McClanahan for their contributions. Thanks to both of you, and I'll probably have to have you both on again at some point in the future to talk about this again, but maybe we can – I mean, Lew Rockwell had an interesting post on his blog that you should donate, get a whole lot of private property and have statues galore and have a museum and have it be a truth-telling museum that tells the truth about Lincoln, tells the truth about the real motivations, tells the truth about what the soldiers were actually writing – how about that? – and maybe have the last laugh that way. But anyway, that's for another day. Thanks to both of you gentlemen.

MCCLANAHAN: Thanks a lot, Tom.

BEANE: Thank you so much.