

FAQ Frequently Asked Questions of the Sons of Confederate Veterans

In honor and remembrance of their Confederate ancestors, the following members of the Sons of Confederate Veterans have made contributions of time, energy, research, and support to this project:

John W. Adams, SCV Webmaster, Florida Division
Kenneth E Bachand, 2nd SC Regiment Camp #71, Pickens, SC
Charles Kelly Barrow, John B. Gordon Camp # 1449, Thomaston, GA
Jack Bridwell, SW Georgia Brigade Commander, John K. McNeill Camp #674, Moultrie GA
Greg Briggs Maj. Gen. Bushrod Johnson Camp #1720, Dayton, OH
Allen C. Connel, Walter P. Lane Camp #1745, Orange, TX
Frank Conner, SCV IHQ Camp # 584, Elm Springs, TN
Jim Dean, Gen. John B. Gordon Camp #46 and Roswell Mills Camp #1546, Atlanta, GA
Donald L Futch Berrien Co. Minutemen Camp #1789, Nashville, GA,
Jim Gabel, General J. O. Shelby Camp #191, Sedalia, MO
John Griffin, John K. McNeill Camp #674, Moultrie GA
Bertil Haggman, SCV Europe Camp # 1612
Scott Adam Hardin John Hunt Morgan Camp #1342, Louisville, KY
Calvin E. Johnson Jr., Gen. Patrick R. Cleburne Camp #1361, Kennesaw, GA
P. Charles Lundsford, The Heritage Preservation Association, GA SCV member
Paul Mattoon, Gen. Richard H. Anderson Camp #47, Beaufort, SC
Jim McNabb, W. L. Cabell Camp #1313, Dallas, TX
Robert McNabb, Stuart's Horse Artillery Camp #1784, Floyd, VA
Chris Millirons, Col. Wm. Norris Camp #1398, Gaithersburg, MD
Maury Morris, Commodore Matthew Fontaine Maury Camp #1722, Fredericksburg, VA
Collin Pulley, Urquhart-Gillette Camp #1471, Franklin, VA
Michael A. Purdy Confederate Memorial Camp #1432, Stone Mountain, GA
Steven Shelnut, Capt. Matthew T. Nunnally Camp #1671 Monroe GA
Scott Williams, Sterling Price Camp #145, St. Louis, MO

Part #1: QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SONS OF CONFEDERATE VETERAN ORGANIZATION

- 1.1. What is the mission of the Sons of Confederate Veterans?**
- 1.2. Why honor men who served for the Confederacy, after all weren't they traitors?**
- 1.3. How does one become a member of the SCV?**
- 1.4. How can I find out if an ancestor fought in the war and how do I find out about his service?**
- 1.5. How can I find information about a particular regiment?**
- 1.6. Who was the last surviving Confederate Veteran of the WBTS?**
- 1.7. What violations of heritage are the Sons of Confederate Veterans battling?**
- 1.8 How can I obtain a Headstone Marker for a Confederate Veteran and how does one go about getting a dedication of this marker?**

1.9. Why do grown men, run around pastures and woods playing soldiers? Doesn't this glorify war and suffering?

Part #2: QUESTIONS ABOUT CONFEDERATE SYMBOLS SUCH AS THE FLAG AND THE HERITAGE THEY REPRESENT TO THE SCV.

2.1. Why are the Confederate flags and other symbols of the Confederacy so important in this day and age?

2.2 What are the "Stars and Bars", "Southern Cross" and other Confederate symbols?

2.3. Doesn't it bother you, flying that hateful racist flag? Don't you care how other people feel or that my ancestors were hurt by men flying that flag?

2.3.A-Argument #1 Since the Ku Klux Klan fly the Confederate flag, it has become a symbol of hatred, racism and intolerance. We cannot let our state (or school or whatever) project an image of racism by flying a Confederate battle flag or something that contains the Confederate battle flag.

2.3.B-Argument #2 Confederate symbols represented history at one time, but Confederate-Americans have not acted to protect the sanctity of their symbols from use and abuse by hate groups, thereby Southerners have forfeited their claim to these symbols.

2.3.C-Argument #3 Confederate symbols should not be honored because they are cruel reminders of the by-gone era of slavery and slave-trade.

2.3.D-Argument #4 Confederate symbols should not be tolerated because they represent a government that fought a war to keep blacks in bondage and to preserve the institution of slavery.

2.3.E-Argument #5 Since Confederate symbols were erected and raised in defiance of court ordered integration during the 1950's and 60', they should be removed.

2.3.F-Argument #6 Confederate flags are un-American and they do not represent all Americans.

2.3.G-Argument #7 What's the big deal? It's only a flag. Besides, you have all of those monuments, memorials, markers, etc. to remind you of the Confederacy. Can't we find a compromise?

Part #3: QUESTIONS ABOUT THE HISTORY OF THE WBTS, THE SOUTH AND THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA

3.1. Is it true that many of the history books we may have used in school about the Civil War and Southern Confederate history have been altered or slanted toward the North's point of view?

3.2. If the history books used in schools are unbalanced, then what are some common "Myths" of the South and Confederacy that are presented to the public?

3.3. What did the Confederates feel they were fighting for?

3.4. Why did the South secede in 1861 and did the South have the right to secede from the Union?

- 3.5. When did each state secede?**
- 3.6. Did the U.S. Supreme Court ever rule on the legality of secession?**
- 3.7. Did the South fight to overthrow of the United States Government?**
- 3.8. Was secession the cause of the war and if not then was the cause of the war?**
- 3.9. What were the populations of the states at the outbreak of the war?**
- 3.10. Why did the Confederates start the war by firing the first shots on Fort Sumter?**
- 3.11. Why did Lincoln break the truce at Fort Pickens and precipitate the war by sending troops to Fort Sumter?**
- 3.12. Did Lincoln carry on the war for the purpose of freeing the slaves and weren't the Confederates fighting for slavery or the extension of slavery?**
- 3.13. Was slavery legal according to the Constitution and the laws of the United States in 1860?**
- 3.14. Did the Emancipation Proclamation really free the slaves and did Lincoln have the legal right to declare an end to slavery?**
- 3.15. Did Abraham Lincoln and or any individuals associated with his administration break the laws of the United States and/or violate the Constitution in any way?**
- 3.16. Did General Grant and General Lee both own slaves and did they free them?**
- 3.17. Was there an actual declaration of war?**
- 3.18. Who were the first Confederates appointed as Generals?**
- 3.19. Why were the Prisoner of War Camps like Andersonville in the South so brutal on prisoners?**
- 3.20. How did the prisoner exchanges and paroles work?**
- 3.21. Did blacks and other minorities fight for the Confederacy?**
- 3.22. Did the Confederate states ever try to establish peace with the North?**
- 3.23. Did Lincoln, by his conquest of the South, save the Union and could Lincoln have "saved" the Union by some other method other than war?**
- 3.24. When did the war end?**
- 3.25. Was Jefferson Davis or any other Southern leader guilty of any crime? If so, what were the crimes? If not, why was Davis imprisoned and why were Confederate officials and military officers disfranchised?**
- 3.26. If the rebel states were never considered legally out of the Union, how was Reconstruction justified?**

3.27. Did the occupation forces break the laws of the United States and violate the Constitutional rights of Southern people during Reconstruction?

3.28. Had the South gained its independence, would the CSA have proved a failure?

3.29. What are alternative names referring to the war of 1861-1865?

Part #1: QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SONS OF CONFEDERATE VETERAN ORGANIZATION

1.1. What is the mission of the Sons of Confederate Veterans?

The Sons of Confederate Veterans are organized to honor and memorialize the principles, sacrifices and history of our ancestors. This is our Southern heritage, history and culture which is threatened by some who wish to deny us our rights. Some in this land of the free would enforce their will to eliminate all historical reference to the Confederacy. In doing so they would remove all symbols and monuments to brave men. Revisionist "historians" have distorted our ancestor's lives and we wish the truth to be known. We are an organization based on heritage, not hate.

In 1896, the veterans and progeny of veterans who fought in the War Between the States founded the Sons of Confederate Veterans. The Sons of Confederate Veterans are the direct heir of the United Confederate Veterans, the oldest hereditary organization for male descendants of Confederate Soldiers. The SCV was established as, and remains, an independent organization that supports the protection and preservation of Confederate heritage and the true history of 1861-1865. Current members are descendants of the original defenders of Confederate heritage and are not aligned or affiliated with any other organization other than the Military Order of the Stars and Bars. The SCV is an organization pledged to serve as a historical, patriotic and non-political organization.

The mission of the SCV is best stated with the Charge to the Sons of Confederate Veterans given by Lt. General Stephen Dill Lee Commander General, United Confederate Veterans, in 1906:

"To you, Sons of Confederate Veterans, we submit the vindication of the Cause for which we fought; to your strength will be given the defense of the Confederate soldier's good name, the guardianship of his history, the emulation of his virtues, the perpetuation of those principles he loved and which made him glorious and which you also cherish. Remember it is your duty to see that the true history of the South is presented to future generations"

Sources and Further Reading: Contact the International Headquarters of the SCV at call 1-800-MY SOUTH (697-6884), Confederate Veteran Magazine, PO Box 59, Columbia, TN 38402-0059, Confederate Veteran Magazine-CD ROM, and bound volumes.

1.2. Why honor men who served for the Confederacy, after all weren't they traitors?

First the soldiers of the Confederacy were not traitors. Some historians have branded any man who fought for their home state in 1861-65 as a traitor. This is a liberal Northern point of view, which is quite narrow. If you investigate the reasons that these men fought for their home (farm, county, state), you may find many different answers to the reason why they fought. Most likely you will NOT find the answer of overthrowing the United States Federal Government.

The citizen soldiers who fought for the Confederacy personified the best qualities of America. The preservation of liberty and freedom was the greatest motivating factor in the South's decision to fight the second time for independence. They resigned their bond to a government they found increasing abusing the constitution and the rights of the states for self-determination. They did not seek to destroy the federal government; they chose to withdraw and form their own government that was to be truer to the original constitution. It was the Northern politicians that were traitors to the constitution.

The tenacity with which Confederate soldiers fought underscored their belief in the rights guaranteed them by the constitution. These attributes are the underpinning of our democratic society and represent the foundation on which this nation was originally built.

General Robert E. Lee and other Southern patriots are slandered by some people as traitors. An interesting point to be noted is that William Rawle's book "View of the Constitution" was the primary book used in teaching the Constitution and was used at West Point until the war. General Lee told Bishop Wilmer (of Louisiana) that had it not been for the instruction received from Rawle's text book at West Point he would not have left the United States Army to join the Confederate Army at the breaking out of the War between the States. He chose to serve the Confederate States army and his home state of Virginia in particular based on instruction given at the (Federal) United States Military Academy. Some quotes from Rawle's include:

"The state is the more important entity, to which citizens gave their allegiance, not some Union of states..."

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

"It will depend upon the State itself whether it will continue a member of the Union."

"If the States are interfered with, they may wholly withdraw from the Union." (p. 289-90)

Many of the Southern leaders were trained and educated by the United States Military Academy. It is slander to call them traitors based on the education received by the Federal government.

We honor our ancestors for their courage, love of family, and dedication to principles that many in today's world can not comprehend. These men endured countless hardships for a cause they felt was right. It is for these reasons that we honor our ancestors, lest the country forget their sacrifices.

Sources and Further Reading: View of the Constitution by William Rawle.

1.3. How does one become a member of the SCV?

Membership in the Sons of Confederate Veterans is open to all male descendants of any veteran who served honorably in the Confederate armed forces. Membership can be obtained through either direct or collateral family lines. Kinship to a veteran must be documented genealogically. The minimum age for membership consideration is age 12.

Proof in kinship to a Confederate Soldier can take many forms. The easiest method is to contact the archives of the state from which the soldier fought and obtain a copy of the veteran's military service record. The SCV has a network of genealogists to assist you in tracing your ancestor's Confederate service.

Joining the Sons of Confederate Veterans serves today as a means for a gentleman to honor his Southern Ancestry with memorial, historical and educational activities. If you are a male descendant of an ancestor who

fought for the Confederacy you can call 1-800-MY SOUTH (697-6884) to receive a membership packet. You can also call this number to inquire about the location of an SCV camp (local organization) nearest you. You can use the internet at <http://www.scv.org/>

Sources and Further Reading: Contact the International Headquarters of the SCV at call 1-800-MY SOUTH (697-6884), or PO Box 59, Columbia, TN 38402-0059 or your local SCV Camp.

1.4. How can I find out if an ancestor fought in the war and how do I find out about his service?

We have come up with this "GENERALIZED" outline to help get you started.

Making a connection to a Confederate ancestor is an exciting way to bring history alive for you and your family. So, the first step has got to be learn your family's genealogy.

The basic facts that you will need to know in order to do research on an ancestor are: name, state, regiment, and if possible, the company. Knowing what county your ancestor resided in during the 1860's would also be helpful.

Start your search by talking with your oldest living relatives. See how much information they can give you to build a family tree. Try to develop a family tree that extends back to the mid 1800's. Males aged 16-40 on the 1860 census are prime candidates for CSA service. Begin your search with these men. Later you can check on older or younger men that may have also served.

It is important now to determine the state and county of residence so that Census records from 1860 may be located and reviewed for information. Census records can be found in local libraries, historical and genealogy societies, government archives and at LDS Family History Centers. Some are in books, but more common are microfilms. Paper copies of census records can usually be made. Develop a list of men whom you suspect may have served.

Contact that county to see if they have local historical society. Many counties have historical societies that have already documented local-county men who fought for the Confederacy. Many have "County History Books" which contain their men's involvement with the WBTS. They'll have at least the local companies raised, and sometimes the roster and pension recipient list. Occasionally the battles their local soldiers participated in, their letters home, etc. may also be found.

Confederate regiments were frequently referred to by the commander's name even when in fact they had a numerical designation. You will find that many states have some sort of indexed listings of a soldier. The National Archives has published a "Consolidated Index to Compiled Confederate Service Records" on microfilm which is available in many large historical libraries. The service records themselves are also frequently on microfilm at the library.

All Southern states have archived records of men who fought in the WBTS and also records of men who applied for pensions based on service to the CSA. Once you have a name or list of names you can visit or contact the state archives to view and/or obtain copies of service and/or pension records. Remember that not all records survived the war and the amount and quality of information can vary greatly from state to state.

When you have gathered the basic information, you can also obtain copies of your ancestor's service records by writing to the National Archives and requesting NATF Form 80. The address is:

Military Service Branch (NNMS)
National Archives and Records Administration
7th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20408

You may also request NATF Form 80 by sending e-mail to: inquire@arch2.nara.gov

When you have the forms, fill one out as completely as possible and check "Military Service". It is recommended that you write in red ink next to the veteran's name "Please send complete contents of files". Several weeks after you send in the Form 80, the Archive will return the form indicating what they have located and how much it will cost to copy it, typically about \$10.

Since the National Archive process is so slow, it is recommended to those who chose to use this source that they just check the block to have their credit card charged the \$10.00 fee. This saves the extra postage and added time.

The information from compiled service records from the National Archives may be the same, similar or different than the information from the state archives on the same soldier. The National Archives will not have pension records for Confederate veterans. Only the former Confederate state did award the pensions and their archives will have such records.

NOTE.....

The National Archives will soon discontinue providing paper copies of Confederate service records. The records will be available but you'll have to buy a roll of microfilm for \$34.00, take it to a microfilm machine w/a printer, look up your veteran and print your own copies. The National Archives cites many reasons for this "life altering" decision. They state that they're under funded and often months behind on filing requests for paper records. Also, while the original records are on microfilm, the staff found it easier to make copies from the original papers, causing continual damage to these records to the point that they're no longer in good condition.

This new policy is being undertaken to preserve Confederate service records, Union border & western states, and the United States Colored Troops. As more Union service records are microfilmed, they will also be covered by this policy. If you'd like to send any comments about this policy change, write: CYNTHIA G. FOX, Chief, National Archives & Records Admin. Civil and Old Military Reference Staff (NWCTB), 700 Pennsylvania Ave, NW - Room 13W, Washington, DC 20408

Another option is to order paper copies of individual Confederate records from:

[BROADFOOT PUBLISHING COMPANY](#). They are a private company with years of experience in Confederate and WBTS research. The charge is \$25.00 plus \$5.00 S&H. You can contact them at

Broadfoots Publishing Co.
1907 Buena Vista Circle,
Wilmington, NC 28405,

For each request Broadfoot receives from SCV researchers, a portion of the proceeds will go to the National SCV organization. They can also be reached at 1-800-537-5243.

Another source is the LDS Family History Centers. Most communities will have a Family History Center (genealogy library) within easy driving distance. Check your yellow pages. You can rent an entire roll of microfilm that covers your ancestor's regiment and records. You may view and copy the records at your local FHC. You may find other ancestors on this same roll of film as it was common for family and friends in the same county to join the same regiment. The cost to rent the microfilm is \$3.45 for the initial period (I believe 6 weeks) and \$3.45 for each of the renewals. A second renewal puts the roll in permanent loan status to your local FHC, so for \$10.35 up front you can have the entire roll available for your own use (and anyone else who may be interested now or in the future). To look for a FHC in your state go to <http://www.genhomepage.com/FHC/>

[Washington Genealogy Library, Macon, GA](#): The library has graciously agreed to provide a Georgia CSA soldier service. Please follow the guidelines. Submit only 2 Soldier's names at one time. (Can reorder after

receipt of research) 40 cent per page, plus postage, to be paid upon receiving material. GEORGIA RECORDS ONLY! No email, only written requests sent to:

Genealogy & History Room
Washington Memorial Library
1180 Washington Avenue
Macon, GA 31201

Finally, there are some on-line data bases that allow you, usually for a fee, to search by name and state for ancestors. There are also persons who register with state archives and for hire will conduct searches in genealogy.

[Georgia Civil War Soldiers Index](#): The Georgia Civil War Soldiers Index is an alphabetical listing of most soldiers serving the state of Georgia during the War Between the States. In all, the list contains over 211,000 records, with more to come in the next few months.

[National Park Service, Ancestor Research](#): A page on how to research your Civil War ancestors with further references and suggestions.

[National Park Service Civil War Soldiers Index](#): A site that offers a free search for soldiers by last name, regiment, state, etc.

Sources and further reading:

[Georgia and Confederate Military History](#) : Resources and links to many regimental histories and WBTS sites relating to Georgia and the Confederacy. This is a great source of information regarding regimental work and researchers on the web.

In Search of Confederate Ancestors by J.H. Segars.

Civil War Genealogy by G.K. Schweitzer,

In the Footsteps of the Blue and Gray: A Civil War Research Handbook" by Brian A. Brown (1996)

Tracing Your Civil War Ancestor by B.H. Groene, ISBN 0-345-36192-X; Confederate Research Sources: A Guide to Archive Collections by James C. Neagles, (ISBN 0-916489-11-6,

Military Bibliography of the Civil War, (4 vols) by C.E. Dornbusch;

Broadfoot's: Roster of Confederate Soldiers 1861-1865 16 vols. (1,500,000 Names in One Cumulative Index A cumulative index of all Confederate soldiers as transcribed from the 535 microfilm rolls entitled *Consolidated Index to All Confederate Soldiers*. The Roster provides name, rank, regiment, company and state. Included are all Confederate soldiers from all branches from all Confederate states. Also included will be guidelines and tables for further researching and identifying Confederate soldiers and units);

Roster of the Confederate Soldiers of Georgia 1861-1865, 6 Volumes by Lillian Henderson, (also available on CD-ROM Names, ranks, dates, and status of the soldiers of Georgia, organized by regiments).

1.5. How can I find information about a particular regiment?

The following are sources of information on regiments:

Compendium of the Confederate Armies by Stewart Sifakis, (New York: Facts on File, 1991-1994?), 11 vols. (The volumes in this series are for VA; TN; AL; FL and AR; NC; LA; MS; TX; SC and GA; KY, MD, MO and Indian units; and a volume of Tables of Organizations).

Units of the Confederate States Army by Joseph H. Crute Jr., (Midlothian, VA: Derwent Books, 1987), (Crute's work is not quite as comprehensive as Sifakis', but it has the advantage of having everything in one volume).

Military Bibliography of the Civil War by C.E. Dornbusch, 4 Vols. (bibliography of regimental histories, both North and South). Vol. II, contains listings of publications, i.e. books, as well as articles, concerning Confederate units.

Confederate Military History, 1899 by the Confederate Publishing Company 19 volumes by state, 6,100 Biographical Sketches, Edited by Gen. Clement A. Evans of Georgia; (This set was written by distinguished men of the South, producing a work which truly portrays the times and issues of the Confederacy. Each state being treated in a separate history allows space for details concerning its peculiar story, its own devotion, its own heroes, and its, battlefields with information about regiments that formed from that state. The military history of each Confederate state with eye-witness battle accounts, first-hand narratives, maps, military organizational charts and thousands of detailed biographical sketches. These volumes contain information on each unit; where, when, and by whom the unit was formed. There are some Rosters. There are two General Subject volumes, Maryland & West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama & Mississippi, Kentucky & Missouri, Louisiana & Arkansas, and Texas & Florida volumes. It is now also available on CD-ROM.

Tennesseans in the Civil War is a two-volume set which has essentially a Tennessee State Index to Complied Service Records for both Confederate and Union veterans. Vol. 1 has unit histories.

Confederate Research Center: At Hill College there is a research center that maintains files that includes regimental histories. You can contact the center at (817)-582-2555 or write PO Box 619, Hillsboro, TX 76645.

In addition many "County History Books" contains their men's involvement with the WBTS. They'll have at least the local companies raised, sometimes the roster and pension recipient list. Occasionally the battles their local soldiers participated in, their letters home, etc. Contact the county of origin. Ask for contacts for the county historical society or local library or local UDC or SCV organizations.

Finally many books on individual regiments, brigades, divisions, and corps have been written. A search on the internet or in your local library or local book store may turn up works that will cover the history of the specific regiments of interest.

On the internet:

There are many researchers that have posted regimental histories. Use search engines to match up with regiments of interest. In particular here are some sites to help you in your research:

[Georgia and Confederate Military History](#) : Resources and links to many regimental histories and WBTS sites relating to Georgia and the Confederacy. This is a great source of information regarding regimental work and researchers on the web.

Confederate Regimental Histories: <http://www.tarleton.edu/~kjones/confeds.html>,

<http://www.tarleton.edu/~kjones/A-g.html#GA-Inf>

Regiments of Georgia & South Carolina: <http://www.researchonline.net/gacw/>

Infantry sites and book lists by CSA state:

Alabama <http://www.erols.com/jreb/alabama.html>, and
<http://www.researchonline.net/alcw/page2.htm>

Arkansas <http://www.erols.com/jreb/arkansas.html> and
<http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Lair/3680/cw/cw-ar.html>

Florida <http://www.erols.com/jreb/florida.html> and
<http://www.researchonline.net/cwsites.htm>

Georgia <http://www.erols.com/jreb/georgia.html>

Kentucky (CSA) <http://www.erols.com/jreb/kentucky.html> and
<http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Lair/3680/cw/cw-ky.html>

Louisiana <http://www.erols.com/jreb/louisiana.html> and
<http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Lair/3680/cw/cw-la.html>

Mississippi <http://www.erols.com/jreb/mississippi.html> and
<http://www.researchonline.net/mscw/msstart.htm>

Missouri <http://users.erols.com/jreb/missouri.html> and
<http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Lair/3680/cw/cw-la.html>

North Carolina <http://www.erols.com/jreb/northcarolina.html> and
<http://www.researchonline.net/nccw/ncunits.htm>

South Carolina: <http://www.erols.com/jreb/southcarolina.html> and
<http://www.researchonline.net/sccw/scunits.htm>

Tennessee: <http://www.erols.com/jreb/tennessee.html> and
<http://www.researchonline.net/tncw/page2.htm>

Texas: <http://www.erols.com/jreb/texas.html> and
<http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Lair/3680/cw/cw-tx.html>

Virginia: <http://www.erols.com/jreb/va.html> and
<http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Lair/3680/cw/cw-va.html>

Military History Institute: <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usamhi/Bibliographies/CivilWar/CWUnits/>

[National Park Service](#): Sources of Confederate Regimental Histories.

Regiments of the Confederate Army: <http://www.webring.org/cgi-bin/webring?ring=csregiment&list>

WBTS Researchers list CSA A-M <http://sunsite.utk.edu/civil-war/unit4.html>

WBTS Researches List CSA N-V <http://sunsite.utk.edu/civil-war/unit5.html>

You can also try the "OR's" Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies. It is suggested that you use the index or obtain the CD-ROM that allows searches. This may be your only alternative for particularly obscure units. The index lists the regiments by state. It is a good idea to check the index for the name of the regiment's commander and perhaps for the brigade commander.

At some point it will be helpful to learn of the regiment's place in the army structure. In other words which brigade, division, corps it was attached to. Knowing other regiments in the same brigade can give you a picture of what the regiment may have experienced. Histories of battles or campaigns may not mention every regiment, but they may mention the brigade or division the regiment is in.

While it is not possible to answer every specific question that you might have here on this web page, it is hoped that we have helped you to get started in this exciting, honorable, and worthy cause. Please feel free to contact us for further clarification and assistance. Email to [John K. McNeill SCV Camp, Moultrie, GA.](mailto:John.K.McNeill@SCV.org)

1.6. Who was the last surviving Confederate Veteran of the WBTS?

The last authenticated veteran of the Confederate army was Pleasant Crump of the 10th Alabama Volunteer Infantry, who died on 31 Dec 1951. Previous claims to be the last veteran of the Confederate army were made for Walter Washington Williams (died 19 Dec 1959) of Texas and for John Salling (died 19 Mar 1959) of Virginia. However, their claims must be rejected, since among other reasons, census records indicated that, in 1860, Williams was only 5 years old and Salling was just 2 years old.

Sources and further reading: William Marvel in "Blue and Gray", Feb 1991; The Civil War Notebook, by A.A. Nofi; New York Times article, Dec. 19, 1959; Civil War Dictionary, by M.M. Boatner.

1.7. What violations of heritage are the Sons of Confederate Veterans battling?

In General, the SCV fights against attacks, falsifications, revisionism, stereotypes and attempts to remove all things Confederate from the public.

In each issue of the Confederate Veteran (the bimonthly publication of the SCV), a section is devoted to heritage promotion and to fighting heritage violations. This section is called "Forwarding the Colors, a report from the SCV Heritage Committee". Violations have ranged from items such as vandalism of Confederate soldier's graves, vandalism to Confederate monuments, removal of Confederate flags that have flown over graves of Confederate veterans, attacks (physical, verbal, legal) on citizens who choose to promote Confederate history and honor their ancestors, denial of citizens and students from displaying anything Confederate on their person, vehicles, etc, banning of the playing of Dixie at school events, challenging the media who defame our ancestors by publishing false information, or portraying our ancestors or their symbols in a demeaning manner, stereotyping of the Southern people as racist and bigoted, removal of "rebel" as school and college mascots, just to name a few.

As descendants of these men, it is our duty to stand up for their place in history and defend their good name.

Sources and Further Reading: Contact the International Headquarters of the SCV at call 1-800-MY SOUTH (697-6884), or PO Box 59, Columbia, TN 38402-0059 or your local SCV Camp.

1.8. How can I obtain a Headstone Marker for a Confederate Veteran and how does one go about getting a dedication of this marker?

The Veterans Administration will provide a marker for your Confederate Veteran ancestor at no expense but you must apply for the marker. The marker can be a upright granite or marble headstone, a bronze flat marker, a bronze niche, or a flat granite or marble stone, depending on your choice.

The form you need, for ordering, is VA Form 40-1330 and it can be obtained from a local Veterans Administration Office. Many local funeral homes also have this form available. You can also call 1-800-827-1000 to request a form, or write

**Office of Memorial Programs (403A),
Department of Veterans Affairs,
810 Vermont Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20420-0001.**

A copy of the form can also be downloaded from www.va.gov/benefits.htm

The applicant may be anyone having knowledge of the deceased. The applicant must certify that the grave is unmarked or marked inappropriately (such as errors in the marker, damage to the marker, or deterioration of the marker which make it difficult to identify the subject in the grave) and a Government headstone or marker is preferred to a privately purchased headstone or marker. This restriction also applies for companion markers, which identify two or more decedents buried, or to be buried, in the same or adjoining graves. A grave is considered marked if a monument displays the decedent's name and date of birth and/or death, even though the veteran's military data is not shown.

Any deceased veteran discharged under conditions other than dishonorable is eligible and that includes Confederate Veterans of the War Between the States. To expedite processing, attach a copy of the veteran's proof of service. The stone or marker will be shipped within 70 days, after the VA receives the fully completed application with correct information. The stone or marker will be shipped to the consignee designated on Form 40-1330 at no cost. All costs for pick up and installation must be paid from private funds.

Gravestone Restoration: www.geocities.com/scvinfo/restoration.html learn how to properly clean and care for old headstones by visiting this web site.

In addition to honor our Confederate ancestors an SCV Confederate Cross of Honor marker may be purchased. You may go to www.scv674.org/csacross.htm to view sketches and get further information.

The SCV Confederate Cross of Honor is a visible reminder to all that, "Here lies a Southern Hero"! Confederate crosses are of the cross pattee design, 11" x 11" with an 18" steel shaft for mounting. All are powder coated to preserve the beauty of this wonderful monument to our resting heroes and ancestors. Documented PROOF of the soldier's serving honorably in the CSA must be presented by all purchasers. Copies of Military or Pension records can verify this.

Crosses can be obtained from some local SCV camps or you send a check for \$55 (includes shipping) to the:

**John K. McNeill SCV Camp #674,
P.O. Box 1353,
Moultrie, GA 31776.**

When contacting an SCV Camp, please allow them to record some grave information for future generations. Please include the following: Soldier's Name, Rank, Unit, Location of Grave and any other pertinent information on the soldier). Please contact us if you have any questions on how to document this service.

To have a dedication of the marker, or a memorial service, contact an SCV camp in the area where the grave is located. Most camps will be happy to help you plan and put on a dedication ceremony to honor a Confederate hero. If you need help in locating a local camp, contact the IHQ, SCV at 1-800-MY SOUTH (697-6884), or PO Box 59, Columbia, TN 38402-0059 or the internet at <http://www.scv.org/>

1.9. Why do grown men, run around pastures and woods playing soldiers? Doesn't this glorify war and suffering?

These men are called reenactors. They are for the most part not playing soldier, but demonstrating a living history project. They are trying to recreate a time in history that will be lost and which some are trying to eliminate. The purpose is not to glorify suffering, but to show today's people what it was like to live and perhaps die in the 1860's. Types of events sponsored by reenactors include:

Educational Programs for schools and civic groups, in which the WBTS and display reenacting equipment is discussed.

Living History Encampments for the general public, where historical camps are set up, demonstrations on the lifestyles and folkways of the era are presented and displays of reenacting equipment are shown. Reenactors often discuss how the WBTS affected the lives of the combatants, their families, and the nation.

Battle Reenactments-At times the battle reenactment is a largest event open to the general public. It is meant to demonstrate the maneuvers and tactics used by the opposing armies on the field of battle. Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, and Engineers can be utilized in scenario.

A graphic field hospital demonstration may follow a battle.

Revival tent and period church services are sometimes presented.

Cooking and food samples of the troops may be available.

19th Century Skill competitions, which can be of warfare such as accuracy with firing a musket or revolver, Cavalry maneuvers, artillery actions, or other competitions such as cooking, uniform representation, music, others.

Civilian encampments which demonstrate what a citizen's life might have been like in the 1860's.

The SCV it's self does not sponsor reenactors or reenactments, but many SCV members to participate in living history, reenacting at events, performing as honor guards for grave and headstone memorial services. Many SCV members who also choose to be reenactors do so in honor of an ancestor who served and may have died for the Confederacy. It gives a descendant a sample of what life was like for their ancestor.

Reenactors are involved in a non-profit organizations committed to education of the public on the WBTS. Too much history these days seems to be viewed only with a 1990's outlook. The living historians or reenactors try to put people back into the mind set of a mid 1800's civilization. Remember events in history took place in perspective of the times in which they happened. People of the 1860's did not view it as how their life might be judged 150 years later.

Many of the reenactors are excellent research historians and much could be learned by attending an event, viewing the program and asking questions. Most reenactors go to great personal expense and sacrifice to demonstrate to the public what accurate history is about.

By the way there are reenactors throughout the country and world that reenact many periods of history, not just WBTS area including: the Roman Empire, Middle Ages, Revolutionary war, Lewis & Clark era, Mountain man/fur traders, Mexican War, Oregon Trail, Indian Wars, Spanish American War, WWI just to name a few. Not all are military in nature. Many are civilian, medical, industrial, reenactments.

There are many living history and reenacting groups found through out the United States. There are many sites on the internet that can give you further contacts. Someone serious about history can learn much from reenactors.

Sources and further reading: Reliving the Civil War, A Reenactors Handbook by R. Lee Hadden, Stackpole Books, 5067 Ritter Road, Mechanicsburg, PA 17055 (1996), Camp Chase Gazette, The Voice of Civil War

Reenacting, PO Box 707, Marietta, OH 45750, The Citizens' Companion the Voice of Citizens Reenacting, PO Box 707, Marietta, OH 45750

Internet: Cryders Civil War Reenacting pages: <http://marin.org/npo/cwar/home/>, <http://midas.org/npo/cwar/home/direct.htm>, <http://reenact.org/home/index.html>, <http://marin.org/npo/cwar/>

Part #2: QUESTIONS ABOUT CONFEDERATE SYMBOLS SUCH AS THE FLAG AND THE HERITAGE THEY REPRESENT TO THE SCV.

2.1. Why are the Confederate flags and other symbols of the Confederacy so important in this day and age?

They are symbols that our ancestors fought, sacrificed and died for. They allow us to share their history and meaning with our children and with persons interested in historical research. There are groups in America who would deny us the right to remember, explain, or display any symbols of the Confederacy. It is a sad fact that some people and groups have taken up the cause to re-write history and erase anything that dealt with the people of the Confederacy. Too many persons appear to make judgments on the people of the 1860's with only their current 1990's perspective. Regardless of what some people may claim about the symbols they are our heritage and have nothing to do with hate. They are our history and our culture, which in a free society, we are allowed to have. The symbols go deep into our family roots and unite us as a Southern people. Family unity and responsibility should be a greater point for the social reformers to focus on rather than trying to defame our ancestors. Perhaps these groups have much to learn from our heritage which is the Confederate States of America and the patriots that died to protect their family.

Sources and Further Reading:

2.2. What are the "Stars and Bars", "Southern Cross" and other Confederate symbols?

The "Stars and Bars" IS NOT the familiar rectangle "rebel" flag one sees adorning license plates and often carried, that is the CS Naval Jack, based on the CS battle flag. The Stars and Bars was actually the First National Flag of the Confederacy, where as the "Southern Cross" is actually the Confederate battle flag, a military flag.

NOTE: The following information is provided as a general guide to the flags of the Confederate States of America. There were many variations in the flags and particularly the battle flags. This page will give you good background information on the CSA flags but can not in the space here cover all the variations, materials, colors, and times of service. There are many works that focus just on the battle flag variations.

Flags of the Confederate States of America: National flags are those that identify a nation. These flags were very important and a matter of great pride to those citizens where in the Confederate States of America. It is also a matter of great pride for their ancestors as part of their heritage and history. For the first 24 days, the Confederate government had no officially approved flag. The capitol building in Montgomery, Alabama flew the State flag of Alabama. When Jefferson Davis was inaugurated as President of the Confederacy, the inaugural parade was led by a company of infantry carrying the State flag of Georgia.

A committee on Flag and Seal was appointed by the Provisional Congress, the chairman of the committee was William P. Miles of South Carolina. Hundreds of flag designs were received from all over the new nation and from the now foreign country of the United States. There was an unwritten deadline for a flag design of 4

March 1861 because that was the day Lincoln was to be inaugurated president of the United States. On that date the Confederate States were determined to fly a flag to express their own sovereignty.

There were 3 major "official" flags of the Confederate nation from 1861 to 1965, but many people only know of the "Battle Flag", which was not a national flag at all.

Bonnie Blue Flag: On 9 January 1861 the Convention of the People of Mississippi adopted an Ordinance of Secession and a large blue flag with a single white star was raised over the capital building in Jackson. Although the Confederate government did not adopt it, the people did. Lone star flags, in one form or another, were adopted in five of the Confederate States that adopted new flags in 1861.

The First National "The Stars and Bars" (4 March 1861-1 May 1863) On the morning of 4 March 1861 large models of the proposed flags were hung on the walls of the Congressional chamber. The First National Flag "The Stars and Bars" was adopted on the same day it was to be raised over the capitol at Montgomery. A flag made of soft merino wool was completed within two hours of it's adoption by the Congress. The very first flag of the Confederate States of America was raised by Miss Letitia Christian Tyler, grand- daughter of President John Tyler. Six weeks later it was flying over Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor. The Original First National Flag of the Confederacy can still be seen today at Beauvoir, which is the Jefferson Davis Memorial and Shrine, located in Biloxi, Mississippi, on the Gulf Coast Highway. It had 7 stars in a circle on a blue field, to represent the 7 states of the CSA Later versions would have 11 stars and then eventually 13 stars as other states joined the Confederacy. The bars consisted of two red and one white. In their hurry to adopt a flag and have it ready the same afternoon, the Congress forgot to enact a flag law. Nowhere in the statute books of the Confederate States is a Flag Act of 1861. In official use for over two years, the Stars and Bars was never established as the Confederate Flag by the laws of the land. The Stars and Bars flag was replaced in 1863 by the "Stainless Banner"

The Second National Flag "The Stainless Banner" (1 May 1863-4 March 1865) William Porcher Miles, chairman of the Flag and Seal Committee, was not satisfied with the "Stars and Bars" as the Confederate National Flag. He wanted to get away from any flag that resembled the United States flag.

The mood of the Confederate people and their representatives in Congress, was to let the "Stars and Bars" be the National Flag. As the war started to drag on, the sentimental feelings for the "Stars and Bars" began to fade away. More and more Confederate citizens came to see the flag of the United States as a symbol of oppression and imperialistic aggression.

In February 1862 the First Congress of the Confederate States assembled in Richmond. The new members of Congress reflected the changing feelings of the people toward the flag. One of the first actions of the new Congress was to appoint a new Joint Committee on Flag and Seal with instructions to consider and propose a new Confederate Flag.

On 19 April 1862 the committee submitted it's report to both Houses of Congress. While the debate over a new National Flag for the Confederate States of American was going on, the Army of Northern Virginia had been engaged in some battles under it's Battle Flag and a lot of blood was spilled. Because of these actions some members of Congress, and the citizens of the Confederacy, wanted the Battle Flag incorporated into the National Flag as a way of paying respect to the Confederate Soldiers that were wounded and killed fighting for the new nation's freedom and independence.

Senate Bill No. 132 was put into formal language by Representative Peter W. Gray of Houston, Texas. This bill was passed on to the senate and passed with very little debate. Later that same day President Davis signed the bill and gave the new flag to the Confederate States of America. The new flag became official on the 1st of May 1863.

This second National Confederate Flag was referred to as the "Stainless Banner" because of it's pure white field, and was said to represent the purity of the cause which it represented. One of the first uses for the new flag was to drape the coffin of General Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson. General Jackson died on the 10th of May and he lay in state in the Confederate House of Representatives on 12 May 1863. By the order of President Davis, his coffin was draped with the first of the new National Confederate flags to be manufactured.

This very first "Stainless Banner" is now on display in the Museum of the Confederacy in Richmond. Because of its use on General Jackson's coffin the new flag is at times referred to as the "Jackson Flag". The Second National Flag was replaced by the Third National Flag in 1865.

Third National Flag (4 March 1865-Present) In 1863 congress had argued that "the white flag would not be taken for a flag of truce as it was patterned after the old French Bourbon Flag", but the flag had been considered by many as looking too much like a flag of truce. As a result the flag was often manufactured with a shorter fly length in order to minimize the white field.

A new flag bill was introduced to the Confederate States Senate on 13 December 1864. Senator Thomas J. Semmes of Louisiana introduced Senate Bill No 137 with the statement that "naval officers objected to the present flag, that in a calm looked like a flag of truce". Much consideration followed the introduction of this bill, including consultations with high ranking officers of both the Confederate navy and army. The senate passed bill 137 on 5 February 1865 on to the house which also passed it on 27 February 1865. It was signed into law by President Davis on 4 March 1865.

Unlike existing war flags of the earlier patterns, there are very few survivors of the 1865 version as it was approved so late in the war. Many of the ones that do exist are actually the 1863 Stainless Banner with the fly shortened and a red bar added to the flag.

CSA Battle Flag "The Southern Cross" (November 1861-present) Flags that are used by troops in the field are known as "Battle Flags". The use of distinctive battle flags by combat units can be traced back to the middle ages in Europe and even to Roman legions. Flags that are used in battle are important because they let the battlefield commanders know what troops are where.

At the first great battle of Manassas 21 July 1861 General Joseph E Johnston had overall command of the Army of Northern Virginia, but the greatest part of the actual planning and field operations were conducted by General P.G.T. Beauregard. On several occasions during the fighting, confusion was caused by the inability of commanders to distinguish their troops from that of the enemy. There were too many similarities in uniforms and the Confederate stars and bars (1st national flag) looked similar to the Union Stars and Stripes, add this to the dust and smoke of battle, it combined into a confusing battle to fight or command.

General Beauregard complained to Johnston, so the commanding General ordered the troops to use their state flags for recognition. But there were not enough of these state flags for all the regiments. General Beauregard asked Congress to change the 1st National Flag. Instead Congressman Miles suggested that the Army adopt a distinctive battle flag for its own use. The design that Miles urged the army to use was one that he had originally submitted to be the national flag of the confederacy, but was rejected. The Generals liked the Red Flag, with the blue cross and white stars, but felt a square flag would be more convenient for military use.

In November 1861 the first battle flags were issued to regiments. This flag is referred to as the "Southern Cross". It had 11 stars for the states currently in the CSA and one for Missouri (for a total of 12), which had seceded, but was not yet admitted to the Confederacy.

The first flags were made of silk, but which did not last very long exposed to the harsh weather conditions the army had to live in. Army of Northern Virginia (ANV) silk flags were used into 1863 by some units. Two were lost at Gettysburg for example. Their borders were yellow and the hoist edge a blue sleeve. The next flag issue was the ANV cotton flags, also of 12 stars. These were made in April, 1862 and given to three brigades as a stop gap measure.

The next issue of these flags in 1862 were made of heavy English wool bunting. They would now proclaim 13 stars. These first wool bunting flags were made in May 1862, Second Wool bunting flags in June (both with orange borders) and Third Wool bunting flags (with white borders for the first time) from July 1862 until May 1864. Fourth Wool bunting flags (these were the only ones that were 51 inches square) came in June 1864 with later bunting issues beginning in October through March 1865. The ANV flew 9 variants of their battle flag during the war.

The some regimental flags would have the regimental designation painted in gold on the blue cross above and below the central star. The regimental battle honors were painted in blue on the red field of the flag. Further researchers point out that most ANV flags were unmarked by honors or unit designations. Only those units in the 1863 divisions of D.H. Hill, A.P. Hill and Ed Johnson (issued April, May and September 1863

respectively) had flags done with the gold letters over the center stars and blue honors on the field. Pickett's Division received flags in June 1863 with white painted unit designations on their fields. Some brigades, like Cox's NC Brigade, Kershaw's SC Brigade and a few others had their own flags done in particular manners, most with honors only, either painted on the flag in white or blue letters or sewn on strips.

Battle Flags used on land by Confederate troops were usually in three sizes:

INFANTRY FLAG: This flag was the largest size a 48 inches to a square side.

ARTILLERY FLAG: This flag was the middle size. 36 inches to a square side

CAVALRY FLAG: This flag was the smallest size. 30 inches to a square side

NOTES: These measurements include the borders which were folded over the exterior of the field of the flag. In May through September, 1863 the infantry flags were only about 45 inches square to save scarce imported bunting. Also in many cases the artillery used infantry sized flags.

The different sizes of the flags made it easier for the commanders to not only tell what combat unit was where, but it also told the commander what type of unit it was. The Battle Flag was always in front of the regiment. This way the soldiers in the regiment always knew where they were to be. Should a soldier ever be separated from his unit, all he had to do was look for his regiment's flag.

It was indeed the intent of Generals Beauregard and Johnston to permeate the ANV flag all over the South in the field armies but both men met resistance from commands in other areas that had already created their own distinctive battle flags and so their efforts were mixed in terms of results.

The Armies of Tennessee, Mississippi, the states departments, and the Trans-Mississippi Department all had variations on size, shape color and markings on its battle flags. Many CSA battle flags were created by other unit commanders for the same reasons the ANV flag was, to settle battlefield confusion. Gen. Polk created his flag (a St. George's cross) in 2 versions for his corps (and a sub-unit, Dea's Alabama Brigade created flags similar but based more on French imperial flags); Gen. Hardee's corps used the famous "moon" flag of a white device (circle, oval or rectilinear, depending on when issued) on a blue field (the flag was actually invented by Gen. Buckner); Gen. Bragg's Corps used flags inspired by the ANV flag but with 12 six-pointed stars on it; Breckenridge's Corps used First Nationals well into 1863 as their battle flags; Bowen's Missouri Division used blue flags with red borders and a white Latin cross on it; Van Dorn's Army of the West used a Middle Eastern looking flag with a red field, either yellow or white stars and borders.

As for flags inspired by the ANV flag, The Army of Tennessee (AOT) flag of 1864 was supposed to be square also like the ANV (as per Johnston's orders to the Atlanta Depot) but the depot goofed and they came back rectangular. The flags of the Department of Alabama, Mississippi & East Louisiana (the command unit for Polk's Army of Mississippi, Forrest's Cavalry Corps and others) were also slightly rectangular but with only 12 stars. These were made in Mobile by contractors Jackson Belknap and to a lesser extent James Cameron. Neither flag had colored borders. The flags of the Department of South Carolina, Florida and Georgia were also ANV flag inspired but were built differently. These square flags were made by the Charleston Depot and began showing up in April 1863. They can be discerned easily from ANV flags by their wider cross and colored pole sleeves of red or blue (ANV flags were tied to the poles).

Other ANV inspired flags, both square and rectangular appeared in ad hoc situations in the west and Trans-Mississippi theaters. The most unique were the flags of Gen. Walker's Texas Division issued in 1864. These were square, blue flags with red St. Andrews crosses and 13 stars. Other battle flags bore no resemblance to anything else previously known but contained usually a device that was prominent to the troops that carried them.

NOTE: All three national flags also served as unit battle flags, particularly in the West and Trans- Mississippi theaters. The First National flag, despite being changed officially in May 1863, was actually the only CS flag pattern that saw battle use from the beginning to the end of the war! Examples were taken at Appomattox, in North Carolina, and in battles of the 1864 campaigns.

Naval Jacks- The jack was flown from a "jackstaff" located on the bow of a ship, and was only flown when the ship was in port. The Naval Jack denoted the ship flying it was a ship of war.

First Confederate Naval Jack (4 March 1861-26 May 1863) had a blue field with a circle of 11 stars in the center.

Second Confederate Naval Jack (27 May 1863-present)The naval regulations of 1863 adopted the new National Ensign and also adopted a new Naval Jack. It was to be the same as the union of the new National ensign except it's length was to be one and a half times it's width. The Flag Act of 1865 didn't change the basic design of the

National flag's canton, the jack of 1863 would have remained the Naval Jack after 1865. The Naval jack of 1863 is very much like the Battle Flag of the Army of Tennessee.

Sources and further reading: Flags of the Confederacy, Cannon, Devereaux D. Pelican Publishing 1994, Internet: <http://members.xoom.com/JKMcNeillSCVcamp/Flags.htm>

2.3. Doesn't it bother you, flying that hateful racist flag? Don't you care how other people feel or that my ancestors were hurt by men flying that flag?

The flags of the Confederacy represented the Southern people, their nation, and their armies. There was no hate associated or intended with the making or displaying of the Confederate symbols of 1861-1865. Those symbols represent our ancestors and their struggles and sacrifices. They are a part of this countries history. Acts of war in 1861-1865 killed and hurt many people. The SCV deplors the use of these symbols by extremists and hate groups (such as white supremacist, skinhead, Neo-Nazi, KKK) which have no right to use the often seen Confederate Naval Jack of 1863, or any other sign, symbol, or token of the Southern Confederacy of 1861-1865. Acts of hate, in which our symbols are used, are an inappropriate condemnation of our heritage and culture.

If you research closely you will see that these extremist groups fly and also defame the fifty-star American Flag, not to mention the flag of the Christian Churches of the world, with their white supremacist, racist bigoted, hate rhetoric. There is no demonstration to ban those flags, even when used by the hate groups. The Sons of Confederate Veterans zealously, condemn, denounce, all of these hate group for the misuse and degradation of any and all of the symbols of the Southern Confederacy 1861-1865. THE SCV also denounces any organized group that oppose our history and symbols for their own misinformed campaigns, self promotions, or down right ignorance of history. Remember, these Confederate symbols are stained with the blood of our Southern patriot ancestors.

Many emotionalized attacks on our Confederate images have been presented. These shallow anti-Confederate arguments lack substance when studied. Again using 1990's perspectives to judge actions of the 1860's. This thought process is doomed to failure in a thinking society.

The following (Arguments 2.3.A to 2.3. G) are shared from the Heritage Preservation Association (HPA). The Heritage Preservation Association has organized counter attack arguments against those out to destroy Southern culture and its symbols. Some border on absurd and others appear, on the surface, to have merit unless you take a minute to study a little deeper. The most common arguments given for removing, changing or censoring a Confederate symbols are here presented. Immediately following each argument, is a logical response that successfully refutes the argument, demonstrating why it usually fails in its mission to convince.

(Note: The following arguments are copyrighted by the HPA 1996-1997. All Rights Reserved)

2.3.A-Argument #1 " Since the Ku Klux Klan fly the Confederate flag, it has become a symbol of hatred, racism and intolerance. We cannot let our state (or school or whatever) project an image of racism by flying a Confederate battle flag or something that contains the Confederate battle flag."

First, many in the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) do not fly the Confederate battle flag. In fact, only a small number actually use a Confederate flag. However, we are told that KKK bylaws require the U.S. flag and the Christian flag to be present at every event. Most people are not aware that the largest KKK membership is in the North and it has been that way since the early 1900s. Mr. Boyd Lewis, a Klan expert who spoke at DeKalb College in Atlanta, states that at the height of Klan power, "Indiana had the largest Klan population with over 2 million members between 1915-1916," (71). Most KKK groups prefer to use a U.S. flag or a Christian flag, yet oddly enough, no one is calling for the permanent censorship of those symbols!

Americans have been programmed, by the liberal media, into believing that the KKK is only a "Southern Thing" and that only Southern symbols must pay for the Klan's transgressions. A free-lance photographer and friend once related with frustration at how the newspapers never buy or use his photographs if they show the Klan carrying a U.S. flag. "They only want to use the photographs that show a Confederate flag." Based on the magnitude of media bias that would have us believe the Confederate flag and the Klan go hand-in-hand, although incorrect, it is understandable why people have the perceptions they do. However, those perceptions are based on false information, and it is the perception that must be changed, not the symbol that has been victimized by the perception.

At one time, man had the perception that the earth was flat. This was because his eyes were giving his brain false information, which was also fed by the many stories told and retold by sailors at sea. However, once we acquired accurate geographical information, we were forced to change our perception and accept the fact that the earth was not flat, but round. We must likewise change our false perceptions of Confederate symbols as being symbols of the Klan, when in truth, they are not.

Second, the use of a symbol by a person or group, does not convey the characteristics of that person or group to that symbol. For example, Malcolm X and the nation of Islam were indisputably, the black equivalent of David Duke and the Klan. Both lived and preached racial hatred. Both claimed to have found religion and converted. If the Confederate flag symbolizes the Klan's white racism against blacks, then we must interpret the "X" of Malcolm X, emblazoned on the clothes of many black consumers, as being symbolic of Malcolm X's black racism

2.3.B-Argument #2 "Confederate symbols represented history at one time, but Confederate-Americans have not acted to protect the sanctity of their symbols from use and abuse by hate groups, thereby Southerners have forfeited their claim to these symbols."

Southerners never willingly gave up their symbols 130 years ago and the same is true today. The abduction of our symbols by another group, does not constitute forfeiture, especially when there is no recourse for preventing their use by another group. Ironically, the same liberals who burn and abuse the U.S. flag and Confederate flags, are the same ones who work to overthrow the laws that are designed to protect those symbols from abuse. Even when the flag being abused is the U.S. flag, the courts have ruled that laws against such abuse are unconstitutional. If there is no recourse for protecting the U.S. flag from abuse by hate groups, how can any flag be protected? If the Nation of Islam marches with the black liberation flag, should we assume that this flag now represents the same racism and anti-Semitism espoused by this "hate group"?

2.3.C-Argument #3 "Confederate symbols should not be honored because they are cruel reminders of the by-gone era of slavery and slave-trade."

Slavery was a legal institution in this country for over 200 years. Africans were brought here by northern slave traders to be used in northern industry, long before the antebellum South or the Confederacy ever existed. The

first American colony to legalize slavery was Massachusetts in 1641, only 17 years after the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. "The slave trade became very profitable to the shipping colonies and Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut and New Hampshire had many ships in the triangular trade," (72). "The moral argument against slavery arose early in the New England shipping colonies but it could not withstand the profits of the trade and soon died out." (73).

Thomas Jefferson condemned the slave trade in the original draft of the Declaration of Independence, but the New England slave traders lobbied to have the clause stricken. In a short eleven year period from 1755 to 1766, no fewer than 23,000 slaves landed in Massachusetts. By 1787, Rhode Island had taken first place in the slave trade to be unseated later by New York. Before long, millions of slaves would be brought to America by way of 'northern' slave ships. After all, there were no Southern slave ships involved in the triangular slave trade, it was simply too cruel.

William P. Cheshire, the senior editorial columnist for the Arizona Republic recently noted, the New England Yankee who brought slaves to America, "were interested in getting money, not in helping their cargo make a fresh start in the New World." He adds that northern slave ownership "isn't widely known - American textbooks tend to be printed in Boston, not Atlanta - but early New Englanders not only sold blacks to Southern planters but also kept slaves for themselves as well as enslaving the local Indian population," (74).

Slavery did not appear in the South until northern settlers began to migrate South, bringing with them their slaves. It was soon discovered that while slaves were not suited to the harsh climate and working conditions of the north, they were ideal sources of cheap labor for the newly flourishing economy of the agricultural South. Of the 9.5 million slaves brought to the Western Hemisphere from 1500 - 1870, less than 6% were brought to the United States. This means that our Hispanic, British and French neighbors to the south owned over 94% of the slaves brought to the New World. In the South, less than 7% of the total population ever owned a slave. In other words, over 93% of Southerners did not own any slaves, (75).

Attempts to outlaw the slave trade in the north only increased the profits of smuggling. In 1858, only two years prior to the birth of the Confederacy, Stephen Douglas noted that over 15,000 slaves had been smuggled into New York alone, with over 85 vessels sailing from New York in 1859 to smuggle even more slaves. Perhaps it was their own guilt that drove the abolitionists of the day to point an accusing finger at the South, while closing their eyes to the slavery and the slave trade taking place in their own back yards.

For more than 200 years, northern slave traders made enormous profits that furnished the capital for future investments into mainstream industries. Who is more responsible for slavery in America, the Southern plantation owner who fed and clothed his slaves, or the New England "Yankee" slave trader who brought the slaves here in the first place?

From 1641, when Massachusetts first legalized slavery, until 1865, when the Confederate struggle for independence ended, slavery was a legal institution in America that lasted over 224 years. The Confederate battle flag flew for 4 of those 224 years, but the U.S. flag and its colonial predecessors flew over legalized slavery for ALL of those 224 years. It was the U.S. flag that the slave first saw, and it was the U.S. flag that flew on the mast of New England slave ships as they brought their human cargo to this country. It is clear, that those who attack the Confederate flag as a reminder of slavery is overlooking the most guilty and hateful of all reminders of American slavery, the U.S. flag.

2.3.D-Argument #4 "Confederate symbols should not be tolerated because they represent a government that fought a war to keep blacks in bondage and to preserve the institution of slavery."

This is one of the most commonly used arguments against Confederate symbolism and one of the easiest to prove false. Everyone knows that the South (and the North) had slavery until 1865. The north had slavery at least until 1866, due to some holdouts like Union General Ulysses S. Grant who refused to give up his slaves until the

passage of the 13th Amendment. Prior to 1866, slavery was completely legal. The Supreme Court had ruled favorably on the legality and constitutionality of slavery. Presidents Buchanan and Lincoln both promised many times, that they would not interfere with the practice of slavery. New laws were recently put on the books protecting slave owners from loss of slave property due to theft or runaways. Add to that, the fact that the Confederate states constituted the fifth wealthiest region in the world. The slave owning states had all of these things and more. So why on earth would Southern states secede from the United States? Surely, no one believes that the South would have left the security of the Union and gone to fight a war for something they already had! Countries do not fight wars for the things they have, they fight wars to obtain the things they do not have.

To emphasize how safe the institution of slavery was, let's look at what it would have taken to eliminate it. Since slavery was enshrined in the U.S. Constitution, it would require a constitutional amendment and that is very difficult to achieve. Two-thirds of the House and Senate must agree to the amendment and then three-fourths of all the states must vote to ratify the amendment before it can become part of the U.S. Constitution. This simply would never have happened as long as the Southern states stayed in the Union! That's right, with the South in the Union, the northern and Southern slave states would have voted down any attempt to amend the Constitution, thereby guaranteeing that the institution of slavery could continue almost indefinitely. So you see, it is quite easy to prove that the South did not secede and fight a war to maintain slavery, an institution they already possessed.

What the South did not have was financial freedom. Southerners were slaves to the industrial demands of the north, just as blacks were slaves to the agricultural demands of the South. Growth potential was severely limited in the South, so long as the north continued to levy heavy tariffs on things that Southerners needed to purchase and heavy taxes on those things that Southerners produced. In the words of South Carolina senator John C. Calhoun in 1850, "The north has adopted a system of revenue and disbursements, in which an undue proportion of the burden of taxation has been imposed on the South, and an undue proportion of its proceeds appropriated to the north ... The South as the great exporting portion of the Union has, in reality, paid vastly more than her due proportion of the revenue". Unfair taxation drove Americans to war with Britain in 1775 and against each other in 1861. History is quite clear on this point.

2.3.E-Argument #5 "Since Confederate symbols were erected and raised in defiance of court ordered integration during the 1950's and 60', they should be removed."

This argument goes hand-in-hand with those who try to portray the 1950's, especially in the South, as a decade of hate. This approach was popular with "civil rights" groups in Georgia as well as the liberal media. The Georgia state flag, for example, was changed in 1956. Those who want the flag changed today; claim that the current state flag was established as a slap in the face of court ordered integration, even though records indicate otherwise. The courts ordered integration in 1952. If Georgia legislators were angry over integration, it would not have taken them four years to change the Georgia flag. If defiance had been the reason for the flag's change, it would have been changed the very same day as the court decision! After all, opposing integration in the 1950's was a popular position to hold, and it earned votes for politicians, both in the north and the South.

The formula for providing quality education has always been an illusive one with many variables. In the 1950's, some of those variables discussed by the members of the state legislatures in the north and the South included teacher salaries, improved curriculum, funding for new schools and integration. Any state whose elected officials did not thoroughly debate how court ordered integration might effect quality education was done a serious disservice. Yes, debates over segregation and integration took place during the 1950's, but the timing of those debates was chosen by the civil rights movement and not by the defenders of segregation who would have preferred that the debates never occur at all. Had the courts ordered integration 50 years earlier or 50 years later, the 1950's would have still been a decade of heritage not hate.

In the 1950's and especially the South, a nationwide preparation for the "Civil War Centennial" had begun. This event would include many states with activities spanning several years. The 1996 Olympics in Atlanta paled in

comparison to the celebration surrounding the historic centennial event. President Dwight D. Eisenhower issued a special proclamation calling on all state and federal employees to take part in the festivities. The Postal Service issued a special set of stamps to commemorate the event. Knowing that many visitors coming to the South would take guided tours, hundreds and thousands of historic markers were also placed throughout the 1950's in many states. The decade of the 1950's saw an enormous outpouring of Southern awareness that had its beginnings in the late 1930's with the incredible success of Margaret Mitchell's novel, "Gone With The Wind" and its subsequent movie premier in Atlanta. Hailed as an overwhelming success, this classic and moving story of the South's struggle for independence and then survival continues to serve as an inspiration to millions of Americans today.

2.3.F-Argument #6 "Confederate flags are un-American and they do not represent all Americans."

It is impossible to find a symbol of a flag that will represent everyone. The most accurate polls to date show that 87% of all Americans are not offended by Confederate symbolism. Many Americans feel that they are best represented by a Confederate flag. Actions that appease 13% of our population while disenfranchising 87% of our population, are not progressive or democratic. Nor are they very savvy from a political point of view. When you have a symbol that is as popular as the Confederate battle flag, the best solution is to simply leave it alone.

Any person who claims that Confederate flags are un-American needs a remedial course in geography. "America" as we refer to it, consists of all 50 states, not just those that exist in the north. Southerners are Americans and their flags are American flags as well. A patriotic symbol is one that represents freedom and virtue to its owner, not necessarily to others who view the symbol. If the Confederate battle flag makes you feel patriotic and proud to be a Southern, then it is just as patriotic to fly a Confederate flag at your home or place of business as it is to fly the flag of the United States

2.3.G-Argument #7 "What's the big deal? It's only a flag. Besides, you have all of those monuments, memorials, markers, etc. to remind you of the Confederacy - Can't we find a compromise?"

The issue of whether to fly a Confederate battle flag is only the "tip of the iceberg". We are now seeing children abused in schools for wearing clothing with a portrait of Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson or a likeness of a Confederate symbol, not only by roving gangs of black students, but by the administrators as well. We have seen numerous efforts by various groups to change street names, remove Confederate monuments, censor the playing of Dixie (a song written by a Northerner) and otherwise purge our society of any visible remembrances of Southern Heritage.

The tactic employed by the NAACP on a national level went like this. In one state, the NAACP would claim it was only the flag they wanted to remove. In another state, they would claim it was only a monument, or this, or that, trying to minimize the importance of their claim by contradicting or ignoring what the other NAACP spokesperson had said. In other words, they would use any means necessary to remove a Confederate symbol from its place of honor. The Heritage Preservation Association was the first "national" civil rights organization for Southern Heritage and we exposed this ploy of the NAACP for what it was. This forced the NAACP to go public with their true intentions in 1994 by stating it was their goal to remove ALL Confederate symbols from public property. No more lies. No more hidden agendas. It was now out in the open!

At the state or local level, their tactic was to strike with the absurd and then back off just enough to give the appearance of a "willingness to compromise". This ploy usually starts with a "civil rights" leader or group coming out with ridiculous proposals for censoring Southern symbols, knowing and expecting that these proposals will meet with opposition. To show their "charity" and "flexibility", they offer a "compromise" that amounts to something less, but still hideous in the eyes of those who must give something up.

Civil rights leaders in Georgia, for example, declared that the Georgia state flag was not historic since it was only 35 or so years old. They wanted the Georgia state flag removed, but as a "compromise" they would allow it

to be flown on special historic days. While this may sound charitable and rational to those who dislike Confederate symbols, it was unacceptable to everyone else. The HPA mirrored their efforts by suggesting "in the spirit of compromise" that the black community give up Martin Luther King Holiday, Black History Month in public schools and Kwanzaa. For those unfamiliar with Kwanzaa, it is a pagan harvest ritual, claiming to have African roots and celebrated during Christmas by a few blacks. It was invented only a decade or so ago, so it really has no historical importance, and is considered by many to be un-American. These civil rights leaders became furious that we would suggest that they give up anything. We were supposed to be grateful that they didn't start another race riot like the one Atlanta witnessed during the Rodney King fiasco. We flatly refused, and the media portrayed us, the victims, as "unwilling to compromise".

In Danville VA, a black city council woman complained that a Confederate flag was flying in front of the "Last Capitol of the Confederacy Museum and Memorial", so the city took it down. Apparently, Southerners are not supposed to fly Confederate flags anymore, even at Confederate museums. The flag had been flying approximately 250 days a year. The local chapter of the Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV), had initially opposed the removal of the flag. But shortly after chapter leaders were reportedly offered positions on the museum board, the SCV and others quietly engineered a compromise where the Confederate third national flag would be flown only 23 days a year. The SCV claimed a victory but HPA and local residents were shocked and angry. A local HPA chapter was formed and within a year, had worked to elect one of their own to the city council. Knowing that HPA would replace them one-by-one, the city council became frantic to find a solution that would meet with HPA's approval. They did. There is now a Confederate monument where none stood before, and we have our Confederate flag proudly flying, not 23 days a year, or 250 days a year, but 365 days a year! Now that is what HPA calls compromise.

In South Carolina, we have another prime example of the dangers of compromise. Civil rights leaders wanted the Confederate battle flag removed from the State House dome in Columbia where it flies underneath the U.S. and state flags. To counter this, numerous "pro-Southern" leaders in the Sons of Confederate Veterans introduced yet another compromise that would remove the flag from the dome and place it next to a monument on the capitol grounds. But the monument had already been the target of the NAACP. In other words, these so-called leaders were willing to reduce the visibility of a Confederate symbol, give the civil rights leaders what they wanted by removing it from the State House dome, and place it next to a monument targeted for removal and in a location where it would surely be vandalized. The HPA exposed this "compromise" as cowardly, unthinkable, and unacceptable. HPA is desperately working in South Carolina to prevent this "compromise" from becoming a reality.

We have learned over the years, and through many attempts to negotiate a solution, that those who attack Southern Heritage are themselves, unwilling to compromise. They expect Southerners away their heritage, but they are not willing to give them anything in return. If we start giving in on any issue, then all symbols of the South will gradually disappear. Pro-Southern organizations such as the Sons of Confederate Veterans and others must learn this lesson, and soon. Compromise has become the gradual dismantling of Southern Heritage - one symbol at a time.

A simple test for the worthiness of any offer to compromise is to determine the resulting visibility of the Confederate symbol being challenged. After all, a true compromise is where both sides win something or both sides lose something. If one side wins and the other loses, that, by definition, is not a compromise but a defeat. Any solution that reduces the value, validity or visibility of a Confederate symbol is not a compromise and therefore unacceptable.

Sources and Further Reading: Contact the International Headquarters of the SCV at call 1-800-MY SOUTH (697-6884), Heritage Preservation Association, P.O Box 98209, Atlanta, GA 30359-1909, Phone: (770)-928-2714 Fax: (770)-928-2719, email: hpa@american.net

Part #3: QUESTIONS ABOUT THE HISTORY OF THE WBTS, THE SOUTH, AND THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA

Note: For your research information on the CSA, the following books are recommended for further reading:

Listed are but some of the many good books that are available for reading. These books will present to the reader a perspective of the War For Southern Independence that many books do not present. They are listed in alphabetical order.

“Abolitionism Unveiled” by Henry F. James 1856

“Battles and Leaders of the Civil War” 8 Volumes, by the men who fought in the war, edited by Century Magazine, 1887

“Berry Benson’s Civil War Book: Memoirs of a Confederate Scout and Sharpshooter” by Berry Benson 1962

“Black Slaveowners, Free Black Slave Masters in South Carolina 1790-1860” by Larry Koger 1985

“Cannoneers in Gray: The Field Artillery of the Army of Tennessee, 1861-1865” by Larry J. Daniel 1984

"The Civil War: A Narrative" by Shelby Foote 1974.

"Civil War Trivia and Fact Book" by Webb Garrison 1992.

“The Coming of Glory” by John S. Tilley, 1948

“Company Aytch, Maury Grays First Tennessee Regiment or A Side Show of the Big Show” by Sam R. Watkins 1882

“A Confederate Catechism, The War for Southern Self-Government” by Lyon Gardiner Tyle, 1935

“The Confederate Cause and Conduct in the War Between the States” by Hunter McGuire and George L. Christian 1907

“The Confederate Constitution of 1861: An Inquiry into American Constitutionalism” by Marshall L. DeRosa 1991

“Confederate Military History” 12 Volumes, by Edited by Gen. Clement A. Evans 1899

“Confederate Nurse: The Diary of Ada W. Bacot 1860-1864, 1944

“A Constitutional View of the War Between the States” by Alexander H. Stephens 1868

“Crimes of the Civil War and the Curse of the Funding System” by Judge Henry Clay Dean 1868

“The Defense of Battery Wagner July 18th, 1863” by Lt. Col. Twiggs

"A Defense Of Virginia And The South" by Robert L. Dabney 1867.

“Destruction and Reconstruction: Personal Experiences of the Late War” by General Richard Taylor 1877

“A Diary From Dixie” by Mary Chesnut 1905

“The Diary of Edmund Ruffin” 3 Vols 1972

"Embattled Banner-A Reasonable Defense of the Confederate Battle Flag", by Don Hinkle, 1997

“Facts and Falsehoods Concerning the War on the South 1861-1865” by George Edmonds, 1904

"Facts The Historians Leave Out-A Confederate Primer" by John S. Tilley 1951.

“The Federal Government: Its True Nature and Character: Being a Review of Judge Story's Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States” by Abel P. Upshur 1997

"The Flags of The Confederacy: An Illustrated History" by Devereaux D. Cannon, Jr. 1988.

“Forgotten Confederates: An Anthology about Black Southerners” by Kelly Barrow 1995

“Fourteen Months in American Bastille’s” by C.W. Howard 1863

“Free and Impartial Exposition of the Causes Which Led to the Failure of the Confederate States to Establish Their Independence” Oct 14, 1865

“Generals in Gray” by Ezra J. Warner 1959

“Gladstone, Morley, and the Confederate Loans of 1863” by John Bigelow 1905

“Give Us Back the Constitution of Our Fathers” by Henderson Hallman 1924

“The Gray Book: A Confederate Catechism” by Lyon Gardiner Tyler, 1935

“Immortal Captives” by Mauriel Joslyn , 1999

“In Search of Confederate Ancestors” by J. H. Segars 1993

“Inside of Rock Island Prison from December 1863 to June 1865” by J.W. Minnich 1908

"Is Davis a Traitor" by Albert Taylor Bledsoe 1866

“The Last Rebel Yell” by Michael A. Grissom 1919

“The Letters of Judah P. Benjamin to Ambrose Dudley Mann, Minister of the Confederacy to Belgium & the Vatican”

“The Life of Johnny Reb” by Bell Irwin Wiley 1943

“The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates” by Edward A. Pollard, 1866

"Maryland: The South’s First Casualty" by Bart Rhett Talbert 1995.

“Memoirs of Service Afloat” by Admiral Raphael Semmes 1868

“Men in Gray” by Robert Catlett Cave, 1911

“Miss Rutherford's Scrapbook 1923” by Mildred Lewis Rutherford (Topics: The Causes That Led to the War Between the States, Secession Was Not Rebellion, Who Was Responsible For War?, Was Coercion Constitutional?, Army and Navy of the Confederate States Organized, Battles and Leaders The Surrender and Results)

“Miss Rutherford's Scrapbook 1924” by Mildred Lewis Rutherford (Topics: The Assassination of Abraham Lincoln, Reconstruction Days of 1865-1876, The 13th and 14th Amendments, The South's Responsibility)

“Miss Rutherford's Scrapbook 1925” by Mildred Lewis Rutherford (Topics: Things That Make for Peace - What is Meant by Peace?, Disputed Points in Southern History - Proofs Given, What Has the Negro Meant to the South, What Has the South Meant to the Negro,)

“Miss Rutherford's Scrapbook-Historical Notes 1927” by Mildred Lewis Rutherford

“Nathan Bedford Forrest: The First With the Most”, by Robert S. Henry 1944

“The Negro, North and South: The status of the Colored Population in the North and South Compared” by Robert Trimble 1861

"Ordeal of the Union (Volumes 1, 2, 3, & 4)" by Allan Nevins 1992.

“Prison Life During the War” by Fritz Fuzzlebug 1869

"The Prison Life of Jefferson Davis" by John J. Craven, M.D. Carleton 1866.

"The Real Lincoln" by Charles L.C. Minor. Everett Wadley Company, 1904.

“The Recognition of the Southern Confederation” by James Spence 1862

“Reminiscences of the Civil War” by General John B. Gordon 1903

“Report of the Joint Committee of the State of the Republic (Georgia) on November 9th, 1866 - Reasons for rejecting the 14th Amendment”

“The Right of Recognition: A Sketch of the present policy of the Confederate States By a Recent Tourist 1862”

"The Rise And Fall Of The Confederate Government" by Jefferson Davis 1881

"Sack and Destruction of the City of Columbia, South Carolina" by William Gilmore Simms 1865

"The Secret Six: John Brown And The Abolitionist Movement" by Otto Scott, 1979.

“The Shackling of Jefferson Davis” by T.K. Oglesby 1899

“So Good a Cause: A Decade of Southern Partisan” by Oran P. Smith, 1993

"The South Must Have Her Rightful Place In History" by Mildred Lewis Rutherford. 1923.

“The South Vindicated From The Charge of Treason and Rebellion” by William E. Boggs 1881.

"The South Was Right" by James Ronald Kennedy and Walter Donald Kennedy 1991.

"Southern By The Grace of God" by Michael Andrew Grissom 1988.

"Southern Historical Society Papers" - 52 Volumes (Also Available on CD-ROM) 1876-1959

"Southern Rights Convention of Maryland Feb 18-19, 1861"

"A Southern View Of The Invasion Of The Southern States and War Of 1861-1865" by Captain Samuel A'Court Ashe 1911

"States' Rights The Law of the Land" by Charles J. Bloch 1958

"The Story of the Confederacy" by Robert Selph Henry, 1931

"The Story of the Confederate States or History of the War for Southern Independence" by Joseph T. Derry 1895

"Three Hundred Days in a Yankee Prison: Imprisonment at Camp Chase Ohio" by John H. King, M.D. 1904

"The Tragic Era: The Revolution after Lincoln" by Claude Bowers 1929

"The Treatment of P.O.W. 1861-1865" by Samuel E. Lewis M.D. 1910

"A True Estimate of Abraham Lincoln", By Mildred Lewis Rutherford, 1923

"The True Story of Andersonville Prison" by James Madison Page 1908.

"Truths of History" by Mildred Lewis Rutherford. 1920.

"Truth of the War Conspiracy of 1861" By H.W. Johnstone, 1921

"The Typical Georgia Confederate" by John C. Whatley. 1991

"The Uncivil War: Union Army and Navy Excesses In The Official Records" by Thomas Bland Keys 1991.

"A View Of The Constitution" by William Rawle 1825

"War Claims Against The United States" by William Whiting 1866

"War For What" by Francis W. Springer 1990.

"War of The Rebellion - Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies (130 Volumes also available on CD-ROM)" Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880-1901.

"Was Jefferson Davis Right?" by James Ronald Kennedy and Walter Donald Kennedy 1998

"What The South May Claim or Where The South Leads" by Mildred L. Rutherford

"Why Not Freedom?-America's Revolt Against Big Government" by James Ronald Kennedy and Walter Donald Kennedy 1995

“The Works of John C. Calhoun” by John C. Calhoun 1844

“Wrongs of History Righted” by Mildred L. Rutherford 1919.

3.1. Is it true that many of the history books we may have used in school about the Civil War and Southern Confederate history have been altered or slanted toward the North’s point of view?

The simple truth is that the victors that write the history of the vanquished. It makes sense, if you scratch beneath the surface, that you might find another side to the story. A story, based on facts that have been purposely suppressed by the Yankee reconstructionists and now the politically correct revisionist historians.

The history about the War Between The States or WBTS, but often referred to incorrectly as the American Civil War) was fought by Southern patriots from all ethnic backgrounds and religions, rich and poor, free and slave. They fought to protect their home and family from a hostile foreign invader (the Federal Yankee government). In general we all have been taught the misrepresentations, outright lies, and falsehoods about the war and the Southern Confederacy. Generations of American school children have been taught a version of the War of Northern Aggression that only shows one side. What is civil about a war that was fought for the subjugation of a land and its' people?

As an example, in a divorce proceeding, would anyone listen only to one side, totally ignoring the other, even though the first claimed to be fair in representing the other’s side? That is exactly what has happened to the Southern people. The United States acted like most empires do when a portion of the population declares itself free. England invaded American when we as 13 colonies declared ourselves free and independent in 1776. The Romans had the same before and the list is nearly as long as history itself, of one power dominating and overrunning a free people. The southern people declaring independence lost and have been paying the price ever since.

Sources and further reading: (See list at the beginning of section #3)

3.2. If the history books used in schools are unbalanced, then what are some common “Myths” of the South and of the Confederacy that are presented to the public?

The way most history books deal with the South before 1865 is slanted and present many false presumptions. Liberals and black activists that spread emotional lies about the war and about the South often go so far as to equate the Confederate battle flag with "Nazi swastika," and calling our ancestors "traitors" and Nazi concentration camp guards. The news media seems to relish these kinds of attacks on our heritage. Liberals and historical revisionists who attack the legitimacy of the Confederacy and its cause and thus the right of the traditional white Southerners to exist as a people with a culture and a heritage, usually base their attacks upon false assumptions. These attacks can be easily disarmed by a thinking citizen. Some of the premier “MYTHS” include:

1. The antebellum Southern whites treated their slaves cruelly and nearly every white Southerner had slaves.
2. Slavery, was practiced only by white Southerners, and when practiced was a sin, equitable with Original Sin, which damned all Southern whites and their descendants forever.
3. The Southern states attempted to leave the Union only to protect slavery and thus fought the war primarily to protect the institution of slavery

4. The Southern states could not lawfully secede from the Union; therefore they were in rebellion against the Union.
5. The Southern states started the War of Rebellion, and fought a civil war with the intent to overthrow the Federal government in Washington D.C.
6. The sorely-beset Union fought the war to free the slaves. (As Col. Chamberlain is portrayed to say to the Maine dissidents in the propaganda filled movie, "Gettysburg," "We are fighting to set men free.")
7. After that war, the Southern whites invented and have since been the sole perpetrators of hate crimes and social injustice.
8. Reconstruction benefited the South and the blacks in America have benefited immeasurably from Reconstruction.
9. Reconstruction ended before the turn of the century.

The most obvious myth is that of the "great and good" North marching into the "cruel and evil" South for the sole purpose of freeing the slaves. There are many quotes from Northern leaders (Lincoln, Grant, Sherman and others) that show clearly that the main purpose of the North was not the eradication of slavery, but subjugation of the southern people. If you study these common accepted myths, you will easily find them to be false and spread accidentally by ignorance of the common student/teacher or deliberately with contempt towards the southern people.

Sources and Further Reading: Facts the Historians Leave Out; John S. Tilley; 1951, 1993, A Southern View of the Invasion of the Southern States; Capt. Samuel Ashe; 1938; 1994, War for What?; Francis W. Springer; 1990

3.3. What did the Confederates feel they were fighting for?

An honest answer is that there may have been as many different reasons for fighting this war as there were soldiers in the Confederate Army. The politically correct revisionist historians would like to state the Confederate soldiers were fighting to protect and preserve slavery. It seems an odd statement since less than 10% of those men were actual slave holders.

Some common answers that appear over and over from the Confederates were that they were fighting to establish their own government, just as their forefathers did in the first American war for Independence in 1776. Just like in 1776, years of oppression and many complex and interwoven issues produced the feeling in the Southern population to secede and then later to take up arms to defend their land.

Some were fighting to repel the invasion of the Federal Army and in essence fighting to protect their home and families. Since the constitution did not authorize the Federal government to make war on a state, yet the Federal military presence was definitely a threat to the Confederate states and the people within, taking up arms for defense of their land seems a logical reason for fighting.

Sources and Further Reading: (See list at the beginning of section #3)

3.4. Why did the South secede in 1861 and did the South have the right to secede from the Union?

The South did have the Constitutionally guaranteed right to secede from the Union. A sovereign State always maintains the right to chose its course and the fact of “free and independent States” cannot be denied for this was their status as recognized by England after independence was gained. The Articles of Confederation of 1778 to 1789 guaranteed it and the US Constitution which was merely a revision of the Article of Confederation, strengthened that guarantee. The Federalist papers show it to be an option and that force to maintain the Union is not.

Add to this the precedent of Northern states threatening to secede and further proof is found that it was a real option. This is irrefutable proof that the Southern States had the right to secede.

Examine the particulars which are grounded in the words of our founding fathers, the framers of our Constitution, and the acts of the several States in ratifying the Constitution. The fact of the matter is that this is a simple process if one takes a plain meaning of the words. Problems only arise when we do not take as matter of fact the words of the founding fathers. The technique of adding meaning or changing definitions is how men have always tried to cloud issues.

First, in the Colonies the individual Colony considered itself independent of the others. New York would not pay the ransom of John Stark who was captured by the “savages” and brought to Albany for a ransom. Inasmuch as he belonged to New Hampshire, the government of New York took no action for his release. There was not even enough community of feeling to induce individual citizens to provide money for that purpose.

Local and partial confederacies were found in the New England colonies. Even these early confederacies retained what Jefferson Davis named as “the germ-principle of states rights”. The “United Colonies of New England” which lasted nearly fifty years was one and there were several other temporary and provisional associations of colonies formed. The people were taught the advantages of union for a common purpose, while they had never abandoned or compromised the great principle of community independence. Since these unions were dissolved and reformed into new unions the fact is evident they had the sovereign right as independent communities to secede or form unions as they saw fit.

The Articles of Confederation continued the ideal of sovereign communities gathering for a united purpose but not at the expense of their independence. This sentiment is traceable through the dissolution of the colonial ties with England to the Articles of Confederation. A general Congress made the declaration that the colonies were and had the right to be, “free and independent States.” Great Britain then recognized each State individually, not in aggregate. This idea was carried to the Articles of Confederation and found in:

“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.”

Another point is that these articles were adopted by eleven of the original States in 1778. It took three years for the other two states to join the compact. The reason for the delay in joining was their fear that their sovereignty may be compromised. Finally their fears were quieted and with their sovereign status intact they entered the United States. They did so without coercion or force by the other states for they were free and independent States who could either reject or accept the Articles of Confederation.

When the States decided that the government created by the “Articles” was inadequate and that it was time to revise the “Articles”, that is what they gathered to do. Revise not recreate was the charter given to the representatives who gathered at the Constitutional Convention. Still of note is that the revision had to be accepted and ratified by the States, not the people of the United States in aggregate, but rather the people of the States ratifying for their own sovereign State.

When the states ratified the Constitution, they acceded to the Union by voting through their delegates assembled in convention to accept the Constitution, but they did not surrender any of their sovereign power. Because the states had the authority to accede, it follows logically that they had the authority to secede. Naturally, if they had the right to do something, they would also have the right to undo it if they so chose. In addition, several of the states, including Virginia, Rhode Island, and New York, specifically and explicitly stated in their ratification’s that they retained the right to withdraw from the Union, when so ever it was their desire to do so.

“We, the delegates of the people of New York ... do declare and make known that the powers of government may be reassumed by the people whenever it shall become necessary to their happiness ...” (The ratification by New York, 26 July 1788)

“We the delegates of the people of Rhode Island and Plantations, duly elected, etc, do declare and make known... That the powers of government may be resumed by the people whenever it shall become necessary to their happiness” (The ratification by Rhode Island)

“We the delegates of the people of Virginia, ... , do in the name and 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 when so ever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression..” (Proceedings in the convention of Virginia, Wednesday, 25 June 1788. Debates of the Convention.)

There are several points to consider in the discussions of the time. One of the primary is the striking of the phrase “National Government “ from the Constitution. Since this was done quickly is of great importance in understanding the meaning of their action to delete it. The prompt rejection, after introduction, of this word national, is obviously more expressive of the intent and purpose of the authors of the Constitution than its mere absence from the Constitution would have been. The rejection makes it even more abundantly clear that they did not mean for our government to be a “consolidated nationality”, instead of a confederacy of sovereign members. In order to insure this fact the Tenth Amendment was added, which was in essence is the same as the Second Article of Confederation. The Tenth Amendment 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 tenth amendment clearly states that power is delegated by the States and power not delegated remains with the people of the State. Therefore, when we see “the people” we should think the people of the individual sovereign State acting in concert for the State independent of the people of other States. Clearly, what we have is a double statement of the reserved power of the States individually. New York stated it thusly,

“Every power not delegated remains to the people of the several States, or to their respective State governments, to whom they may have granted the same.”

The proof is conclusive the sovereignty of the States individually remains and that the States have not delegated away their right to secede, which may be necessary, if there is a breach in the compact (the Constitution). That is why Madison in the Federalist papers would give the grounds for a State or States right to secede.

“It is an established doctrine on the subject of treaties, that all the articles are mutually conditions of each other; that a breach of any one article is a breach of the whole treaty; and that a breach committed by either of the parties absolves the others, and authorizes them, if they please, to pronounce the compact violated and void.”

Timothy Pickering, of Massachusetts was the first to threaten secession. Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts was the first to mention secession in Congressional halls in 1811. John Quincy Adams of Massachusetts was the first to petition Congress to dissolve the Union. Charles Francis Adams testified that there was no doubt but that his grandfather, John Quincy Adams, believed that a State had the right to secede.

The truth of this principle was appealed to several times in the history of our Union and never doubted as a legitimate alternative to continuing in the Union. The first was Massachusetts which threatened to secede because of the Louisiana purchase. Their reason was it gave more weight to the Southern section of the country. The solution offered:

“The principles of our revolution point to the remedy, a separation. That this can be accomplished, without spilling one drop of blood, I have little doubt. I do not believe in the

practicality of a long continued Union. A Northern Confederacy would unite congenial characters and present a fairer prospect of public happiness; while the Southern States, having a similarity of habits, might be left to manage their own affairs in their own way.” (Colonel Timothy Pickering, Senator from Mass. in a letter to George Cabot)

The writer then goes on to list the Northern States that would join their Confederacy.

There were other instances where secession was threatened in the North such as in 1845 when the “measures for the annexation of Texas evoked remonstrance’s, accompanied by threats of dissolution.”

As a last example we have the Southern States. The Southern States did not only threaten, but acted on the right to secede. The Southern States believed that the Northern States had made a breach in the contract (constitution) by not allowing equal access to the territories which in effect gave the Northern States the advantage politically and therefore decided to exercise their sovereign right to secede.

While this answer cannot give exhaustive support of the South’s right to secede, it does clearly demonstrate that the right existed. It can be realized by a plain interpretation of our Constitution, and the words of the founding fathers. In the Federalist alone there can be found many additional proofs. It only remains to realize why the Southern War for Independence came about, with the North’s gross trampling of our Constitution, which in fact signaled the death of the United States. If our United States was freely entered, it cannot be maintained by force. As Hamilton said in the Federalist

“For in politics, as in religion, it is equally absurd to aim at making proselytes by fire and sword.”

It was President Andrew Jackson who said, “The Federal Union, It must be preserved”, but also stated the Union “could not be preserved by force.” The Union he referred to was a voluntary union, and force, which precludes volition, would in itself destroy the very thing it was supposed to be preserving.

The nature of our federation is not Consolidated States, but United States. A number of States held together by coercion, or point of bayonet, would not be a Union. Union is necessarily voluntary, the act of choice, and free association. A Union of States necessarily implies separate sovereignties, voluntarily acting together. To force these distinct sovereignties into one mass of power is, simply, to destroy the Union, and to overthrow our system of government.

It should be noted that William Rawle’s book “View of the Constitution” was the primary book used in teaching the Constitution and was used at West Point until the war. General Lee told Bishop Wilmer (of Louisiana) that had it not been for the instruction received from Rawle’s text book at West Point he would not have left the United States Army to join the Confederate Army at the breaking out of the War between the States. He chose to serve the Confederate States army and his home state of Virginia in particular based on instruction given at the United States Military Academy. Some quotes from Rawle’s include:

“The state is the more important entity, to which citizens gave their allegiance, not some Union of states...”

“The Union was formed by the voluntary agreement of the States, and in uniting together they have not forfeited their nationality, nor have they been reduced to one and the same people. If one state chooses to withdraw its name from the contract, it would be difficult to disprove its right of doing so, and the Federal Government would have no means of maintaining its claim, either by force or right.”

“It will depend upon the State itself whether it will continue a member of the Union.”

“If the States are interfered with they may wholly withdraw from the Union.” (p. 289-90)

Judge Black of Pennsylvania in “Black’s Essays” noted :

“John Quincy Adams, in 1839, and Abraham Lincoln in 1847 made elaborate arguments in favor of the legal right of a State to secede.”

Horace Greeley is quoted:

“If the Declaration of Independence justified the secession of 3,000,000 colonists in 1776, I do not see why the Constitution ratified by the same men should not justify the secession of 5,000,000 of the Southerners from the Federal Union in 1861.” We have repeatedly said, and we once more insist that the great principle embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence that government derives its power from the consent of the governed is sound and just, then if the Cotton States, the Gulf States, or any other States choose to form an independent nation they have a clear right to do it. (New York Tribune)

“Let the people be told why they wish to break up the Confederation, and let the act of secession be the echo of an unmistakable popular fiat. Then those who rush to carnage to try to defeat it would place themselves clearly in the wrong.” (American Conflict Vol. 1, p. 359)

Abraham Lincoln is quoted in the Congressional records of 1847:

“Any people whatever have a right to abolish the existing government and form a new one that suits them better.”

Charles Beecher Stowe, (Note he was the son of Harriet Beecher Stowe who wrote the propaganda novel “Uncle Tom’s Cabin” which assumed by a hysterical Northern population as fact. That infamous book condemned the Southern people’s way of life, penned by her without ever one visit to the Southland.) was quoted:

“When the South drew the sword to defend the doctrine of States Rights and the institution of slavery, they certainly had on their side the Constitution and the laws of the land, for the National Constitution justified the doctrine of States Rights.”

“Is it not perfectly evident that there was a great rebellion but the rebels were the men of the North, and the men who defended the Constitution were the men of the South, for they defended States Rights and slavery, which were distinctly entrenched within the Constitution.”

The idea that the North was fighting to free the Negro people might be quashed with this quote from the New York Herald 11 Nov 1860:

“The South has an undeniable right to secede from the Union. In the event if secession, the City of New York, and the State of New Jersey, and very likely Connecticut will separate from New England when the black man is put on a pinnacle above the white.”

If we maintain and believe that the colonists were justified in leaving British rule to form their own government, which is the principle embodied in the Declaration of Independence, then that same principle is how we would have to view the act of secession executed by the Southern States in 1861. They were exercising the exact same right. The right of freedom!

Sources and further reading: “The Federal Government: Its True Nature and Character: Being a Review of Judge Story's Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States” by Abel P. Upshur 1997, View of the Constitution by William Rawle, The Rise and Fall of The Confederate Government by Jefferson Davis

3.5. When did each state secede?

Before Lincoln's call for troops, the following states seceded:

South Carolina, Convention passed Ordinance of Secession, 20 Dec 1860

Mississippi, Convention passed Ordinance of Secession, 9 Jan 1861

Florida, Convention passed Ordinance of Secession, 10 Jan 1861

Alabama, Convention passed Ordinance of Secession, 11 Jan 1861

Georgia, Convention passed Ordinance of Secession, 19 Jan 1861

Louisiana, Convention passed Ordinance of Secession, 26 Jan 1861

Texas, Convention passed Ordinance of Secession, 1 Feb 1861, to take effect 2 Mar 1861 provided it was ratified by the voters on 23 Feb 1861 (approved 46,153 to 14,747). Texas admitted to the Confederacy, 2 Mar 1861.

After Lincoln's call for troops on 15 Apr 1861, the following states seceded:

Virginia, Convention rejected secession 4 Apr 1861, Convention passed Ordinance of Secession 17 Apr 1861 and ratified CSA Constitution, both subject to ratification of voters 23 May 1861 (approved 132,201 to 37,451). Virginia admitted to CSA 7 May 1861.

Arkansas, Convention rejected secession ordinance on 18 Mar 1861 and called for referendum in August, Convention passed Ordinance of Secession 6 May 1861. Arkansas admitted to CSA 20 May 1861.

North Carolina, Voters narrowly rejected (47,705 to 47,611) calling a Convention 28 Feb 1861. Legislature called Convention 1 May 1861. Convention passed Ordinance of Secession 20 May 1861. North Carolina provisionally admitted to CSA 17 May 1861.

Tennessee, Voters rejected (69,772 to 57,708) calling a Convention 9 Feb 1861. On 6 May 1861 Legislature passed "Declaration of Independence" and ratification of CSA Constitution subject to referendum on 8 June 1861 (approved 104,471 to 47,183). Tennessee admitted to CSA 17 May 1861.

The following two states never seceded via any mechanism provided by a regular government:

Missouri, Convention rejected secession 9 March 1861; Convention reconvened in July 1861 and declared offices of governor and legislature vacant; meeting in Neosho on 28 October 1861 the Legislature ratifies the Ordinance of Secession. 31 October 1861 Governor Claiborn Jackson signs the Bill authorizing the Ordinance of Secession and requests admission to CSA. 28 November 1861 The Confederate Congress Admits Missouri as the twelfth state of the Confederation

Kentucky, southern sympathizers called for convention Oct 1861, Convention passed Ordinance of Secession 18 Nov 1861. Kentucky admitted to the CSA 10 Dec 1861.

Sources and further reading: Civil War Day-by-Day; Official Records, Series IV, Vol. 1; D.W. Crofts, Reluctant Confederates (1989); W.L. Buenger, Secession and the Union in Texas (1984).

3.6. Did the U.S. Supreme Court ever rule on the legality of secession?

Secession is a question that has never been satisfactorily resolved by the Supreme Court and is unlikely to ever be addressed by the Court in the future. After the war had ended, the case most often cited about secession was Texas vs White from 1869. Could you guess what the conclusion reached might have been with a Northern court needing to justify the war of Northern Aggression? Their answer was

“The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States. Considered, therefore, as transactions under the Constitution, the Ordinance of Secession, adopted by the convention and ratified by a majority of the citizens of Texas, and all the Acts of her Legislature intended to give effect to that ordinance, were absolutely null. They were utterly without operation in law. Our conclusion, therefore, is, that Texas continued to be a State, and a State of the Union, notwithstanding the rationale for military occupation is also self-contradictory.”

Interesting enough in *Coleman vs Tennessee*, the U.S. Supreme Court held military occupation lawful, not on constitutional grounds, but by resorting to international law principles which apply primarily to independent nations.

"Though the late war was not between independent nations, but between different portions of the same nation, yet having taken the proportions of a territorial war, the insurgents having become formidable enough to be recognized as belligerents, the same doctrine must be held to apply. The right to govern the territory of the enemy during its military occupation is one of the incidents of war and the character and form of the government to be established depend entirely upon the laws of the conquering State or the orders of its military commander." (97 U.S. 509, 517; 1879)

It would appear then that to justify the otherwise unconstitutional military occupation of a state, the post war U.S. Supreme Court treats the state as if it were an independent nation, implicitly recognizing the validity of its secession. What the Court did not cite was any constitutional provision which justified the war in the first place. Since the invocation of international law was based on the fact of war, and the Union's involvement in that war violated the Constitution, it is evident that the Constitution's supremacy clause forbade this action. Yet the Yankee government felt compelled to resort to international law to override the Constitution. The unconstitutional and amoral nature of the Court's reasoning can be seen.

Since the end of the War Between the States, there have been two legal developments impacting the issue of secession. Those are amendment of state constitutions to prohibit secession and the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment. While under military occupation and control, the states of Arkansas, North Carolina, Florida, South Carolina, Mississippi and Virginia, each enacted new constitutions containing clauses prohibiting secession. Soon thereafter, the troops were withdrawn soon after the passing of the clauses. Such clauses do not serve to abolish the right of those states to secede from the Union as the clauses were added only under duress. It is an principle of law that agreements made under duress are voidable at the option of the aggrieved party.

Neither was the issue of secession settled by various Supreme Court decisions resolving questions tangential to the issue itself. (See the much cited case examples such as *The Prize Cases*, (1862), *Mississippi vs Johnson*, (1866); *Texas vs White*, (1868); and *White vs Hart*, (1871). In none of these example cases was the Court asked to deal squarely with the issue of state secession when the outcome of the case impacted on the rights of the seceding states and those states were represented by counsel before the Court. None of these cases contained a detailed and serious analysis of the issues, arguments and constitutional clauses one would expect to see in a comprehensive treatment of the issue by the highest court in the land. Therefore, these cases carry little moral or legal authority.

Sources and further reading:

3.7. Did the South fight to overthrow of the United States Government?

No. The South had no intent of "conquering" the North. The fought to establish it's own government. The government of Great Britain was not destroyed by the success of the colonies in 1783 to win it's freedom and the Union government, while reduced in land size, would not have been destroyed either. Secession was not rebellion. It was perfectly legal in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, but fighting Southern states secession with armed resistance by the Federal Army was the true rebellion.

The American system of government was intended to be a republic of states, and the underlying principle upon which the republic was formed was that any people have the right to withdraw from a government they do not like and form one that better suits their needs and desires. This was the intent of the Southern states, to withdraw not to overthrow. The men of the South did not fight to win their freedom, they fought to keep it! To quote from the Declaration of Independence:

“... that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the People to alter or 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.”

“The Southern leaders ought not to have been treated as rebels - secession is not rebellion.” (Goldwin Smith of Cornell University)

“If Congress can regulate matters entrusted to local authority, the power of the States may be eliminated and thus our system of government be practically destroyed.” (Chief Justice Day, United States Supreme Court)

When the states that comprised the Confederate States of America chose to secede from the Union, they did so legally, and formed an independent nation, which was promptly invaded by the United States of America. Our system of government prior to the War for Southern Independence was one of a republican system, wherein every state was a sovereign republic. The federal government was the servant of the many states, not the other way around.

Considering the sectional animosity before, during, and after the War for Southern Independence, if the Northern leaders had thought that they could have successfully tried any Southern leader for treason, they would have done so. They did not, because they knew that such a trial would lead to the public realization that the South had exercised a constitutional and natural right, and that the North had invaded a sovereign and independent nation.

Sources and further reading: The South Was Right!; James Ronald Kennedy and Walter Donald Kennedy; 1991, 1994, Truths of History; Mildred Rutherford, A Southern View of the Invasion of the Southern States; Capt. Samuel Ashe; 1938, 1994, War for What?; Francis W. Springer; 1990, Facts the Historians Leave Out; John S. Tilley; 1951, 1993

3.8. Was secession the cause of the war and if not then was the cause of the war?

No. Secession is a civil process of withdrawal and has no implications of force, violence or war. It is often written that to prevent secession (keeping the union whole) and slavery were the burning issues that caused the war, but again these are emotional arguments, that when studied, do not have the substance of fact. Economic and trade relations, including tariffs are other issues raised by some as the cause of the war.

The main cause of the war was the Lincoln government of the North's rejection of the right of peaceable secession of the eleven sovereign states and subsequently the denial of self-government to the nearly 8 million people living in those states. Without consulting Congress, Lincoln sent great armies of destruction to the South. The Southern people had no choice but to defend themselves from this invasion.

There were two factors about the election of 1860 which disturbed the Southerners so badly that Southern states subsequently seceded. First Was the Republican-party platform for 1860. Basically, the Northern capitalists wanted the U.S. government to tax (only) the South deeply, to finance the industrialization of the North, and the necessary transportation-net to support that. In those days, there was no income tax. The federal government received most of its revenue from tariffs on imported goods. The Southern states imported from England most of the manufactured goods they used, thus paid most of the taxes to support the federal government. The Northerners imported very little. In 1860, for example, just four Southern-states paid in 50% of the total tariffs.

In 1860, the averaged tariff-rate was 18.84%; the Republicans spread the word that they were shooting for 40%-which could bankrupt many Southerners and would make life much harder for most of them. The Republican platform included a transcontinental railroad, following a Northern route, extensive internal-improvements to

extend the transportation net for the Northern manufacturers; a homestead act which would eliminate the only other important source of federal funding, etc.

Second, if the Republicans somehow managed to gain control of Congress and the White House, they would then be able to use the federal government to enact and enforce their party platform, and thus convert the prosperous Southern states into the dirt-poor agricultural colonies of the Northern capitalists. And given the trends in demographics, the Southern states would never be able to reverse that process. The intent of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution would then have been subverted completely: the Southern states would no longer be governed with the consent of the governed, but instead bullied mercilessly by the Northern majority. Why, then, remain in the Union?

After the Republicans gained control of the presidency and the Congress, eleven Southern states eventually seceded from the Union, specifically to avoid becoming the helpless agricultural-colonies of the Northern capitalists. This move took the Northern capitalists completely by surprise. Southern states had been threatening to secede ever since the Tariff of Abominations and the days of Calhoun. The North no longer took those threats seriously. But with the South now gone, there would be no federal funding to industrialize the North--for the Northern citizenry would certainly never agree to be taxed to pay for it. And far worse than that, the many, many Northern-capitalists who had been earning fortunes factoring the Southern cotton-crop, transporting the cotton, and buying the cotton for New England textile-mills now faced financial ruin. The South normally bought its manufactured goods from Britain, anyway. Now, as a sovereign nation, the South could easily cut far better deals with the British financiers, Ship owners, and textile mills to supply the South with all of the necessary support services, leaving the Northern capitalists out in the cold. There was no way Lincoln or anyone else from the Republican party could possibly talk the Southern states back into the Union now, so he would have to conquer them in war. Lincoln assumed it would be a 90-day war, which the Union Army would win in one battle. If you read Lincoln's first inaugural-address with any care at all, you'll see that it was simply a declaration of war against the South.

What caused the war? Mr. Lincoln. His violation of the Constitution including the sending of hostile invading armies into the South, provoked this war. Had the Southern states been allowed to form their own government, there would have been no war.

3.9. What were the populations of the states at the outbreak of the war?

The following statistics are from J.C.G. Kennedy, Supt. of Census, Population of the United States in 1860, (Washington, GPO, 1864)

State	White	Free Colored	Slave	Total	Military
Alabama	526,271	2,690	435,080	964,201	99,967
Arkansas	324,143	144	111,115	435,450	65,231
California	323,177	4,086	0	379,994	169,975
Connecticut	451,504	8,627	0	460,147	94,411
Delaware	90,589	19,829	1,798	112,216	18,273
Florida	77,747	932	61,745	140,424	15,739
Georgia	591,550	3,500	462,198	1,057,286	111,005
Illinois	1,704,291	7,628	0	1,711,951	375,026
Indiana	1,338,710	11,428	0	1,350,428	265,295
Iowa	673,779	1,069	0	674,913	139,316
Kansas	106,390	625	191	107,206	27,976
Kentucky	919,484	10,684	225,483	1,155,684	180,589
Louisiana	357,456	18,647	331,726	708,002	83,456

Maine	626,947	1,327	0	628,279	122,238
Maryland	515,918	83,942	87,189	687,049	102,715
Massachusetts	1,221,432	9,602	0	1,231,066	258,419
Michigan	736,142	6,799	0	749,113	164,007
Minnesota	169,395	259	0	172,023	41,226
Mississippi	353,899	773	436,631	791,305	70,295
Missouri	1,063,489	3,572	114,931	1,182,012	232,781
New Hampshire	325,579	494	0	326,073	63,610
New Jersey	646,699	25,318	18	672,035	132,219
New York	3,831,590	49,005	0	3,880,735	796,881
North Carolina	629,942	30,463	331,059	992,622	115,369
Ohio	2,302,808	36,673	0	2,339,511	459,534
Oregon	52,160	128	0	52,465	15,781
Pennsylvania	2,849,259	56,949	0	2,906,215	555,172
Rhode Island	170,649	3,952	0	174,620	35,502
South Carolina	291,300	9,914	402,406	703,708	55,046
Tennessee	826,722	7,300	275,719	1,109,801	159,353
Texas	420,891	355	182,566	604,215	92,145
Vermont	314,369	709	0	315,098	60,580
Virginia	1,047,299	58,042	490,865	1,596,318	196,587
Wisconsin	773,693	1,171	0	775,881	159,335
Territories				76,214 all	
Colorado	34,231	46	0	34,277	
Dakotas	2,576	0	0	4837	
Nebraska	28,696	67	15	28,841	
Nevada	6,812	45	0	6,857	
New Mexico	82,979	85	0	93,516	
Utah	40,125	30	29	40,273	
Washington	11,138	30	0	11,594	
Washington, DC	60,763	11,131	3,185	75,080	12,797

Totals:

	White	Free Colored	Slave	Total	Military
Union*	21,475,373	355,310	432,650	22,339,989	4,559,872
CSA	5,447,220	132,760	3,521,110	9,103,332	1,064,193

*includes MO and KY, DC, and territories

The following statistics are from J.C.G. Kennedy, Supt. of Census, Preliminary Report on the Eighth Census, 1860 (Washington, GPO, 1862) and from Annie Abel, The American Indian as Slaveholder and Secessionist (1915)

The Five Civilized Tribes

Tribe	White	Free Colored	Slave	Indian
Choctaw	802	67	2,297	18,000
Cherokee	713	17	2,504	21,000
Creek	319	277	1,651	13,550
Chickasaw	146	13	917	5,000
Seminole	8	30	0	2,267

The following statistics are from J.C.G. Kennedy, Supt. of Census, Agriculture in the United States in 1860, (Washington: GPO, 1864)

State	Slave Holders	Slave Holder %	Slaves/holder
Alabama	33,730	6.4	12.9
Arkansas	11,481	3.5	9.7
Delaware	587	0.65	3.1
Florida	5,152	6.6	12.0
Georgia	41,084	6.9	11.2
Kentucky	38,645	4.2	5.8
Louisiana	22,033	6.1	15.0
Maryland	13,783	2.7	6.3
Mississippi	30,943	8.7	14.1
Missouri	24,320	2.3	4.7
North Carolina	34,658	5.5	9.6
South Carolina	26,701	9.2	15.1
Tennessee	36,844	4.4	7.5
Texas	21,878	5.2	8.3
Virginia	52,128	5.0	9.4
Totals	393,967	4.9	10.0

3.10. Why did the Confederates start the war by firing the first shots on Fort Sumter?

While technically true that the South did fire the first gunshots of the war, this resulted from intentional provocation on the part of the Lincoln administration. By the time Lincoln took office, secession was well under way. The Confederate government had assumed control of numerous U.S. government “Federal” forts, arsenals and mints within the Confederate states. Union Major Robert Anderson secretly and at night moved his garrison from the weaker Fort Moultrie in the Charleston harbor to the stronger Fort Sumter. While this was taking place Lincoln’s predecessor, President James Buchanan, had announced his belief in the right of secession by stating that the U.S. had no right to coerce the Southern states to rejoin the Union. Oddly enough, Lincoln had affirmed his own similar belief on the Senate floor in January, 1848. His position changed drastically once appointed President.

In these next two incidences, the pattern of provocation by the North that caused the shots to be fired, which was not necessary, should be fully obvious.

The South’s first shots were fired on the ship "Star of the West" and only after having given a bow shot as a warning not to proceed. She carried provisions to re-supply Fort Sumter and the 200 armed men in her hold. The ship’s mission was to have been a secret. The plan was devised by Union General Winfield Scott and followed through by order of President Buchannan. An important fact about that incident which is often left out of the story is that the ship “Star of the West” after being warned with a bow shot, kept moving forward. It did not heed the warning. It was fired upon again, and was hit twice.

So, who started the war? The North did through this first incident of provocation. The firing the warning shot and the later shots and hits on the “Star of the West” did not have the desired effect by Scott and Buchannan to incite the Northern people enough to call for war.

Remember that South Carolina had legally seceded from the Union with the united States, and Fort Sumter was on South Carolina land. After South Carolina seceded, the fort was still manned by a Union garrison. The

South Carolina demanded possession of the fort and offered to pay for it. The Lincoln administration promised that the garrison would leave. However, Lincoln sent Federal war ships, which were supposed to be ships providing provisions for the men there, but instead were actually war ships. When General Beauregard learned of the ships sailing for Fort Sumter, he demanded that Major Anderson, the Union general in charge of the garrison, surrender the fort, or he would commence firing. Anderson refused to surrender, and Beauregard gave the order to fire before the garrison could be reinforced by the Federal war ships.

In short, South Carolina wanted her property back, offered to buy it back, and were promised to be given it back. When the promise was found out to be a lie, they were forced to take it back with force. Lincoln knew he could not gain support of the Northern people for war, so he forced the South into a position of “firing the first shots”, This allowed him to trick the North and the world, and as we see now most history teachers into thinking, “Look, Confederates fired on our United States flag. They want war.” You can see this was a propaganda stunt staged by the Northerners to win sympathy for the political aspirations of Lincoln. Once the Fort was fired on the fleet then continued on, as planned to Florida.

The Official Record discloses that beginning 20 January 1861, the Governor of South Carolina arranged to supply the garrison of Fort Sumter with fresh meat, vegetables, and groceries. At the time of the attack, it was reported that 4 weeks of rations were on store at the fort.

Firing on Fort Sumter did not mean the South wanted war. No one was hurt in the firing and Lincoln knew that the Confederates would have to gain control of this fort that had been erected for the defense of and now commanded the entrance to the city of Charleston, one of the busiest seaports at the time. A cold and calculated move that would cost thousands of lives in the next 4 years.

A fatal error made by the casual historian is to assume that the firing on Fort Sumter or even the earlier firing on the “Star of the West” was the beginning of the war. This would be then to assume that powerful elements in the North had no prior intent to invade and subjugate the South, and that they had no inkling that actions they were undertaking would result in physical resistance, and subsequent defense of the Southern homeland. The first casualty of the war was a Northerner inside Fort Sumter, who wanted to fire a cannon salute before leaving Fort Sumter and was killed in doing so.

Secretary of the Northern Navy Gideon Wells wrote: “It was very important that the Rebels strike the first blow in the conflict.”

Why the provocation? Republican leaders and their predecessors, the Federalists, in the North had long hated the South, a result of not only the Southern Democrats having controlled the White House and Congress for many of the country’s early years, but also resulting from a genuine dislike of democracy. In a general sense the beginning of the war can be traced to the Northern desire for disunion that surfaced in the late 18th century. These men were desirous of a monarchical government which would be a throwback to that of King George III, from whom our forefathers had fought seven years to attain separation.

Throughout the 19th century, and many years before the secession of any Southern state, prominent Northern legislators, editors, clergymen and civic leaders openly petitioned and pontificated the need for disunion; in fact, many conventions were held and resolutions supporting disunion passed in the Northern states. The hatred of democracy and the wish to form a Northern Confederacy was emphatically pronounced. Examples to make the point are:

George Cabot wrote:

“I cannot believe essential good will come from separation while we retain the maxims and democratic principles which all experience and reason pronounce to be impracticable and absurd.... We are too democratic altogether, and I hold democracy to be the government of the worst.”

From the Massachusetts convention of 1851:

“Resolved, That the one issue before the country is dissolution of the

Union, in comparison with which all other issues are as dust in the balance; therefore, we have given ourselves to the work of annulling this covenant with death.”

Rev. Andrew T. Foss, New York, 1857

“There never has been an hour when this infamous Union should have been made, and now the hour has to be prayed for when it shall be dashed to pieces forever! I hate the Union!”

Wendell Phillips, Boston, 1849

“We confess that we intend to trample on the Constitution of this country. We of New England are not a law-abiding community, God be thanked for it! We are disunionists; we want to get rid of this Union.”

Resolution passed in a meeting at Faneuil Hall in Boston, 1850:

“Resolved, That we seek a dissolution of the Union; and Resolved, That we do hereby declare ourselves the enemies of the Constitution, of the Union, and of the Government of the United States; and Resolved, That we proclaim it as our unalterable purpose and determination to live and labor for the dissolution of the present Union.”

And still other Northern leaders wrote:

“A thousand times accursed be this Union!”, William Lloyd Garrison, 1850

“Let us sweep away this remnant we call a Union.”, Senator Ben Wade of Ohio, 1855

“Why preserve the Union? It is not worth preserving. I hate the Union as I hate hell!”, Senator Langdon of Ohio

The above quotes offer a glimpse into the hearts and minds of Northern Federalist leaders of the day. It should be noted that the general populace did not, as a rule, wish for war. This lack of will among the average citizen was the reason Northern secession failed. When the Southern states began to desire disunion, the Northern leaders devised a plan of revenge and subjugation the general population was duped into supporting. How? By disseminating propaganda designed to make the population believe that their very existence was threatened by the Southern Confederacy, that the capitol of Washington would be attacked, and that the “rebels” were desirous of, not just separation, but conquest of the United States.

The absurdity of this effort in the face of overwhelming facts to the contrary, and the even more absurd fact that it succeeded as a motivation for war is mind-numbing in light of the above quotations which leave no doubt whatsoever as to who the true enemies of the United States were at the time. However, there was no effort to whip the public into a frenzy in response to these Northerners who openly professed to be “the enemies of the Constitution, of the Union, and of the Government of the United States.”

Interestingly enough, while some disunionists were also ardent abolitionists the primary motivation of the Northern disunionists was not rooted in abolition. During the early to mid 1800’s abolitionists were often physically attacked in Northern states, while the non-abolitionist disunionists were not. Although the ranks of abolitionists increased significantly in the 1830’s, Catherine Stowe, older sister of Harriet Beecher Stowe, reasoned that rather than through a belief in the abolitionist movement, many of these new supporters joined “because the violence of opposers had identified that cause with the question of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and civil liberty.” In other words, the motivating factor that brought many into the abolition movement was a belief in the very Constitutional guarantees that would later be crushed in the North as well as the South by the oppression of their own president.

Although the Republican party was an anti-slavery party since its beginnings in 1854, that plank of the party's platform was cast aside in the effort already discussed on motivating the populace for war. Remember the majority of the Northern people were not abolition-minded. At the urging of Secretary of State William Seward, Lincoln's policy became one of union vs disunion rather than one of slave vs free. Seward's desire for war was so strong that he urged Lincoln to demand explanations from France and Spain categorically as to whether or not they would officially recognize and/or support the Confederate States of America. Lincoln said, "And if satisfactory explanations are not received...I would convene Congress and declare war against them." Why was Mr. Lincoln so war hungry that he was willing to fight three wars at once?

Though Seward desired war, he preferred to begin the war in Florida rather than at Ft. Sumter. While debating the reinforcement of the fort in a Cabinet meeting he stated, "The attempt to reinforce Sumter will provoke an attack and invoke war. The very preparation for such an expedition will precipitate war at that point." Lincoln viewed this possibility as a way to galvanize support at home for his war by giving the appearance of not being the aggressor and by not having fired the first shot.

As proof of the war being "Lincoln's War" consider the following quote by Joseph Medill, an outspoken South hater and editor of the Chicago Tribune, from a 1864 meeting to protest the order for 6,000 additional Cook County, Illinois men to be drafted into the Union army:

"The citizens held a mass meeting and appointed three men, of whom I was one, to go to Washington and ask Stanton, Secretary of War, to give Cook County a new enrollment...He refused. Then we went to President Lincoln. 'I can not do it, but I will go with you to Stanton and hear the arguments of both sides.'...The argument went on for some time, and was finally referred to Lincoln, who had been silently listening. 'Gentlemen,' he said, with a voice full of bitterness, 'after Boston, Chicago has been the chief instrument in bringing this war on the country. The Northwest opposed the South, as New England opposed the South. It is you, Medill, who is largely responsible for making blood flow as it has. You called for war until you had it. I have given it to you. What you have asked for you have had....You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. Go home and raise your 6,000 men.'"

Nothing could be clearer: "You called for war...I have given it to you." By their own admission the North, and more precisely, Lincoln, started the War Between The States in spite of the expressed intentions of the Confederate States for peace. If the initiation and perpetuation of the war had not been the work of the North, why else would they have denied repeated requests from the Confederate government offering to send emissaries to Washington to negotiate peace? Because conquest of the South, its land and its people, not peace, was the Northern objective.

Who fired the first shots, the South. Why? Provocation and invasion by the North.

Sources and further reading: Facts the Historians Leave Out; John S. Tilley, copyright 1951 and 1993., The South Speaks Out, video by Mr. P. Charles Lunsford, Truths of History; Mildred Rutherford, War for What?; Francis W. Springer; copyright 1990, The South Was Right!; James Ronald Kennedy and Walter Donald Kennedy; 1991,1994

3.11. Why did Lincoln break the truce at Fort Pickens and precipitate the war by sending troops to Fort Sumter?

Lincoln did not think that war would result by sending troops to Fort Pickens, and it would give him the appearance of asserting the national authority. Lincoln needed an excuse to start his war of aggression, because Congress did not want war and would not declare war of its own volition. The most-likely hot-spot in which Lincoln could start his war was Charleston Harbor, where shots had already been fired in anger under the Buchanan administration. But the newly-elected governor of South Carolina, Francis Pickens, saw the danger, that Lincoln might, as an excuse, send a force of U.S. Navy warships to Charleston Harbor supposedly to re-supply Major Anderson's Union garrison in Fort Sumter. So Governor Pickens opened negotiations with Major

Anderson, and concluded a deal permitting Anderson to send boats safely to the market in Charleston once a week, where Anderson's men would be allowed to buy whatever victuals they wished. This arrangement remained in effect until a day or so before the U.S. Navy warships arrived at Charleston. Major Anderson wrote privately to friends, saying that he hoped Lincoln would not use Fort Sumter as the excuse to start a war, by sending the U.S. Navy to re-supply it.

Before his inauguration, Lincoln sent a secret message to General Winfield Scott, the U.S. general-in-chief, asking him to make preparations to relieve the Union forts in the South soon after Lincoln took office. Lincoln knew all along what he was going to do.

President Jefferson Davis sent peace commissioners to Washington to negotiate a treaty with the Lincoln administration. Lincoln refused to meet with them; and he refused to permit Secretary of State Seward to meet with them.

After Lincoln assumed the presidency, his principal generals recommended the immediate evacuation of Major Anderson's men from Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor, which was now located on foreign soil. To re-supply it by force at this point would be a deliberate act-of-war against the CSA

It turned out that Lincoln's postmaster general, Montgomery Blair, had a brother-in law, Gustavus V. Fox, who was a retired Navy captain, who wanted to get back into action. Fox had come up with a plan for re-supplying Fort Sumter which would force the Confederates to fire the first shot. These would be the circumstances which would force them to take the blame for the war. Lincoln sent Fox down to talk with Major Anderson about the plan, but Anderson wanted no part of it. Lincoln had Fox pitch the plan to his Cabinet twice. The first time, the majority said that move would start

A war. But the second time, the Cabinet members got Lincoln's pointed message, and capitulated.

Meanwhile, Congress got wind of the plan. Horrified, they called General Scott and others to testify about it; Scott and the other witnesses said they wanted no part of the move against the Confederacy in Charleston and neither did Congress. Congress demanded from Lincoln, as was Congress's right, Fox's report on Major Anderson's reaction to the plan. Lincoln refused to hand it over to them.

Lincoln sent to Secretary Cameron, for transmittal to Secretary Welles, orders in his own handwriting to make the warships Pocahontas and Pawnee and the armed-cutter Harriet Lane ready for sailing, along with the passenger ship Baltic, which would be used as a troop ship, and two ocean-going tugboats to aid the ships in traversing the tricky shallow harbor entrance at Charleston. Fox's plan was to send 500 extra Union-soldiers to reinforce Major Anderson's approximately-86-man force at Fort Sumter, along with huge quantities of munitions, food, and other supplies. The Confederacy would, of course, resist this invasion, in the process firing upon the U.S. flag. The unarmed tugs would, of necessity, enter the harbor first, whereupon they would likely be fired upon by the Confederates, giving Lincoln the best-possible propaganda to feed to the Northern newspapers, which would then rally the North to his "cause."

Lincoln sent orders for the Union naval-force to begin its journey so as to enter Charleston Harbor on 11 or 12 April 1861. Next, Lincoln sent a courier to deliver an ultimatum to Governor Pickens on 8 April 1861, saying that Lincoln intended to re-supply Fort Sumter peaceably or by force. There was no mistaking the intent of that message. Lincoln had set the perfect trap. He had given President Davis just enough time to amass his forces and fire upon the U.S. Navy. But if Davis acquiesced instead, Lincoln need merely begin sending expeditionary forces to recapture all of the former Union forts in the South now occupied by Confederate forces. Sooner or later Davis would have to fight; and the more forts he allowed Lincoln to recapture in the interim, the weaker would be the military position of the CSA. As a practical matter, Davis was left with no choice.

Accordingly, the CSA, informed that the U.S. Navy was en route, demanded that Major Anderson surrender the fort. Anderson refused. Beauregard's artillery bombarded Fort Sumter into rubble, miraculously without loss of life inside, and Anderson then surrendered with honor intact. The U.S. Navy arrived during the bombardment, but because elements of the force had been delayed for various reasons, did not join in the fight. The Navy was allowed to transport Anderson's men back to the U.S.

Thereafter Lincoln wrote to Fox, pronouncing the mission a great success. Lincoln ended his letter by saying, "You and I both anticipated that the cause of the country would be advanced by making the attempt to provision Fort Sumter, even if it should fail; and it is no small consolation now to feel that our anticipation is justified by the result."

Lincoln now had his excuse for a war, but there was no reason for him to believe that Congress would declare war against the South on his asking. In fact, there was every indication that they would not. So instead of calling Congress into emergency session and asking them to declare war, which was their prerogative, and not Lincoln's, Lincoln simply declared war himself--by calling the CSA's defense of its sovereignty in Charleston Harbor an "insurrection" against the U.S. government. Lincoln did not call Congress into session until several months later when his war had progressed so far that Congress could not then call it off, but as a practical matter would have to rubberstamp it.

Sources and further reading: Lincoln Takes Command by John S. Tilley
North Against South/An American Iliad by Ludwell Johnson's

3.12. Did Lincoln carry on the war for the purpose of freeing the slaves and weren't the Confederates fighting for slavery or the extension of slavery?

There are those who will tell you the War Between the States had everything to do with slavery and those who will say it had nothing to do with slavery. Issues of slavery were involved, but were certainly not the only reason for hostilities.

The causes of the War Between the States are too complex now for our "instant-fast food schooling" systems. Students and teachers seem to want a short, quick, easy answer to complex situations. It is historically inaccurate to say that the war was fought to free the slaves. The evidence is entirely against that interpretation. Charles

Adams, in his book "For Good and Evil: the Impact of taxes on the Course of Civilization", has a great way of summarizing the real situation:

"Wars are not really fought to free some unfortunate minority not directly involved in the conflict. People who want freedom have to fight for it themselves."

Too often 21st century thinking is used to judge issues of the 19th century. One would be hard pressed in this day and age to support or condone slavery. Feelings and thoughts were very different in the 1800's. As an example, of the leaders of that period Abraham Lincoln wrote to Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia on 22 December 1860, just 2 days after South Carolina seceded,

"Do the people of the South really entertain fears that a Republican administration would, directly or indirectly, interfere with their slaves, or with them about their slaves? If they do, I wish to assure you, as once a friend, and still, I hope, not an enemy, that there is no cause for such fears."

Later at his inaugural address in March 1861 Lincoln said:

"I declare that I have no intention, directly or indirectly, to interfere with slavery in the states where it exists."

In 1862, after a year of fighting, several Republican senators urged Lincoln to take action to free the slaves. His response was:

“Gentlemen, I can’t do it, But I’ll tell you what I can do, I can resign in favor of Mr. Hamlin. Perhaps Mr. Hamlin could do it.”

Lincoln himself stated many times that the war was to preserve the Union, not to free the slaves. Freeing the slaves only became an issue when Lincoln decided to use it as a war measure, such as freeing slaves to deprive the South of a valuable asset that was helping the South in its war effort.

The Old South's conservative nature is often misinterpreted by liberals and shallow historians as racial hatred, but in reality was only their tendency to oppose social change no matter what it concerned, from the topic of race, the style of dress, to manners at the dinner table. Their main fault was not racism, but perhaps was simply being conservative and traditional.

The Republicans had won the White House, and substantial majorities in the House and the Senate in the 1860 elections. When that message sank in, Southern states began seceding from the Union. If slavery was the main issue, the Southern legislators knew full well that the only truly safe way to protect the institution of slavery would be for the Southern states to remain in the Union and simply refuse to ratify any proposed constitutional amendment to emancipate the slaves. Slavery was specifically protected by the Constitution, and that protection could be removed only by an amendment ratified by three-quarters of the states.

In 1860 there were 15 slave states and 18 free states. Had the number of slave states remained constant, 27 more free states would have had to be admitted into the Union, for a total of 60 states, before an abolition amendment could be ratified. That was not likely to occur anytime soon.

The question of expansion of slavery into the territories was one of the catalysts that help ignited the war, but this does not mean that the North wanted to free the slaves. The truth is far from it. The North wanted slaves to stay where they were, along with their owners, and continue to form the basis for a cash machine that would perpetually generate tax revenue for the benefit of Northern interests. The money for all those bridges, railroads, and other infrastructures that were fueling Northern manufacturing interests had to come from somewhere. Tariffs on goods needed by the South for their agrarian society were the main source of that capital. For over 70 years, from the writing of the Constitution in 1787 until 1860, Northern interests had been quite content to live with slavery in the South. It was only when Southerners sought to change the equation by expanding along with the rest of the country that slavery became an issue for them.

As late as 1864, CSA President Davis offered to free the slaves if Britain would recognize the Confederate States. In that same year, Lincoln offered to leave slavery intact, if the South would simply stop fighting and rejoin the Union. These two events do not match with the simplistic idea that the North fought to abolish slavery and the South fought to retain it.

Slavery was not an exclusively Southern institution. Almost 400,000 slaves lived in Northern states at the start of the war. Many of those slaves were not freed until the 13th Amendment was passed. In fact, it is commonly accepted that the last slaves freed were in Delaware, a staunchly Union state. The 13th Amendment, passed after the war ended, was approved by Southern states who had already seen their capital assets stripped away without compensation and who were considered occupied enemy territory by the Northern States at that time.

At the time of the American Revolution, slavery existed in almost all States. Its disappearance in most Northern states over the next 60-70 years was an economic decision as much as anything. One of the dirty little secrets that Northerners don't like to have mentioned is that laws freeing slaves in Northern states during the period 1780-1860 almost universally allowed the owners to sell their slaves to slave-owners in Southern states, rather than freeing their slaves outright. Some of those state laws also forbade freed slaves from living in that same state.

Slavery was a world-wide institution whose days were numbered, at least in Western civilizations. If the South had won the War, slavery would have disappeared anyway. More than anything, the rise, decline and fall of slavery in the US must be viewed in economic terms. Slavery existed in the US, just as it had in other nations, for economic reasons. It disappeared for the same reason. A perspective on the historical role of slavery is called for in order to get a true understanding of the issues of the time. The South frequently gets the blame for slavery, but this institution continued for decades after the War in other parts of the world. Mauritania, an African country frequently mentioned for its cultural heritage efforts, did not abolish slavery until 1984!

One more point we should make is that the Old South was not anymore racist than the Old North. Hate was not founded in the South as liberals like to imply. We demand fair and equal treatment of the Old South and our ancestors. Less than one in fifteen Southerners ever owned a slave. There were fewer than 350,000 Southern slave-owners, yet over 600,000 soldiers who fought for the Confederacy. Do you believe that every slave holder was in uniform?

As Confederate General Robert Edward Lee once said: "Every one should do all in his power to collect and disseminate the truth, in the hope it may find a place in history and descend to posterity. History is not the relation of campaigns, and battles, and generals or other individuals, but that which shows the principles for which the South contended and which justified her struggle for those principles."

This should be evidence that slavery or its extension was not the cause of the war. Robert E. Lee declared that slavery was "a moral and political evil.", and the best men in the South oppose this system." He was quoted as saying "the mild and melting influences of Christianity, rather than war, would solve the problem"

Sources and further reading: The Lincoln Reader, by Paul Angle.

For Good and Evil: the Impact of Taxes on the Course of Civilization, by Charles Adams

Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government, by Jefferson Davis

3.13. Was slavery legal according to the Constitution and the laws of the United States in 1860?

Yes, slavery was legal and so was secession. Legislators and historians who study the constitution know full well that the only truly safe way to for the South to protect the institution of slavery would be for the Southern states to remain in the Union and simply refuse to ratify any proposed constitutional amendment to emancipate the slaves. Slavery was specifically protected by the Constitution, and that protection could be removed only by an amendment ratified by three-quarters of the states. Does it make sense to secede for the cause of preserving slavery? No. Isn't it odd that the Northern politicians would work to subvert two constitutionally legal actions with an invasion of the south?

Slavery was not indigenous to the Confederate States of America, or The South, as the reconstructionist and politically correct historians would have all America believe. In ancient history Greece, Rome, Egypt and nearly every civilization had some form of slavery. Biblical references are also found on slavery In Europe, Great Britain, Spain and the British Colonies in North America we all allowed to practice slavery. It is said that over half of the early colonists, of which were from Britain, were indentured. Native African tribes took each other as slaves; North and South American native Indian tribes took each other as slaves. Slavery has been a part of the life of Mankind from the beginning. If one tribe or civilization was strong enough to defeat another in battle, it was the conquerors right to take the conquered as slaves. This does not mean that we condone

slavery. It is ridiculous to even imply this in the 1990's. It is equally ridiculous to use 1990 knowledge and judgment to look back at the ancient times or even the 1860 and presume to judge those people on our terms.

As early as 1444 Spain was engaged in selling African slaves in Europe. Christopher Columbus is credited as being the first slaver to land in the Western Hemisphere in the 1492. In 1513, King Ferdinand declared: ". . . the servitude of the Indians was warranted by the laws of God and man."

The British opened their slave trade in 1562 on the coast of Guinea. The next year 1563 they began to import Negro slaves into the West Indies for profit. In 1619 when a British ship flying a Dutch flag landed off the coast of Jamestown, Virginia and unloaded twenty Negroes. The Virginians accepted these people not as slaves, but as indentured servants. One of this number was a man known as Anthony Johnson. In 1623 Anthony Johnson served four years as an indentured servant and was now a free man. Through his own diligence and hard work he became a prosperous land owner in seventeenth century Virginia. He imported servants of his own. In 1658, one of his servants, a Negro named John Castor, complained to the authorities that Mr. Johnson had kept him past his servitude release date, an act which was a serious offense. Johnson, frightened by the threat of censure, released all claims on Castor. Johnson then found out that Castor had bound himself to a Mr. Parker who had helped Castor gain his freedom from Johnson. Johnson filed a lawsuit against Parker claiming that he (Johnson), was entitled to lifetime service from Castor. Johnson won the case and set the precedent for lifetime Negro slavery in the British Colony of Virginia in North America. Slavery was established in 1654, when Anthony Johnson, convinced the court that he was entitled to the lifetime services of John Castor. This was the first judicial approval of life servitude, except as punishment for a crime. Johnson started a colony of free Negroes in Virginia, some time after 1660.

In 1650, there were only 300 Negroes in Virginia, about 1% of an estimated 30,000 population. They were not slaves, any more than were the approximately four thousand white indentured "servants" working out their loans for passage money to Virginia, and who were granted 50 acres each when freed from their indentures, so they could raise their own tobacco.

From Hildreth's History of the United States:

"The first recorded case, in 1677, in which the question of property in Negroes appears to have come before the English courts, it was held, that being usually bought and sold among merchants as merchandize, and being infidels, there might be a property in them sufficient to maintain trover."

The Assiento Treaty of 1714 created a company for the prosecution of African Slave Trade. Twenty-five percent of the stock went to King Philip of Spain. Queen Anne took twenty-five percent for herself and the rest went to the nobility of England. Quoting Bancroft: ". . . thus did the sovereigns of England and Spain become the largest slave-merchants in the world."

There were no slave ships ever chartered from a Southern port. The charters came from London, Seville, Lisbon, Boston, and New York just to name a few. In the year 1775 the people of the Colony of Georgia in congress wrote the Darden resolutions. Quoting from the Darden resolutions, June 12, 1775:

"To show the world that we are not influenced by any contracted or interested motive, but a general philanthropy for all mankind, of whatever climate, language, or complexion, we hereby declare our disapprobation and abhorrence of the unnatural practice of slavery in America. A practice founded in injustice and cruelty, upon a very wrong foundation. We therefore resolve at all times to use our utmost efforts for the manumission of our slaves in this colony upon the most safe and equitable footing for the masters and themselves."

When the original colony of Georgia ceded the lands that now form the states of Alabama and Mississippi, she stipulated in the agreement that the new states enter the Union of States as a free states with no slaves. The

states of Illinois and Ohio banned the legal entry of slaves as well as freemen into their states. Ohio also required newcomers to post a prohibitively high financial bond to keep out the unwanted.

Quoting Horace Greeley from his book, *The American Conflict*:

“The Negroes, uncouth and repulsive, could speak no word intelligible to British or Colonial ears . . . Some time ere the middle of the Seventeenth Century, a British Attorney-General, having the question formally submitted to him, gave his official opinion, that Negroes, being pagans, might justly be held in slavery, even in England itself.”

The census of 1860 gives the number of free Negroes living in the United States as 488,000. Historically accurate facts prove that over fifty-three percent or 260,000 free Black men, women, and children lived in the South and considered themselves Southerners.

Do not forget the conservative factor of the South and its play in the continuity of slavery. They were simply carrying on a colonial tradition of their forefathers. Many believed the institutions and lifestyles of Washington's and Jefferson's day were good for their grandfathers so it should be just fine for us as well now. Those Southerners that were more progressive saw the curse of slavery, but they had no easy answers on how to humanely end the institution.

Most slaveholders had no hatred for the Negro and they had the best of intentions in regard to their well being. Any racism that they had must be evaluated based upon the times and culture they lived in. We should not be judging their character simply by racial values of the 1990's. We enjoy information that they had no access to, plus have the advantage of historical hindsight that makes it impossible for many today to see the past without a biased prejudiced view of 18th and 19th century Old South culture.

3.14. Did the Emancipation Proclamation really free the slaves and did Lincoln have the legal right to declare an end to slavery?

President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation did not free a single slave. It was politics, not principle. Issued at a time when the Confederacy seemed to be winning the war, Lincoln hoped to transform a disagreement over secession into a crusade against slavery, thus preventing Great Britain and France from intervening on the side of the South. The proclamation allowed slavery to continue in the North as well as in Tennessee and large parts of Louisiana and Virginia. He applied this proclamation only to Confederate held slaves, which Lincoln had no authority over, but not to slaves under Federal control. The constitution would be subverted in order to “declare” slavery ended. If the emancipation proclamation was such a law to set the slaves free, why did it not follow the flow of governmental checks and balances and why did it not cover the slaves of the North? Would not that be illegal?

Lincoln has gone down through history with these quotes on slavery:

“If all earthy power was given to me, I would not know what to do as to the existing institution of slavery” 1854 speech in Peoria.

"I am not in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office...."
9/15/1858 campaign speech

"I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery...." 3/4/1861 First Inaugural Address

"I am a little uneasy about the abolishment of slavery in this District of Columbia...." 3/24/1862 letter to Horace Greeley

"If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it...." 8/22/1862 letter to Horace Greeley, New York Tribune editor

Another aspect that is often forgotten is the hope on the supporters of this proclamation that the Southern slaves would rise up in violent revolt murdering their former owners, neighbors and anyone in their path. This stress and fear would not only impact the wives and children at home, but the men in arms fighting for the Confederacy. This was a cruel psychological impact on the fighting man away from home.

It appears the "Great Emancipator" was more "political", by raising the issue of slavery, only after it was needed to incite the Northern citizens against the Confederate States and to terrorize the Southerners. Lincoln's past historical comments regarding slavery speak for themselves. This proclamation was political, an effort to accelerate support for the war and had no humanitarian inspiration.

3.15. Did Abraham Lincoln and or any individuals associated with his administration break the laws of the United States and/or violate the Constitution in any way?

Yes. Lincoln violated many laws and chose to ignore the constitution at will. When he took office, the oath required him "to execute the office of President and to the best of his ability to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution. He actions on the next seven points clearly show he was in violation of the law of the land. The seven most common examples of this violation of oath and law are:

- #1) invading the South after legal and peaceful session of the Southern states,
- #2) initiating a war without declaration from congress,
- #3) blockades of Southern ports and seizing of neutral countries ships and cargo,
- #4) the "emancipation" of slaves in the CSA, of which his proclamation had no legal authority in the South
- #5) the cruel retaliation against the South, known as reconstruction
- #6) the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus
- #7) the crimes against a civilian population, burning of towns, homes, crops, etc.

In other questions in Part 3, we have examined:

#1) illegal invasion following secession (questions 3.4, 3.6, 3.7), Remember that either the Southern states were in the union or out of it. If the ordinances of secession were void, then the President was limited by the acts of Congress which under the Constitution, had the whole military power. Lincoln admitted in Seward's official letters to the United States Ministers at London and Paris (in 10 April and 22 April 1861), that the government had no power to war upon a State.

#2) initiation of the war without declaration (question 3.17), Not only did Lincoln send troops into the South without Congressional authority, but he also raised an army far above the limits fixed by congress. If the secession ordinances were valid, and the Confederate States were out of the Union, then Lincoln's acts were acts of war and he was again in violation of oath and Constitution as only Congress can declare war and make the laws necessary for the war to progress.

#3) blockades (question 3.4, 3.17), In declaring a blockade and in denouncing Confederate privateersmen as pirates, he usurped the powers of Congress and the Constitution again.

#4) emancipation proclamation (questions 3.12, 3.13, 3.14). Aside from the obvious illegalities mention in other questions, part of the politics of this proclamation was the hope by Lincoln and his cronies that a mass

slave uprising would take place. There was at best indifference, and most likely approval, that this uprising would cause a massacre among the white population of the South while the able-bodied men were off serving with the Confederate armies.

#5) reconstruction (questions 3.25, 3.26) For a government that stated they were trying to preserve and restore the union, reconstruction was a punishment imposed by the Northern government on the former Confederate states, for daring to assert their constitutional rights to secede and be free and independent.

For #6) suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. The courts were in full operation in the North, and there was no threat by the seceding states to do anything to overthrow the government in the North. Arrests with the suspension of habeas corpus meant no due process or timely trials. The accused and suspected were held for months in gloomy jails, without charge, without trial and without counsel.

For #7) Crimes against the civilian population. If Lincoln's contention was that his actions were taken in suppression of an insurrection that would mean fighting only the insurgents themselves. An offensive action that made enemies of innocent inhabitants of the territory under Confederate control required a declaration of war, which remember, was never done. The later actions of Sheridan in the Valley and Sherman in Georgia and the Carolinas show that the Union was willing to make war on the innocent by assuming they weren't really innocent. It sacking and burning of homes and towns, and the general destruction of fences, crops, stock and farm implements coupled with the expulsion from their homes of all persons, including women and children and non-combatants, unless an oath of allegiances was taken are other examples of Yankee war crimes. Over 60 towns were destroyed in the South and the country laid to waste from the Potomac to the Rio Grande. Even Federal General Halleck declared the burning of houses and private property as "barbarous" Any living animal in Georgia that was not needed alive by the Federal Army was usually killed or maimed to render it useless.

3.16. Did General Grant and General Lee both own slaves and did they free them?

General Grant was the last of the United States Presidents that bought, owned, and worked a slave. The slave's name was William Jones. In 1858, while attempting to make a go in civilian life as a farmer near St. Louis, Missouri, Ulysses S. Grant bought the slave, William Jones, from his brother-in-law. Grant's also became the owner of record of his wife's inheritance of four slaves, but as was the case at the time, women could not actually own slaves, so they were under the control of Grant. There is no record of these slaves having been freed prior to emancipation in Missouri in 1865.

It is interesting to note some of the thoughts of General Grant. Grant informed his family that his only desire was, "...to put down the rebellion. I have no hobby of my own with regard to the Negro, either to effect his freedom or continue his bondage. I am using them as teamsters, hospital attendants, company cooks and so forth thus saving soldiers to carry the musket. . . . it weakens the enemy to take them from them."

Robert E. Lee personally owned at least one slave, an elderly house servant that he inherited from his mother. It is said that Lee continued to hold the slave as a kindness, since he was too feeble to have made his way as a free man. Although it is commonly believed that Lee owned the Arlington Plantation and the associated slaves, these and two other plantations totaling over 1,000 slaves were the property of Lee's father-in-law, George Washington Parke Custis. Upon Mr. Custis's death in 1858, Lee did not personally inherit either the plantations or slaves, but was named the executor of the estate. Mr. Custis willed that his slaves should be freed within 5 years. Legal problems with the fulfillment of other terms of the will led Lee to delay in the execution of the terms of manumission until the latest specified date. On 29 Dec 1862, Lee executed a deed of manumission for all the slaves of the Custis estate who were still behind Confederate lines. Arlington was in Union hands by that time in history.

Sources and further reading: Lee & Grant, by Gene Smith; The Civil War: Strange and Fascinating Facts, by Burke Davis; Let Us Have Peace: Ulysses S. Grant and Politics of War and Reconstruction, by Brooks D. Simpson,

3.17. Was there an actual declaration of war?

The United States never officially declared war. Lincoln without a declaration from the US Congress sent the Northern troops to invade the south. Lincoln issued a proclamation on 15 April 1861 that an insurrection existed in the states of Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas (Messages & Papers of the Presidents, vol. V, pg 3214). He also proclaimed a blockade of Southern harbors on 19 April 1861. (Proclamation No. 4, 12 Stat. 1258, 1861, and Proclamation No. 5, 12 Stat. 1259, 1861).

The blockading of ports is an action that can only be done against a foreign nation, and that's what Lincoln did to southern ports. These blockades were treated by the President not as a blockade under the law of nations but as a restraint upon commerce at the interdicted ports under the municipal laws of the Government. The Court's decision is rather convoluted. Basically it says the Union initiated war on the CSA without declaring war. Any surprises that the President of the United States would continue to take the law into his own hands and for his own uses to attack the South?

The Confederate States passed "An Act Recognizing the Existence of War Between the United States and the Confederate States" on 6 May 1861. This was in direct response to the Yankee invasion and blockades. At the time this act exempted Maryland, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Arkansas, Missouri Delaware and the territories of Arizona, New Mexico and the Indian Territory.

In 1862 the owners of the Amy Warwick, Crenshaw, Hiawatha, and Brillante sued the US government for the illegal seizure of their ships and cargoes. With the help of Lincoln's three newest appointees (Davis, Miller, and Swayne), in a 5 to 4 decision the US Supreme Court upheld the legality of seizing ships attempting to enter or leave Southern ports.

In the dissenting opinion written by Justice Nelson, joined by Taney, Catron, and Clifford, he questioned the constitutionality of the President's proclamations and stated that only Congress had the power to declare war. He also stated that a declaration of war was necessary before the existence of neutral third parties could be admitted. The blockade was instituted to prevent neutral third parties from supplying the CSA with goods.

Grier responded by saying that Congress could not declare war against a State, or any number of States, implying that the United States could never formally be at war with any subdivision of itself. He also stated that the President had no power to initiate or declare a war either against a foreign nation or a domestic State. However, as Commander-in-Chief, the President had been authorized by Congress to call out the armed forces to suppress insurrections.

Grier used a very convoluted trail of reasoning to demonstrate that a state of war didn't exist, that the Confederate States were in insurrection, but this state of insurrection was of such character and magnitude that it allowed the United States the same rights and powers which they might exercise in the case of a national or foreign war, and in fact a state of war could exist without a declaration of war.

Grier noted that Congress had retroactively sanctioned the blockade by subsequent legislation. His argument was that the ex post facto clause had no application in a tribunal administering public and international law. He also stated that, "all power is claimed by the President" in defense of the nation. This line of reasoning implied the Constitution was non-operational during an emergency, a conclusion the Court would deny later in ex parte Milligan.

Nelson's most interesting objection was his last. Suppression of an insurrection meant fighting only the insurgents themselves. An offensive action that made enemies of innocent inhabitants of the territory under rebel control required a declaration of war. However, Grier stated that, "all persons residing within the territory occupied by the hostile party in this contest, are liable to be treated as enemies." He made this statement even though he admitted the President believed most of the citizens in the seceding States were loyal to the Union. The later actions of Sheridan in the Valley and Sherman in Georgia and the Carolinas show that the Union was willing to make war on the innocent by assuming they weren't really innocent.

In the end, falling back on circular logic, Grier stated, "the proclamation of blockade is itself official and conclusive evidence to the Court that a state of war existed which demanded and authorized a recourse to such a measure." In essence the Court was saying the President was immune from judicial scrutiny on any matter concerned with pursuing what they termed "lawful hostilities" or how he chose to interpret "lawful hostilities". Indeed the President's council had argued that the Supreme Court was nothing more than a prize court in this instance and that the President's prize court has no commission to thwart his purpose, or overrule his construction of the law of nations.

This case is often quoted as proof of the constitutionality of the President's constitutional war powers. However, a careful examination of this case shows the existence of a convoluted and contradictory trail of reasoning used to justify the seizure of ships from neutral nations in an undeclared war based on extra-constitutional actions by the President.

Sources and further reading: McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*; *Official Records*, Series IV, Vol. 1
 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (1923), *Prize Cases Decided in the United States Supreme Court, 1789-1918*. The Clarendon Press.
 Currie, David P. (1985), *The Constitution in the Supreme Court: The First Hundred Years, 1789-1888*. University of Chicago Press.

3.18. Who were the first Confederates appointed as Generals?

The first Confederate Generals were: Samuel Cooper, 16 May 1861 (Adjutant & Inspector General), Albert Sidney Johnston 30 May 1861, Robert Edward Lee 14 Jun 1861, Joseph Eggleston Johnston 4 Jul 1861, Pierre Gustave Toutant Beauregard 21 Jul 1861

In addition to the CSA Regular Army, there was the Provisional Army which had the ranks of Brigadier and Major General: Pierre Gustave Toutant Beauregard 1 Mar 1861, David Emanuel Twiggs 22 May 1861, Leonidas Polk, 25 Jun 1861. At least 35 others were appointed between March and August 1861.

Sources and further reading: *Generals in Gray* and *More Generals in Gray*, Ezra J. Warner, 1995,

3.19. Why were the Prisoner of War Camps like Andersonville in the South so brutal on prisoners?

One of the greatest myths about the "evil" Southern Confederacy was that the misery at Andersonville was purposeful. In the chart below compare the figures as we begin to look at the facts

Number of Yankees in CSA prisons	270,000
Number of Confederates in Union prisons	220,000
Excess number of Union prisoners	50,000

Yankee deaths in Confederate prisons	22,570
Confederate deaths in Union prisons	26,436
Excess of Confederate deaths in Union prisons	3,866

**from UCV sources in 1900*

Many of the “friends of Lincoln” have tried to hold the Confederates responsible for the deaths in Southern prisons. It was more clearly the action of Lincoln that cause this death and suffering to occur. Lincoln’s policy, informed by his army and navy, was to starve the South by blockade, halting the importing of materials including food and medicine and to destroy all grain, stock, farming utensils, etc. This had impact not only on the South’s ability to feed, cloth and take care of medical needs of it’s men in arms, but also of its civilian population, innocent women and children, and of course prisoners in their charge. The North wanted to bleed the South of all resources, including man power. They were satisfied allowing their captured troops to be held in camps. Camps that had to be in remote areas, away from the invading Northern troops. Camps that would require men be pulled from the fight against the invasion to guard the prisoners. The Union soldiers, held in Southern prisons were mere pawns in Lincoln’s campaign against the South.

By refusing all exchanges, which would have allowed the northern prisoners to return home, receive medicine that was not available in the South, and also access to food and clothing that was abundant in the North, it was at Lincoln’s hand and that of Butler and Grant that his soldiers suffered.

The Southern officials offered many times on humanitarian grounds to release the sick to Northern officials without the consideration of the return of Confederate soldiers. Pleas for medicine and doctors to administer to the prisoners were made by the Confederate government. These offers were all refused or simply ignored. The Confederate government, even though it was strapped for resources, offered to buy medicine for the prisoners with gold, cotton or tobacco and that Union Surgeons could bring the medicines down to the prison camps and administer them to their sick troops. The offers were ignored.

The rations and medicine issued were all that were available. It is stated that the men of the army and even the citizens of the South often went as hungry or in need of medicine, just as the prisoners at Andersonville. On several occasions Yankee prisoners were released from Andersonville to travel to Washington D.C. to plead for relief and the resumption of exchanges. Their heartrending petition was published in the New York and Washington papers. Their pleas fell on deaf government ears as there was no relief offered. Lincoln was unwilling to interfere with Grant’s inhuman determination. The prisoners were allowed to speak freely about Andersonville and the conditions there. No where in there report can it be found that any murders had been committed by Southern troops, nor did they speak evil of the Southern leaders. In fact they spoke of Major Wirz as a kind man, and of General Winder, Wirz’s commander, they had nothing but praise for his kindness.

On two occasions the Confederate authorities were requested to send their very worst cases of sick prisoners North. It was thought that possibly humanitarian efforts were forth coming. Instead the sick prisoners were taken to Annapolis, and then photographed as “specimen prisoners”. This was another propaganda measure to trick the Northern population in to believing the South was willfully starving and mistreating the Northern soldiers.

The Andersonville myth was a Northern political tool to turn the civilian population to hate the Southern people and to support the horrible reconstruction that would be imposed upon them. Yes, conditions were bad. Conditions that the North exacerbated. It was noted in several reports that the Southern government gave their prisoners the same rations as it gave to its own soldiers.

On the other hand, if the North held approximately 50,000 less prisoners than the South held, why is it that nearly 4000 more Confederates died in Union prison? Why were Confederate prisoners starving and dying in

the North, which was the land of plenty? The North had plenty of food, clothing, medicine, housing, and had every opportunity to purchase and import and supplies needed if they could not produce it themselves. The fact is that the mortality rate was higher in Union prisons than in Confederate prisons. Consider the inequality in resources. Why is Andersonville the shame? The truth is the South did the best they could with what they had. The North did the worst. They allowed suffering of their own men held in prison by their policies and practices. They tortured Southern soldiers with neglect, starvation and disease in the face of abundant resources that were available. Where were the real war crimes committed? Was it Wirz or Lincoln and Grant that were guilty of war crimes?

Sources and further reading: Andersonville: The Southern Perspective by J.H. Seagars, Prison Life during the Civil War by Fritz Fuzzlebug, 1869
Andersonville Prison by Page & Healey
A Confederate Catechism, The War for Southern Self-Government, by Lyon Gardiner Tyler, 1935
Facts the Historians Leave Out: A Confederate Primer by John S. Tilley; 1951, 1993,

3.20. How did the prisoner exchanges and paroles work?

Prisoner exchanges were a way for captors to avoid the responsibility and burden of guarding, housing, feeding, clothing, and providing medical care for POW's. It allowed for sick and wounded prisoners to be released to their own forces for treatment and care. Exchange of prisoners began with informal agreements between the individual commanders of the armies after particular battles, but the practice was formalized by a cartel between the USA and CSA in July 1862. The cartel was suspended by the US Government in May 1863. Still in the name of decency and humanity, individual commanders again arranged exchanges and paroles until 1864. The US Government was outraged at this humanitarian action and called a halt to all exchanges in early 1864, threatening commanders who continued the practice.

Commissioners of exchange were appointed by each government, and they exchanged and compared lists and computed how many on each side were to be exchanged. There were official points where prisoners were to be taken for exchange such as City Point, Virginia in the East and Vicksburg, Mississippi in the West. Equal ranks were exchanged equally, and higher ranks could be exchanged for some number of lower ranks according to an agreed upon list of equivalents (e.g. 1 colonel equaled 15 privates). If one side still had prisoners left, after the other side had exhausted its supply of prisoners by exchange, those excess prisoners would be released on parole. Paroled prisoners were returned to their side, but were prohibited by an oath of honor from taking up arms or performing any duty that soldiers normally performed until they were properly exchanged. Generally each side maintained parole camps where their paroled soldiers were kept while they awaited exchange, but in other cases the parolee was allowed to return home until exchanged.

Exchanging of prisoners up to 1863 was a common and humane policy practice by all civilized countries with a history going back to the middle ages. Lincoln wanted to fight a war of attrition with the South. Draining her of fighting men, food, supplies, materials, medicine and the ability to fight on. Lincoln threw every obstacle he could in the way of exchanges. He appointed "The Beast", Benjamin Butler as Commissioner of Exchanges, a man who so outraged Southerners, that he had been outlawed for base conduct. Later he appointed Grant in this position who was opposed to all exchanges on the ground apparently of the superior patriotism of the Southern soldiers, who he felt if exchanged would hurry back to their regiments to take up arms against the North once again. Grant is quoted in a letter to Butler in 1864 as:

"It is hard on our men held in Southern prisons not to exchange them, but it is humanity to those left in the ranks to fight our battles. Every man released on parole becomes an active soldier against us at once. If we commence a system of exchange which liberates all prisoners taken, we will have to fight on until the whole South is exterminated. If we hold those caught, they amount to no more than dead men."

The North with overwhelming numbers could easily replace captured men, but South called up every available man and each soldier lost rendered them that much weaker. The North then abandoned their captured comrades to fend with what fate had in store.

Sources and further reading: A Confederate Catechism, The War for Southern Self-Government, by Lyon Gardiner Tyler, 1935

Tyler, 1935

Facts the Historians Leave Out: A Confederate Primer by John S. Tilley; 1951, 1993,

Civil War Dictionary by Boatner,

Prisons and Hospitals, vol 8 by Miller, Photographic History of the Civil War

3.21. Did blacks and other minorities fight for the Confederacy?

Yes there were Black, Hispanic and other minority Confederates. There were minority soldiers. There were also many black men in supporting roles, that in today's army would allow them to be classified as a soldier. In addition to soldiers they served as cooks, teamsters, nurses, blacksmiths, and other support functions. The question often asked then is, "Why haven't we heard more about them?" National Park Service historian, Ed Bearrs, stated:

"I don't want to call it a conspiracy to ignore the role of Blacks both above and below the Mason-Dixon line, but it was definitely a tendency that began around 1910"

Historian, Erwin L. Jordan, Jr., calls it a cover-up which started back in 1865. He writes,

"During my research, I came across instances where Black men stated they were soldiers, but you can plainly see where 'soldier' is crossed out and 'body servant' inserted, or 'teamster' on pension applications."

Another black historian, Roland Young, says he is not surprised that blacks fought. He explains that, "...some, if not most, Black southerners would support their country" and that by doing so they were "demonstrating it's possible to hate the system of slavery and love one's country." This is the very same reaction that most African Americans showed during the American Revolution, where they fought for the colonies, even though the British offered them freedom if they fought for them.

It has been estimated that over 65,000 Southern blacks were in the Confederate ranks. Over 13,000 of these, meet the enemy in some sort of combat. These Black Confederates included both slave and free.

The Confederate Congress did not approve blacks to be officially enlisted as soldiers, except as musicians, until late in the war, but in the ranks it was a different story. Many Confederate officers did not obey the mandates of politicians, they frequently enlisted blacks with the simple criteria, "Will you fight?" Historian Ervin Jordan, explains that bi-racial units were frequently organized by local Confederate and State militia Commanders in response to immediate threats in the form of Union raids.

Dr. Leonard Haynes, an African-American professor at Southern University, stated,

"When you eliminate the black Confederate soldier, you've eliminated the history of the South."

As the war came to an end, the Confederacy took progressive measures to build back up it's army. The creation of the Confederate States Colored Troops came too late to be successful. Had the Confederacy been successful, it would have created the world's largest armies at the time consisting of black soldiers, even larger than that of the North. This would have given the future of the Confederacy a vastly different appearance than what modern

day racists or anti-Confederate liberals conjecture. Not only did Jefferson Davis envision black Confederate veterans receiving bounty lands for their service, there would have been no future for slavery after the goal of 300,000 armed black CSA veterans came home after the war.

BLACK CONFEDERATE HERITAGE

This fact sheet is prepared by the Sons of Confederate Veterans Education Committee for distribution to professors, teachers, librarians, principals, ethnic leaders, members of the press, and others interested in promoting an understanding of Black contributions to United States history.

"There are at the present moment, many colored men in the Confederate Army doing duty...as real soldiers, having muskets on their shoulders and bullets in their pockets...." Frederick Douglas, former slave & abolitionist (Fall, 1861)

How many? Easily tens of thousands of blacks served the Confederacy as laborers, teamsters, cooks and even as soldiers. Some estimates indicate 25% of free blacks and 15% of slaves actively supported the South during the war.

Why? Blacks served the South because it was their home, and because they hoped for the reward of patriotism; for these reasons they fought in every war through Korea, even though it meant defending a segregated United States.

Confederates: Famed bridge engineer and former slave Horace King received naval contracts for building Confederate warships. A black servant named Sam Ashe killed the first Union officer during the war, abolitionist Major Theodore Winthrop. John W. Buckner, a black private, was wounded at Ft. Wagner repulsing the U.S. (Colored) 54th Massachusetts Regiment. George Wallace, a servant who surrendered with General Lee at Appomattox, later served in the Georgia Senate. Jim Lewis served General Stonewall Jackson, and was honored to hold his horse "Little Sorrel" at the general's funeral. Captured black cook Dick Poplar suffered cruelty by Yankee Negro guards at Pt. Lookout, MD for being a "Jeff Davis man."

Surprising Facts: In St. Louis, General John Fremont freed slaves of "disloyal" Missouri Confederates; an angry Lincoln fired him.

Slaves in Washington, D.C. were not freed until April 1862, a year after the war began with the firing at Ft. Sumter.

Slavery continued throughout the entire war in five Union-held states: Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky and Missouri.

The New York City draft riots of July 1863 resulted in burning of a black orphanage and lynching of blacks. A provision in the Confederate Constitution prohibited the African slave trade outright, unlike the U.S. Constitution.

Encouraged by General Lee, the CSA eventually freed slaves who would join the army, and did recruit and arm black regiments.

General Robert E. Lee freed his family slaves before the war; Union Gen. U.S. Grant kept his wife's slaves well into the war.

Many blacks owned slaves themselves. In 1861 Charleston, for example, a free colored planter named William Ellison owned 70 slaves. Even in 1830 New York City, three decades before the war, eight black planters owned 17 slaves.

Blacks Today: Nelson W. Winbush, a retired educator and SCV member, lectures on his black Confederate ancestor, private Louis N. Nelson. A black Chicago funeral home owner, Ernest A. Griffin, flies the CSA battle flag and erected at his own expense a \$20,000 monument to the 6,000 Confederate soldiers who are buried on his property, once site of the Union prison Camp Douglas. Black professor Lloyd Haynes (recently deceased) of Southeastern Louisiana University spoke regularly on black Confederates. American University's professor

Edward Smith also lectures on the truth of black Confederate history and, with Nelson W. Winbush, has prepared an educational videotape entitled "Black Southern Heritage."

The "Richmond Howitzers" were partially manned by black militiamen. They saw action at First Manassas where they operated Battery number 2. In addition two black regiments, one free and one slave, participated in the battle on behalf of the South. "Many colored people were killed in the action", recorded John Parker, a former slave.

At least one Black Confederate was a non-commissioned officer. James Washington, Company D, 34th Texas Cavalry, "Terrell's Texas Cavalry" became its 3rd Sergeant.

Free black musicians, cooks, soldiers and teamsters earned the same pay as white confederate privates. This was not the case in the Union army where blacks did not receive equal pay.

At the Confederate Buffalo Forge in Rockbridge County, Virginia, skilled black workers earned on average three times the wages of white Confederate soldiers and more than most Confederate army officers (\$350- \$600 a year).

Dr. Lewis Steiner, Chief Inspector of the United States Sanitary Commission while observing General Stonewall Jackson's occupation of Frederick, Maryland, in 1862 noted:

"Over 3,000 Negroes must be included in this number Confederate troops. These were clad in all kinds of uniforms, not only in cast-off or captured United States uniforms, but in coats with Southern buttons, State buttons, etc. These were shabby, but not shabbier or seedier than those worn by white men in the rebel ranks. Most of the Negroes had arms, rifles, muskets, sabers, bowie-knives, dirks, etc.....and were manifestly an integral portion of the Southern Confederate Army."

Frederick Douglas reported,

"There are at the present moment many Colored men in the Confederate Army doing duty not only as cooks, servants and laborers, but real soldiers, having musket on their shoulders, and bullets in their pockets, ready to shoot down any loyal troops and do all that soldiers may do to destroy the Federal government and build up that of the...rebels."

Black and white militiamen returned heavy fire on Union troops at the Battle of Griswoldsville, near Macon, GA. Approximately 600 boys and elderly men were killed in this skirmish.

In 1864, President Jefferson Davis approved a plan that proposed the emancipation of slaves, in return for the official recognition of the Confederacy by Britain and France. France showed interest but Britain refused.

The Jackson Battalion included two companies of black soldiers. They saw combat at Petersburg under Col. Shipp. "My men acted with utmost promptness and goodwill.Allow me to state sir that they behaved in an extraordinary acceptable manner."

Recently the National Park Service, with a recent discovery, recognized that blacks were asked to help defend the city of Petersburg, Virginia and were offered their freedom if they did so. Regardless of their official classification, black Americans performed support functions that in today's army many would be classified as official military service. The successes of white Confederate troops in battle, could only have been achieved with the support these loyal black Southerners.

Confederate General John B. Gordon, Army of Northern Virginia, reported that all of his troops were in favor of Colored troops and that its adoption would have “greatly encouraged the army”.

General Lee was anxious to receive regiments of black soldiers. The Richmond Sentinel reported on 24 Mar 1864, “None will deny that our servants are more worthy of respect than the motley hordes which come against us. Bad faith to black Confederates must be avoided as an indelible dishonor.”

In March 1865, Judah P. Benjamin, Confederate Secretary Of State, promised freedom for blacks who served from the State of Virginia. Authority for this was finally received from the State of Virginia and on 1 April 1865. \$100 bounties were offered to black soldiers. Benjamin exclaimed,

“Let us say to every Negro who wants to go into the ranks, go and fight, and you are free...Fight for your masters and you shall have your freedom.” Confederate Officers were ordered to treat them humanely and protect them from "injustice and oppression".

A quota was set for 300,000 black soldiers for the Confederate States Colored Troops. 83% of Richmond's male slave population volunteered for duty. A special ball was held in Richmond to raise money for uniforms for these men. Before Richmond fell, black Confederates in gray uniforms drilled in the streets. Due to the war ending, it is believed only companies or squads of these troops ever saw any action.

Union General U.S. Grant in Feb 1865, ordered the capture of “all the Negro men... before the enemy can put them in their ranks.” Frederick Douglas warned Lincoln that unless slaves were guaranteed freedom (those in Union controlled areas were still slaves) and land bounties, “they would take up arms for the rebels”.

On April 4, 1865 in Amelia County, VA, a Confederate supply train was exclusively manned and guarded by black Infantry. When attacked by Federal Cavalry, they stood their ground and fought off the charge, but on the second charge they were overwhelmed. These soldiers are believed to be from "Major Turner's" Confederate command.

A Black Confederate, named George, when captured by Federal troops was bribed to desert to the other side. He defiantly spoke, "Sir, you want me to desert, and I ain't no deserter. Down South, deserters disgrace their families and I am never going to do that."

Horace King, a former slave, accumulated great wealth as a contractor to the Confederate Navy. He was also an expert engineer and became known as the “Bridge builder of the Confederacy.” One of his bridges was burned in a Yankee raid. His home was pillaged by Union troops, as his wife pleaded for mercy.

As of February 1865 1,150 black seamen served in the Confederate Navy. One of these was among the last Confederates to surrender, aboard the CSS Shenandoah, six months after the war ended. This surrender took place in England.

Nearly 180,000 Black Southerners from Virginia alone, provided logistical support for the Confederate military. Many were highly skilled workers. These included a wide range of jobs: nurses, military engineers, teamsters, ordnance department workers, brakemen, firemen, harness makers, blacksmiths, wagon makers, boatmen, mechanics, wheelwrights. In the 1920'S Confederate pensions were finally allowed to some of those workers that were still living. Many thousands more served in other Confederate States.

Mr. Adam Miller Moore, born a slave to the Roberts family of Lincoln County North Carolina, grew up with his master's son Adam Miller Roberts. Young Mr. Roberts joined the Confederate Army, while Mr. Moore remained at home. Mr. Roberts fought with Company "M" of the 16th. North Carolina Regiment and came home after recuperating from wounds received in battle. When he returned to the fighting in Virginia, Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Moore to go with him. The men left the Cherryville, North Carolina railroad station and

arrived at Chancellorsville, Virginia on 30 April 1863. Mr. Roberts was killed in action the next day. Mr. Moore stayed with Company "M" of the 16th North Carolina until the unit surrendered at Appomattox in 1865.

John Price was a slave and followed his master John T. Price and joined Company "B" of the 4th Texas Infantry, also known as The Tom Green Rifles. After the war John Price joined and was accepted into the United Confederate Veterans organization.

Henderson Howard can be seen setting between two of his white compatriots in a photograph of the 28th reunion of Hood's Texas Brigade in 1900.

The Charleston Mercury of January 3, 1861 said:

“We learn that 150 able-bodied free colored men, of Charleston, yesterday offered their services gratuitously to the Governor, to hasten forward the important work of throwing up redoubts wherever needed along our coast.”

The Tennessee Legislature on 28 June 1861, passed an act authorizing Governor Isham G. Harris to receive into the military service of the State all male free persons of color, between the ages of 15 and 50.

The Memphis Avalanche stated:

“A procession of several hundred stout Negro men, of the domestic institution, marched through our streets yesterday in military order, under command of Confederate officers. A merrier set were never seen. They were brimful of patriotism, shouting for Jeff. Davis and singing war-songs.”

A telegram sent to the newspapers of the South:

“New Orleans, November 23, 1861. Over 28,000 troops were reviewed today by Gov. Moore, Major. Gen. Lovell, and Brig.-Gen. Ruggles. The line was over seven miles long. One regiment comprised 1,400 free colored men.

During the early 1900's, many members of the United Confederate Veterans (UCV) advocated awarding former slaves rural acreage and a home. There was hope that justice could be given those slaves that were once promised “forty acres and a mule” but never received any. In the 1913 Confederate Veteran magazine published by the UCV, it was printed that this plan “If not Democratic, it is the Confederate” thing to do. There was much gratitude toward former slaves, which “thousands were loyal, to the last degree”, now living with total poverty of the big cities. Unfortunately, their proposal fell on deaf ears on Capitol Hill.

During the 50th Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg in 1913, arrangements were made for a joint reunion of Union and Confederate veterans. The commission in charge of the event made sure they had enough accommodations for the black Union veterans, but were completely surprised when unexpected black Confederates arrived. The white Confederates immediately welcomed their old comrades, gave them one of their tents, and “saw to their every need”. Nearly every Confederate reunion including those blacks that served with them, wearing the gray.

The first military monument in the US Capitol that honors an African-American soldier is the Confederate monument at Arlington National cemetery. The monument was designed in 1914 by Moses Ezekiel, a Jewish Confederate, who wanted to correctly portray the racial makeup in the Confederate Army. A black Confederate soldier is depicted marching in step with white Confederate soldiers. Also shown is one “white soldier giving his child to a black woman for protection”.

Black Confederate heritage is beginning to receive the attention it deserves. For instance, Terri Williams, a black journalist for the Suffolk "Virginia Pilot" newspaper, writes: "I've had to re-examine my feelings toward the [Confederate] flag...It started when I read a newspaper article about an elderly black man whose ancestor worked with the Confederate forces. The man spoke with pride about his family member's contribution to the cause, was photographed with the [Confederate] flag draped over his lap...that's why I now have no definite stand on just what the flag symbolizes, because it no longer is their history, or my history, but our history."

It is estimated that 3,600 Mexican-Americans or Hispanics fought in the War Between the States in the ranks of the Confederacy. As a result of the Spanish colonial settlement of the Gulf Coast states and, during the 19th century, Mexican control of the territories that were to become Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, a significant number of Hispanic-Americans were affected by the outbreak of the WBTS. As John O'Donnell-Rosales explains in the introduction to his ground-breaking list of Hispanic Confederate soldiers, many of these individuals, including businessmen and sailors living in cities like New Orleans, St. Louis, Natchez, Biloxi, and Mobile, would have to choose between their cultural aversion to American slavery, which had been outlawed throughout most of Latin America by 1860, and the natural desire to protect their way of life in the South. The author has compiled the first comprehensive roster of Hispanic Confederate soldiers in print. The list of 3,600 soldiers, which includes Private Kelvin Rosales, the author's Confederate ancestor, is arranged alphabetically by surname and gives each individual's rank, company, and regiment (Infantry, Cavalry, etc.). Included among the soldiers are persons of Jewish descent whose ancestors were expelled from Spain in 1492, as well as a short list of Hispanic Confederate naval personnel. At the back of the volume there is a bibliography of the sources utilized by the author in the compilation of this unique list.

Colonel Santos Benavides lead the 33rd Texas Cavalry, totaling almost ten thousand Tejanos (Mexican Americans) throughout the War.

Stand Watie, a Cherokee Indian and a Brigadier General in the Confederate Army, lead a brigade of Native-Americans. Some of the tribes involved were: the Cherokee, Choctaw, Caddos, Chickasaw, Creek, Comanche, Osage, Seminole, Alabama, and Coushatta.

Judah P. Benjamin was a Jew and served as Jeff Davis' Personal Advisor, Attorney General, Treasurer, Secretary of War, and Secretary of State.

Loretta Janeta Velasquez disguised her self as a man. She named herself Harry T. Buford and raised a full regiment to fight for the Confederacy. She was wounded several times, one of these was in the battle of Pittsburgh Landing (Shiloh). Because of these wounds she was forced to retire from active service. Loretta continued to work for the Confederacy as a spy.

Sources and further reading: Fact sheet-Black Confederates by Scott K. Williams at web page at www.geocities.com/BourbonStreet/Delta/3843/blackconfed.htm, swcelt@stlnet.com

Dr. Edward Smith, American University, 4400 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20016; (202) 885-1192 (Dr. Smith is a black professor dedicated to clarifying the historical role of African Americans.)

Forgotten Confederates: An Anthology About Black Southerners (1995). Charles Kelly Barrow

Black Southerners in Gray (1994) Richard Rollins.

"Black Southern Heritage-video". By Dr. Edward Smith & Nelson Winbush

Library of Congress Black History Resource Guide: <http://www.lcweb.loc.gov/exhibits/african/intro.html>

The New York Draft Riots (1990) Iver Bernstein.

Black Slave-owners: Free Black Slave-owners in South Carolina, 1790-1860 (1985) Larry Koger.

Vaqueros in Blue & Gray, by Jerry Don Thompson

Hispanic Confederates John O'Donnell-Rosales (1997), ISBN 0-8063-4082-X

Black Confederates and Afro-Yankees in Civil War Virginia (1995). Ervin L. Jordan, Jr.

3.22. Did the Confederate states ever try to establish peace with the North?

Yes, several times the Confederacy made efforts to open peace negotiations with the North, but were rudely rebuffed. The South seceded to form their own government in a peaceful action. They then were forced into a war to defend themselves from a hostile invasion. The Confederate states never wanted war, so in an attempt to defend themselves, they fought, but on several occasions petitioned the Northern government for peace negotiations. Lincoln refused to see either formally or informally the Southern commissioners sent before the fighting started on “legalism” that they could not represent an independent nation. This attitude was maintained by Lincoln throughout the war, but wavered some as his re-election in 1864 seemed in jeopardy.

In August 1864 the Northern people had become tired of Lincoln and the war. Lincoln had addressed his cabinet that re-election was a great risk. Political pressure was forcing Lincoln’s government to establish peace. He finally sent a delegation to Richmond to ascertain the views of President Davis. Shortly after this Sherman and Sheridan savage assaults on the South helped sew up Lincoln’s re-election. On 6 December 1864 in an address Lincoln is quoted as saying “On careful consideration of all the evidence accessible, it seems to me that no attempt at negotiations with the insurgents could result in any good”.

Still the South was not conquered and the prospect of indefinite war continued. Southern delegations again petitioned Lincoln for a negotiated peace. General Grant convinced Lincoln to meet Confederate Commissioners Alexander H. Stephens, R.M.T. Hunter, and John A. Campbell at Old Point on 3 February 1865. At this meeting Lincoln would not suspend hostilities and declined to make any reasonable or humanitarian proposals for peace. Instead he would except absolute submission to the Federal government and would not state any specifics of the cost or policy involved with total submission. Instead Lincoln urged the Confederate representatives to trust in his mercy.

This trust was hard to accept based on all the treatment the Southern people had received up to and including the war of Northern aggression. On 8 December 1863 Lincoln, mimicking the threats of death and confiscation’s to all connected with the Confederacy by Congress, Lincoln issued a proclamation as a masked “pardon”. When Lincoln or his agents failed to specifically spell out the terms of and conditions for peace, it made it impossible for the Confederate government or army to abandon its defensive effort. The threat of death to all who served or supported the Confederacy, along with loss of all personal and real property, was hanging over every man’s head.

Sources and further reading: A Confederate Catechism, The War for Southern Self-Government, by Lyon Gardiner Tyler, 1935

3.23. Did Lincoln, by his conquest of the South, save the Union and could Lincoln have "saved" the Union by some other method other than war?

No, Lincoln did not save the Union by his war of aggression on the South. The original Union was a union of consent based on the Articles of Confederation and later the Constitution. Lincoln used military force and suffering on the Southern civilian population to re-establish a “new” Union. This Union was now based on force, coercion, threat and control toward the Southern states.

For many years following the war the Southern states were viewed in an imperialistic way as a “province” of the North. What ever privileges that were extended by the conquerors were mere concessions given, not inherited rights from the Constitution.

As was stated in question 3.15, Lincoln and his government subverted the Constitution, trifling with its words and bending them to suit their need at the time. This was a moral and ethical destruction of the very Union he was claimed to have fought to preserve.

The Union before 1861 could have been saved if he would have supported the resolutions offered in the US Senate by John J. Crittenden, which called for the extension of the line of the Missouri Compromise through the territories. The 1861 Compromise as it related to the territories was considered one of pride vs actual material advantages. It was the intemperate, arrogant, and self-righteous attitude of Lincoln and the Northern Republicans that made any peaceable constructive solution of the territorial question impossible. For in rejecting of the Crittenden resolutions, Lincoln placed themselves on record as virtually preferring the slaughter of 400,000 men and the sacrifice of billions of dollars of property to a compromise involving a mere abstraction.

Sources and further reading: A Confederate Catechism, The War for Southern Self-Government, by Lyon Gardiner Tyler, 1935

3.24. When did the war end?

The following are surrender dates of the various commanding CSA generals.

9 April 1865, Gen. R.E. Lee surrendered the Army of Northern Virginia at Appomattox Courthouse, VA

26 April 1865, Gen. J.E. Johnston surrendered the Army of Tennessee at Durham, NC

4 May 1865, Gen. Richard Taylor surrendered Dept. of Alabama, Mississippi, and Eastern Louisiana at Citronelle, AL

13 May 1865, engagement at Palmetto Ranch, near Brownsville, TX, often taken to be the last engagement of the war

2 June 1865, Gen. E.K. Smith surrendered the Trans-Mississippi Department at Galveston, TX (the surrender had been agreed to by Smith's representative, Lt. Gen. S.B. Buckner, in New Orleans on 26 May)

13 June 1865, Pres. Johnson proclaimed the insurrection in Tennessee at an end. (Messages and Papers of the Presidents, V, p3515)

23 June 1865, Brig. Gen. Stand Watie's troops in the Indian Territory signed a cease hostilities agreement (not an official surrender) at Doaksville. Watie was the last CSA general to disband his troops.

4 November 1865, The raider CSS Shenandoah surrendered in Liverpool to British authorities. For several months after the surrender of ground forces, this last of the CSA's naval vessels had been burning USA shipping, with her captain, James I. Waddell, still thinking the war was in progress. Her last fight was against a whaling fleet in the Bering Sea on 28 Jun 1865. After this, the vessel was the object of a worldwide search. On August 2, Waddell had contact with a British ship, whose captain informed him that the CSA was no more. With this in mind, he put guns below decks and sailed to England, where the ship was surrendered to the British Admiralty. Upon the boarding of the vessel by British authorities, the last sovereign Confederate flag was furled.

2 April 1866, Pres. Johnson proclaimed the insurrection ended in all the former Confederate States except Texas. This was his recognition of the legitimacy of the governments formed under his Reconstruction proclamation. (Mess. & Papers, V, p3627)

20 August 1866, Pres. Johnson proclaimed that Texas had complied with the conditions of his Reconstruction proclamation and declared the insurrection in Texas at an end. (Mess. & Paper, V, p3632)

And there are some that say the war against the South has never ended and continues to be punished for losing the war.

3.25. Was Jefferson Davis or any other Southern leader guilty of any crime? If so, what were the crimes? If not, why was Davis imprisoned and why were Confederate officials and military officers disfranchised?

No where can it be found that Jefferson Davis or other CSA National leader was guilty of any crime, yet he was imprisoned for two years following the war. Remember the intent of the seceding states was to peacefully leave the Union, which no longer represented or protected their interests, and form their own government based on their needs, economy and true belief in the original founding fathers version of the Constitution. The Confederate states were bullied into the war in order to defend their property and citizens from a Northern invasion.

Jefferson Davis was captured near Irwinville, Georgia in 1865 and sent to Fort Monroe for two years of imprisonment. Vice President Andrew Stephens was imprisoned in Fort Warren in Boston Harbor. Interestingly enough Stephens was released soon after imprisonment.

President Davis was first accused of being an accomplice in the Lincoln assassination. There was no evidence of any involvement on his part in this assassination. Next the Northern government charged Davis with cruelty to prisoners of war. Again no case could be made here that Davis was directly or even indirectly responsible for any suffering of prisoners of war. Finally a charge of treason was entered against Davis, but after some of the best legal minds reviewed the facts, the charge was dropped. Davis was later taken to the Federal court room in the Custom House at Richmond, VA and admitted to bail. Horace Greeley, Gerritt Smith and Cornelius Vanderbilt signed the bail bond.

Jefferson Davis was never brought to trial on any violation of law by the United States government.

As for other leaders, officials, and officers, on 29 May 1865, President Andrew Johnson issued a "Proclamation of Amnesty" to the majority who fought for the Confederacy. He excluded the benefits of amnesty to many Southern leaders including civil and diplomatic officers and agents, officers above the rank of colonel in the army and lieutenant in the navy and all who had been educated at either West Point or the Naval Academy. Two years later he issued another proclamation on 7 September 1867 that reduced the exceptions to brigadier generals in the army and captains in the navy. Finally on Christmas 1868 Johnson issued a proclamation for unconditional pardon, with the formality of any oath and without exception to all who in any way sided with the Confederacy. It took the course of 3 years for the Federal government to acknowledge the rights of the members of the Confederacy that were "reclaimed" by the Union in 1865.

The only conclusion one could reach is that the Northern Republican controlled Federal government wanted punishment and revenge to be placed on the heads of all Southern people. With an arrogant use of the law, and conveniently removing justice when it fit their needs, the Federal government brought false charges and denied rights to her Southern citizens for years.

Sources and further reading: The Story of the Confederate States, by Joseph T. Derry 1895

3.26. If the rebel states were never considered legally out of the Union, how was Reconstruction justified?

There is no justification for the terrible ten year period from 1867 to 1877 known as reconstruction. The South had been wrongfully invaded and subjugated by the northern Yankee armies. The war ceased in 1865 and Southerners were left with a homeland that had been destroyed in every aspect by the northern invaders. The South was still occupied by hostile forces. It was the contention of the Northern Republican Congress

that the Southern States should be punished before being allowed back into the union. It was very important to the Northern Republicans that they maintain their voting majority in the congress. They feared that the return of the Southern Democrats would take away from their majority and for that reason they sought to keep their new found power.

Although Northern contention was that the Southern states remained part of the United States, they charged that the states lacked loyal governments. The Northern federal government needed to invent mechanisms to erect what they called "loyal state governments". The manipulation of the law is said to be derived from Article IV, Section #4 of the Constitution. That section provides that the United States shall guarantee to each state a republican form of government.

It was the Lincoln and the North's strange and unconstitutional concept that although the Confederate States never left the Union, the populace of the Southern States had abrogated all their constitutional rights through rebellion, but still retained all their obligations as citizens of the United States.

Of course, the Union never even attempted to determine who, in the Southern States, had remained loyal, and who had been rebellious. Lincoln appears to have invoked a strange concept that the State could mean the land itself devoid of any people. Under this concept the Southern States never left the Union because the land couldn't rebel; however, the people could and they had to be "transformed" or "reconstructed" into loyal citizens. It was their view that the Confederates had put themselves outside the Union and it was now necessary for them to be reconstructed before they could resume their former state as true citizens.

Another important provision of the Constitution was Article I, Section #5 which provides that each House of Congress shall be the judge of the qualifications of its members. This allowed the Congress to refuse to seat delegations from former Confederate states until the states had met the Federally imposed conditions of the Reconstruction Acts.

On 29 May 1865, President Andrew Johnson issued a "Proclamation of Amnesty" to the majority who fought for the Confederacy. He excluded the benefits of amnesty to many Southern leaders including civil and diplomatic officers and agents, officers above the rank of colonel in the army and lieutenant in the navy and all who had been educated at either West Point or the Naval Academy. Two years later he issued another proclamation on 7 September 1867 that reduced the exceptions to brigadier generals in the army and captains in the navy. Finally on Christmas 1868 Johnson issued a proclamation for unconditional pardon, with the formality of any oath and without exception to all who in any way sided with the Confederacy.

At the end of the war, the president, not the people, chose provisional governors in the seceded states, except Tennessee which had been re-instated to the union before the close of the war. The terms given were that the seceding states would be required to repeal all the CSA related legislation and to ratify the 13th amendment. When this was done, the states and their citizens were to receive all the rights guaranteed under the constitution for all states.

Having done this the Southern sent elected senators and representatives to Congress, but the rules changed again as the Congress of 1865 with its republican majority refused to admit the Southern members unless their states would now ratify the 14th amendment. Legislation by coercion. The states refused and Congress passed an act declaring another state of rebellion existing in Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. This new act now overturned the existing governments in those states and divided them into five military districts, each to be governed by an officer of the Federal army and called for new conventions in all states again.

This kind of "government" was forced on the Southern states for many years. If they could not get the states to ratify the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution with the body selected by the people, the Federal

Congress would simply issue a new proclamation to purge the officials and replace them with new representatives. They continued this tactic until they could find submissive and kowtowing individuals who would do the Northern Republican's will. Not only did the Northern Republican treachery reach into the capitals and legislative branches of the Southern people, but also their judiciary system. Lawyers could only practice law if they had not had any connection to the Confederate states and judges were appointed that were sympathetic to the Republicans.

With this type of government controls, the carpetbaggers took advantage of what was left of the Southern resources. These "federally approved" governments were some of the most corrupt to ever exist. A few Southern men (called scalawags) sold out their heritage and joined the carpetbaggers in their corruption of law and justice. With this Republican domination and subjugation of the South, it was not until 1876 that any hope of relief from this oppression and corruption would be had by the people.

Reconstruction was the contention of the Northern Republican Congress to maintain their power without any true Constitutional legal justification whatsoever. Contention, not justification, is what brought about the era after the war known as reconstruction.

Sources and further reading: Southern By The Grace Of God by Michael Andrew Grissom
The Story of the Confederate States by Joseph T. Derry 1895

3.27. Did the occupation forces break the laws of the United States and violate the Constitutional rights of Southern people during Reconstruction?

Yes, the Constitutional rights of the Southern people were in jeopardy when they saw no further protection in membership in the United States and seceded. The invasion of northern armies showed them that the Northern Republicans indeed had no respect for the laws of the United States and would warp the Constitution to suit its purposes. It is then no surprise that after the resources of the South are exhausted and its armies disbanded, their civic leaders ousted, this defenseless civilian population would be at the mercy of the Northern invaders and their arrogant interpretation of law of any kind.

After the laying down of arms it took over 3 years (1865-1868) before all the men associated with the Confederate states had been pardoned and all sanctions against them were removed by then President Johnson.

Without regard to the civilian population innocence, they were all basically declared guilty of acts against the Union and subject to brutal "governing" from 1865-1877. The Northern Republican controlled Congress would issue one set of requirements to be made in order to be re-instated with full rights to the Union, then would change and add more requirements. (examples can be found in question 3.26) Men of honor in the South would fight these continually increasing terms. Since the strong willed, honorable Southern leaders could not be controlled by the Northern Republicans, they simply would purge the leaders, unseat them, and either appoint or cause a re-election of officials to be conducted. They would not allow due process and democratic rule. They wanted puppet governments to follow blindly whatever notion they had.

Couple the military rule, purging of duly elected officials, forced ratification of amendments, importation of carpet-bagger officials in cooperation with exploitative scalawags locals, election fraud to a "point of bayonet" government and you will find that even the basic of rights guaranteed under the US Constitution were violated with the acts of reconstruction.

Sources and further reading: Southern By The Grace Of God by Michael Andrew Grissom
The Story of the Confederate States by Joseph T. Derry 1895

3.28. Had the South gained its independence, would the CSA have proved a failure?

This point is raised from time to time, perhaps by Northerners as a reason to rally support for their war of aggression and to mask the true issues of the war. Interestingly enough General Grant said in his Memoirs that if the CSA would have established “a real and respected nation”. There are some who speculate that the very nature of states rights was contrary even to the Confederation of States within the CSA and the tension and strife within the CSA would have caused it to dissolve at some future date. Detractors point to some opposition to President Davis and his government policies in Georgia and North Carolina. It might be important to put that in perspective comparing it to serious opposition to Lincoln and his policies from many Northern states, including Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio, draft riots in New York and Massachusetts just to name a few.

Others note that the threats from the Northern states and their Republican fueled economy would have helped to bind the states together for mutual defense. Still others note that the economic conditions would have been a binding factor. A low tariff, decided on by themselves, rather than an economically oppressive North would have attracted trade to the South. From this trade, its cities and ports would have seen prosperity and growth. Instead of a failure, the South could have formed an important and growing economy based on trade. The vision of this prosperity, should the Southern states ever break away and form their own country, and the devastating economic impacts to the Northern states, is another one of the reasons that Lincoln forced war on the seceding states.

3.29. What are alternative names referring to the war of 1861-1865?

The War for Constitutional Liberty, The War for Southern Independence, The Second American Revolution, The War for States' Rights, Mr. Lincoln's War, The Southern Rebellion, The War for Southern Rights, The War of the Southern Planters, The War of the Rebellion, The Second War for Independence, The War to Suppress Yankee Arrogance, The Brothers' War, The War of Secession, The Great Rebellion, The War for Nationality, The War for Southern Nationality, The War Against Slavery, The Civil War Between the States, The War of the Sixties, The War Against Northern Aggression, The Yankee Invasion, The War for Separation, The War for Abolition, The War for the Union, The Confederate War, The War of the Southrons, The War for Southern Freedom, The War of the North and South, The Lost Cause, The War Between the States, The Late Unpleasantness, The Late Friction, The Late Ruction, The Schism, The Uncivil War, “THE War” (as if the planet had not heard a shot fired in anger since 1865)

Sources and further reading: The Civil War: Strange and Fascinating Facts originally published as "Our Incredible Civil War" by Davis, B. (1982), SBN 0-517-37151-0 (Chapter 13. Which War? pp. 79-80.)