

The Confederate Experience Reader

Selected Documents and Essays

Edited by
John D. Fowler

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
New York London

E 484
C6
2008

Property of
U.S. Military Academy
Library

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
270 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10016

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
2 Park Square
Milton Park, Abingdon
Oxon OX14 4RN

© 2008 by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC
Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis Group, an Informa business

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

International Standard Book Number-13: 978-0-415-97879-8 (Softcover) 978-0-415-97878-1 (Hardcover)

No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted, or utilized in any form by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying, microfilming, and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the publishers.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Confederate experience reader : selected documents and essays / edited by John Derrick Fowler.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-0-415-97878-1 (alk. paper) -- ISBN 978-0-415-97879-8 (alk. paper)

1. Confederate States of America--History--Sources. 2. Confederate States of America--History.
3. United States--History--Civil War, 1861-1865--Sources. 4. United States--History--Civil
War, 1861-1865. 5. Reconstruction (U.S. history, 1865-1877)--Sources. 6. Reconstruction
States--Politics and government--Sources. 9. Southern States--Social conditions--Sources. 10. United
States--History--Civil War, 1861-1865--Influence. I. Fowler, John D., 1965-

E484.C6 2007
973.7'13--dc22

2007001059

Visit the Taylor & Francis Web site at
<http://www.taylorandfrancis.com>

and the Routledge Web site at
<http://www.routledge.com>

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	xi
CHAPTER 1 Diverging Cultures: The Early National Period to 1846	1
<i>Documents</i>	1
1-1. United States Constitution, Excerpts on Slavery	2
1-2. The Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions	3
1-3. Letter from Thomas Jefferson to John Holms, April 22, 1820	5
1-4. Speeches of John C. Calhoun	6
<i>Essays</i>	13
1-1. Edmund S. Morgan, "Slavery and Freedom: The American Paradox"	14
1-2. Don E. Fehrenbacher, "The Missouri Controversy and the Sources of Southern Sectionalism"	26
CHAPTER 2 Sectional Tensions, 1846 to 1860	37
<i>Documents</i>	38
2-1. George Fitzhugh on slavery	38
2-2. Hinton Rowan Helper, Excerpts from <i>The Impending Crisis of the South</i>	45
2-3. Southern Editorials on Sumner Caning	48
2-4. The Dred Scott Decision, 1857	50
2-5. Southern Editorials on Dred Scott Decision	50
2-6. Southern Editorials on John Brown's Raid	52
<i>Essays</i>	54

2-1.	William Barney, "The Radical Effort"	54
2-2.	Frank L. Owsley, "The Fundamental Cause of the Civil War: Egocentric Sectionalism"	73
CHAPTER 3 The Secession Crisis		83
<i>Documents</i>		84
3-1.	Jefferson Davis's Farewell Speech to U.S. Senate	85
3-2.	Southern Editorials on Secession	87
3-3.	Robert Toombs's Secessionist Speech	92
3-4.	Alexander H. Stephens's Unionist Speech	94
3-5.	Secession Ordinances	96
3-6.	Declarations of Causes of Seceding States	102
3-7.	South Carolina's Address to the People of the Slaveholding States	114
3-8.	Mary Boykin Chesnut, Excerpts from <i>A Diary from Dixie</i>	119
<i>Essays</i>		122
3-1.	James L. Abrahamsom, "Alexander Stephens, Deep South Secession, and the Failure of Unionism"	122
3-2.	Dwight Lowell Dumond, "The Secession of the Gulf States"	132
CHAPTER 4 Establishing the Southern Republic		143
<i>Documents</i>		143
4-1.	The Constitution of the Confederate States of America	144
4-2.	Jefferson Davis's Inaugural Address	146
4-3.	Jefferson Davis's Message to the Confederate Congress	149
4-4.	Alexander Stephens's Cornerstone Speech	151
<i>Essays</i>		154
4-1.	George C. Rable, "Establishing Political Legitimacy"	155
4-2.	Charles M. Hubbard, "The Burden of Cotton"	169
CHAPTER 5 A War for Liberty and Slavery: Military Events and Issues, 1861 to 1862		179
<i>Documents</i>		180
5-1.	Songs of the Confederacy	180
5-2.	Letter from David Pierson to William H. Pierson, April 22, 1861	183
5-3.	Letter from Reuben Allen Pierson to William H. Pierson, November 12, 1861	183
5-4.	Letter from Shephard Pryor to his Wife, February 12, 1862	184

5-5.	Letter from William Ross Stilwell to his Wife Molly, September 10, 1862	185
5-6.	Letter from William Ross Stilwell to his Wife Molly, September 18, 1862	186
5-7.	General John B. Gordon, excerpts from <i>Reminiscences of the Civil War</i>	187
5-8.	Kate Cumming, excerpts from <i>Journal of a Confederate Nurse</i>	189
5-9.	Abraham Lincoln, The Emancipation Proclamation, January 1, 1863	191
<i>Essays</i>		192
5-1.	Gary W. Gallagher, "The Net Result of the Campaign Was in Our Favor: Confederate Reaction to the Maryland Campaign"	192
5-2.	Richard M. McMurry, "Officers and Enlisted Men"	211
CHAPTER 6 The Daily Life of Johnny Reb		223
<i>Documents</i>		224
6-1.	Carlton McCarthy, Excerpts from <i>Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia</i>	225
6-2.	Diary of Chaplain Thomas H. Deavenport	228
6-3.	Letter of Lieutenant John W. Comer, June 14, 1864	228
6-4.	Diary of Captain James Litton Cooper	229
6-5.	Letter from Benjamin Mobley to his Parents, August 25, 1861	229
6-6.	Letter from Madison Kilpatrick to his Wife, October 17, 1864	230
6-7.	Sam R. Watkins, Excerpts from Co. "Aytch"	230
<i>Essays</i>		231
6-1.	Philip Burnham, "The Andersonvilles of the North"	232
6-2.	Gardiner H. Shattuck, Jr., "The Chariot of Fire: Religion, Revivalism, and Confederate Failure"	241
CHAPTER 7 Confederate Women		251
<i>Documents</i>		252
7-1.	Letter from Louticia Jackson to Asbury H. Jackson, August 23, 1863	252
7-2.	Mrs. James M. Loughborough, Excerpts from <i>My Cave Life in Vicksburg</i>	253
7-3.	Letter from Henrietta E. Lee to General Hunter, July 20, 1864	254
7-4.	Letters from Eva B. Jones to Mary Jones, 1865	255
7-5.	Dolly Sumner Lunt Burge, Excerpts from <i>A Woman's Wartime Journal</i>	259
<i>Essays</i>		262
7-1.	Drew Gilpin Faust, Thavolia Glymph, and George C. Rable, "A Woman's War: Southern Women in the Civil War"	262

- 7-2. Jean V. Berlin, "Did Confederate Women Lose the War?: Deprivation, Destruction, and Despair on the Home Front" 271

CHAPTER 8 The African American Experience 287

Documents 288

- 8-1. Melvin Smith, Excerpts from WPA Slave Narrative 289
 8-2. Dr. Daniel Heyward Trezevant, Excerpts from *The Burning of Columbia, S.C.* 290
 8-3. Letter from H. S. Beals to Major General Butler, December 10, 1863 290
 8-4. Letter from John C. Chadwick, October 3, 1863 290
 8-5. Letter from James C. Beecher to Brigadier General Edward A. Wild, September 13, 1863 291
 8-6. Affidavit of Joseph Howard, January 30, 1865 292

Essays 292

- 8-1. Thavolia Glymph, "'This Species of Property': Female Slave Contrabands in the Civil War" 293
 8-2. Randall C. Jimerson, "The Test of Slaves' Loyalty" 301

CHAPTER 9 Dissension and Internal Collapse on the Home Front 321

Documents 321

- 9-1. Kate Cumming, Excerpt from *Journal of a Confederate Nurse* 322
 9-2. Letter from William Ross Stilwell to his Wife Molly, August 13, 1863 323
 9-3. First Confederate Conscription Law, April 16, 1862 323
 9-4. The Twenty Negro Law 325
 9-5. Act Regulating Impressments, March 26, 1863 326
 9-6. Parthenia Hague, Excerpts from *A Blockaded Family* 328
 9-7. John B. Jones, Excerpts from *A Rebel War Clerk's Diary* 330

Essays 334

- 9-1. Paul D. Escott, "Fighting against Disintegration" 335
 9-2. George C. Rable, "Despair, Hope, and Delusion: The Collapse of Confederate Morale Reexamined" 348

CHAPTER 10 A Struggle for Survival: Military Events and Issues, 1863 to 1865 367

Documents 367

- 10-1. From the Diary of Chaplain Thomas H. Deavenport 368
 10-2. Sam R. Watkins, Excerpts from *Co. "Aytch"* 368
 10-3. Kate Cumming, Excerpts from *Journal of a Confederate Nurse* 370

- 10-4. Letter from Robert E. Lee to Governor Zebulon Vance, February 1865 371
 10-5. Governor Zebulon B. Vance, Proclamation 371
 10-6. Letter from William H. Lee to Jefferson Davis, May 4, 1861 371
 10-7. Letter from John J. Cheatham to Hon. L. P. Walker, May 4, 1861 372
 10-8. Enrollment of Slaves in the Army 372
 10-9. The Farewell Message of Jefferson Davis 373

Essays 374

- 10-1. Reid Mitchell, "The Confederate Soldier and the Crisis of the South" 374
 10-2. Gary W. Gallagher, "I Have to Make the Best of What I Have": Robert E. Lee at Spotsylvania" 387

CHAPTER 11 Why Did the Confederacy Fail? 401

Documents 401

- 11-1. Robert Garlick Kean, Excerpts from *Inside the Confederate Government* 401
 11-2. Robert E. Lee's Farewell Address to the Army of Northern Virginia, April 10, 1865 402
 11-3. Kate Cumming, Excerpts from *Journal of a Confederate Nurse* 403

Essays 404

- 11-1. James M. McPherson, "American Victory, American Defeat" 404
 11-2. Carl Zebrowski, "Why the South Lost the Civil War" (Ten Historians Analyze Confederate Defeat) 415

CHAPTER 12 Reconstructing the South 423

Documents 423

- 12-1. Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution 424
 12-2. Louisiana Black Codes, 1865 425
 12-3. Testimony before Congress of General Nathan Bedford Forrest, General John Brown Gordon, and William Coleman 426
 12-4. *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) 432

Essays 433

- 12-1. James L. Roark, "The Soul is Fled" (Excerpts) 433
 12-2. William L. Barney, "Lincoln's Republic" (Excerpts) 440

CHAPTER 13 Remembering the War: The Lost Cause and Confederate Memorialization 457

Documents 457

- 13-1. Father Abram J. Ryan, "The Conquered Banner" 458

13-2.	Alexander H. Stephens, Excerpts from <i>A Constitutional View of the Late War between the States</i>	459
13-3.	Jefferson Davis, Excerpts from <i>The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government</i>	460
13-4.	David Hefner, "Old South, New South Clash on Vanderbilt's Campus" (February 27, 2003)	462
13-5.	Scott Jaschik, "Confederates Defeat Vanderbilt" (May 5, 2005)	464
13-6.	Scott Jaschik, "Lost Cause at Vanderbilt" (July 13, 2005)	465
13-7.	"Lee Statue Vandalized"	466
13-8.	"Open Season on General Lee"	467
13-9.	Pamela Denney, "Monumental Battle" (August 19, 2005)	468
13-10.	Chris Davis, "Deconstruction" (June 21, 2005)	471
13-11.	"NCAA Won't Expand Confederate Flag Ban" (January 23, 2007)	471
13-12.	"Kids Home-Schooled after Confederate Flag Dispute" (November 11, 2006)	472
13-13.	Stephanie Gerry, "Florida Museum Exhibit Showing Confederate Flag, Gallows Rekindles Debate" (March 18, 2007)	473
13-14.	"Defining the Confederate Flag" (October 22, 2006)	474
<i>Essays</i>		475
13-1.	Edward T. Linenthal, "Healing and History: The Dilemmas of Interpretation A Persistent Legacy"	475
13-2.	Gary W. Gallagher, "Jubal A. Early, the Lost Cause, and Civil War History"	481
<i>Permissions and Citation Information</i>		495
<i>Index</i>		501

PREFACE

In February 1861, delegates from the seven seceded states of South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas met in Montgomery, Alabama, to create a new nation. For the mass of Southern whites, this new nation, the Confederate States of America, represented a defense against the Republican Party and its abolitionist supporters who had distorted and destroyed the foundations of the republic. In their minds, the founders of the Confederate States had actually preserved the old Union by seceding from the United States, and they had reestablished a government that would protect their liberties, liberties the federal government now threatened. A counterrevolution to maintain the status quo had begun.

What was the status quo that these delegates and most Southern whites were so eager to maintain and protect? At its core, the Confederacy represented their desire to keep the national government weak and subordinate to the states. This stemmed partly from long-standing fears of tyranny that resulted from the experience of the American Revolution and partly as a reaction against threats to Southern institutions, especially slavery. The Founding Fathers had carefully avoided making slavery an issue both during the creation of the Articles of Confederation and when establishing the Constitution of 1787 in order to placate Southerners and secure their support. Hence, from the very beginning of the new United States, protecting slavery became a Southern condition for entering and maintaining the Union. Subsequent Southern political philosophy developed by Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and John C. Calhoun supported the compact theory of states, interposition, nullification, and ultimately secession as legitimate expressions of state power against the tyranny of a majority. While national issues such as the Alien and Sedition Acts, federal funding for internal improvements, and inequalities in the tariff provoked governmental power clashes with Southerners and the rest of the nation, it was slavery that proved to be the most important factor in the development of Southern regional consciousness and political thought. Ultimately, slavery's expansion and not slavery itself would force a break with the old Union.

As new territory was added to the country, the free and slave states negotiated new compromises on the expansion of slavery. However, at least by the 1850s, two contrasting visions of the economic and social development of the nation had emerged. While the North had developed a *free-labor ideology* that stressed opening the new territories only to free whites who could build better lives for themselves and their families through economic opportunities offered by a supportive national government, the South clung to what can be called a *slave-labor ideology*, with an emphasis on a national government of limited power and the belief that acquisition of land and slaves was the surest way to build wealth and security within their society. To that end, the territories had to be accessible for both cash crop agriculture and the needed slave labor.

What started as a struggle for slavery in territories where it did not exist culminated in the election of 1860. By that point the South, having a smaller white population, had lost control of the House of Representatives. Likewise, because the number of free states

veil, through whose almost impenetrable meshes light seldom gleams, has long been pendent over their eyes, and there, with fiendish jealousy, the slave-driving ruffians sedulously guard it. Non-slaveholders are not only kept in ignorance of what is transpiring at the North, but they are continually misinformed of what is going on even in the South. Never were the poorer classes of a people, and those classes so largely in the majority, and all inhabiting the same country, so basely duped, so adroitly swindled, or so damnably outraged.

It is expected that the stupid and sequacious masses, the white victims of slavery will believe, and, as a general thing, they do believe, whatever the slaveholders tell them; and thus it is that they are cajoled into the notion that they are the freest, happiest and most intelligent people in the world, and are taught to look with prejudice and disapprobation upon every new principle or progressive movement. Thus it is that the South, woefully inert and inventionless, has lagged behind the North, and is now weltering in the cesspool of ignorance and degradation.

2-3. SOUTHERN EDITORIALS ON SUMNER CANING

Charleston, South Carolina, *Mercury* [Democratic] (28 May 1856)

WASHINGTON, May 24, 1856.

MESSRS. EDITORS: There is high excitement in Washington. You will have heard, through telegraphic reports, that Col. BROOKS, of your State, punished Mr. SUMNER, of Massachusetts, on last Thursday, for a libel on South Carolina and a slander against Judge BUTLER.

SUMNER, on Monday and Tuesday, delivered a coarse and malignant Abolition speech, in which he assailed South Carolina and Judge BUTLER with great bitterness. The speech was so coarse and insulting, that even his own faction condemned it, and the Southern men freely said he should be chastised. His peculiar friends tauntingly declared that he was armed during its delivery, and that he was prepared for all responsibility. Col. BROOKS, who is a relative of Judge BUTLER, and from his immediate district, deemed it his duty to chastise Mr. SUMNER for his insolence, and his slanders against Judge BUTLER and the State. He sought Mr. SUMNER on Wednesday, but could not find him except in the Senate Chamber. He had determined to postpone the punishment no longer, and therefore he remained in the Senate until it adjourned.

After the adjournment, a number of ladies came into the Senate Hall, and loitered there for some time. Col. BROOKS waited about an hour after the adjournment, until all the ladies had left, Mr. SUMNER having remained in his seat, engaged in franking off his speech. As soon as the last lady had left the hall, Col. BROOKS went up to Mr. SUMNER, and facing him, said: "Mr. SUMNER, I have read your speech with great care, and all the impartiality in my power, and I have come to tell you that you have libelled my State, and slandered my relative, who is old and absent, and I deem it my duty to punish you, which I shall now proceed to do." Col. BROOKS thereupon struck Mr. SUMNER, who was rising, across the face with a gutta percha cane. He continued repeating the blows until Mr. SUMNER fell upon the floor, crying out for help. Col. BROOKS then desisted voluntarily, saying, "I did not wish to hurt him much, but only punish him."

SUMNER was well and elegantly whipped, and he richly deserved it. Senator TOOMBS, of Georgia, who was in the midst of it, said, "BROOKS, you have done the right thing, and in the right place." Gallant old Governor FITZPATRICK, of Alabama, who was in the midst of it, warmly sustained BROOKS also.

The Black Republicans have shingled the occurrence all over with falsehood. They charge Mr. EDMUNDSON, of Virginia, and Mr. KEITT, of South Carolina, with sharing in the attack. It is false. Mr. EDMUNDSON was not in the Senate Chamber when the caning

took place, and Mr. KEITT was at the remotest corner of the room, with the President's desk intervening; so he did not even see the beginning of the attack. Hearing the blows of the cane and the cries of SUMNER, he hurried to the spot, and found Senator FOSTER, of Connecticut, and an officer of the Senate, attempting to grasp BROOKS, when he threw himself between them, and ordered them back at their personal risk. They immediately desisted, and BROOKS flogged SUMNER without any interference.

SUMNER is much the largest and most athletic man, and, had he resisted, might have defended himself; at least that is my opinion. BROOKS was immediately afterwards arrested. The magistrate could not fix the amount of bail, as he did not know the extent of SUMNER'S injuries, so he has fixed four o'clock this evening for taking the bond.

The whole South sustains BROOKS, and a large part of the North also. All feel that it is time for freedom of speech and freedom of the cudgel to go together.

The Senate have appointed a Committee of Investigation. The House, in its super-serviceable Black Republican zeal, has done the same thing. Its action has been imbecile and contemptible. A Speaker elected by a sectional vote — a resolution against HERBERT supported by a sectional vote — and now one against BROOKS by a sectional vote.

Events are hurrying on. A despatch has just been received that Lawrence has been demolished, and lives lost. Next it will be a line of battle for two thousand miles!

PALMETTO.

Columbia, South Carolina, *South Carolinian* [Democratic] (27 May 1856)

We were not mistaken in asserting, on Saturday last, that the Hon. Preston S. Brooks had not only the approval, but the hearty congratulations of the people of South Carolina for his summary chastisement of the abolitionist Sumner.

Immediately upon the reception of the news on Saturday last, a most enthusiastic meeting was convened in the town of Newberry, at which Gen. Williams, the Intendant, presided. Complimentary resolutions were introduced by Gen. A. C. Garlington, and ardent speeches made by him, Col. S. Fair, Maj. Henry Sumner, and others. The meeting voted him a handsome gold-headed cane, which we saw yesterday, on its way to Washington, entrusted to the care of Hon. B. Simpson. At Anderson, the same evening, a meeting was called, and complimentary resolutions adopted. We heard one of Carolina's truest and most honored matrons from Mr. Brooks' district send a message to him by Maj. Simpson, saying "that the ladies of the South would send him *hickory* sticks, with which to chastise Abolitionists and Red Republicans whenever he wanted them."

Here in Columbia, a handsome sum, headed by the Governor of the State, has been subscribed, for the purpose of presenting Mr. Brooks with a splendid silver pitcher, goblet and stick, which will be conveyed to him in a few days by the hands of gentlemen delegated for that purpose. In Charleston similar testimonials have been ordered by the friends of Mr. Brooks.

And, to add the crowning glory to the good work, the slaves of Columbia have already a handsome subscription, and will present an appropriate token of their regard to him who has made the first practical issue for their preservation and protection in their rights and enjoyments as the happiest laborers on the face of the globe.

Meetings of approval and sanction will be held, not only in Mr. Brooks' district, but throughout the State at large, and a general and hearty response of approval will re-echo the words, "Well done," from Washington to the Rio Grande.

Nashville, Tennessee, *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig* [American] (27 May 1856)

Below will be found a telegraphic sketch of the proceedings of both Houses of Congress consequent upon the beating of Mr. Sumner, by Mr. Brooks, a representative from South Carolina. Mr. Sumner was exceedingly virulent, venomous, offensive, and insulting in his

speech; but the Senate Chamber, although that body had adjourned, was no place for such an exhibition, on the part of Mr. Brooks. He could have sought and easily found Mr. Sumner elsewhere. His assault upon Mr. S., a member of the Senate, upon the floor of the Senate, was a great outrage upon that body, and cannot be justified or excused. As to Mr. Sumner, no *Southern* reader of his speech will be likely to feel any sympathy for him *personally*. But that circumstances should not prevent Southern men of all parties from raising their voices in strong and earnest rebuke and condemnation of the desecration, by such brutality, of the Halls of the National Legislature. The effect abroad of this occurrence can not fail to be deeply injurious to our national character. At home — in the non-slave-holding States — the effect will be to cause Mr. Sumner to be looked upon with increased consideration, and to strengthen the party to which he belongs.

Greenville, South Carolina, *Patriot and Mountaineer* [Democratic] (29 May 1856)

The telegraphic despatches inform us that Col. BROOKS, of South Carolina, gave Senator SUMNER, of Massachusetts, a genteel caning, the other day, in Washington. We have no doubt that the Colonel did it handsomely, and we hope it will be of service to the Honorable Senator, in his future abolition frenzies. We suppose the provocation was the speech which SUMNER made, in which he was abusive of Judge BUTLER and Judge DOUGLAS, and denounced all slaveholders as criminals! Well done for Col. BROOKS.

2-4. THE DRED SCOTT DECISION, 1857

Now ... the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution. The right to traffic in it, like an ordinary article of merchandise and property, was guaranteed to the citizens of the United States, in every state that might desire it, for twenty years. And the government in express terms is pledged to protect it in all future time, if the slave escapes from his owner. This is done in plain words — too plain to be misunderstood. And no word can be found in the Constitution which gives Congress a greater power over slave property ... than property of any other description. The only power conferred is the power coupled with the duty of guarding and protecting the owner of his rights.

Upon these considerations, it is the opinion of the Court that the Act of Congress [Missouri Compromise] which prohibited a citizen from holding and owning property of this kind in the territory of the United States north of the line therein mentioned is not warranted by the Constitution, and is therefore void; and that neither Dred Scott himself, nor any of his family, were made free by being carried into this territory; even if they had been carried here by the owner with the intention of becoming a permanent resident.

Upon the whole, therefore, it is the judgment of this Court that it appears by the record before us that the plaintiff in error [Dred Scott] is not a citizen of Missouri in the sense in which that word is used in the Constitution; and that the Circuit Court of the United States for that reason had no jurisdiction in the case, and could give not judgment in it.

2-5. SOUTHERN EDITORIALS ON DRED SCOTT DECISION

Louisville, Kentucky, *Journal [American]* (16 March 1857)

We publish to-day abstracts of the opinions of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Dred Scott against Sanford. The importance of this decision in the highest legal tribunal established under our Federal Constitution is a sufficient reason for devoting to it so much of the space in our columns. The questions upon which these

opinions have been rendered are among those which have shaken our Union from centre to circumference, and threatened imminently its dissolution. The points adjudicated are more strictly political than legal, and affect materially the *status* of political parties throughout the confederacy.

The Court, by Taney, Chief Justice, decided that the case was not within the jurisdiction of the Court, as the plaintiff was not a citizen, and had no right to sue in a Federal Court. This decision was concurred in by Judges Campbell, Catron, Wayne, Daniels, Nelson, and Grier. The opinion of the Court was delivered by Chief Justice Taney. Judges Nelson and Catron delivered separate opinions concurring in the decision, but arriving at it by a somewhat different course of reasoning. Judges McLean and Curtis delivered opinions dissenting, in conclusion and in detail, from the opinion of the majority of the Court.

The principal points in this decision are that a negro cannot, under the *Constitution*, become a *citizen* of the United States, that the power given to Congress to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property of the United States, referred exclusively to the Territory which belonged to the United States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution and can have no influence on Territory subsequently acquired; that the ordinance of 1787 was a compact between confederated colonies which was set aside by the adoption of the *Constitution*, and that by the provisions of the *Constitution* neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature organized by authority of an act of Congress, has any right to prohibit slavery in the Territories, and that consequently the Missouri Compromise act of 1820, and the squatter sovereignty feature of the Kansas-Nebraska act are void for unconstitutionality.

In a strictly legal sense perhaps all of these questions were not properly before the court for adjudication, and all, except the decision that the court had no jurisdiction over the case of Dred Scott against Sanford, because Dred was not a citizen of the United States, may be considered as mere dicta and not strictly decisions of the court; but for all practical purposes they are equivalent to regular decisions upon adjudicated cases, as they indicate clearly what would be the decision of the court in any case directly presenting the questions which in this are simply incidental. However different this decision may be from the views entertained by a large portion of the people of the United States, it must be regarded as an authoritative exposition of constitutional law, emanating from the highest legal tribunal in the country, to whose decisions the people and the Government are bound to yield obedience and respect.

The importance of the decision is greatly enhanced by its immediate effect upon two of the great political parties of the country. At a single blow it shatters and destroys the platform of the Republican party. It annihilates the issue which was made paramount in the recent Presidential election, and takes away from the Democratic party all the advantages of its advocacy of popular sovereignty in the Territories. It leaves both of these great parties all abroad, without a single plank of their late platforms upon which to rest.

In the recent election, while the Republicans demanded the *restoration* of the Missouri compromise, the Democratic party strongly advocated the popular sovereignty doctrine incorporated in the Nebraska-Kansas act. They made this popular sovereignty doctrine the chief, and, in fact, the only, plank in their platform. They made it the paramount issue of the canvass. They eulogised it as "more ancient than free government itself," and contended most justly that the only truly constitutional method of disposing of the question of slavery in the Territories was to allow the people of the Territories themselves, while in a territorial condition, to decide whether they would establish or prohibit slavery therein. In the Inaugural address of Mr. Buchanan, delivered, we believe, only the day before the decision in this Dred Scott case was tendered, the Democratic President elect greatly eulogised this squatter sovereignty doctrine, "that the will of the majority shall govern the settlement of the question of domestic slavery in the Territories," and frankly admitted that it was upon this doctrine that the Democratic party had succeeded in the last election.

The voice of the President elect, admitting the position of the Democratic party in favor of squatter sovereignty, had hardly ceased to be echoed from the walls of the Capitol when this decision of the Supreme Court pronounced the new favorite doctrine of the Democracy unconstitutional. It has therefore become necessary for the formation of a new platform. What this will be has already been foreshadowed in the action of the Democrats in the United States Senate in reference to Bigg's amendment to the Minnesota bill, and the significant declaration in the inaugural address of Mr. Buchanan that "it is the imperative and indispensable duty of the Government to secure to every *resident inhabitant* the free and independent expression of his opinions by his vote." The alien suffrage and States' rights doctrine will be made the cardinal principles of the Democratic and Republican parties, and they will seek to avoid annihilation by a fusion of their failing fortunes.

Milledgeville, Georgia, *Federal Union* [Democratic] (31 March 1857)

The late decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Dred Scott case, will bring the enemies of the South face to face with the Constitution of their country. They cannot escape the issue presented — the observance of the laws of the land, or disunion. They can no longer dodge under such pretexts as "bleeding Kansas." That harp of one string has played its last tune, and must now be hung up. Or, if continued to be used by the reverends Henry Ward Beecher and Theodore Parker, it will not call forth the responses it was wont to do in the flush times of "bleeding Kansas." Many of the followers of these infidel preachers are not the fools or fanatics their conduct would seem to indicate. They acted upon principle, many of them, in their opposition to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise; and their zeal for free Kansas was excited to the highest pitch, by the lying agents of the Free State Party. But it is a quite different question now. The leaders of the Black Republican Party are denouncing the decision of the very Tribunal to which they had appealed, and are endeavoring to excite among the people of the North a bitter hostility to it. They will endeavor to organize a party on the basis of opposition to the decision of the majority of the Court in the Dred Scott case. But as fanatical as the people of New England are, they will hesitate to enter the ranks of a political party, organized for the express purpose of overturning a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. Some of our Southern editors depreciate the agitation to which this decision will give rise. But let it come. The fury of the storm has passed. The treasonable conduct of the leaders of the Black Republican party will be rebuked at their very doors. The issue they have raised will be met by the true-hearted, Constitutional, law-abiding men of the North, and thousands who followed Fremont and "bleeding Kansas," will find themselves allied with the Union men of the country, in sustaining the determination of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case.

2-6. SOUTHERN EDITORIALS ON JOHN BROWN'S RAID

Charleston, South Carolina, *Mercury* [Democratic] (1 November 1859)

Although BROWN'S effort at an insurrection has been silly and abortive, the developments are rapidly showing that a wide-spread scheme was maturing at the North for insurrections throughout the South. A carefully concocted plan is published in the New York *Herald*, republished in the Richmond *Whig*, and incorporated into the address of the Democratic Committee of the City of New York in an address to the people of New York, by which slavery was to be overthrown in the South with the aid of military force from the North. We forbear laying this scheme before our readers on account of its incendiary nature, but we advise our readers to get it and read it for themselves. It will give them a clearer insight into the true relations they occupy in the Union, and the "priceless value" of its continuance

to them, than any other document which has yet seen the light. It is no answer to say that the diabolical incendiaries who can in cold blood get up such a scheme for our destruction, are comparatively few in numbers in the North. It is enough for us to know that, few or many, they have, by the Constitution of the United States, the right to come among us — to live among us — and in their good time carry out their purposes; and even if their purposes should fail again and again, and scaffold after scaffold shall drip with their gore, the elements of mischief and trouble may survive them, and give new impulse to future adventurers and fanatics. The great source of the evil is, that we are under one government with these people — that by the constitution they deem themselves responsible for the institution of slavery, and, therefore, they seek to overthrow it. They do not plot insurrections for Cuba or Brazil. If we had a separate government of our own, the post office, all the avenues of intercourse, the police and military of the country, would be under our executive control. Abolitionism would die out at the North, or its adherents would have to operate in the South as foreign emissaries, in a country armed and prepared to exclude their intercourse or arrest their designs, and punish their intervention. As it is, the "irrepressible conflict" of SEWARD is destined to go on, although it may be checked and suppressed by repeated failures, until one of two things shall take place — the Union shall be dissolved, or slavery shall be abolished. The experience of the last twenty-five years, of ignominious toleration and concession by the South, with the lights of the present reflected on them, show to the most bigoted Unionist that there is no peace for the South in the Union, from the forbearance or respect of the North. The South must control her own destinies or perish.

Charleston, South Carolina, *Mercury* [Democratic] (4 November 1859)

The New York *Tribune*, the leading organ of the abolition party, in noticing the late proceedings at Harper's Ferry, says:

There will be enough to heap execration on the memory of these mistaken men. We leave this work to the fit hands and tongues of those who regard the fundamental axioms of the Declaration of Independence as "glittering generalities." Believing that the way to universal emancipation lies not through insurrection, civil war, and bloodshed, but through peace, discussion and quiet diffusion of sentiments of humanity and justice, we deeply regret this outbreak; but, remembering that, if their fault was grievous, grievously have they answered it, we will not, by one reproachful word, disturb the bloody shrouds wherein John Brown and his compatriots are sleeping. They dared and died for what they felt to be the right, though in a manner which seems to us fatally wrong. Let their epitaphs remain unwritten until the not distant day when no slave shall clank his chains in the shades of Monticello or by the graves of Mount Vernon.

It will be seen that the *Tribune* considers the act of Brown as the act of a patriot, which future ages will admire and extol. This is evident from its closing allusion to him — the sentiment of which is borrowed from the last speech of Robert Emmett, the Irish patriot, when sentence of death was about to be pronounced on him. To become a hero and a martyr, in the *Tribune's* estimation, is to go to the South and excite the slaves to rise and cut the throats of their white masters. Their bloody shrouds it will not disturb by one reproachful word. Kind and considerate *Tribune*.

suspended without an effort for its preservation, and permitted our people to be driven in exile from their homes; have subjected our property to confiscation and our persons to confinement in the penitentiary as felons, because we may choose to take part in a cause for civil liberty and constitutional government against a sectional majority waging war against the people and institutions of fifteen independent States of the old Federal Union, and have done all these things deliberately against the warnings and vetoes of the Governor and the solemn remonstrances of the minority in the Senate and House of Representatives: Therefore,

Be it further ordained, That the unconstitutional edicts of a factious majority of a Legislature thus false to their pledges, their honor, and their interests are not law, and that such a government is unworthy of the support of a brave and free people, and that we do therefore declare that the people are thereby absolved from all allegiance to said government, and that they have a right to establish any government which to them may seem best adapted to the preservation of their rights and liberties.

Texas

An Ordinance to dissolve the union between the State of Texas and the other States, united under the compact styled "The Constitution of the United States of America."

Whereas, the Federal Government has failed to accomplish the purposes of the compact of union between the States, in giving protection either to the persons of our people upon an exposed frontier, or to the property of our citizens; and, whereas, the action of the Northern States of the Union is violative of the compact between the States and the guarantees of the Federal Constitution, and, whereas, the recent developments in Federal affairs, make it evident that the power of the Federal Government is sought to be made a weapon with which to strike down the interest and prosperity of the people of Texas and her sister slaveholding States, instead of permitting it to be, as was intended our shield against outrage and aggression:

Therefore,

Sec. 1. We, the People of the State of Texas, by delegates in Convention assembled, do declare and ordain, that the ordinance adopted by our convention of delegates, on the 4th day of July, a.d. 1845, and afterwards ratified by us, under which the Republic of Texas was admitted into union with other States and became a party to the compact styled "The Constitution of the United States of America" be, and is hereby repealed and annulled; that all the powers which by said compact were delegated by Texas to the Federal Government are revoked and resumed; that Texas is of right absolved from all restraints and obligations incurred by said compact, and is a separate sovereign State, and that her citizens and people are absolved from all allegiance to the United States, or the Government thereof.

Sec. 2. This ordinance shall be submitted to the people of Texas for their ratification or rejection by the qualified voters thereof, on the 23d day of February, 1861, and, unless rejected by a majority of the votes cast, shall take effect and be in force on and after the 2d day of March, a.d. 1861. Provided that in the representative district of El Paso said election may be held on the 18th day of February, a.d. 1861.

3-6. DECLARATIONS OF CAUSES OF SECEDING STATES

South Carolina

Declaration of the Immediate Causes Which Induce and Justify the Secession of South Carolina from the Federal Union

The people of the State of South Carolina, in Convention assembled, on the 26th day of April, a.d., 1852, declared that the frequent violations of the Constitution of the United States, by the Federal Government, and its encroachments upon the reserved rights of the

States, fully justified this State in then withdrawing from the Federal Union; but in deference to the opinions and wishes of the other slaveholding States, she forbore at that time to exercise this right. Since that time, these encroachments have continued to increase, and further forbearance ceases to be a virtue.

And now the State of South Carolina having resumed her separate and equal place among nations, deems it due to herself, to the remaining United States of America, and to the nations of the world, that she should declare the immediate causes which have led to this act.

In the year 1765, that portion of the British Empire embracing Great Britain, undertook to make laws for the government of that portion composed of the thirteen American Colonies. A struggle for the right of self-government ensued, which resulted, on the 4th of July, 1776, in a Declaration, by the Colonies, "that they are, and of right ought to be, FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES; and that, as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do."

They further solemnly declared that whenever any "form of government becomes destructive of the ends for which it was established, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government." Deeming the Government of Great Britain to have become destructive of these ends, they declared that the Colonies "are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved."

In pursuance of this Declaration of Independence, each of the thirteen States proceeded to exercise its separate sovereignty; adopted for itself a Constitution, and appointed officers for the administration of government in all its departments — Legislative, Executive and Judicial. For purposes of defense, they united their arms and their counsels; and, in 1778, they entered into a League known as the Articles of Confederation, whereby they agreed to entrust the administration of their external relations to a common agent, known as the Congress of the United States, expressly declaring, in the first Article "that 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."

Under this Confederation the war of the Revolution was carried on, and on the 3rd of September, 1783, the contest ended, and a definite Treaty was signed by Great Britain, in which she acknowledged the independence of the Colonies in the following terms: "ARTICLE 1 — His Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz: New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, to be FREE, SOVEREIGN AND INDEPENDENT STATES; that he treats with them as such; and for himself, his heirs and successors, relinquishes all claims to the government, propriety and territorial rights of the same and every part thereof."

Thus were established the two great principles asserted by the Colonies, namely: the right of a State to govern itself; and the right of a people to abolish a Government when it becomes destructive of the ends for which it was instituted. And concurrent with the establishment of these principles, was the fact that each Colony became and was recognized by the mother Country a FREE, SOVEREIGN AND INDEPENDENT STATE.

In 1787, Deputies were appointed by the States to revise the Articles of Confederation, and on 17th September, 1787, these Deputies recommended for the adoption of the States, the Articles of Union, known as the Constitution of the United States.

The parties to whom this Constitution was submitted, were the several sovereign States; they were to agree or disagree, and when nine of them agreed the compact was to take effect among those concurring; and the General Government, as the common agent, was then invested with their authority.

If only nine of the thirteen States had concurred, the other four would have remained as they then were — separate, sovereign States, independent of any of the provisions of the

Constitution. In fact, two of the States did not accede to the Constitution until long after it had gone into operation among the other eleven; and during that interval, they each exercised the functions of an independent nation.

By this Constitution, certain duties were imposed upon the several States, and the exercise of certain of their powers was restrained, which necessarily implied their continued existence as sovereign States. But to remove all doubt, an amendment was added, which declared that 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. On the 23d May, 1788, South Carolina, by a Convention of her People, passed an Ordinance assenting to this Constitution, and afterwards altered her own Constitution, to conform herself to the obligations she had undertaken.

Thus was established, by compact between the States, a Government with definite objects and powers, limited to the express words of the grant. This limitation left the whole remaining mass of power subject to the clause reserving it to the States or to the people, and rendered unnecessary any specification of reserved rights.

We hold that the Government thus established is subject to the two great principles asserted in the Declaration of Independence; and we hold further, that the mode of its formation subjects it to a third fundamental principle, namely: the law of compact. We maintain that in every compact between two or more parties, the obligation is mutual; that the failure of one of the contracting parties to perform a material part of the agreement, entirely releases the obligation of the other; and that where no arbiter is provided, each party is remitted to his own judgment to determine the fact of failure, with all its consequences.

In the present case, that fact is established with certainty. We assert that fourteen of the States have deliberately refused, for years past, to fulfill their constitutional obligations, and we refer to their own Statutes for the proof.

The Constitution of the United States, in its fourth Article, provides as follows: "No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

This stipulation was so material to the compact, that without it that compact would not have been made. The greater number of the contracting parties held slaves, and they had previously evinced their estimate of the value of such a stipulation by making it a condition in the Ordinance for the government of the territory ceded by Virginia, which now composes the States north of the Ohio River.

The same article of the Constitution stipulates also for rendition by the several States of fugitives from justice from the other States.

The General Government, as the common agent, passed laws to carry into effect these stipulations of the States. For many years these laws were executed. But an increasing hostility on the part of the non-slaveholding States to the institution of slavery, has led to a disregard of their obligations, and the laws of the General Government have ceased to effect the objects of the Constitution. The States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin and Iowa, have enacted laws which either nullify the Acts of Congress or render useless any attempt to execute them. In many of these States the fugitive is discharged from service or labor claimed, and in none of them has the State Government complied with the stipulation made in the Constitution. The State of New Jersey, at an early day, passed a law in conformity with her constitutional obligation; but the current of anti-slavery feeling has led her more recently to enact laws which render inoperative the remedies provided by her own law and by the laws of Congress. In the State of New York even the right of transit for a slave has been denied by her tribunals; and the States of Ohio and Iowa have refused to surrender to justice fugitives charged with murder, and with inciting servile insurrection in

the State of Virginia. Thus the constituted compact has been deliberately broken and disregarded by the non-slaveholding States, and the consequence follows that South Carolina is released from her obligation.

The ends for which the Constitution was framed are declared by itself to be "to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

These ends it endeavored to accomplish by a Federal Government, in which each State was recognized as an equal, and had separate control over its own institutions. The right of property in slaves was recognized by giving to free persons distinct political rights, by giving them the right to represent, and burthening them with direct taxes for three-fifths of their slaves; by authorizing the importation of slaves for twenty years; and by stipulating for the rendition of fugitives from labor.

We affirm that these ends for which this Government was instituted have been defeated, and the Government itself has been made destructive of them by the action of the non-slaveholding States. Those States have assumed the right of deciding upon the propriety of our domestic institutions; and have denied the rights of property established in fifteen of the States and recognized by the Constitution; they have denounced as sinful the institution of slavery; they have permitted open establishment among them of societies, whose avowed object is to disturb the peace and to elohn the property of the citizens of other States. They have encouraged and assisted thousands of our slaves to leave their homes; and those who remain, have been incited by emissaries, books and pictures to servile insurrection.

For twenty-five years this agitation has been steadily increasing, until it has now secured to its aid the power of the common Government. Observing the *forms* of the Constitution, a sectional party has found within that Article establishing the Executive Department, the means of subverting the Constitution itself. A geographical line has been drawn across the Union, and all the States north of that line have united in the election of a man to the high office of President of the United States, whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery. He is to be entrusted with the administration of the common Government, because he has declared that that "Government cannot endure permanently half slave, half free," and that the public mind must rest in the belief that slavery is in the course of ultimate extinction.

This sectional combination for the submersion of the Constitution, has been aided in some of the States by elevating to citizenship, persons who, by the supreme law of the land, are incapable of becoming citizens; and their votes have been used to inaugurate a new policy, hostile to the South, and destructive of its beliefs and safety.

On the 4th day of March next, this party will take possession of the Government. It has announced that the South shall be excluded from the common territory, that the judicial tribunals shall be made sectional, and that a war must be waged against slavery until it shall cease throughout the United States.

The guaranties of the Constitution will then no longer exist; the equal rights of the States will be lost. The slaveholding States will no longer have the power of self-government, or self-protection, and the Federal Government will have become their enemy.

Sectional interest and animosity will deepen the irritation, and all hope of remedy is rendered vain, by the fact that public opinion at the North has invested a great political error with the sanction of more erroneous religious belief.

We, therefore, the People of South Carolina, by our delegates in Convention assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, have solemnly declared that the Union heretofore existing between this State and the other States of North America, is dissolved, and that the State of South Carolina has resumed her position among the nations of the world, as a separate and independent State; with full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do.

Mississippi

A Declaration of the Immediate Causes which Induce and Justify the Secession of the State of Mississippi from the Federal Union.

In the momentous step which our State has taken of dissolving its connection with the government of which we so long formed a part, it is but just that we should declare the prominent reasons which have induced our course.

Our position is thoroughly identified with the institution of slavery — the greatest material interest of the world. Its labor supplies the product which constitutes by far the largest and most important portions of commerce of the earth. These products are peculiar to the climate verging on the tropical regions, and by an imperious law of nature, none but the black race can bear exposure to the tropical sun. These products have become necessities of the world, and a blow at slavery is a blow at commerce and civilization. That blow has been long aimed at the institution, and was at the point of reaching its consummation. There was no choice left us but submission to the mandates of abolition, or a dissolution of the Union, whose principles had been subverted to work out our ruin.

That we do not overstate the dangers to our institution, a reference to a few facts will sufficiently prove.

The hostility to this institution commenced before the adoption of the Constitution, and was manifested in the well-known Ordinance of 1787, in regard to the Northwestern Territory.

The feeling increased, until, in 1819–20, it deprived the South of more than half the vast territory acquired from France.

The same hostility dismembered Texas and seized upon all the territory acquired from Mexico.

It has grown until it denies the right of property in slaves, and refuses protection to that right on the high seas, in the Territories, and wherever the government of the United States had jurisdiction.

It refuses the admission of new slave States into the Union, and seeks to extinguish it by confining it within its present limits, denying the power of expansion.

It tramples the original equality of the South under foot.

It has nullified the Fugitive Slave Law in almost every free State in the Union, and has utterly broken the compact which our fathers pledged their faith to maintain.

It advocates negro equality, socially and politically, and promotes insurrection and incendiarism in our midst.

It has enlisted its press, its pulpit and its schools against us, until the whole popular mind of the North is excited and inflamed with prejudice.

It has made combinations and formed associations to carry out its schemes of emancipation in the States and wherever else slavery exists.

It seeks not to elevate or to support the slave, but to destroy his present condition without providing a better.

It has invaded a State, and invested with the honors of martyrdom the wretch whose purpose was to apply flames to our dwellings, and the weapons of destruction to our lives.

It has broken every compact into which it has entered for our security.

It has given indubitable evidence of its design to ruin our agriculture, to prostrate our industrial pursuits and to destroy our social system.

It knows no relenting or hesitation in its purposes; it stops not in its march of aggression, and leaves us no room to hope for cessation or for pause.

It has recently obtained control of the Government, by the prosecution of its unhallowed schemes, and destroyed the last expectation of living together in friendship and brotherhood.

Utter subjugation awaits us in the Union, if we should consent longer to remain in it. It is not a matter of choice, but of necessity. We must either submit to degradation, and to the

loss of property worth four billions of money, or we must secede from the Union framed by our fathers, to secure this as well as every other species of property. For far less cause than this, our fathers separated from the Crown of England.

Our decision is made. We follow their footsteps. We embrace the alternative of separation; and for the reasons here stated, we resolve to maintain our rights with the full consciousness of the justice of our course, and the undoubting belief of our ability to maintain it.

Georgia

The people of Georgia having dissolved their political connection with the Government of the United States of America, present to their confederates and the world the causes which have led to the separation. For the last ten years we have had numerous and serious causes of complaint against our non-slave-holding confederate States with reference to the subject of African slavery. They have endeavored to weaken our security, to disturb our domestic peace and tranquility, and persistently refused to comply with their express constitutional obligations to us in reference to that property, and by the use of their power in the Federal Government have striven to deprive us of an equal enjoyment of the common Territories of the Republic. This hostile policy of our confederates has been pursued with every circumstance of aggravation which could arouse the passions and excite the hatred of our people, and has placed the two sections of the Union for many years past in the condition of virtual civil war. Our people, still attached to the Union from habit and national traditions, and averse to change, hoped that time, reason, and argument would bring, if not redress, at least exemption from further insults, injuries, and dangers. Recent events have fully dissipated all such hopes and demonstrated the necessity of separation. Our Northern confederates, after a full and calm hearing of all the facts, after a fair warning of our purpose not to submit to the rule of the authors of all these wrongs and injuries, have by a large majority committed the Government of the United States into their hands. The people of Georgia, after an equally full and fair and deliberate hearing of the case, have declared with equal firmness that they shall not rule over them. A brief history of the rise, progress, and policy of anti-slavery and the political organization into whose hands the administration of the Federal Government has been committed will fully justify the pronounced verdict of the people of Georgia.

The party of Lincoln, called the Republican party, under its present name and organization, is of recent origin. It is admitted to be an anti-slavery party. While it attracts to itself by its creed the scattered advocates of exploded political heresies, of condemned theories in political economy, the advocates of commercial restrictions, of protection, of special privileges, of waste and corruption in the administration of Government, anti-slavery is its mission and its purpose. By anti-slavery it is made a power in the state. The question of slavery was the great difficulty in the way of the formation of the Constitution. While the subordination and the political and social inequality of the African race was fully conceded by all, it was plainly apparent that slavery would soon disappear from what are now the non-slave-holding States of the original thirteen. The opposition to slavery was then, as now, general in those States and the Constitution was made with direct reference to that fact. But a distinct abolition party was not formed in the United States for more than half a century after the Government went into operation. The main reason was that the North, even if united, could not control both branches of the Legislature during any portion of that time. Therefore such an organization must have resulted either in utter failure or in the total overthrow of the Government.

The material prosperity of the North was greatly dependent on the Federal Government; that of the South not at all. In the first years of the Republic the navigating, commercial, and manufacturing interests of the North began to seek profit and aggrandizement at the expense of the agricultural interests. Even the owners of fishing shacks sought and obtained bounties for pursuing their own business (which yet continue), and \$500,000 is now paid

them annually out of the Treasury. The navigating interests begged for protection against foreign shipbuilders and against competition in the coasting trade. Congress granted both requests, and by prohibitory acts gave an absolute monopoly of this business to each of their interests, which they enjoy without diminution to this day. Not content with these great and unjust advantages, they have sought to throw the legitimate burden of their business as much as possible upon the public; they have succeeded in throwing the cost of light-houses, buoys, and the maintenance of their seamen upon the Treasury, and the Government now pays above \$2,000,000 annually for the support of these objects. These interests, in connection with the commercial and manufacturing classes, have also succeeded, by means of subventions to mail steamers and the reduction in postage, in relieving their business from the payment of about \$7,000,000 annually, throwing it upon the public Treasury under the name of postal deficiency.

The manufacturing interests entered into the same struggle early, and has clamored steadily for Government bounties and special favors. This interest was confined mainly to the Eastern and Middle non-slave-holding States. Wielding these great States it held great power and influence, and its demands were in full proportion to its power. The manufacturers and miners wisely based their demands upon special facts and reasons rather than upon general principles, and thereby mollified much of the opposition of the opposing interest. They pleaded in their favor the infancy of their business in this country, the scarcity of labor and capital, the hostile legislation of other countries toward them, the great necessity of their fabrics in the time of war, and the necessity of high duties to pay the debt incurred in our war for independence. These reasons prevailed, and they received for many years enormous bounties by the general acquiescence of the whole country.

But when these reasons ceased they were no less clamorous for Government protection, but their clamors were less heeded — the country had put the principle of protection upon trial and condemned it. After having enjoyed protection to the extent of from 15 to 200 per cent. upon their entire business for above thirty years, the act of 1846 was passed. It avoided sudden change, but the principle was settled, and free trade, low duties, and economy in public expenditures was the verdict of the American people. The South and the Northwestern States sustained this policy. There was but small hope of its reversal; upon the direct issue, none at all.

All these classes saw this and felt it and cast about for new allies. The anti-slavery sentiment of the North offered the best chance for success. An anti-slavery party must necessarily look to the North alone for support, but a united North was now strong enough to control the Government in all of its departments, and a sectional party was therefore determined upon. Time and issues upon slavery were necessary to its completion and final triumph. The feeling of anti-slavery, which it was well known was very general among the people of the North, had been long dormant or passive; it needed only a question to arouse it into aggressive activity. This question was before us. We had acquired a large territory by successful war with Mexico; Congress had to govern it; how, in relation to slavery, was the question then demanding solution. This state of facts gave form and shape to the anti-slavery sentiment throughout the North and the conflict began. Northern anti-slavery men of all parties asserted the right to exclude slavery from the territory by Congressional legislation and demanded the prompt and efficient exercise of this power to that end. This insulting and unconstitutional demand was met with great moderation and firmness by the South. We had shed our blood and paid our money for its acquisition; we demanded a division of it on the line of the Missouri restriction or an equal participation in the whole of it. These propositions were refused, the agitation became general, and the public danger was great. The case of the South was impregnable. The price of the acquisition was the blood and treasure of both sections — of all, and, therefore, it belonged to all upon the principles of equity and justice.

The Constitution delegated no power to Congress to exclude either party from its free enjoyment; therefore our right was good under the Constitution. Our rights were further fortified by the practice of the Government from the beginning. Slavery was forbidden in the country northwest of the Ohio River by what is called the ordinance of 1787. That ordinance was adopted under the old confederation and by the assent of Virginia, who owned and ceded the country, and therefore this case must stand on its own special circumstances. The Government of the United States claimed territory by virtue of the treaty of 1783 with Great Britain, acquired territory by cession from Georgia and North Carolina, by treaty from France, and by treaty from Spain. These acquisitions largely exceeded the original limits of the Republic. In all of these acquisitions the policy of the Government was uniform. It opened them to the settlement of all the citizens of all the States of the Union. They emigrated thither with their property of every kind (including slaves). All were equally protected by public authority in their persons and property until the inhabitants became sufficiently numerous and otherwise capable of bearing the burdens and performing the duties of self-government, when they were admitted into the Union upon equal terms with the other States, with whatever republican constitution they might adopt for themselves.

Under this equally just and beneficent policy law and order, stability and progress, peace and prosperity marked every step of the progress of these new communities until they entered as great and prosperous commonwealths into the sisterhood of American States. In 1820 the North endeavored to overturn this wise and successful policy and demanded that the State of Missouri should not be admitted into the Union unless she first prohibited slavery within her limits by her constitution. After a bitter and protracted struggle the North was defeated in her special object, but her policy and position led to the adoption of a section in the law for the admission of Missouri, prohibiting slavery in all that portion of the territory acquired from France lying North of 36 [degrees] 30 [minutes] north latitude and outside of Missouri. The venerable Madison at the time of its adoption declared it unconstitutional. Mr. Jefferson condemned the restriction and foresaw its consequences and predicted that it would result in the dissolution of the Union. His prediction is now history. The North demanded the application of the principle of prohibition of slavery to all of the territory acquired from Mexico and all other parts of the public domain then and in all future time. It was the announcement of her purpose to appropriate to herself all the public domain then owned and thereafter to be acquired by the United States. The claim itself was less arrogant and insulting than the reason with which she supported it. That reason was her fixed purpose to limit, restrain, and finally abolish slavery in the States where it exists. The South with great unanimity declared her purpose to resist the principle of prohibition to the last extremity. This particular question, in connection with a series of questions affecting the same subject, was finally disposed of by the defeat of prohibitory legislation.

The Presidential election of 1852 resulted in the total overthrow of the advocates of restriction and their party friends. Immediately after this result the anti-slavery portion of the defeated party resolved to unite all the elements in the North opposed to slavery and to stake their future political fortunes upon their hostility to slavery everywhere. This is the party to whom the people of the North have committed the Government. They raised their standard in 1856 and were barely defeated. They entered the Presidential contest again in 1860 and succeeded.

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

With these principles on their banners and these utterances on their lips the majority of the people of the North demand that we shall receive them as our rulers.

The prohibition of slavery in the Territories is the cardinal principle of this organization. For forty years this question has been considered and debated in the halls of Congress, before the people, by the press, and before the tribunals of justice. The majority of the people

of the North in 1860 decided it in their own favor. We refuse to submit to that judgment, and in vindication of our refusal we offer the Constitution of our country and point to the total absence of any express power to exclude us. We offer the practice of our Government for the first thirty years of its existence in complete refutation of the position that any such power is either necessary or proper to the execution of any other power in relation to the Territories. We offer the judgment of a large minority of the people of the North, amounting to more than one-third, who united with the unanimous voice of the South against this usurpation; and, finally, we offer the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, the highest judicial tribunal of our country, in our favor. This evidence ought to be conclusive that we have never surrendered this right. The conduct of our adversaries admonishes us that if we had surrendered it, it is time to resume it.

The faithless conduct of our adversaries is not confined to such acts as might aggrandize themselves or their section of the Union. They are content if they can only injure us. The Constitution declares that persons charged with crimes in one State and fleeing to another shall be delivered up on the demand of the executive authority of the State from which they may flee, to be tried in the jurisdiction where the crime was committed. It would appear difficult to employ language freer from ambiguity, yet for above twenty years the non-slaveholding States generally have wholly refused to deliver up to us persons charged with crimes affecting slave property. Our confederates, with punic faith, shield and give sanctuary to all criminals who seek to deprive us of this property or who use it to destroy us. This clause of the Constitution has no other sanction than their good faith; that is withheld from us; we are remediless in the Union; out of it we are remitted to the laws of nations.

A similar provision of the Constitution requires them to surrender fugitives from labor. This provision and the one last referred to were our main inducements for confederating with the Northern States. Without them it is historically true that we would have rejected the Constitution. In the fourth year of the Republic Congress passed a law to give full vigor and efficiency to this important provision. This act depended to a considerable degree upon the local magistrates in the several States for its efficiency. The non-slaveholding States generally repealed all laws intended to aid the execution of that act, and imposed penalties upon those citizens whose loyalty to the Constitution and their oaths might induce them to discharge their duty. Congress then passed the act of 1850, providing for the complete execution of this duty by Federal officers. This law, which their own bad faith rendered absolutely indispensable for the protection of constitutional rights, was instantly met with ferocious revilings and all conceivable modes of hostility. The Supreme Court unanimously, and their own local courts with equal unanimity (with the single and temporary exception of the supreme court of Wisconsin), sustained its constitutionality in all of its provisions. Yet it stands today a dead letter for all practicable purposes in every non-slaveholding State in the Union. We have their covenants, we have their oaths to keep and observe it, but the unfortunate claimant, even accompanied by a Federal officer with the mandate of the highest judicial authority in his hands, is everywhere met with fraud, with force, and with legislative enactments to elude, to resist, and defeat him. Claimants are murdered with impunity; officers of the law are beaten by frantic mobs instigated by inflammatory appeals from persons holding the highest public employment in these States, and supported by legislation in conflict with the clearest provisions of the Constitution, and even the ordinary principles of humanity. In several of our confederate States a citizen cannot travel the highway with his servant who may voluntarily accompany him, without being declared by law a felon and being subjected to infamous punishments. It is difficult to perceive how we could suffer more by the hostility than by the fraternity of such brethren.

The public law of civilized nations requires every State to restrain its citizens or subjects from committing acts injurious to the peace and security of any other State and from attempting to excite insurrection, or to lessen the security, or to disturb the tranquility of

their neighbors, and our Constitution wisely gives Congress the power to punish all offenses against the laws of nations.

These are sound and just principles which have received the approbation of just men in all countries and all centuries; but they are wholly disregarded by the people of the Northern States, and the Federal Government is impotent to maintain them. For twenty years past the abolitionists and their allies in the Northern States have been engaged in constant efforts to subvert our institutions and to excite insurrection and servile war among us. They have sent emissaries among us for the accomplishment of these purposes. Some of these efforts have received the public sanction of a majority of the leading men of the Republican party in the national councils, the same men who are now proposed as our rulers. These efforts have in one instance led to the actual invasion of one of the slave-holding States, and those of the murderers and incendiaries who escaped public justice by flight have found fraternal protection among our Northern confederates.

These are the same men who say the Union shall be preserved.

Such are the opinions and such are the practices of the Republican party, who have been called by their own votes to administer the Federal Government under the Constitution of the United States. We know their treachery; we know the shallow pretenses under which they daily disregard its plainest obligations. If we submit to them it will be our fault and not theirs. The people of Georgia have ever been willing to stand by this bargain, this contract; they have never sought to evade any of its obligations; they have never hitherto sought to establish any new government; they have struggled to maintain the ancient right of themselves and the human race through and by that Constitution. But they know the value of parchment rights in treacherous hands, and therefore they refuse to commit their own to the rulers whom the North offers us. Why? Because by their declared principles and policy they have outlawed \$3,000,000,000 of our property in the common territories of the Union; put it under the ban of the Republic in the States where it exists and out of the protection of Federal law everywhere; because they give sanctuary to thieves and incendiaries who assail it to the whole extent of their power, in spite of their most solemn obligations and covenants; because their avowed purpose is to subvert our society and subject us not only to the loss of our property but the destruction of ourselves, our wives, and our children, and the desolation of our homes, our altars, and our firesides. To avoid these evils we resume the powers which our fathers delegated to the Government of the United States, and henceforth will seek new safeguards for our liberty, equality, security, and tranquility.

Texas

A Declaration of the Causes which Impel the State of Texas to Secede from the Federal Union.

The government of the United States, by certain joint resolutions, bearing date the 1st day of March, in the year a.d. 1845, proposed to the Republic of Texas, then a *free, sovereign and independent nation*, the annexation of the latter to the former, as one of the co-equal states thereof,

The people of Texas, by deputies in convention assembled, on the fourth day of July of the same year, assented to and accepted said proposals and formed a constitution for the proposed State, upon which on the 29th day of December in the same year, said State was formally admitted into the Confederate Union.

Texas abandoned her separate national existence and consented to become one of the Confederate Union to promote her welfare, insure domestic tranquility and secure more substantially the blessings of peace and liberty to her people. She was received into the confederacy with her own constitution, under the guarantee of the federal constitution and the compact of annexation, that she should enjoy these blessings. She was received as a commonwealth holding, maintaining and protecting the institution known as negro slavery —

the servitude of the African to the white race within her limits — a relation that had existed from the first settlement of her wilderness by the white race, and which her people intended should exist in all future time. Her institutions and geographical position established the strongest ties between her and other slave-holding States of the confederacy. Those ties have been strengthened by association. But what has been the course of the government of the United States, and of the people and authorities of the non-slave-holding States, since our connection with them?

The controlling majority of the Federal Government, under various pretences and disguises, has so administered the same as to exclude the citizens of the Southern States, unless under odious and unconstitutional restrictions, from all the immense territory owned in common by all the States on the Pacific Ocean, for the avowed purpose of acquiring sufficient power in the common government to use it as a means of destroying the institutions of Texas and her sister slaveholding States.

By the disloyalty of the Northern States and their citizens and the imbecility of the Federal Government, infamous combinations of incendiaries and outlaws have been permitted in those States and the common territory of Kansas to trample upon the federal laws, to war upon the lives and property of Southern citizens in that territory, and finally, by violence and mob law, to usurp the possession of the same as exclusively the property of the Northern States.

The Federal Government, while but partially under the control of these our unnatural and sectional enemies, has for years almost entirely failed to protect the lives and property of the people of Texas against the Indian savages on our border, and more recently against the murderous forays of banditti from the neighboring territory of Mexico; and when our State government has expended large amounts for such purpose, the Federal Government has refused reimbursement therefore, thus rendering our condition more insecure and harassing than it was during the existence of the Republic of Texas.

These and other wrongs we have patiently borne in the vain hope that a returning sense of justice and humanity would induce a different course of administration.

When we advert to the course of individual non-slave-holding States, and that a majority of their citizens, our grievances assume far greater magnitude.

The States of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan and Iowa, by solemn legislative enactments, have deliberately, directly or indirectly violated the 3rd clause of the 2nd section of the 4th article [the fugitive slave clause] of the federal constitution, and laws passed in pursuance thereof; thereby annulling a material provision of the compact, designed by its framers to perpetuate the amity between the members of the confederacy and to secure the rights of the slave-holding States in their domestic institutions — a provision founded in justice, and wisdom, and without the enforcement of which the compact fails to accomplish the object of its creation. Some of those States have imposed high fines and degrading penalties upon any of their citizens or officers who may carry out in good faith that provision of the compact, or the federal laws enacted in accordance therewith.

In all the non-slave-holding States, in violation of that good faith and comity which should exist between entirely distinct nations, the people have formed themselves into a great sectional party, now strong enough in numbers to control the affairs of each of those States, based upon an unnatural feeling of hostility to these Southern States and their beneficent and patriarchal system of African slavery, proclaiming the debasing doctrine of equality of all men, irrespective of race or color — a doctrine at war with nature, in opposition to the experience of mankind, and in violation of the plainest revelations of Divine Law. They demand the abolition of negro slavery throughout the confederacy, the recognition of political equality between the white and negro races, and avow their determination to press on their crusade against us, so long as a negro slave remains in these States.

For years past this abolition organization has been actively sowing the seeds of discord through the Union, and has rendered the federal congress the arena for spreading firebrands and hatred between the slave-holding and non-slave-holding States.

By consolidating their strength, they have placed the slave-holding States in a hopeless minority in the federal congress, and rendered representation of no avail in protecting Southern rights against their exactions and encroachments.

They have proclaimed, and at the ballot box sustained, the revolutionary doctrine that there is a 'higher law' than the constitution and laws of our Federal Union, and virtually that they will disregard their oaths and trample upon our rights.

They have for years past encouraged and sustained lawless organizations to steal our slaves and prevent their recapture, and have repeatedly murdered Southern citizens while lawfully seeking their rendition.

They have invaded Southern soil and murdered unoffending citizens, and through the press their leading men and a fanatical pulpit have bestowed praise upon the actors and assassins in these crimes, while the governors of several of their States have refused to deliver parties implicated and indicted for participation in such offenses, upon the legal demands of the States aggrieved.

They have, through the mails and hired emissaries, sent seditious pamphlets and papers among us to stir up servile insurrection and bring blood and carnage to our firesides.

They have sent hired emissaries among us to burn our towns and distribute arms and poison to our slaves for the same purpose.

They have impoverished the slave-holding States by unequal and partial legislation, thereby enriching themselves by draining our substance.

They have refused to vote appropriations for protecting Texas against ruthless savages, for the sole reason that she is a slave-holding State.

And, finally, by the combined sectional vote of the seventeen non-slave-holding States, they have elected as president and vice-president of the whole confederacy two men whose chief claims to such high positions are their approval of these long continued wrongs, and their pledges to continue them to the final consummation of these schemes for the ruin of the slave-holding States.

In view of these and many other facts, it is meet that our own views should be distinctly proclaimed.

We hold as undeniable truths that the governments of the various States, and of the confederacy itself, were established exclusively by the white race, for themselves and their posterity; that the African race had no agency in their establishment; that they were rightfully held and regarded as an inferior and dependent race, and in that condition only could their existence in this country be rendered beneficial or tolerable.

That in this free government *all white men are and of right ought to be entitled to equal civil and political rights*; that the servitude of the African race, as existing in these States, is mutually beneficial to both bond and free, and is abundantly authorized and justified by the experience of mankind, and the revealed will of the Almighty Creator, as recognized by all Christian nations; while the destruction of the existing relations between the two races, as advocated by our sectional enemies, would bring inevitable calamities upon both and desolation upon the fifteen slave-holding states.

By the secession of six of the slave-holding States, and the certainty that others will speedily do likewise, Texas has no alternative but to remain in an isolated connection with the North, or unite her destinies with the South.

For these and other reasons, solemnly asserting that the federal constitution has been violated and virtually abrogated by the several States named, seeing that the federal government is now passing under the control of our enemies to be diverted from the exalted objects of its creation to those of oppression and wrong, and realizing that our own State can no longer look for protection, but to God and her own sons — We the delegates of the

people of Texas, in Convention assembled, have passed an ordinance dissolving all political connection with the government of the United States of America and the people thereof and confidently appeal to the intelligence and patriotism of the freemen of Texas to ratify the same at the ballot box, on the 23rd day of the present month.

3-7. SOUTH CAROLINA'S ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE SLAVEHOLDING STATES

It is seventy-three years since the Union between the United States was made by the Constitution of the United States. During this time, their advance in wealth, prosperity and power has been with scarcely a parallel in the history of the world. The great object of their Union was defence against external aggression; which object is now attained, from their mere progress in power. Thirty-one millions of people, with a commerce and navigation which explore every sea, and with agricultural productions which are necessary to every civilized people, command the friendship of the world. But unfortunately, our internal peace has not grown with our external prosperity. Discontent and contention have moved in the bosom of the Confederacy for the last thirty-five years. During this time, South Carolina has twice called her people together in solemn Convention, to take into consideration the aggressions and unconstitutional wrongs perpetrated by the people of the North on the people of the South. These wrongs were submitted to by the people of the South, under the hope and expectation that they would be final. But such hope and expectation have proved to be vain. Instead of producing forbearance, our acquiescence has only instigated to new forms of aggression and outrage; and South Carolina, having again assembled her people in Convention, has this day dissolved her connection with the States constituting the United States.

The one great evil, from which all other evils have flowed, is the overthrow of the Constitution of the United States. The Government of the United States is no longer the Government of Confederated Republics, but of a consolidated Democracy. It is no longer a free government, but a despotism. It is, in fact, such a Government as Great Britain attempted to set over our fathers; and which was resisted and defeated by a seven years' struggle for independence.

The Revolution of 1776 turned upon one great principle, self-government — and self-taxation, the criterion of self-government. Where the interests of two people united together under one Government, are different, each must have the power to protect its interests by the organization of the Government, or they cannot be free. The interests of Great Britain and of the Colonies were different and antagonistic. Great Britain was desirous of carrying out the policy of all nations towards their Colonies, of making them tributary to her wealth and power. She had vast and complicated relations with the whole world. Her policy towards her North American Colonies was to identify them with her in all these complicated relations; and to make them bear, in common with the rest of the Empire, the full burden of her obligations and necessities. She had a vast public debt; she had a European policy and an Asiatic policy, which had occasioned the accumulation of her public debt; and which kept her in continual wars. The North American Colonies saw their interests, political and commercial, sacrificed by such a policy. Their interests required that they should not be identified with the burdens and wars of the mother country. They had been settled under charters, which gave them self-government; at least so far as their property was concerned. They had taxed themselves, and had never been taxed by the Government of Great Britain. To make them a part of a consolidated Empire, the Parliament of Great Britain determined to assume the power of legislating for the Colonies in all cases whatsoever. Our ancestors resisted the pretension. They refused to be a part of the consolidated Government of Great Britain.

The Southern States now stand exactly in the same position towards the Northern States that the Colonies did towards Great Britain. The Northern States, having the majority in Congress, claim the same power of omnipotence in legislation as the British Parliament.

"The General Welfare" is the only limit to the legislation of either; and the majority in Congress, as in the British Parliament, are the sole judges of the expediency of the legislation this "General Welfare" requires. Thus, the Government of the United States has become a consolidated Government; and the people of the Southern States are compelled to meet the very despotism their fathers threw off in the Revolution of 1776.

The consolidation of the Government of Great Britain over the Colonies was attempted to be carried out by the taxes. The British Parliament undertook to tax the Colonies, to promote British interests. Our fathers resisted this pretension. They claimed the right of self-taxation *through their Colonial Legislatures*. They were not represented in the British Parliament, and, therefore, could not rightly be taxed by its legislation. The British Government, however, offered them a representation in Parliament; but it was not sufficient to enable them to protect themselves from the majority, and they refused the offer. Between taxation without any representation, and taxation without a representation adequate to protection, there was no difference. In neither case would the Colonies tax themselves. Hence, they refused to pay the taxes laid by the British Parliament.

And so with the Southern States, towards the Northern States, in the vital matter of taxation. They are in a minority in Congress. Their representation in Congress is useless to protect them against unjust taxation; and they are taxed by the people of the North *for their benefit*, exactly as the people of Great Britain taxed our ancestors in the British Parliament for their benefit. For the last forty years, the taxes laid by the Congress of the United States, have been laid with a view of subserving the interests of the North. The people of the South have been taxed by duties on imports, not for revenue, but for an object inconsistent with revenue — to promote, by prohibitions, Northern interests in the productions of their mines and manufactures.

There is another evil, in the condition of the Southern towards the Northern States, which our ancestors refused to bear towards Great Britain. Our ancestors not only taxed themselves, but all the taxes collected from them, were expended amongst them. Had they submitted to the pretensions of the British Government, the taxes collected from them would have been expended in other parts of the British Empire. They were fully aware of the effect of such a policy in impoverishing the people from whom taxes are collected, and in enriching those who receive the benefit of their expenditure. To prevent the evils of such a policy was one of the motives which drove them on to revolution. Yet this British policy has been fully realized towards the Southern States by the Northern States. The people of the Southern States are not only taxed for the benefit of the Northern States, but after the taxes are collected, three-fourths of them are expended at the North. This cause, with others, connected with the operation of the General Government, has made the cities of the South provincial. Their growth is paralyzed; they are mere suburbs of Northern cities. The agricultural productions of the South are the basis of the foreign commerce of the United States; yet Southern cities do not carry it on. Our foreign trade is almost annihilated. In 1740, there were five ship-yards in South Carolina, to build ships to carry on our direct trade with Europe. Between 1740 and 1779, there were built in these yards, twenty-five square rigged vessels, besides a great number of sloops and schooners, to carry on our coast and West India trade. In the half century immediately preceding the Revolution, from 1725 to 1775, the population of South Carolina increased seven-fold.

No man can, for a moment, believe that our ancestors intended to establish over their posterity, exactly the same sort of Government they had overthrown. The great object of the Constitution of the United States, in its internal operation, was, doubtless, to secure the great end of the Revolution — a limited free Government — a Government limited to those matters only, which were general and common to all portions of the United States. All sectional or local interests were to be left to the States. By no other arrangement would they obtain free Government, by a Constitution common to so vast a Confederacy. Yet, by gradual and steady encroachments on the part of the people of the North, and acquiescence

on the part of the South, the limitations in the Constitution have been swept away; and the Government of the United States has become consolidated, with a claim of limitless powers in its operations.

It is not at all surprising, such being the character of the Government of the United States, that it should assume to possess power over all the institutions of the country. The agitations on the subject of slavery are the natural results of the consolidation of the Government. Responsibility follows power; and if the people of the North have the power by Congress "to promote the general welfare of the United States," by any means they deem expedient — why should they not assail and overthrow the institution of slavery in the South? They are responsible for its continuance or existence, in proportion to their power. A majority in Congress, according to their interested and perverted views, is omnipotent. The inducements to act upon the subject of slavery, under such circumstances, were so imperious, as to amount almost to a moral necessity. To make, however, their numerical power available to rule the Union, the North must consolidate their power. It would not be united, on any matter common to the whole Union — in other words, on any constitutional subject — for on such subjects divisions are as likely to exist in the North as in the South. Slavery was strictly a sectional interest. If this could be made the criterion of parties at the North, the North could be united in its power; and thus carry out its measures of sectional ambition, encroachment and aggrandizement. To build up their sectional predominance in the Union, the Constitution must first be abolished by constructions; but that being done, the consolidation of the North, to rule the South, by the tariff and slavery issues, was in the obvious course of things.

The Constitution of the United States was an experiment. The experiment consisted in uniting under one Government, peoples living in different climates, and having different pursuits and institutions. It matters not how carefully the limitations of such a Government be laid down in the Constitution — its success must, at least, depend upon the good faith of the parties to the constitutional compact, in enforcing them. It is not in the power of human language to exclude false inferences, constructions and perversions, in any Constitution; and when vast sectional interests are to be subserved, involving the appropriation of countless millions of money, it has not been the usual experience of mankind, that words on parchments can arrest power. The Constitution of the United States, irrespective of the interposition of the States, rested on the assumption that power would yield to faith — that integrity would be stronger than interest; and that thus, the limitations of the Constitution would be observed. The experiment has been fairly made. The Southern States, from the commencement of the Government, have striven to keep it within the orbit prescribed by the Constitution. The experiment has failed. The whole Constitution, by the constructions of the Northern people, has been absorbed by its preamble. In their reckless lust for power, they seem unable to comprehend that seeming paradox — that the more power is given to the General Government, the weaker it becomes. Its strength consists in the limitation of its agency to objects of common interests to all sections. To extend the scope of its power over sectional or local interests, is to raise up against it opposition and resistance. In all such matters, the General Government must necessarily be a despotism, because all sectional or local interests must ever be represented by a minority in the councils of the General Government — having no power to protect itself against the rule of the majority. The majority, constituted from those who do not represent these sectional or local interests, will control and govern them. A free people cannot submit to such a Government. And the more it enlarges the sphere of its power, the greater must be the dissatisfaction it must produce, and the weaker it must become. On the contrary, the more it abstains from usurped powers, and the more faithfully it adheres to the limitations of the Constitution, the stronger it is made. The Northern people have had neither the wisdom nor the faith to perceive, that to observe the limitations of the Constitution was the only way to its perpetuity.

Under such a Government, there must, of course, be many and endless "irrepressible conflicts," between the two great sections of the Union. The same faithlessness which has abolished the Constitution of the United States, will not fail to carry out the sectional purposes for which it has been abolished. There must be conflict; and the weaker section of the Union can only find peace and liberty in an independence of the North. The repeated efforts made by South Carolina, in a wise conservatism, to arrest the progress of the General Government in its fatal progress to consolidation, have been unsupported, and she has been denounced as faithless to the obligations of the Constitution, by the very men and States, who were destroying it by their usurpations. It is now too late to reform or restore the Government of the United States. All confidence in the North is lost by the South. The faithlessness of the North for half a century, has opened a gulf of separation between the North and the South which no promises nor engagements can fill.

It cannot be believed, that our ancestors would have assented to any union whatever with the people of the North, if the feelings and opinions now existing amongst them, had existed when the Constitution was framed. There was then no tariff — no fanaticism concerning negroes. It was the delegates from New England who proposed in the Convention which framed the Constitution, to the delegates from South Carolina and Georgia, that if they would agree to give Congress the power of regulating commerce by a majority that they would support the extension of the African Slave Trade for twenty years. African slavery existed in all the States but one. The idea that the Southern States would be made to pay that tribute to their northern confederates which they had refused to pay to Great Britain; or that the institution of African slavery would be made the grand basis of a sectional organization of the North to rule the South, never crossed the imaginations of our ancestors. The Union of the Constitution was a Union of slaveholding States. It rests on slavery, by prescribing a representation in Congress for three-fifths of our slaves. There is nothing in the proceedings of the Convention which framed the Constitution, to show that the Southern States would have formed any other Union; and still less, that they would have formed a Union with more powerful non-slaveholding States, having majority in both branches of the Legislature of the Government. They were guilty of no such folly. Time and the progress of things have totally altered the relations between the Northern and Southern States, since the Union was established. That identity of feelings, interests and institutions which once existed, is gone. They are now divided, between agricultural and manufacturing, and commercial States; between slaveholding and non-slaveholding States. Their institutions and industrial pursuits have made them totally different peoples. That equality in the Government between the two sections of the Union which once existed, no longer exists. We but imitate the policy of our fathers in dissolving a union with non-slaveholding confederates, and seeking a confederation with slaveholding States.

Experience has proved that slaveholding States cannot be safe in subjection to non-slaveholding States. Indeed, no people can ever expect to preserve its rights and liberties, unless these be in its own custody. To plunder and oppress, where plunder and oppression can be practiced with impunity, seems to be the natural order of things. The fairest portions of the world elsewhere have been turned into wildernesses, and the most civilized and prosperous communities have been impoverished and ruined by anti-slavery fanaticism. The people of the North have not left us in doubt as to their designs and policy. United as a section in the late Presidential election, they have elected as the exponent of their policy, one who has openly declared that all the States of the United States must be made *free States or slave States*. It is true, that amongst those who aided in his election, there are various shades of anti-slavery hostility. But if African slavery in the Southern States be the evil their political combination affirms it to be, the requisitions of an inexorable logic must lead them to emancipation. If it is right to preclude or abolish slavery in a Territory, why should it be allowed to remain in the States? The one is not at all more unconstitutional than the other, according to the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. And when it is considered that

the Northern States will soon have the power to make that Court what they please, and that the Constitution never has been any barrier whatever to their exercise of power, what check can there be, in the unrestrained counsels of the North, to emancipation?

There is sympathy in association, which carries men along without principle; but when there is principle, and that principle is fortified by long existing prejudices and feelings, association is omnipotent in party influences. In spite of all disclaimers and professions, there can be but one end by the submission of the South to the rule of a sectional anti-slavery government at Washington; and that end, directly or indirectly, must be — the emancipation of the slaves of the South. The hypocrisy of thirty years — the faithlessness of their whole course from the commencement of our union with them, show that the people of the non-slaveholding North are not and cannot be safe associates of the slaveholding South, under a common Government. Not only their fanaticism, but their erroneous views of the principles of free Governments, render it doubtful whether, if separated from the South, they can maintain a free Government amongst themselves. Numbers, with them, is the great element of free Government. A majority is infallible and omnipotent. "The right divine to rule in Kings," is only transferred to their majority. The very object of all Constitutions, in free popular Government, is to restrain the majority. Constitutions, therefore, according to their theory, must be most unrighteous inventions, restricting liberty. None ought to exist; but the body politic ought simply to have a political organization, to bring out and enforce the will of the majority. This theory may be harmless in a small community, having identity of interests and pursuits; but over a vast State — still more, over a vast Confederacy, having various and conflicting interests and pursuits, it is a remorseless despotism. In resisting it, as applicable to ourselves, we are vindicating the great cause of free Government, more important, perhaps, to the world, than the existence of all the United States. Nor in resisting it, do we intend to depart from the safe instrumentality, the system of Government we have established with them, requires. In separating from them, we invade no rights — no interest of theirs. We violate no obligation or duty to them. As separate, independent States in Convention, we made the Constitutions of the United States with them; and as separate independent States, each State acting for itself, we adopted it. South Carolina, acting in her sovereign capacity, now thinks proper to secede from the Union. She did not part with her Sovereignty in adopting the Constitution. The last thing a State can be presumed to have surrendered is her Sovereignty. Her Sovereignty is her life. Nothing but a clear express grant can alienate it. Inference is inadmissible. Yet it is not at all surprising that those who have construed away all the limitations of the Constitution, should also by construction, claim the annihilation of the Sovereignty of the States. Having abolished all barriers to their omnipotence, by their faithless constructions in the operations of the General Government, it is most natural that they should endeavor to do the same towards us in the States. The truth is, they having violated the express provisions of the Constitution, it is at an end, as a compact. It is morally obligatory only on those who choose to accept its perverted terms. South Carolina, deeming the compact not only violated in particular features, but virtually abolished by her Northern confederates, withdraws herself as a party from its obligations. The right to do so is denied by her Northern confederates. They desire to establish a sectional despotism, not only omnipotent in Congress, but omnipotent over the States; and as if to manifest the imperious necessity of our secession, they threaten us with the sword, to coerce submission to their rule.

Citizens of the slaveholding States of the United States! Circumstances beyond our control have placed us in the van of the great controversy between the Northern and Southern States. We would have preferred that other States should have assumed the position we now occupy. Independent ourselves, we disclaim any design or desire to lead the counsels of the other Southern States. Providence has cast our lot together, by extending over us an identity of pursuits, interests, and institutions. South Carolina desires no destiny separated from yours. To be one of a great Slaveholding Confederacy, stretching its arms over a territory

larger than any power in Europe possesses — with a population four times greater than that of the whole United States when they achieved their independence of the British Empire — with productions which make our existence more important to the world than that of any other people inhabiting it — with common institutions to defend, and common dangers to encounter — we ask your sympathy and confederation. Whilst constituting a portion of the United States, it has been *your* statesmanship which has guided it, in its mighty strides to power and expansion. In the field, as in the cabinet, *you* have led the way to its renown and grandeur. You have loved the Union, in whose service your great statesmen have labored, and your great soldiers have fought and conquered — not for the material benefits it conferred, but with the faith of a generous and devoted chivalry.

You have long lingered in hope over the shattered remains of a broken Constitution. Compromise after compromise, formed by your concessions, has been trampled under foot by your Northern confederates. All fraternity of feeling between the North and the South is lost, or has been converted into hate; and we, of the South, are at last driven together by the stern destiny which controls the existence of nations. Your bitter experience of the faithlessness and rapacity of your Northern confederates may have been necessary to evolve those great principles of free Government, upon which the liberties of the world depend, and to prepare you for the grand mission of vindicating and reestablishing them. We rejoice that other nations should be satisfied with their institutions. Contentment is a great element of happiness, with nations as with individuals. We are satisfied with ours. If they prefer a system of industry, in which capital and labor are in perpetual conflict — and chronic starvation keeps down the natural increase of population — and a man is worked out in eight years — and the law ordains that children shall be worked only *ten hours a day* — and the sabre and the bayonet are the instruments of order — be it so. It is their affair, not ours. We prefer, however, our system of industry, by which labor and capital are identified in interest, and capital, therefore, protects labor — by which our population doubles every twenty years — by which starvation is unknown, and abundance crowns the land — by which order is preserved by an unpaid police, and many fertile regions of the world, where the white man cannot labor, are brought into usefulness by the labor of the African, and the whole world is blessed by our productions. All we demand of other peoples is to be left alone, to work out our own high destinies. United together, and we must be the most independent, as we are among the most important, of the nations of the world. United together, and we require no other instrument to conquer peace, than our beneficent productions. United together, and we must be a great, free and prosperous people, whose renown must spread throughout the civilized world, and pass down, we trust, to the remotest ages. We ask you to join us in forming a Confederacy of Slaveholding States.

3-8. MARY BOYKIN CHESNUT, EXCERPTS FROM *A DIARY FROM DIXIE*

April 8th, 1861 — Allen Green came up to speak to me at dinner in all his soldier's toggery. It sent a shiver through me. Tried to read Margaret Fuller Ossoli, but could not. The air too full of war news, and we are all so restless.

Went to see Miss Pinckney, one of the last of the old-world Pinckneys. Governor Manning walked in, bowed gravely, and seated himself by me. Again he bowed low in mock-heroic style and with a grand wave of his hand said, "Madam, your country is invaded." When I had breath to speak I asked, "What does he mean?" He meant this: There are six men-of-war outside the bar. Talbot and Chew have come to say that hostilities are to begin. Governor Pickens and Beauregard are holding a council of war. Mr. Chesnut then came in and confirmed the story. Wigfall next entered in boisterous spirits and said, "There was a sound of revelry by night." In any stir of confusion my heart is apt to beat so painfully. Now

the agony was so stifling I could hardly see or hear. The men went off almost immediately. And I crept silently to my room, where I sat down to a good cry.

Mrs. Wigfall came in, and we had it out on the subject of civil war. We solaced ourselves with dwelling on all its known horrors, and then we added what we had a right to expect with Yankees in front and Negroes in the rear. "The slaveowners must expect a servile insurrection, of course," said Mrs. Wigfall, to make sure that we were unhappy enough. Suddenly loud shouting was heard. We ran out. Cannon after cannon roared. We met Mrs. Allen Green in the passageway, with blanched cheeks and streaming eyes. Governor Means rushed out of his room in his dressing gown and begged us to be calm. "Governor Pickens," said he, "has ordered, in the plenitude of his wisdom, seven cannon to be fired as a signal to the Seventh Regiment. Anderson will hear as well as the Seventh Regiment. Now you go back and be quiet; fighting in the streets has not begun yet."

So we retired. Doctor Gibbes calls Mrs. Allen Green, Dame Placid. There was no placidity today, with cannon bursting and Allen on the island. No sleep for anybody last night. The streets were alive with soldiers, men shouting, marching, singing. Wigfall, the stormy petrel, is in his glory, the only thoroughly happy person I see. Today things seem to have settled down a little. One can but hope still. Lincoln or Seward has made such silly advances and then far sillier drawings back. There may be a chance for peace after all. Things are happening so fast. My husband has been made an aide-de-camp to General Beauregard.

Three hours ago we were quickly packing to go home. The convention has adjourned. Now he tells me the attack on Fort Sumter may begin tonight; depends upon Anderson and the fleet outside....

Mrs. Hayne called. She had, she said, but one feeling — pity for those who are not here. Jack Preston, Willie Alston, "the take-life-easys," as they are called, with John Green, "the big brave," have gone down to the islands — volunteered as privates. Seven hundred men were sent over. Ammunition wagons were rumbling along the streets all night. Anderson is burning blue lights, signs and signals for the fleet outside, I suppose.

Today at dinner there was no allusion to things as they stand in Charleston harbor. There was an undercurrent of intense excitement. There could not have been a more brilliant circle. In addition to our usual quartet, Judge Withers, Langdon Cheves, and Trescott, our two ex-governors dined with us, Means and Manning. These men all talked so delightfully. For once in my life I listened. That over, business began in earnest. Governor Means has rummaged a sword and red sash from somewhere and brought it for Colonel Chesnut, who had gone to demand the surrender of Fort Sumter. And now, patience — we must wait.

Why did that green goose Anderson go into Fort Sumter? Then everything began to go wrong. Now they have intercepted a letter from him, urging them to let him surrender. He paints the horrors likely to ensue if they will not. He ought to have thought of all that before he put his head in the hole.

12th — Anderson will not capitulate. Yesterday's was the merriest, maddest dinner we have had yet. Men were audaciously wise and witty. We had an unspoken foreboding that it was to be our last pleasant meeting. Mr. Miles dined with us today. Mrs. Henry King rushed in saying: "The news, I come for the latest news! All the men of the King family are on the island," of which fact she seemed proud.

While she was here our peace negotiator or envoy came in — that is, Mr. Chesnut returned. His interview with Colonel Anderson had been deeply interesting, but Mr. Chesnut was not inclined to be communicative. He wanted his dinner. He felt for Anderson and had telegraphed to President Davis for instructions — what answer to give Anderson, etc. He has now gone back to Fort Sumter with additional instructions. When they were about to leave the wharf, A. H. Boykin sprang into the boat in great excitement. He thought himself ill-used, with a likelihood of fighting and he to be left behind!

I do not pretend to go to sleep. How can I? If Anderson does not accept terms at four, the orders are he shall be fired upon. I count four, St. Michael's bells chime out, and I begin

to hope. At half past four the heavy booming of a cannon. I sprang out of bed, and on my knees prostrate I prayed as I never prayed before.

There was a sound of stir all over the house, pattering of feet in the corridors. All seemed hurrying one way. I put on my double gown and a shawl and went too. It was to the housetop. The shells were bursting. In the dark I heard a man say, "Waste of ammunition." I knew my husband was rowing a boat somewhere in that dark bay. If Anderson was obstinate, Colonel Chesnut was to order the fort on one side to open fire. Certainly fire had begun. The regular roar of the cannon, there it was. And who could tell what each volley accomplished of death and destruction?

The women were wild there on the housetop. Prayers came from the women and imprecations from the men. And then a shell would light up the scene. Tonight they say the forces are to attempt to land. We watched up there, and everybody wondered that Fort Sumter did not fire a shot....

We hear nothing, can listen to nothing; boom, boom, goes the cannon all the time. The nervous strain is awful, alone in this darkened room. "Richmond and Washington ablaze," say the papers — blazing with excitement. Why not? To us these last days' events seem frightfully great. We were all women on that iron balcony. Men are only seen at a distance now. Stark Means was leaning over and looking with tearful eyes, when an unknown creature asked, "Why did he take his hat off?" Mrs. Means stood straight up and said, "He did that in honor of his mother; he saw me." She is a proud mother and at the same time most unhappy. Her lovely daughter Emma is dying in there, before her eyes, of consumption. At that moment I am sure Mrs. Means had a spasm of the heart.

13th — Nobody has been hurt after all. How gay we were last night! Reaction after the dread of all the slaughter we thought those dreadful cannon were making. Not even a battery the worse for wear. Fort Sumter has been on fire. Anderson has not yet silenced any of our guns. So the aides, still with swords and red sashes by way of uniform, tell us. But the sound of those guns makes regular meals impossible. None of us goes to table. Tea trays pervade the corridors, going everywhere. Some of the anxious hearts lie on their beds and moan in solitary misery. Mrs. Wigfall and I solace ourselves with tea in my room. These women have all a satisfying faith. "God is on our side," they say. When we are shut in Mrs. Wigfall and I ask, "Why?" "Of course, He hates the Yankees," we are told, "You'll think that well of Him."

Not by one word or look can we detect any change in the demeanor of these Negro servants. Lawrence sits at our door, sleepy and respectful, and profoundly indifferent. So are they all, but they carry it too far. You could not tell that they even heard the awful roar going on in the bay, though it has been dinning in their ears night and day. People talk before them as if they were chairs and tables. They make no sign. Are they stolidly stupid? or wiser than we are; silent and strong, biding their time? ...

15th — I did not know that one could live such days of excitement. Some one called: "Come out! There is a crowd coming." A mob it was, indeed, but it was headed by Colonels Chesnut and Manning. The crowd was shouting and showing these two as messengers of good news. They were escorted to Beauregard's headquarters. For Sumter had surrendered! Those upon the housetops shouted to us, "The fort is on fire." That had been the story once or twice before.

When we had calmed down, Colonel Chesnut, who had taken it all quietly enough, if anything more unruffled than usual in his serenity, told us how the surrender came about. Wigfall was with them on Morris Island when they saw the fire in the fort; he jumped in a little boat and, with his handkerchief as a white flag, rowed over. Wigfall went in through a porthole. When Colonel Chesnut arrived shortly after and was received at the regular entrance, Colonel Anderson told him he had need to pick his way warily, for the place was all mined. As far as I can make out the fort surrendered to Wigfall. But it is all confusion. Our flag is flying there. Fire engines have been sent for to put out the fire. Everybody tells you half of something and then rushes off to tell something else or to hear the last news.

In the afternoon Mrs. Preston, Mrs. Joe Heyward, and I drove out around the battery. We were in an open carriage. What a changed scene — the very liveliest crowd I think I ever saw, everybody talking at once. All glasses were still turned on the grim old fort.

ESSAYS

James L. Abrahamson's *The Men of Secession and Civil War* (2000) chronicles the efforts of the fire-eaters in the Deep South to overcome Unionist opposition. In chapter six, "Alexander Stephens, Deep South Secession, and the Failure of Southern Unionism," Abrahamson examines how Southern radicals used Lincoln's election to maneuver white Southerners toward secession by exploiting their fears of a hostile federal government — fears that nonslaveholding whites might ally with Northern farmers of the Republican party and work to abolish slavery and fears that emancipation would lead to economic ruin and a race war. The author explores the efforts of those rejecting secession (Unionists) and those who advocated joint action of all the slave states in their struggle against immediate secessionists (cooperationists). Ultimately, the secessionists built strong coalitions in the Deep South states and overcame the opposition of both of these groups.

In a chapter from the classic *The Secession Movement 1860–1861* (1931), author Dwight Dumond offers a detailed description of the Gulf States' move toward secession. He examines the prominent politicians, their actions, the compromise measures offered, and the various groups that attempted to slow or prevent secession. Whether Unionists, cooperationists, or those advocating state referendums on secession, all were eventually overcome by the organization of the radicals.

3-1. JAMES L. ABRAHAMSON, "ALEXANDER STEPHENS, DEEP SOUTH SECESSION, AND THE FAILURE OF UNIONISM"

I have no doubt Lincoln is just as good, safe and sound a man as Mr. Buchanan, and would administer the Government so far as he is individually concerned just as safely for the South.... I know the man well. He is not a bad man.

—Alexander Stephens

On the eve of the cotton states' secession, the Deep South enjoyed a fifteen-year economic boom that had pushed the per capita income of its free population and the average wealth of its farmers ahead of every other region in the nation. Because international demand for cotton had grown sufficiently to sustain prices even as planters boosted output by opening new lands and buying more slaves, the value of the region's principal crop doubled between 1845 and 1860. In addition to higher incomes, slaveholders growing 90 percent of the cotton also saw the value of their human assets multiply when the average price of slaves doubled in those years. Free to prosper and govern, and sustained by the proslavery argument, most planters regarded slavery as the basis of a superior civilization and themselves as its exemplars.

Though political upheaval rarely emerges from the ease and confidence born of power and growing wealth, something beneath the surface troubled residents of the Deep South. In the end, it prompted most to forsake a political system that they had long regarded as the world's best. Something also affected cooler heads, leaving them unable to defeat the rush

to secession and force a reasoned assessment of the risks of independence and the merits of the Union.

The fire-eaters' lurid descriptions of the consequences of a Lincoln presidency, and the overwhelming rush of events, help to explain why many Southerners joined the secession crusade in late 1860, eventually enough to make Deep South independence a reality. Horrified by fire-eater polemics, secession's new supporters concluded that the newly elected administration intended to destroy Southern society, degrade and imperil its white citizens, and threaten the planters' right to prosper and rule. The risks, it seemed, lay in remaining within the Union until antislavery blows had begun to fall.

In regard to the national government, secession's supporters feared that the South would soon lose its ability to shape federal policies. With the presidency slipping away, it mattered not to them that a Southern-dominated Democratic Party could still control the government's other branches or that the South — with the aid of policies acceptable to Northern Democratic allies — might again elect a president. Aiming for independence, Deep South radicals instead warned of nothing ahead but antislavery legislation and the appointment of enough justices to end the Supreme Court's proslavery bias. The time for action had come.

Nor did Republicans threaten only Southern control of the federal government. Radicals worried about the loyalty of the South's slaveless yeomanry considered their relative poverty a menace to planter domination of state and local administrations. A mere 5 percent of the region's farm population controlled nearly 40 percent of its agricultural wealth. Focusing only on the even fewer families owning fifty or more slaves, William Barney discovered that they possessed about one-quarter of the cotton South's personal property and somewhat more of its real estate. According to Roger Ransom's sampling, the \$33,906 value of the average cotton South slave farm exceeded by fifteen times the worth of its farms operated without benefit of bound labor.

Antebellum visitors to the Deep South regularly observed that the radically uneven distribution of its wealth left many slaveless farm families living in dire poverty with an average wealth barely one-half that of Northern farmers. Should the poor yeomen of the Cotton Kingdom attribute their disadvantage to slavery, might they one day end it? Reject planter rule? Would the newly empowered Republican Party become agent and outlet for their frustrations? Fearing so, Southern governments quickly banned Hinton Helper's 1857 book, *The Impending Crisis of the South*, in which the North Carolinian blamed slavery for the yeomen's distress. Doubting that men could be kept forever in ignorance, a February 1860 correspondent of William Porcher Miles's provocatively asked the young fire-eater: "Think you that 360,000 Slaveholders will dictate terms for 3,000,000 of non-slaveholders at the South — I fear not, I mistrust our own people more than I fear all of the efforts of the Abolitionists."

Reinforced by a powerful racism, planters had wooed the region's yeomen by combining the prospect of future slave ownership with the incredible notion that black inferiority made all white men equal. That had worked in the Age of Jackson, but might the slaveless soon give a receptive hearing to Republican free-labor doctrines? Would their loyalties shift when Abraham Lincoln began to build a Southern wing to his party as he appointed antislavery men to the post offices of the South and made an antiplanter appeal for the votes of yeomen and white artisans?

Maybe not. Republican opposition to slavery's expansion roused the cotton South's most primal fear, one that helped planters hold the allegiance of those owning no slaves. Filled with anxiety by the predicted doubling of the South's slave population over the next two decades, Southerners wondered what the region might do with so many slaves when soil exhaustion reduced their agricultural productivity. Might large numbers of bondmen become insurrectionary, especially if Republicans flooded the South with abolitionist speakers and antislavery literature? Realistic or not, slaveowners or not, Southern whites generally feared such violence. Anxiety made them ready to believe the worst, like the troubling news coming out of Texas in the summer of 1860. A "general revolt of the slaves, aided by

government. The first document is the Constitution of the Confederate States of America (Document 4-1), which in most respects is an exact copy of the United States Constitution. Although this fits clearly with the secessionists' notion that they were the true heirs of the Founders, subtle differences between the documents highlight the concerns of Southern political leaders.

Also included are two speeches by Jefferson Davis, his inaugural address of February 18, 1861 (Document 4-2), and his message to Congress of April 29, 1861 (Document 4-3), as war commences with the United States. Both speeches together outline Davis's contention that the North had spurred on secession and eventual war by abusing Southern constitutional rights. Carefully tracing the theory of secession, Davis presents the Confederate position on government and advocates the just nature of their cause. In sharp contrast to Davis's arguments, Alexander Stephens's "Cornerstone Speech" (Document 4-4) identifies slavery and racial superiority as the foundation on which the new republic will be established. The speeches of both men indicate the long symbiotic nature of states' rights theory and slavery.

4-1. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA

We, the people of the Confederate States, each State acting in its sovereign and independent character, in order to form a permanent federal government, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity — invoking the favor and guidance of Almighty God — do ordain and establish this Constitution for the Confederate States of America....

Article I.

Sec. 2. 3. Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States, which may be included within this Confederacy, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all slaves. The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the Confederate States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct. The number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every fifty thousand, but each State shall have at least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of South Carolina shall be entitled to choose six; the State of Georgia ten; the State of Alabama nine; the State of Florida two; the State of Mississippi seven; the State of Louisiana six; and the State of Texas six....

Sec. 7. 2. Every bill which shall have passed both Houses, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the Confederate States; if he approve, he shall sign it; but if not, he shall return it, with his objections, to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House, it shall become a law. But in all such cases, the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the journal of each House respectively. If any bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress, by their adjournment, prevent its return; in which case it shall not be a law. The President may approve any appropriation and disapprove any other appropriation in the same bill. In such case he shall, in signing the bill, designate the appropriations disapproved; and shall return a copy of such appropriations, with his objections, to the

House in which the bill shall have originated; and the same proceedings shall then be had as in case of other bills disapproved by the President....

Sec. 8. The Congress shall have power —

To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises for revenue, necessary to pay the debts, provide for the common defense, and carry on the Government of the Confederate States; but no bounties shall be granted from the Treasury; nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry; and all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the Confederate States.

To borrow money on the credit of the Confederate States.

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes; but neither this, nor any other clause contained in the Constitution, shall ever be construed to delegate the power to Congress to appropriate money for any internal improvement intended to facilitate commerce; except for the purpose of furnishing lights, beacons, and buoys, and other aids to navigation upon the coasts, and the improvement of harbors and the removing of obstructions in river navigation; in all which cases such duties shall be laid on the navigation facilitated thereby as may be necessary to pay the costs and expenses thereof.

To establish uniform laws of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies, throughout the Confederate States; but no law of Congress shall discharge any debt contracted before the passage of the same.

To coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the Confederate States.

To establish post-offices and post-routes; but the expenses of the Post-Office Department, after the 1st day of March in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred and sixty-three, shall be paid out of its own revenues.

To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.

To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations.

To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water.

To raise and support armies; but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years.

To provide and maintain a navy.

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces....

Sec. 9. 1. The importation of negroes of the African race, from any foreign country other than the slave-holding States or Territories of the United States of America, is hereby forbidden; and Congress is required to pass such laws as shall effectually prevent the same.

2. Congress shall also have power to prohibit the introduction of slaves from any State not a member of, or Territory not belonging to, this Confederacy.

3. The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it.

4. No bill of attainder, *ex post facto* law, or law denying or impairing the right of property in negro slaves shall be passed....

Article II.

Section 1.1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the Confederate States of America. He and the Vice-President shall hold their offices for the term of six years; but the President shall not be reeligible....

Article IV.

Sec. 2.1. The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States; and shall have the right of transit and sojourn in any State of this Confederacy, with their slaves and other property; and the right of property in said slaves shall not be thereby impaired.

Sec. 2.3. No slave or other person held to service or labor in any State or Territory of the Confederate States, under the laws thereof, escaping or lawfully carried into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such slave belongs, or to whom such service or labor may be due....

Sec. 3.3. The Confederate States may acquire new territory; and Congress shall have power to legislate and provide governments for the inhabitants of all territory belonging to the Confederate States, lying without the limits of the several States; and may permit them, at such times, and in such manner as it may by law provide, to form States to be admitted into the Confederacy. In all such territory the institution of negro slavery, as it now exists in the Confederate States, shall be recognized and protected by Congress and by the Territorial government; and the inhabitants of the several Confederate States and Territories shall have the right to take to such Territory any slaves lawfully held by them in any of the States or Territories of the Confederate States....

Adopted unanimously by the Congress of the Confederate States of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas, sitting in convention at the capital, in the city of Montgomery, Ala., on the eleventh day of March, in the year eighteen hundred and sixty-one.

4-2. JEFFERSON DAVIS'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Friends and Fellow-Citizens: Called to the difficult and responsible station of Chief Executive of the Provisional Government which you have instituted, I approach the discharge of the duties assigned to me with an humble distrust of my abilities, but with a sustaining confidence in the wisdom of those who are to guide and to aid me in the administration of public affairs, and an abiding faith in the virtue and patriotism of the people. Looking forward to the speedy establishment of a permanent government to take the place of this, and which, by its greater moral and physical power, will be better able to combat with the many difficulties which arise from the conflicting interests of separate nations, I enter upon the duties of the office to which I have been chosen with a hope that the beginning of our career as a confederacy may not be obstructed by hostile opposition to our enjoyment of the separate existence and independence which we have asserted, and, with the blessing of Providence, intend to maintain. Our present condition, achieved in a manner unprecedented in the history of nations, illustrates the American idea that governments rest upon the consent of the governed, and that it is the right of the people to alter or abolish governments whenever they become destructive of the ends for which they were established. The declared purpose of the compact of the Union from which we have withdrawn was "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity;" and when, in the judgment

of the sovereign States now composing this Confederacy, it had been perverted from the purposes for which it was ordained, and had ceased to answer the ends for which it was established, a peaceful appeal to the ballot box declared that, so far as they were concerned, the Government created by that compact should cease to exist. In this they merely asserted a right which the Declaration of Independence of 1776 had defined to be inalienable; of the time and occasion for its exercise they, as sovereigns, were the final judges, each for itself. The impartial and enlightened verdict of mankind will vindicate the rectitude of our conduct, and He who knows the hearts of men, will judge of the sincerity with which we labored to preserve the Government of our fathers in its spirit. The right solemnly proclaimed at the birth of the States, and which has been affirmed and reaffirmed in the bills of rights of States subsequently admitted into the Union of 1789, undeniably recognize in the people the power to resume the authority delegated for the purposes of government. Thus the sovereign States here represented proceeded to form this Confederacy, and it is by abuse of language that their act has been denominated a revolution. They formed a new alliance, but within each State its government has remained; the rights of person and property have not been disturbed. The agent through whom they communicated with foreign nations is changed, but this does not necessarily interrupt their international relations.

Sustained by the consciousness that the transition from the former Union to the present Confederacy has not proceeded from a disregard on our part of just obligations or any failure to perform every constitutional duty; moved by no interest or passion to invade the rights of others; anxious to cultivate peace and commerce with all nations, if we may not hope to avoid war, we may at least expect that posterity will acquit us of having needlessly engaged in it. Doubly justified by the absence of wrong on our part, and by wanton aggression on the part of others, there can be no cause to doubt that the courage and patriotism of the people of the Confederate States will be found equal to any measures of defense which honor and security may require.

An agricultural people, whose chief interest is the export of a commodity required in every manufacturing country, our true policy is peace, and the freest trade which our necessities will permit. It is alike our interest and that of all those to whom we would sell and from whom we would buy that there should be the fewest practicable restrictions upon the interchange of commodities. There can be but little rivalry between ours and any manufacturing or navigating community, such as the Northeastern States of the American Union. It must follow, therefore, that a mutual interest would invite good will and kind offices. If, however, passion or the lust of dominion should cloud the judgment or inflame the ambition of those States, we must prepare to meet the emergency and to maintain by the final arbitrament of the sword the position which we have assumed among the nations of the earth. We have entered upon the career of independence, and it must be inflexibly pursued. Through many years of controversy with our late associates, the Northern States, we have vainly endeavored to secure tranquillity and to obtain respect for the rights to which we were entitled. As a necessity, not a choice, we have resorted to the remedy of separation; and henceforth our energies must be directed to the conduct of our own affairs and the perpetuity of the confederacy which we have formed. If a just perception of a mutual interest shall permit us peaceably to pursue our separate political career, my most earnest desire will have been fulfilled. But, if this be denied to us, and the integrity of our territory and jurisdiction be assailed, it will but remain for us, with firm resolve, to appeal to arms and invoke the blessings of Providence on a just cause.

As a consequence of our new condition, and with a view to meet anticipated wants, it will be necessary to provide for the speedy and efficient organization of branches of the Executive Department, having special charge of foreign intercourse, finance, military affairs, and the postal service.

For purposes of defense the Confederate States may, under ordinary circumstances, rely mainly upon their militia, but it is deemed advisable in the present condition of affairs that

there should be a well-instructed and disciplined army, more numerous than would usually be required on a peace establishment. I also suggest that, for the protection of our harbors and commerce on the high seas, a navy adapted to those objects will be required. These necessities have doubtless engaged the attention of Congress.

With a Constitution differing only from that of our fathers in so far as it is explanatory of their well-known intent, freed from the sectional conflicts which have interfered with the pursuit of the general welfare, it is not unreasonable to expect that States from which we have recently parted may seek to unite their fortunes with ours under the Government which we have instituted. For this your Constitution makes adequate provision; but beyond this, if I mistake not the judgment and will of the people, a reunion with the States from which we have separated is neither practicable nor desirable. To increase the power, develop the resources, and promote the happiness of a confederacy, it is requisite that there should be so much of homogeneity that the welfare of every portion shall be the aim of the whole. Where this does not exist antagonisms are engendered, which must and should result in separation.

Actuated solely by the desire to preserve our own rights and promote our own welfare, the separation of the Confederate States has been marked by no aggression upon others, and followed by no domestic convulsion. Our industrial pursuits have received no check, the cultivation of our fields has progressed as heretofore, and even should we be involved in war, there would be no considerable diminution in the production of the staples which have constituted our exports, and in which the commercial world has an interest scarcely less than our own. This common interest of the producer and consumer can only be interrupted by an exterior force which should obstruct its transmission to foreign markets — a course of conduct which would be as unjust toward us as it would be detrimental to manufacturing and commercial interests abroad. Should reason guide the action of the Government from which we have separated, a policy so detrimental to the civilized world, the Northern States included, could not be dictated by even the strongest desire to inflict injury upon us; but otherwise a terrible responsibility will rest upon it, and the suffering of millions will bear testimony to the folly and wickedness of our aggressors. In the meantime there will remain to us, besides the ordinary means before suggested, the well-known resources for retaliation upon the commerce of the enemy.

Experience in public stations of subordinate grade to this, which your kindness has conferred, has taught me that care, and toil, and disappointment are the price of official elevation. You will see many errors to forgive, many deficiencies to tolerate, but you shall not find in me either a want of zeal or fidelity to the cause that is to me highest in hope and of most enduring affection. Your generosity has bestowed upon me an undeserved distinction; one which I neither sought nor desired. Upon the continuance of that sentiment, and upon your wisdom and patriotism, I rely to direct and support me in the performance of the duty required at my hands.

We have changed the constituent parts but not the system of our Government. The Constitution formed by our fathers is that of these Confederate States, in their exposition of it; and in the judicial construction it has received we have a light which reveals its true meaning.

Thus instructed as to the just interpretation of the instrument, and ever remembering that all offices are but trusts held for the people, and that delegated powers are to be strictly construed, I will hope, by due diligence in the performance of my duties, though I may disappoint your expectations, yet to retain, when retiring, something of the good will and confidence which welcome my entrance into office.

It is joyous, in the midst of perilous times, to look around upon a people united in heart, where one purpose of high resolve animates and actuates the whole; where the sacrifices to be made are not weighed in the balance against honor, and right, and liberty, and equality. Obstacles may retard, they cannot long prevent, the progress of a movement sanctified by its justice and sustained by a virtuous people. Reverently let us invoke the God of our fathers to guide and protect us in our efforts to perpetuate the principles which, by His blessing, they

were able to vindicate, establish, and transmit to their posterity, and with a continuance of His favor ever gratefully acknowledged, we may hopefully look forward to success, to peace, and to prosperity.

4-3. JEFFERSON DAVIS'S MESSAGE TO THE CONFEDERATE CONGRESS

The declaration of war made against this Confederacy by Abraham Lincoln, the President of the United States, in his proclamation issued on the 15th day of the present month, rendered it necessary, in my judgment, that you should convene at the earliest practicable moment to devise the measures necessary for the defense of the country. The occasion is indeed an extraordinary one. It justifies me in a brief review of the relations heretofore existing between us and the States which now unite in warfare against us and in a succinct statement of the events which have resulted in this warfare, to the end that mankind may pass intelligent and impartial judgment on its motives and objects....

The people of the Southern States, whose almost exclusive occupation was agriculture, early perceived a tendency in the Northern States to render the common government subservient to their own purposes by imposing burdens on commerce as a protection to their manufacturing and shipping interests. Long and angry controversies grew out of these attempts, often successful, to benefit one section of the country at the expense of the other. And the danger of disruption arising from this cause was enhanced by the fact that the Northern population was increasing, by immigration and other causes, in a greater ratio than the population of the South. By degrees, as the Northern States gained preponderance in the National Congress, self-interest taught their people to yield ready assent to any plausible advocacy of their right as a majority to govern the minority without control. They learned to listen with impatience to the suggestion of any constitutional impediment to the exercise of their will, and so utterly have the principles of the Constitution been corrupted in the Northern mind that, in the inaugural address delivered by President Lincoln in March last, he asserts as an axiom, which he plainly deems to be undeniable, that the theory of the Constitution requires that in all cases the majority shall govern.... This is the lamentable and fundamental error on which rests the policy that has culminated in his declaration of war against these Confederate States.

In addition to the long-continued and deep-seated resentment felt by the Southern States at the persistent abuse of the powers they had delegated to the Congress, for the purpose of enriching the manufacturing and shipping classes of the North at the expense of the South, there has existed for nearly half a century another subject of discord, involving interests of such transcendent magnitude as at all times to create the apprehension in the minds of many devoted lovers of the Union that its permanence was impossible. When the several States delegated certain powers to the United States Congress, a large portion of the laboring population consisted of African slaves imported into the colonies by the mother country.... This property was recognized in the Constitution, and provision was made against its loss by the escape of the slave. The increase in the number of slaves by further importation from Africa was also secured by a clause forbidding Congress to prohibit the slave trade anterior to a certain date, and in no clause can there be found any delegation of power to the Congress authorizing it in any manner to legislate to the prejudice, detriment, or discouragement of the owners of that species of property, or excluding it from the protection of the Government.

The climate and soil of the Northern States soon proved unpropitious to the continuance of slave labor, whilst the converse was the case at the South.... As soon, however, as the Northern States that prohibited African slavery within their limits had reached a number sufficient to give their representation a controlling voice in the Congress, a persistent and organized system of hostile measures against the rights of the owners of slaves in the Southern States was inaugurated and gradually extended. A continuous series of measures was devised and

prosecuted for the purpose of rendering insecure the tenure of property in slaves. Fanatical organizations, supplied with money by voluntary subscriptions, were assiduously engaged in exciting amongst the slaves a spirit of discontent and revolt; means were furnished for their escape from their owners, and agents secretly employed to entice them to abscond; the constitutional provision for their rendition to their owners was first evaded, then openly denounced as a violation of conscientious obligation and religious duty; men were taught that it was a merit to elude, disobey, and violently oppose the execution of the laws enacted to secure the performance of the promise contained in the constitutional compact; owners of slaves were mobbed and even murdered in open day solely for applying to a magistrate for the arrest of a fugitive slave; the dogmas of these voluntary organizations soon obtained control of the Legislatures of many of the Northern States, and laws were passed providing for the punishment, by ruinous fines and long-continued imprisonment in jails and penitentiaries, of citizens of the Southern States who should dare to ask aid of the officers of the law for the recovery of their property. Emboldened by success, the theater of agitation and aggression against the clearly expressed constitutional rights of the Southern States was transferred to the Congress; ... the transaction of public affairs was impeded by repeated efforts to usurp powers not delegated by the Constitution, for the purpose of impairing the security of property in slaves, and reducing those States which held slaves to a condition of inferiority. Finally a great party was organized for the purpose of obtaining the administration of the Government, with the avowed object of using its power for the total exclusion of the slave States from all participation in the benefits of the public domain acquired by all the States in common, whether by conquest or purchase; of surrounding them entirely by States in which slavery should be prohibited; of thus rendering the property in slaves so insecure as to be comparatively worthless, and thereby annihilating in effect property worth thousands of millions of dollars. This party, thus organized, succeeded in the month of November last in the election of its candidate for the Presidency of the United States....

With interests of such overwhelming magnitude imperiled, the people of the Southern States were driven by the conduct of the North to the adoption of some course of action to avert the danger with which they were openly menaced. With this view the Legislatures of the several States invited the people to select delegates to conventions to be held for the purpose of determining for themselves what measures were best adapted to meet so alarming a crisis in their history.... In the exercise of a right so ancient, so well-established, and so necessary for self-preservation, the people of the Confederate States, in their conventions,... passed ordinances resuming all their rights as sovereign and independent States and dissolved their connection with the other States of the Union.

Having done this, they proceeded to form a new compact amongst themselves by new articles of confederation.... They have organized their new Government in all its departments; the functions of the executive, legislative, and judicial magistrates are performed in accordance with the will of the people, as displayed not merely in a cheerful acquiescence, but in the enthusiastic support of the Government thus established by themselves; and but for the interference of the Government of the United States in this legitimate exercise of the right of a people to self-government, peace, happiness, and prosperity would now smile on our land. That peace is ardently desired by this Government and people has been manifested in every possible form....

We feel that our cause is just and holy; we protest solemnly in the face of mankind that we desire peace at any sacrifice save that of honor and independence; we seek no conquest, no aggrandizement, no concession of any kind from the States with which we were lately confederated; all we ask is to be let alone; that those who never held power over us shall not now attempt our subjugation by arms. This we will, this we must, resist to the direst extremity. The moment that this pretension is abandoned the sword will drop from our grasp, and we shall be ready to enter into treaties of amity and commerce that cannot but be mutually beneficial. So long as this pretension is maintained, with a firm reliance on that

Divine Power which covers with its protection the just cause, we will continue to struggle for our inherent right to freedom, independence, and self-government.

4-4. ALEXANDER STEPHENS'S CORNERSTONE SPEECH

We are passing through one of the greatest revolutions in the annals of the world. Seven States have within the last three months thrown off an old government and formed a new. This revolution has been signally marked, up to this time, by the fact of its having been accomplished without the loss of a single drop of blood.

This new constitution, or form of government, constitutes the subject to which your attention will be partly invited. In reference to it, I make this first general remark. It amply secures all our ancient rights, franchises, and liberties. All the great principles of Magna Charta are retained in it. No citizen is deprived of life, liberty, or property, but by the judgment of his peers under the laws of the land. The great principle of religious liberty, which was the honor and pride of the old constitution, is still maintained and secured. All the essentials of the old constitution, which have endeared it to the hearts of the American people, have been preserved and perpetuated. Some changes have been made. Of these I shall speak presently. Some of these I should have preferred not to have seen made; but these, perhaps, meet the cordial approbation of a majority of this audience, if not an overwhelming majority of the people of the Confederacy. Of them, therefore, I will not speak. But other important changes do meet my cordial approbation. They form great improvements upon the old constitution. So, taking the whole new constitution, I have no hesitancy in giving it as my judgment that it is decidedly better than the old....

The new constitution has put at rest, *forever*, all the agitating questions relating to our peculiar institution — African slavery as it exists amongst us — the proper *status* of the negro in our form of civilization. This was the immediate cause of the late rupture and present revolution. Jefferson in his forecast, had anticipated this, as the “rock upon which the old Union would split.” He was right. What was conjecture with him, is now a realized fact. But whether he fully comprehended the great truth upon which that rock *stood* and *stands*, may be doubted. The prevailing ideas entertained by him and most of the leading statesmen at the time of the formation of the old constitution, were that the enslavement of the African was in violation of the laws of nature; that it was wrong in *principle*, socially, morally, and politically. It was an evil they knew not well how to deal with, but the general opinion of the men of that day was that, somehow or other in the order of Providence, the institution would be evanescent and pass away. This idea, though not incorporated in the constitution, was the prevailing idea at that time. The constitution, it is true, secured every essential guarantee to the institution while it should last, and hence no argument can be justly urged against the constitutional guarantees thus secured, because of the common sentiment of the day. Those ideas, however, were fundamentally wrong. They rested upon the assumption of the equality of races. This was an error. It was a sandy foundation, and the government built upon it fell when the “storm came and the wind blew.”

Our new government is founded upon exactly the opposite idea; its foundations are laid, its corner-stone rests upon the great truth, that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery — subordination to the superior race — is his natural and normal condition. This, our new government, is the first, in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth. This truth has been slow in the process of its development, like all other truths in the various departments of science. It has been so even amongst us. Many who hear me, perhaps, can recollect well, that this truth was not generally admitted, even within their day. The errors of the past generation still clung to many as late as twenty years ago. Those at the North, who still cling to these errors, with a zeal above knowledge, we justly denominate fanatics. All fanaticism springs from an aberration of

the mind — from a defect in reasoning. It is a species of insanity. One of the most striking characteristics of insanity, in many instances, is forming correct conclusions from fancied or erroneous premises; so with the anti-slavery fanatics; their conclusions are right if their premises were. They assume that the negro is equal, and hence conclude that he is entitled to equal privileges and rights with the white man. If their premises were correct, their conclusions would be logical and just — but their premise being wrong, their whole argument fails. I recollect once of having heard a gentleman from one of the northern States, of great power and ability, announce in the House of Representatives, with imposing effect, that we of the South would be compelled, ultimately, to yield upon this subject of slavery, that it was as impossible to war successfully against a principle in politics, as it was in physics or mechanics. That the principle would ultimately prevail. That we, in maintaining slavery as it exists with us, were warring against a principle, a principle founded in nature, the principle of the equality of men. The reply I made to him was, that upon his own grounds, we should, ultimately, succeed, and that he and his associates, in this crusade against our institutions, would ultimately fail. The truth announced, that it was as impossible to war successfully against a principle in politics as it was in physics and mechanics, I admitted; but told him that it was he, and those acting with him, who were warring against a principle. They were attempting to make things equal which the Creator had made unequal.

In the conflict thus far, success has been on our side, complete throughout the length and breadth of the Confederate States. It is upon this, as I have stated, our social fabric is firmly planted; and I cannot permit myself to doubt the ultimate success of a full recognition of this principle throughout the civilized and enlightened world.

As I have stated, the truth of this principle may be slow in development, as all truths are and ever have been, in the various branches of science. It was so with the principles announced by Galileo — it was so with Adam Smith and his principles of political economy. It was so with Harvey, and his theory of the circulation of the blood. It is stated that not a single one of the medical profession, living at the time of the announcement of the truths made by him, admitted them. Now, they are universally acknowledged. May we not, therefore, look with confidence to the ultimate universal acknowledgment of the truths upon which our system rests? It is the first government ever instituted upon the principles in strict conformity to nature, and the ordination of Providence, in furnishing the materials of human society. Many governments have been founded upon the principle of the subordination and serfdom of certain classes of the same race; such were and are in violation of the laws of nature. Our system commits no such violation of nature's laws. With us, all of the white race, however high or low, rich or poor, are equal in the eye of the law. Not so with the negro. Subordination is his place. He, by nature, or by the curse against Canaan, is fitted for that condition which he occupies in our system. The architect, in the construction of buildings, lays the foundation with the proper material — the granite; then comes the brick or the marble. The substratum of our society is made of the material fitted by nature for it, and by experience we know that it is best, not only for the superior, but for the inferior race, that it should be so. It is, indeed, in conformity with the ordinance of the Creator. It is not for us to inquire into the wisdom of his ordinances, or to question them. For his own purposes, he has made one race to differ from another, as he has made "one star to differ from another star in glory."

The great objects of humanity are best attained when there is conformity to his laws and decrees, in the formation of governments as well as in all things else. Our confederacy is founded upon principles in strict conformity with these laws. This stone which was rejected by the first builders "is become the chief of the corner" — the real "corner-stone" — in our new edifice.

I have been asked, what of the future? It has been apprehended by some that we would have arrayed against us the civilized world. I care not who or how many they may be against

us, when we stand upon the eternal principles of truth, *if we are true to ourselves and the principles for which we contend*, we are obliged to, and must triumph.

Thousands of people who begin to understand these truths are not yet completely out of the shell; they do not see them in their length and breadth. We hear much of the civilization and christianization of the barbarous tribes of Africa. In my judgment, those ends will never be attained, but by first teaching them the lesson taught to Adam, that "in the sweat of his brow he should eat his bread," and teaching them to work, and feed, and clothe themselves.

But to pass on: Some have propounded the inquiry whether it is practicable for us to go on with the confederacy without further accessions? Have we the means and ability to maintain nationality among the powers of the earth? On this point I would barely say, that as anxiously as we all have been, and are, for the border States, with institutions similar to ours, to join us, still we are abundantly able to maintain our position, even if they should ultimately make up their minds not to cast their destiny with us. That they ultimately will join us — be compelled to do it — is my confident belief; but we can get on very well without them, even if they should not....

It is true, I believe I state but the common sentiment, when I declare my earnest desire that the border States should join us. The differences of opinion that existed among us anterior to secession, related more to the policy in securing that result by co-operation than from any difference upon the ultimate security we all looked to in common.

These differences of opinion were more in reference to policy than principle, and as Mr. Jefferson said in his inaugural, in 1801, after the heated contest preceding his election, there might be differences of opinion without differences on principle, and that all, to some extent, had been federalists and all republicans; so it may now be said of us, that whatever differences of opinion as to the best policy in having a co-operation with our border sister slave States, if the worst came to the worst, that as we were all co-co-operationists, we are now all for independence, whether they come or not.

But to return to the question of the future. What is to be the result of this revolution?

Will every thing, commenced so well, continue as it has begun? In reply to this anxious inquiry, I can only say it all depends upon ourselves. A young man starting out in life on his majority, with health, talent, and ability, under a favoring Providence, may be said to be the architect of his own fortunes. His destinies are in his own hands. He may make for himself a name, of honor or dishonor, according to his own acts. If he plants himself upon truth, integrity, honor and uprightness, with industry, patience and energy, he cannot fail of success. So it is with us. We are a young republic, just entering upon the arena of nations; we will be the architects of our own fortunes. Our destiny, under Providence, is in our own hands. With wisdom, prudence, and statesmanship on the part of our public men, and intelligence, virtue and patriotism on the part of the people, success, to the full measures of our most sanguine hopes, may be looked for....

We have intelligence, and virtue, and patriotism. All that is required is to cultivate and perpetuate these. Intelligence will not do without virtue. France was a nation of philosophers. These philosophers become Jacobins. They lacked that virtue, that devotion to moral principle, and that patriotism which is essential to good government. Organized upon principles of perfect justice and right-seeking amity and friendship with all other powers — I see no obstacle in the way of our upward and onward progress. Our growth, by accessions from other States, will depend greatly upon whether we present to the world, as I trust we shall, a better government than that to which neighboring States belong. If we do this, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Arkansas cannot hesitate long; neither can Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri. They will necessarily gravitate to us by an imperious law. We made ample provision in our constitution for the admission of other States; it is more guarded, and wisely so, I think, than the old constitution on the same subject, but not too guarded to receive them as fast as it may be proper. Looking to the distant future, and, perhaps, not very far distant either, it is not beyond the range of possibility, and even probability, that all

the great States of the north-west will gravitate this way, as well as Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, Arkansas, etc. Should they do so, our doors are wide enough to receive them, but not until they are ready to assimilate with us in principle.

The process of disintegration in the old Union may be expected to go on with almost absolute certainty if we pursue the right course. We are now the nucleus of a growing power which, if we are true to ourselves, our destiny, and high mission, will become the controlling power on this continent. To what extent accessions will go on in the process of time, or where it will end, the future will determine. So far as it concerns States of the old Union, this process will be upon no such principles of *reconstruction* as now spoken of, but upon *reorganization* and new assimilation. Such are some of the glimpses of the future as I catch them....

The prospect of war is, at least, not so threatening as it has been. The idea of coercion, shadowed forth in President Lincoln's inaugural, seems not to be followed up thus far so vigorously as was expected.... Our object is *peace*, not only with the North, but with the world. All matters relating to the public property, public liabilities of the Union when we were members of it, we are ready and willing to adjust and settle upon the principles of right, equity, and good faith. War can be of no more benefit to the North than to us. Whether the intention of evacuating Fort Sumter is to be received as an evidence of a desire for a peaceful solution of our difficulties with the United States, or the result of necessity, I will not undertake to say. I would fain hope the former. Rumors are afloat, however, that it is the result of necessity. All I can say to you, therefore, on that point is, keep your armor bright and your powder dry.

The surest way to secure peace is to show your ability to maintain your rights. The principles and position of the present administration of the United States — the republican party — present some puzzling questions. While it is a fixed principle with them never to allow the increase of a foot of slave territory, they seem to be equally determined not to part with an inch "of the accursed soil." Notwithstanding their clamor against the institution, they seemed to be equally opposed to getting more, or letting go what they have got. They were ready to fight on the accession of Texas, and are equally ready to fight now on her secession. Why is this? How can this strange paradox be accounted for? There seems to be but one rational solution — and that is, notwithstanding their professions of humanity, they are disinclined to give up the benefits they derive from slave labor. Their philanthropy yields to their interest. The idea of enforcing the laws has but one object, and that is a collection of the taxes, raised by slave labor to swell the fund, necessary to meet their heavy appropriations. The spoils is what they are after — though they come from the labor of the slave....

In olden times the olive branch was considered the emblem of peace; we will send to the nations of the earth another and far more potential emblem of the same, the cotton plant....

If, we are true to ourselves, true to our cause, true to our destiny, true to our high mission, in presenting to the world the highest type of civilization ever exhibited by man — there will be found in our lexicon no such word as fail.

ESSAYS

This chapter's essays explore the serious issues faced by the Davis administration both at home and abroad. In the first essay, taken from noted Civil War historian George Rable's book *The Confederate Republic: A Revolution against Politics* (1994), the author recounts the establishment of the Davis administration and the early problems faced in launching the republic. Rable discusses

the expectations that Southerners had for Jefferson Davis as a revolutionary political leader. Davis was not a radical, yet he wholeheartedly supported secession once the issue had been decided. However, Davis faced a formidable task of building a sense of unity and national identity among a group whose identity had historically been tied to local communities and states. In an effort to create an immediate spirit of nationalism, Confederates appropriated the ideology and symbolism of the American Revolution. Interestingly, like the old Union, people initially distrusted political parties. Most Southern politicians naively hoped that the struggle for independence and the defense of Southern rights would be enough to bind the country together without the need for factional politics.

Even as the Confederate government sought to establish its legitimacy at home, it also had to do so abroad. A chapter from Charles M. Hubbard's *The Burden of Confederate Diplomacy* (1998) covers the initial Confederate efforts to obtain aid and recognition from Britain and France, and addresses both nations' demand for Southern cotton as a bargaining chip. Hubbard discusses the inherent flaws in Confederate diplomacy toward Britain and France. From the very beginning, the Davis administration looked to Europe for diplomatic recognition and military and economic aid in its struggle against the Union. As in the formation of the Confederate government, Southerners again relied on their Revolutionary experience, in this case, foreign aid against a common enemy. Unfortunately for the Rebel cause, while France favored direct aid to the Confederacy, Britain did not. The British did not behave as the Davis administration hoped for a variety of reasons. Anglo-American diplomacy had improved during the 1850s with peaceful compromises on Oregon and Texas, and a strong commercial relationship had developed between the North and Britain. Additionally, the Confederacy's attempts to use cotton as a coercive tool failed, and finally, and perhaps most importantly, the Confederacy misunderstood the balance of power in Europe.

4-1. GEORGE C. RABLE, "ESTABLISHING POLITICAL LEGITIMACY"

Shortly after the election of Jefferson Davis and Alexander H. Stephens as provisional president and vice-president of the Confederate States of America, the Florida General Assembly rejoiced over the "burial of former political differences which is so much to be desired by all true lovers of their country." These words reaffirmed the antiparty character of the secession movement, and for once even fire-eaters were pleased. Edmund Ruffin applauded selections made "without any previous electioneering ... difficulty or opposition." The Montgomery delegates had avoided even the appearance of political jobbery. Stephens and Davis, Ruffin claimed, were men "who for intellectual ability and moral worth are superior to any President and Vice President elected together ... since Madison's administration." Ruffin hoped that the Confederacy could eventually "get rid of the baleful influence of universal suffrage and popular election." Although this reactionary gloss was not widespread, Southerners clearly expected Davis to become both a national statesman and a revolutionary hero.

Perhaps Jefferson Davis could be the Confederate George Washington, a man of unbending integrity and unquestionable rectitude who could rise above the partisan squabbling that had weakened the old Union. Revolutions require charismatic leadership, and although Davis by instinct and personality could hardly be a Lenin, or a Ho Chi Minh, he possessed the quiet dignity if not quite the commanding presence that had made Washington a natural leader. But even though the secession conventions had wrestled with the question of political legitimacy, Davis's task remained formidable: building a new sense of national identity among people used to thinking of themselves as citizens of small communities, of states, and of the old Union. As Lynn Hunt has cogently observed, every political culture has a "sacred center," but revolutions by their very nature attack and attempt to destroy the sacred center of the old regime. Long-standing reverence for the American Union had delayed secession and still threatened to abort the experiment in Southern separatism. It therefore became critical for the Confederates to define their own sacred center in order to

the Army there famelys will sufer thire is a Nother question to rise with us the Negroes is very Hiley Hope up that they will soon Be free so i think that you Had Better order out All the Negroe felers from 17 years oald up Ether fort them up or put them in the army and Make them fite like good fells for wee ar in danger of our lives hear among them So i Will close with my Best love to you.

10-7. LETTER FROM JOHN J. CHEATHAM TO HON. L. P. WALKER, MAY 4, 1861

Dear Sir

Some of our people are fearful that when a large portion of our fighting men are taken from the country, that large numbers of our negroes aided by emissaries will ransack portions of the country, kill numbers of our inhabitants, and make their way to the black republicans; There is no doubt but that numbers of them believe that Lincoln's intention is to set them all free. Then, to counteract this idea, and make them assist in whipping the black republicans, which by the by would be the best thing that could be done, could they not be incorporated into our armies, say ten or twenty placed promiscuously in each company? In this way there number would be too small to do our army any injury, whilst they might be made quite efficient in battle, as there are a great many I have no doubt that would make good soldiers and would willingly go if they had a chance. They might be valued as you would a horse or other property, and let the government pay for them provided they was killed in battle, and it should be made known to them that if they distinguish^d themselves by good conduct in battle, they should be rewarded. Could some plan of this sort be thought expedient and be carried out with propriety, it would certainly lessen the dangers at home, and increase our strength in the field, and would I have but little doubt, be responded to by large numbers of our people in all the States. It is however only a suggestion, but one that I have thought might merit your consideration. Very Respectfully your humble Servant

10-8. ENROLLMENT OF SLAVES IN THE ARMY

The Congress of the Confederate States of America do enact, That in order to provide additional forces to repel invasion, maintain the rightful possession of the Confederate States, secure their independence, and preserve their institutions, the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to ask for and accept from the owners of slaves, the services of such number of able-bodied negro men as he may deem expedient, for and during the war, to perform military service in whatever capacity he may direct.

SEC. 2. That the General-in-Chief be authorized to organize the said slaves into companies, battalions, regiments and brigades, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, and to be commanded by such officers as the President may appoint.

SEC. 3. That while employed in the service the said troops shall receive the same rations, clothing and compensation as are allowed to other troops in the same branch of the service.

SEC. 4. That if, under the previous sections of this act, the President shall not be able to raise a sufficient number of troops to prosecute the war successfully and maintain the sovereignty of the States and the independence of the Confederate States, then he is hereby authorized to call on each State, whenever he thinks it expedient, for her quota of 300,000 troops, in addition to those subject to military service under existing laws, or so many thereof as the President may deem necessary for the purposes herein mentioned, to be raised from such classes of the population, irrespective of color, in each State, as the proper authorities thereof may determine: *Provided*, that not more than twenty-five per cent of the male slaves between the ages of eighteen and forty-five, in any State, shall be called for under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize a change in the relation which the said slaves shall bear toward their owners, except by consent of the owners and of the States in which they may reside, and in pursuance of the laws thereof.

Approved, March 13, 1865.

10-9. THE FAREWELL MESSAGE OF JEFFERSON DAVIS

To the People of the Confederate States of America.

The General in Chief of our Army has found it necessary to make such movements of the troops as to uncover the capital and thus involve the withdrawal of the Government from the city of Richmond.

It would be unwise, even were it possible, to conceal the great moral as well as material injury to our cause that must result from the occupation of Richmond by the enemy. It is equally unwise and unworthy of us, as patriots engaged in a most sacred cause, to allow our energies to falter, our spirits to grow faint, or our efforts to become relaxed under reverses, however calamitous. While it has been to us a source of national pride that for four years of unequalled warfare we have been able, in close proximity to the center of the enemy's power, to maintain the seat of our chosen Government free from the pollution of his presence; while the memories of the heroic dead who have freely given their lives to its defense must ever remain enshrined in our hearts; while the preservation of the capital, which is usually regarded as the evidence to mankind of separate national existence, was an object very dear to us, it is also true, and should not be forgotten, that the loss which we have suffered is not without compensation. For many months the largest and finest army of the Confederacy, under the command of a leader whose presence inspires equal confidence in the troops and the people, has been greatly trammelled by the necessity of keeping constant watch over the approaches to the capital, and has thus been forced to forego more than one opportunity for promising enterprise. The hopes and confidence of the enemy have been constantly excited by the belief that their possession of Richmond would be the signal for our submission to their rule, and relieve them from the burden of war, as their failing resources admonish them it must be abandoned if not speedily brought to a successful close. It is for us, my countrymen, to show by our bearing under reverses how wretched has been the self-deception of those who have believed us less able to endure misfortune with fortitude than to encounter danger with courage. We have now entered upon a new phase of a struggle the memory of which is to endure for all ages and to shed an increasing luster upon our country.

Relieved from the necessity of guarding cities and particular points, important but not vital to our defense, with an army free to move from point to point and strike in detail the detachments and garrisons of the enemy, operating on the interior of our own country, where supplies are more accessible, and where the foe will be far removed from his own base and cut off from all succor in case of reverse, nothing is now needed to render our triumph certain but the exhibition of our own unquenchable resolve. Let us but will it, and we are free; and who, in the light of the past, dare doubt your purpose in the future?

Animated by the confidence in your spirit and fortitude, which never yet has failed me, I announce to you, fellow-countrymen, that it is my purpose to maintain your cause with my whole heart and soul; that I will never consent to abandon to the enemy one foot of the soil of any one of the States of the Confederacy.... If by stress of numbers we should ever be compelled to a temporary withdrawal from her limits, or those of any other border State, again and again will we return, until the baffled and exhausted enemy shall abandon in despair his endless and impossible task of making slaves of a people resolved to be free.

Let us not, then, despond, my countrymen; but, relying on the never-failing mercies and protecting care of our God, let us meet the foe with fresh defiance, with unconquered and unconquerable hearts.

ESSAYS

The two essays focus on three important issues in the Confederate military defeat: deteriorating camp conditions, loss of morale, and ultimately the Army of Northern Virginia's disintegration. It is not an overstatement to say that Lee's army represented the Confederacy's only real hope of battlefield success in the latter stages of the war. In an excerpt from his book *Civil War Soldiers: Their Expectations and Their Experiences* (1988), Reid Mitchell discusses the effect that the deteriorating conditions in the Confederacy had on the Rebel soldiers. Frustrated with and resentful of conscription, inadequate supplies in the field, impressment, inflation, and food shortages plaguing their families, the fighting men of the Confederacy faced the unenviable choice of continuing the struggle for Southern independence or deserting because of a greater loyalty to family. Mitchell points out that initially Confederates went to war to maintain the status quo, yet the new government was forced to change Southern society by encouraging the growth of industry, centralizing the government, resorting to conscription, collecting taxes, and impressing produce and livestock. These changes were exacerbated by class conflicts, corruption, speculation, and privations on the home front. All of these issues led to disaffection and desertion for some. Those who continued to fight did so for many reasons, including patriotism, religious influences, fear of emancipated blacks, Northern destruction of the Southern homeland, and harsh Union treatment of Southern civilians.

Despite the hardships placed on the Confederate soldiers mentioned by Mitchell, Robert E. Lee and the Army of Northern Virginia remained a deadly opponent. Gary W. Gallagher points out in the second essay, an excerpt from *The Spotsylvania Campaign* (1998), that by 1864 the Civil War had entered a desperate stage for the beleaguered Southern armies. Gallagher describes the disintegration of the leadership in the Confederacy's best army. The Spotsylvania campaign marked a command crisis for Lee and the Army of Northern Virginia. James Longstreet had been wounded earlier in the Wilderness, A. P. Hill collapsed, and Richard S. Ewell proved incompetent. Therefore, Lee had to take on increasing burdens himself. Gallagher uses Lee's behavior at Spotsylvania and its immediate aftermath to test the assumptions that the general was too much of a gentleman to make hard decisions concerning personnel and that he followed a dangerous hands-off style in directing corps commanders. The author concludes that Spotsylvania demonstrated that the general could be stern with his subordinates and that the Confederate commander gradually lost the ability to give his chief lieutenants a free hand in carrying out his orders. By Spotsylvania, Lee was directing the Army of Northern Virginia virtually by himself.

10-1. REID MITCHELL, "THE CONFEDERATE SOLDIER AND THE CRISIS OF THE SOUTH"

In April 1863, Lt. Leonidas Lafayette Polk of the 43rd North Carolina Regiment (C.S.A.) took part in an expedition into the eastern half of his home state, an area that had been held intermittently by Union forces. Elected to the state legislature as a Unionist, Polk had nonetheless volunteered very early in the war and regarded himself as a man of Southern sentiments; he was a slaveholder loyal to his state. By the spring of 1863, however, Lieutenant

Polk had considerable misgivings about the Confederate war effort. Speculation and corruption were creating a "rotten aristocracy" in the South; wealth kept the rich man from the army while the poor boy was forced into service. And while Polk recognized the need for military discipline, he resented the restrictions placed upon his freedom: "A man ceases to be himself when he enlists in the ranks."

The expedition of April 1863 came close to demoralizing Lieutenant Polk entirely. He wrote his wife that he could see no point in the campaign except conscripting men of eastern North Carolina. What particularly saddened him was that he himself was obliged to round up men and force them into the army.

While performing my duty as enrolling officer I witnessed scenes & compelled compliance with orders which God grant I may never do again. To ride up to a man's door, whose hospitable kindness makes you feel welcome & tell him, in the presence of his faithful & loving wife & sunny-faced children, that he must be ready in 10 minutes to go with you, and see the very looks of sadness and despair seize the wife & a cloud of apprehension cover the smiling faces of his children — their imploring looks and glances — the tears of sorrow — the Solemn silence — the affectionate clasping of hands — the fervent kisses — the sad & bitter Goodbye — the longing glance at the place most dear to him on earth, as he slowly moves out of sight — this is indeed a sad & unpleasant task. When we left doors on the road crowded with the faces of frightened & crying & helpless women with the question, "For God's sake are you going to leave us at the mercy of the Yankees" made me ask often what have we gained by this trip?

Three months later Lieutenant Polk was wounded at the battle of Gettysburg. Recuperating in a Petersburg hospital, he continued his frequent letters to his wife. He expressed his doubts about a growing peace movement in North Carolina; he feared that the North would offer no terms except a return to the Union and the abolition of slavery. Still, he admired "the good old Republican spirit evinced by the plain spoken Sons" of North Carolina, and he longed for peace. In the fall of 1864 he left the service and returned to the state legislature to which he had been elected as a soldiers' candidate. In the interval between his election to office and his resignation from the service, he was court-martialed for cowardice, an accusation he believed to be politically motivated. He was found innocent.

L. L. Polk was not the paradigmatic Confederate soldier, that statistical average and sum of impressions known as "Johnny Reb." Nonetheless, his wartime career displayed elements common to the experience of most Confederate soldiers. Thousands of Southern white men in the Confederate army shared his dislike of discipline, his love of the South, and his hatred of speculation and class favoritism — as well as the experience of soldiering and defeat. They marched away to war and left behind friends and family whose lives would be plunged into chaos. They opposed an enemy whose equal skill and bravery were combined with superior resources, whose armies invaded and conquered the South. They served a government unable to protect its people or adequately supply its soldiers. They fought a war while the South underwent the revolution of emancipation. In the end it was not just the soldiers but a whole society that was defeated. This shared experience, too complex to be expressed by the rhetoric of Lost Cause orators, the fancies of filiopietistic neo-Confederates, or the condescension of historians who write of "deference" and "planter hegemony," created loyalties to that sectional fiction — the Confederate nation — while it also revealed the class bias and racism at the heart of Southern society. To understand the Confederate soldier, one must move beyond sentimentality or simplistic class analysis to a realization of the complexities of the wartime experience.

In 1861 Southerners plunged into a war that revealed the strains and cracks within their society. The demands that the war placed upon the Southern people were not shared equally; those whom Bell Wiley called "the plain people of the Confederacy" bore a disproportionate share. The Confederacy, which was born of the crisis of the Old South, died, in part, from its own contradictions.

(Document 12-1). Nonetheless, the vast majority of Southern whites resisted ideas of black equality either through the legal process, as evidenced by the Louisiana Black Codes (Document 12-2), or by extralegal means, as evidenced by the Congressional testimony on the activities of the Ku Klux Klan given by former Confederate generals Nathan Bedford Forrest and John Brown, as well as freedman William Coleman (Document 12-3). The documents conclude with an excerpt from the 1896 Supreme Court decision written by Justice Henry Billings Brown of Michigan on the *Plessy v. Ferguson* case (Document 12-4). The decision upheld segregation as being consistent with the principles of the Constitution. Consequently, African Americans were systematically discriminated against until the Civil Rights Movements of the 1950s and 1960s, when the court finally overturned the *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision.

12-1. THIRTEENTH, FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

Amendment XIII [1865]

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment XIV [1868]

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against

the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations, and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Amendment XV [1870]

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude

Section 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

12-2. LOUISIANA BLACK CODES, 1865

Section 1. *Be it therefore ordained by the board of police of the town of Opelousas*, That no negro or freedman shall be allowed to come within the limits of the town of Opelousas without special permission from his employers, specifying the object of his visit and the time necessary for the accomplishment of the same....

Section 2. *Be it further ordained*, That every negro freedman who shall be found on the streets of Opelousas after 10 o'clock at night without a written pass or permit from his employer shall be imprisoned and compelled to work five days on the public streets, or pay a fine of five dollars.

Section 3. No negro or freedman shall be permitted to rent or keep a house within the limits of the town under any circumstances, and any one thus offending shall be ejected and compelled to find an employer or leave the town within twenty-four hours....

Section 4. No negro or freedman shall reside within the limits of the town of Opelousas who is not in the regular service of some white person or former owner, who shall be held responsible for the conduct of said freedman....

Section 5. No public meetings or congregations of negroes or freedmen shall be allowed within the limits of the town of Opelousas under any circumstances or for any purpose without the permission of the mayor or president of the board....

Section 6. No negro or freedman shall be permitted to preach, exhort, or otherwise declaim to congregations of colored people without a special permission from the mayor or president of the board of police....

Section 7. No freedman who is not in the military service shall be allowed to carry firearms, or any kind of weapons, within the limits of the town of Opelousas without the special permission of his employer, in writing, and approved by the mayor or president of the board of police....

Section 8. No freedman shall sell, barter, or exchange any articles of merchandise or traffic within the limits of Opelousas without permission in writing from his employer or the mayor or president of the board....

Section 9. Any freedman found drunk within the limits of the town shall be imprisoned and made to labor five days on the public streets, or pay five dollars in lieu of said labor.

Section 10. Any freedman not residing in Opelousas who shall be found within the corporate limits after the hour of 3 p.m. on Sunday without a special permission from his employer or the mayor shall be arrested and imprisoned and made to work....

Section 11. All the foregoing provisions apply to freedmen and freedwomen, or both sexes....

12-3. TESTIMONY BEFORE CONGRESS OF GENERAL NATHAN BEDFORD FORREST, GENERAL JOHN BROWN GORDON, AND WILLIAM COLEMAN

General Forrest, when examined, said:

I say to you, frankly, that I think the organization [the Ku Klux Klan] did exist in 1866 and 1867.

Question. In what portions of the country?

Answer. I do not think it existed anywhere except in Middle Tennessee. There may have been some in a small portion of West Tennessee; but if there was any, it was very scattering.

Question. Under what name is it your belief it existed at that time?

Answer. Some called them Pale Faces; some called them Ku-Klux. I believe they were under two names.

Question. Had they an officer known as a commander?

Answer. I presume they did.

Question. Was their organization military in its character?

Answer. No, sir; I think not.

Question. Were they subject to command and drill in any military form?

Answer. They were like the Loyal Leagues, and met occasionally and dispersed again. The Loyal Leagues existed about that time, and I think this was a sort of offset gotten up against the Loyal Leagues. It was in Tennessee at the time; I do not think it was general.

Question. Had it a political purpose then?

Answer. I think it had not then; it had no political purpose.

Question. You say it was organized like the Loyal Leagues, or in opposition to them?

Answer. I think it was in opposition.

Question. Was the purpose of the Loyal Leagues political?

Answer. I do not presume it was; I do not know what it was.

Question. What did you understand to be the purpose of the two organizations?

Answer. I can tell you what I think the purpose of the organization that you first spoke of was; I think it was for self-protection.

Question. You mean now what is called Ku-Klux?

Answer. Yes, sir; I think that organization arose about the time the militia were called out, and Governor Brownlow issued his proclamation stating that the troops would not be injured for what they should do to rebels; such a proclamation was issued. There was a great deal of insecurity felt by the southern people. There were a great many northern men coming down there, forming Leagues all over the country. The negroes were holding night meetings; were going about; were becoming very insolent; and the southern people all over the State were very much alarmed. I think many of the organizations did not have any name; parties organized themselves so as to be ready in case they were attacked. Ladies were ravished by some of these negroes, who were tried and put in the penitentiary, but were turned out in a few days afterward. There was a great deal of insecurity in the country, and I think this organization was got up to protect the weak, with no political intention at all.

Question. Do I understand you to say that the Loyal League organization in Tennessee countenanced or promoted crimes of the kind which you have mentioned?

Answer. I do not know that they promoted them; but those crimes were not punished; there was very little law then.

Question. Was this before the organization of the State government, or did it continue afterward?

Answer. Well, it continued so for a year afterward.

Question. How long, according to your information, did this Ku-Klux organization exist?

Answer. I think it was disorganized in the early part of 1868.

Question. Did it continue until after the presidential election?

Answer. No, sir; I think it was in the latter part of 1867, or the early part of 1868; I do not know the exact date.

Question. Where can we get the information as to the manner of its dissolution and the time of it?

Answer. I do not know where you can get it. I never got any positive information except that it was generally understood that the organization was broken up.

Question. Who were understood to belong to it?

Answer. Men of the Southern States, citizens.

Question. Did they speak to you without hesitation of the organization, as if it required no concealment?

Answer. No, sir; they did not.

Question. Did they deny or admit its existence?

Answer. They did not do either; they did not deny it or admit it. It was understood, though, among the southern people, that this organization had disbanded about the time of the nomination of candidates for President of the United States.

Question. When they proceeded to carry out the objects of the organization, did they do it in numbers, by riding in bands?

Answer. I do not know; I never saw the organization together in my life; never saw them out in any numbers, or anything of the kind....

Question. Were you trying to suppress the organization, or the outrages you speak of?

Answer. I was trying to suppress the outrages.

Question. Outrages committed by colored men?

Answer. By all people; my object was to keep peace.

Question. Did you want to suppress that organization?

Answer. Yes, sir; I did suppress it.

Question. How?

Answer. Had it broken up and disbanded.

Question. What influence did you exert in disbanding it?

Answer. I talked with different people that I believed were connected with it, and urged its disbandment, that it should be broken up.

Question. In the light of that statement, is it not probable that this part of the account of the interview with you is correct?

"Since its organization the Leagues have quit killing and murdering our people. There were some foolish young men who put masks on their faces, and rode over the country, frightening negroes; but orders have been issued to stop that, and it has ceased."

Answer. I never uttered such words; I did not talk to that man twenty words.

Question. You say you were trying to stop the proceedings, and that they did stop.

Answer. Yes, sir; and I think they completely stopped. I do not hear of anything of that kind now — of difficulties there — any more than I hear of them here. I think that since 1868 that organization has been disbanded. I do not think there has been any organization together; if there has been, it has been by irresponsible parties, without any organization at all.

General Gordon, when questioned on the same subject by the committee, said:

Question. What do you know of any combinations in Georgia, known as Ku-Klux, or by any other name, who have been violating the law?

Answer. I do not know anything about any Ku-Klux organization, as the papers talk about it. I have never heard of anything of that sort except in the papers and by general report; but I do know that an organization did exist in Georgia at one time. I know that in 1868 — I think that was the time — I was approached and asked to attach myself to a secret organization in Georgia. I was approached by some of the very best citizens of the State — some of the most peaceable, law-abiding men, men of large property, who had large interests in the State. The object of this organization was explained to me at the time by

these parties; and I want to say that I approved of it most heartily. I would approve again of a similar organization, under the same state of circumstances.

Question. Tell us about what that organization was.

Answer. The organization was simply this — nothing more and nothing less: it was an organization, a brotherhood of the property-holders, the peaceable, law-abiding citizens of the State, for self-protection. The instinct of self-protection prompted that organization; the sense of insecurity and danger, particularly in those neighborhoods where the negro population largely predominated. The reasons which led to this organization were three or four. The first and main reason was the organization of the Union League, as they called it, about which we knew nothing more than this: that the negroes would desert the plantations, and go off at night in large numbers; and on being asked where they had been, would reply, sometimes, "We have been to the muster;" sometimes, "We have been to the lodge;" sometimes, "We have been to the meeting." Those things were observed for a great length of time. We knew that the "carpet-baggers," as the people of Georgia called these men who came from a distance and had no interest at all with us; who were unknown to us entirely; who from all we could learn about them did not have any very exalted position at their homes — these men were organizing the colored people. We knew that beyond all question. We knew of certain instances where great crimes had been committed; where overseers had been driven from plantations, and the negroes had asserted their right to hold the property for their own benefit. Apprehension took possession of the entire public mind of the State. Men were in many instances afraid to go away from their homes and leave their wives and children, for fear of outrage. Rapes were already being committed in the country. There was this general organization of the black race on the one hand, and an entire disorganization of the white race on the other hand. We were afraid to have a public organization; because we supposed it would be construed at once, by the authorities at Washington, as an organization antagonistic to the Government of the United States. It was therefore necessary, in order to protect our families from outrage and preserve our own lives, to have something that we could regard as a brotherhood — a combination of the best men of the country, to act purely in self-defense, to repel the attack in case we should be attacked by these people. That was the whole object of this organization. I never heard of any disguises connected with it; we had none, very certainly. This organization, I think, extended nearly all over the State. It was, as I say, an organization purely for self-defense. It had no more politics in it than the organization of the Masons. I never heard the idea of politics suggested in connection with it.

Question. Did it have any antagonism toward either the State or the Federal Government?

Answer. None on earth — not a particle. On the contrary, it was purely a peace police organization, and I do know of some instances where it did prevent bloodshed on a large scale. I know of one case in Albany, Georgia, where, but for the instrumentality of this organization, there would have been, beyond all doubt, a conflict, growing out of a personal difficulty between a black man and a white man. The two races gathered on each side, but this organization quelled the trouble easily and restored peace, without any violence to anybody, and without a particle of difficulty with either the black race or the white. They stopped one just as much as they did the other. This society was purely a police organization to keep the peace, to prevent disturbances in our State. That was the motive that actuated me in going into it, and that was the whole object of the organization, as explained to me by these persons who approached me. I approved of the object.

Question. You had no riding about at nights?

Answer. None on earth. I have no doubt that such things have occurred in Georgia. It is notoriously stated — I have no personal knowledge of anything of the kind, but I have reason to believe it — that disguised parties have committed outrages in Georgia; but we have discovered in some cases that these disguised parties did not belong to any particular party. We have demonstrated that beyond all question in some cases, by bringing to trial

and conviction parties who belonged, for instance, to the radical party, who had in disguise committed outrages in the State. There is not a good man in Georgia who does not deplore that thing just as much as any radical deplores it. When I use the term "radical," I do not mean to reflect upon the republican party generally; but in our State a republican is a very different sort of a man from a republican generally in the Northern States. In our State republicanism means nothing in the world but creating disturbance, riot, and animosity, and filching and plundering. That is what it means in our State — nothing else; there is no politics in it. In the North the thing is very different. There men can differ in politics, and yet have the kindest relations; in Georgia we cannot do it unless we are willing to countenance all sorts of outrages upon our people. There are genteel republicans in Georgia, who are just as safe as any one else; who travel all over the State; who occupy high positions, and are never insulted in the street, the cars, or anywhere else. If there is any organization in Georgia for the purpose of putting down republicanism there, why does it not attack the leaders of that party? It strikes me as the very highest commentary upon the law-abiding spirit of the people of Georgia that such men as I could name — men in high position who have plundered our people by the million — still live and are countenanced on the streets, have no insults offered to them. The truth is simply this: that individuals in Georgia of all parties and all colors have, I suppose, committed outrage; but such affairs have been purely personal, just as they are when they occur anywhere else in the United States. I do not believe any more crimes have been committed in Georgia than in any other community of the same number anywhere else in the country. That is my honest conviction. I do not believe that any crime has ever been committed by this organization of which I have spoken, and of which I was a member. I believe it was purely a peace police — a law-abiding concern. That was its whole object, and it never would have existed but for the apprehension in the minds of our people of a conflict in which we would have had no sympathy and no protection. We apprehended that the sympathy of the entire Government would be against us; and nothing in the world but the instinct of self-protection prompted that organization. We felt that we must at any cost protect ourselves, our homes, our wives and children from outrage. We would have preferred death rather than to have submitted to what we supposed was coming upon us. At this time I do not believe any such organization exists, or has existed for a long time. I have not heard of it for two years, I am certain.

Question. Why did it cease to exist; why did it pass away?

Answer. Well, sir, it just dissolved because the courts became generally established; and though the courts were in the hands of the opposite party, our people believed they were trying to do justice; that a general protection was extended over us. Our people thought we could get justice at the hands of these judges; though they were of the opposite party, and though negroes were on the juries, we were satisfied that in the existing condition of things we were safe. Since Governor Bullock's election I have not heard anything of that organization. I am not sure that it did not pass away with his election. It certainly has not existed since within my knowledge; and I think I would have known it if it had. I think that my position would have brought it to my knowledge if any such organization had existed for several years past. As I have stated, the only reason it has passed away is, I think, because the people felt safe. Courts were established and police regulations were generally instituted.

You must remember that we were in a state of anarchy there for a long time. We had no law but drum-head courts-martial. Our people were entirely powerless to do anything. We always felt that if the Federal troops were kept in our midst we would be protected. I want to state that with great emphasis. Our people have always felt that if the white troops of the Federal Army could have been stationed in our midst in those negro belts we would have been safe. But the troops were perhaps two hundred miles away; and before they could have been brought to our relief the whole neighborhood might have been slaughtered. We then believed that such a thing might occur on almost any night. Such was the condition of things in Georgia at that time. I do not believe that it exists now, or has existed for two years. To

my certain knowledge this organization never did exist as a political organization. I do not know what may have been the case elsewhere; but very certainly there was no politics in this thing in Georgia, so far as I had anything to do with it; and I think that the organization was of the same character all over the State — probably over the South wherever it existed. We never called it Ku-Klux, and therefore I do not know anything about Ku-Klux.

William Coleman (colored) sworn and examined.

Question. Where do you live?

Answer. I live in Macon.

Question. How long have you lived here?

Answer. I came here about the last of April.

Question. Where did you come from?

Answer. I came from Winston County.

Question. What occasioned your coming here?

Answer. I got run by the Ku-Klux.

Question. Give the particulars to the committee.

Answer. Well, I don't know anything that I had said or done that injured any one, further than being a radical in that part of the land, and as for interrupting any one, I didn't, for I had plenty of my own of anything I wanted myself. I had done bought my land and paid for it, and I had a great deal of hogs; I had eighteen head of hogs to kill this fall. I had twelve head of sheep, and one good milk-cow, and a yearling, and the cow had a right young calf again, and I had my mule and my filly, and all of it was paid for but my mule, and I had my brother hired to pay for him. The mule cost me \$65, and I had him hired out to pay for him. It was like I was getting the mule from you, and you wanting a hand to work the value of the mule out in work.

Question. Did any of the Ku-Klux come to your house?

Answer. They did.

Question. In the night-time?

Answer. They came about a half hour or more before day, as nigh as I can recollect by my brains, being frightened at their coming up in this kind of way. They were shooting and going on at me through the house, and when they busted the door open, coming in shooting, I was frightened, and I can only tell you as nigh as my recollection will afford at this time that it was about a half hour to day.

Question. What did they do to you?

Answer. None of the shot hit me, but they aimed to hit me; but I had one door just like that at the side of the house and the other at this side, and there was the chimney, and there was my bed in that corner opposite, and they came to that door first, [illustrating,] and hollered "Hallo;" bum, bum, bum, on the lock. I jumped up and said, "Hallo." Then one at the door said, "Raise a light in there." "What for; who is you?" I said. He says, "Raise a light in there, God damn you; I'll come in there and smoke my pipe in your ear." He said that just so. I said, "Is that you, uncle Davy?" Says he, "No, God damn you, it isn't uncle Dave; open this door." Says I, "I am not going to open my door to turn nobody on me that won't tell me who they are before I do it. Who are you?" He says, "God damn you, we didn't come to tell you who we are." I was peeping through the little crack in the door. I had bored a gimlet-hole about as big as that pen to put a string through, and had a latch inside so that when I had been off at work anywhere, and happened to come home at night, I could open the door without my wife having to get up, and she would put the string through the door and I would pull, and that was the way I would get in.

Question. That was the hole you looked through?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. What did you see?

Answer. I saw men out there standing with horns and faces on all of them, and they all had great, long, white cow-tails way down the breast. I said it was a cow-tail; it was hair, and it was right white. They told me they rode from Shiloh in two hours, and came to kill me. They shot right smart in that house before they got in, but how many times I don't know, they shot so fast outside; but when they come in, they didn't have but three loads to shoot. I know by the way they tangled about in the house they would have put it in me if they had had it. They only shot three times in the house. The men behind me had busted in through the door; both doors were busted open. By the time the fellows at the back door got in the door, these fellows at the front door busted in, and they all met in the middle of the floor, and I didn't have a thing to fight with, only a little piece of ax-handle; and when I started from the first door to the second, pieces of the door flew and met me. I jumped for a piece of ax-handle and fought them squandering about, and they were knocking about me with guns, and firing balls that cut several holes in my head. The notches is in my head now. I dashed about among them, but they knocked me down several times. Every time I would get up, they would knock me down again. I saw they were going to kill me, and I turned in and laid there after they knocked me down so many times. The last time they knocked me down I laid there a good while before I moved, and when I had strength I jumped to split through a man's legs that was standing over me, and, as I jumped, they struck at me jumping between his legs, and they struck him and he hollered, "Don't hit me, God damn you," but they done knocked him down then, but they hadn't knocked him so he couldn't talk. I jumped through and got past him. They didn't hit him a fair lick, because he was going toward them, and it struck past his head on his shoulder. If it had struck his head, it would have busted it open. I didn't catch that lick. I got up then; they had shot out the loads. I grabbed my ax-handle, and commenced fighting, and then they just took and cut me with knives. They surrounded me in the floor and tore my shirt off. They got me out on the floor; some had me by the legs and some by the arms and the neck and anywhere, just like dogs string out a coon, and they took me out to the big road before my gate and whipped me until I couldn't move or holler or do nothing, but just lay there like a log, and every lick they hit me I grunted just like a mule when he is stalled fast and whipped; that was all. They left me there for dead, and what it was done for was because I was a radical, and I didn't deny my profession anywhere and I never will. I never will vote that conservative ticket if I die.

Question. Did they tell you they whipped you because you were a radical?

Answer. They told me, "God damn you, when you meet a white man in the road lift your hat; I'll learn you, God damn you, that you are a nigger, and not to be going about like you thought yourself a white man; you calls yourself like a white man, God damn you." Here is what I put it to, because I had my filly; I had bought her to ride, not to stay in the stable, but to ride when I got ready, like you would do with your property. When I bought her I bought her for \$75; she was not nigh grown; a little thing, with flaxen mane and tail, and light cream-color, and I would get on my filly on a Saturday evening. I would work until Saturday evening, but I won't work any longer for any man, for my own work or any body else, unless it is mighty urgent; then I will go on until night, but if it is nothing but work straight along, I will work until Saturday at 12 o'clock, and I will strike off there. I believe if a man does it all over the world, he can make an honest living and put his work to good use.

Question. Were you working on your own land?

Answer. Yes, sir; that I bought and paid for; \$473 for it.

Question. How many men were concerned in beating you?

Answer. Eight men.

Question. Were they all disguised?

Answer. Yes, sir; every one of them. ...

12-4. *PLESSY V. FERGUSON* (1896)

Justice Brown delivered the opinion of the Court.

This case turns upon the constitutionality of an act of the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana, passed in 1890, providing for separate railway carriages for the white and colored races....

The constitutionality of this act is attacked upon the ground that it conflicts both with the Thirteenth Amendment of the Constitution, abolishing slavery, and the Fourteenth Amendment, which prohibits certain restrictive legislation on the part of the States.

1. That it does not conflict with the Thirteenth Amendment, which abolished slavery and involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, is too clear for argument....

The proper construction of the 14th amendment was first called to the attention of this court in the Slaughter-house cases, ... which involved, however, not a question of race, but one of exclusive privileges. The case did not call for any expression of opinion as to the exact rights it was intended to secure to the colored race, but it was said generally that its main purpose was to establish the citizenship of the negro; to give definitions of citizenship of the United States and of the States, and to protect from the hostile legislation of the States the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, as distinguished from those of citizens of the States.

The object of the amendment was undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law, but in the nature of things it could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color, or to enforce social, as distinguished from political equality, or a commingling of the two races upon terms unsatisfactory to either. Laws permitting, and even requiring, their separation in places where they are liable to be brought into contact do not necessarily imply the inferiority of either race to the other, and have been generally, if not universally, recognized as within the competency of the state legislatures in the exercise of their police power. The most common instance of this is connected with the establishment of separate schools for white and colored children, which has been held to be a valid exercise of the legislative power even by courts of States where the political rights of the colored race have been longest and most earnestly enforced....

So far, then, as a conflict with the Fourteenth Amendment is concerned, the case reduces itself to the question whether the statute of Louisiana is a reasonable regulation, and with respect to this there must necessarily be a large discretion on the part of the legislature. In determining the question of reasonableness it is at liberty to act with reference to the established usages, customs and traditions of the people, and with a view to the promotion of their comfort, and the preservation of the public peace and good order. Gauged by this standard, we cannot say that a law which authorizes or even requires the separation of the two races in public conveyances is unreasonable, or more obnoxious to the Fourteenth Amendment than the acts of Congress requiring separate schools for colored children in the District of Columbia, the constitutionality of which does not seem to have been questioned, or the corresponding acts of state legislatures.

We consider the underlying fallacy of the plaintiff's argument to consist in the assumption that the enforced separation of the two races stamps the colored race with a badge of inferiority. If this be so, it is not by reason of any thing found in the act, but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction upon it. The argument necessarily assumes that if, as has been more than once the case, and is not unlikely to be so again, the colored race should become the dominant power in the state legislature, and should enact a law in precisely similar terms, it would thereby relegate the white race to an inferior position. We imagine that the white race, at least, would not acquiesce in this assumption. The argument also assumes that social prejudices may be overcome by legislation, and that equal rights cannot be secured to the negro except by an enforced commingling of the two races. We cannot accept this proposition. If the two races are to meet upon terms of social equality,

it must be the result of natural affinities, a mutual appreciation of each other's merits and a voluntary consent of individuals.... Legislation is powerless to eradicate racial instincts or to abolish distinctions based upon physical differences, and the attempt to do so can only result in accentuating the difficulties of the present situation. If the civil and political rights of both races be equal one cannot be inferior to the other civilly or politically. If one race be inferior to the other socially, the Constitution of the United States cannot put them upon the same plane....

ESSAYS

The following two essays offer a clear picture of the chaos in the former Confederacy following emancipation and the end of the war. White Southerners tried desperately to maintain the traditional racial order while adjusting to defeat and black freedom. In this chapter from his book *Masters without Slaves* (1977), James Roark examines the postwar South. He finds that while members of the planter class wanted to recreate the antebellum South, they were confronted by the realities of the new political and socioeconomic situation. The freedom of the slaves radically altered the labor arrangements of the South and threatened to undermine the cash-crop economy. Moreover, the freed people resisted the traditional gang labor arrangements of the antebellum period. Blacks also hoped to obtain land of their own. However, when no permanent land confiscations occurred, both groups eased into the compromise of sharecropping. As Roark points out, the planter class managed to retain their land and status by adapting to black freedom.

In a chapter from his book *Flawed Victory* (1975), William Barney outlines the conditions in the South following Appomattox. Amid social and economic chaos, white Southerners attempted to rebuild their lives while trying to reestablish control over the newly freed black population.

The war had destroyed much of the region's economic infrastructure and created widespread poverty among both whites and freed slaves. Property remained the basis for the Southern economy, and while the freed people sought access to land, there was little incentive on the part of whites to allow it. Therefore, while blacks were no longer slaves, they lacked the economic resources to build a new life. Moreover, neither state Republican governments in the South nor the national government intended to confiscate land from former Rebels to help blacks achieve economic independence. As Barney notes in the conclusion of the chapter, the war had established reunification, but it had not adequately provided for the freed people, nor had it altered racial ideas among whites in either the defeated South or victorious North.

12-1. JAMES L. ROARK, "THE SOUL IS FLED" (EXCERPTS)

"... from that Old World to this New one, through the war-Storm."

Sidney Lanier
May 12, 1866

Little more than a decade after Appomattox, a visitor to the rural South would have viewed a landscape reminiscent of antebellum days. Blacks were back in the cotton fields and kitchens, cotton had resumed its throne, plantations still dominated the countryside, and white Southerners again controlled the fields and the courthouses. As in the years before Fort Sumter, the lives of planters seemed hardly touched by external events, but responded to the everyday

with Yankee capitalism. But few of those who stayed on the land could swallow the entire New South program. Essentially a design for an urban, industrial society, it was a call for a changed way of life. Not only did its spokesmen attack slavery, but they also lambasted planters as soft, self-indulgent snobs who were doomed to extinction in a rawer, more competitive society. The New South advocates proposed rural democracy and yeoman agriculture and launched an assault on plantations, planter hegemony, and cotton. As Sidney Lanier summarized, "The New South means small farming." Planters sometimes wished to escape the plantations, but not by becoming yeoman farmers. Plantations did not pay well, but they still provided social status in the rural areas, and there was always the hope of recovery. Planters must have heard the New South message, but not many could have become whole-souled converts.

Plantations and planters survived the Civil War and Reconstruction. After 1865, land and landlords were quickly reunited with blacks and staples. But the attempt to restore antebellum patterns was hardly auspicious. The planter class suffered considerable attrition. Those planters who managed to retain their lands usually lived at significantly reduced levels. And their moods and temperaments mirrored their economic difficulties. Still, as the major landholders in an agricultural society, planters continued to wield power. Because the protection of the plantations remained a central premise, they continued to do battle with the enemies of plantation agriculture, both the old ones that had survived the war and the new ones that sprang up afterward.

12-2. WILLIAM L. BARNEY, "LINCOLN'S REPUBLIC" (EXCERPTS)

The Burden of Defeat

In blinding contrast to the North, the South emerged from the war defeated and impoverished. Both races were crushed by the burden of defeat. Even before the war ended, the problems of rebuilding the economy and restructuring race relations had been pressing. Yet the generation of Southerners who had fought the war, or had been freed by it, would not live to see full economic recovery or the beginnings of a racial ethos not grounded in the forced subjugation of blacks. The postwar Southern economy in the remainder of the nineteenth century was as severely crippled by the lack of productive capital as race relations were by the debilitating legacy of slavery.

The condition of the South in 1865 was a grim witness to the resolve of the Confederacy. The sheer physical damage to the economy was staggering. In the single blow of emancipation, the South had suffered the greatest act of confiscation in American history. The value of slaves at the start of the war had exceeded \$1.5 billion, easily the largest capital investment in the nation. Still, exclusive of slaves, Southern wealth had shrunk by 43 per cent as a result of the war. The hardest-hit sector was agriculture, which had been neglected by Confederate authorities, subjected to heavy direct taxes and impressment, and exposed to Union raids. The desolation in an area fought over by the armies was described by W. L. Nugent of Mississippi in early 1864, when he noted of the region north of Jackson, "The largest plantations are thinning out, grown up in weeds & pastured upon by a few scattering cattle; fences are pulled down & destroyed; houses burned; Negroes run off. A general gloom pervades everything." This was the war damage encapsulated in the statistics that show that the assessed value of Southern real estate was cut in half and the number of livestock dropped by one-third between 1860 and 1870. Comparable losses were registered in the value of agricultural implements; the Southern share of the national total fell from one-third on the eve of the war to just over 13 per cent in 1870.

The full cost of the losses to Southern agriculture can be measured by the slowness of its recovery. Although the output of cotton and corn, the South's two major crops, surpassed

its prewar level by 1880, the total values of farms, farm products, and livestock in the eight older states of the Confederacy did not recover to their 1860 levels until 1900. Only the newer states, Arkansas, Florida, and Texas, were able to increase their prewar agricultural capital and values in the generation after the war. In the meantime, the 1860 value of Northern farms had more than doubled by 1900.

Southern industry, although nearly as badly crippled as agriculture by 1865, was in a better position to recover. Industrial development had been force-fed during the war as a result of the heavy military demand for manufactured products and the blockade, which sharply restricted the importation of finished goods. Confederate businessmen were hampered by a number of problems, such as competition with government bureaus for raw materials, the unsettling effects of conscription regulations, and the rapid drop in the real value of money, but they enjoyed high profits because of the lag between the increases in wages and prices. The cost of living rose approximately thirtyfold between 1861 and 1865, whereas wages rose only tenfold. Although the Confederacy always suffered a shortage of skilled labor, especially machinists and metalworkers, an ample supply of unskilled labor was available. Attracted by cash wages that were quite high by prewar standards, and forced to add to their income in a time of inflation, many rural families entered the industrial work force for the first time. The lure of high returns, coupled with the shrinkage of the cotton export market, also induced more planters to sell or rent out slaves to mills, factories, and railroads.

Despite an absolute increase in industrial resources and output and the prosperity of businessmen as a class, Confederate industrialization could not serve as a springboard for the postwar economic development of the South. Much of the prosperity was based on inflationary paper profits and the hothouse effect of special wartime conditions. Directed and controlled by the military, the industrialization effort had demanded sacrifices bearable only in the context of the intense patriotism of most Confederates. Labor had complained that it was being driven to the point of destitution, and bread riots had broken out, but massive unrest had been avoided because the work force had been willing to accept a lower standard of living before it would destroy from within the Southern bid for independence. With the defeat of the Confederacy and the removal of wartime patriotism as a control mechanism, Southern labor would no longer be so willing to subsidize high business profits. Exploitation would continue, but not as flagrantly as during the war years.

In addition, most of the expanded industrial base of the Confederacy was gutted by the end of the war. Railroads and factories had been singled out as military targets by Union raiders. In two of the most extensive raids, the march of Sherman through Georgia and the Carolinas in the fall and winter of 1864-65 and the cavalry incursion of General James Wilson through Alabama and Georgia in the spring of 1865, the previously untouched munitions and rail complex of the interior Confederacy had been smashed. As Sherman's army had moved south from Atlanta, Oliver O. Howard, commander of the Army of the Tennessee, recalled, "wrecked engines, bent and twisted iron rails, blackened ruins and lonesome chimneys saddened the hearts of the few peaceful citizens who remained there." The destruction of rails had been refined to an art by Sherman's soldiers. Special work details had been assigned to uproot and heat the rails and then twist them into the shape of a doughnut. It was estimated that one thousand men could destroy 5 miles of track per day, and Sherman reported that about 300 miles of track had been obliterated during his campaign.

Nonetheless, the greatest success of Sherman's march lay in its devastating impact on Confederate morale. For all the notoriety of the march as an exercise in the terror tactics of psychological warfare, the heaviest blow to Confederate industry had been struck by the cavalry columns of General Wilson. Advancing down the valleys of the Black Warrior and Cahaba rivers and then swinging eastward across central Alabama into Georgia, Wilson's raiders had wrecked the last significant centers of Confederate industry and their rail network. The equipment of three railroads, the Montgomery and West Point, the Alabama and Florida, and the Mobile and Girard, had been almost totally destroyed. Selma, Alabama,

and Columbus, Georgia, had been eliminated as factors in the war-making potential of the Confederacy. The destruction in Columbus, as summarized by Wilson in his report, had consisted of "15 locomotives, 250 cars, the railroad bridge and foot bridges, 115,000 bales of cotton, four cotton factories, the navy yard, foundry, armory, sword and pistol factory, accouterment shops, three paper mills, over 100,000 rounds of artillery ammunition, besides immense stores of which no account could be taken."

The very thoroughness of the Union armies created favorable conditions for the rehabilitation of Southern industry after the war. Cities had to be rebuilt, production centers for consumer goods and agricultural implements had to be established, and a new rail network had to be laid down while what was left of the old one was refurbished. Atlanta, Charleston, and Richmond experienced building booms, and as early as the end of 1865 the track mileage of Southern railroads was but 32 miles short of the 1860 figure. In one of the few instances of federal economic assistance to the postwar South, the government returned to its previous owners the approximately 2,000 miles of track that had come under the control of the Union military during the war. Most of this mileage had already been repaired. Government-held rolling stock was also returned at less than its market value on favorable terms of short-term credit. In the 1870's federal generosity extended to writing off \$3 million in delinquent debts on this rolling stock.

By 1870 the South had nearly 80 per cent more business firms than in 1860, and 30 per cent more workers were engaged in nonagricultural pursuits. However, the extent of this recovery, though more complete and faster than that of agriculture, was still limited. The reintegration of the South into a national market after 1865 placed its economy under the same competitive disadvantages that had existed before the war. Having but limited access to capital and skilled labor, and lacking the demand of a purchasing power within the South sufficient to sustain an industrialization effort, Southern businessmen could do little more than produce for small, local markets. Manufacturing remained confined largely to the initial processing of crops and resources by cheap, unskilled labor. The Southern share of the nation's manufacturing output, which had stood at 7.2 per cent in 1860, fell to 4.7 per cent in 1870, and did not regain its prewar level until 1900.

Most important as a brake on the postwar economic development of the South was the lack of capital. In gold dollars the Confederacy had spent approximately \$570 million on the war, a debt that had to be repudiated as part of the terms for readmission to the Union. Therefore, none of this debt could serve after the war as the basis of a Hamiltonian-type funding program for capital accumulation. Indeed, the very opposite occurred. The defeated South was eventually drained of at least a billion dollars in tax revenue that was used as a war indemnity to help pay for the Northern war debt and pensions for Union soldiers. This aggravated what was already a desperate credit problem. The situation the *New York Times* described in South Carolina in the summer of 1865 was typical: "The funds of churches, colleges, charitable institutions, \$15,000,000 in bank stock, and nearly all the funds of private individuals which were available have been almost entirely sunk [into the war]." Throughout the South between 1860 and 1870 the banking capital had been reduced from \$61 million to \$17 million, and the proportionate loss in circulating currency had been as great. The gap was not filled by an influx of capital from the North, because investors there had more profitable and secure outlets than the politically and socially unstable South.

The shortage of agricultural capital was particularly critical, for over 90 per cent of the South's labor force worked on the land, and the sale of agricultural surpluses was fundamental to any economic recovery. Because the North provided no assistance, the capital necessary for commercial agriculture would have to be generated internally. Given the steady decline in cotton prices that persisted after the late 1860's and the dominance of cotton in the Southern economy, capital accumulation would be an expensive and slow process with exploitative social consequences.

In the absence of capital, plantation agriculture was reorganized through sharecropping, a labor system in which the landlord supplied the use of his land and passed along credit in return for one-half of the tenant's crop. What little credit was available commanded interest charges of from 25 to 70 per cent. Even at these prices, credit was extended only in anticipation of a quick cash return on a staple crop, usually cotton. At the very time its price was dropping because of a world-wide glut, attributable in part to the development of new sources of production by Britain during the Civil War, cotton became ever more important to the Southern economy. In turn, the low economic return of cotton per worker doomed the South to poverty. An individual working full-time could produce annually 2,000 pounds of cotton, which, at the prices prevailing in the 1870's and 1880's, would gross about \$220. After the crop had been divided with the landlord and interest charges had been deducted, the sharecropper would be left with a net monthly income of about \$10.

Although defeat for most whites and freedom for blacks resulted in the impoverishment of both races, the burden was not shared equally. For example, by 1900 white farmers were almost three times as likely to be the full owners of their farms as were blacks; 57 per cent of the former owned their own farms as compared to 21 per cent of the latter. Any chance for economic democracy for blacks had been ruled out during the Civil War or immediately thereafter. The failure of blacks to secure land ownership removed most of their bargaining power relative to their ex-masters and left them economically helpless. It ensured that black labor would be divorced from control over the means of production, and it thwarted efforts to initiate communal use of the land by blacks.

Few Southern whites were prepared to encourage or even permit ownership of the land by their former slaves. In the debate over arming the slaves and how best to motivate them to fight for the Confederacy, a few Southern newspapers had suggested that, in addition to freedom, a homestead would have to be granted to black soldiers. As heretical as was the idea of emancipation, many Southern whites were able to countenance it during the last half of the war because of the gathering momentum of military emancipation by the Union and the unsolved wartime problems of imposing discipline and extracting efficient labor from the slaves. But the distribution of land to the freedmen, which implied an economic basis for black equality after the war, was too obviously a threat to white supremacy to be seriously considered. The few whites who favored land for black Confederate veterans were denounced as race traitors. In January, 1865, the *Raleigh North Carolina Standard* warned that "the negro is to be the pet, and the gallant white veteran ... is to be turned off to work as a tenant, if he have [*sic*] no land, and must be jostled and insulted in his neighborhood as long as he lives, by his black comrade, who is to have a homestead provided for him by the state!" The paper added that even the Yankee enemies "have appeared disposed thus far to spare us this humiliation."

The proposition for black homesteads was stillborn, but in contemplating for the first time the role of most blacks as free men in Southern society, many Confederates formulated a rationale for keeping the ex-slaves subservient. As explained in December, 1864, by Judah P. Benjamin, a member of the Confederate cabinet, this rationale was a succinct statement of what in fact would be the status of blacks after the war. Stressing the need to create some "intermediate stage of serfage or peonage" before the eventual emancipation of the families of black soldiers, Benjamin wrote:

We might then be able, while vindicating our faith in the doctrine that the negro is an inferior race ..., yet so modify and ameliorate the existing condition of that inferior race by providing for it certain rights of property, a certain degree of personal liberty, and legal protection for the marital and parental relations, so as to relieve our institutions from much that is not only unjust and impolitic in itself, but calculated to draw down on us the odium and reprobation of civilized man.

Ratified into law by the Southern Black Codes of 1865, and then enforced by white majority opinion after the repeal of these codes during Radical Reconstruction, this twilight zone between freedom and slavery was nearly as confining to blacks as their antebellum legal bondage had been.

The intransigence of whites meant that any land reform in the South had to rest either on the external agency of the federal government, working through confiscation of rebel estates and subsequent redistribution, or on the forcible seizure of land by blacks. The Confiscation Act of July, 1862, and the failure of Southern landowners to pay the direct war tax levied by Congress in August, 1861, had established a legal basis for federal expropriation of rebel property. At Lincoln's insistence, however, Congress passed a joint resolution that limited the forfeiture of property to the lifetime of the offender. Because this resolution gave the heirs of rebels the legal right to reclaim their property, the act was emasculated as far as land redistribution was concerned.

The sale of rebel land for the nonpayment of the direct tax could benefit the ex-slaves only if special safeguards were provided. In open competition with Northern investors and speculators for these tax lands, blacks would be at a clear disadvantage because they lacked capital. Thus, when the first major tax sale occurred in March, 1863, on the South Carolina Sea Islands, Northern interests purchased 90 per cent of the auctioned plantation lands. The government still held some 60,000 acres on the islands, part of which had been set aside for "charitable purposes," to benefit the freedmen. At the urging of Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase and abolitionist-oriented missionaries and teachers who were working among the blacks, the government announced that the heads of black families could pre-empt 40-acre plots of this reserved land at the fixed price of \$1.25 per acre. This liberal policy was reversed before the next land auction in February, 1864. Opposition from the tax commissioners and Edward Philbrick, the manager of the Boston group that had speculated in abandoned plantations on the Sea Islands, convinced Chase to rescind the pre-emption order. The land was sold in large blocks at an average price of \$11 per acre, and the freedmen acquired less than 2,500 acres at the pre-emption price.

The amount of land expropriated for blacks during the war was quite limited. While Republican congressional efforts to extend the provisions of the Homestead Act to include abandoned and confiscated lands in the South were bogged down in legal technicalities, the racial containment and plantation-leasing policies of the Lincoln government were ensuring that blacks would be a landless proletariat within the South. The results were painfully obvious to black spokesmen. "The slaves were made serfs and chained to the soil," charged the *New Orleans Tribune* in the fall of 1864. "Such was the boasted freedom acquired by the colored man at the hands of the 'Yankees.'" Yet, just before the end of the war, the land question was revived and the hopes of blacks suddenly raised by General Sherman's "Special Field Order No. 15." In conjunction with a previous program in black separatism initiated by Grant in the lower Mississippi Valley, Sherman's order implied that the federal government was about to pledge itself to reserving land within the South for the field slaves.

Burdened with a train of several thousand refugee blacks as his army entered Savannah in December, 1865, Sherman, joined by Secretary of War Edwin Stanton, held a conference with the black leaders of Savannah in a effort to learn how to free his army from caring for the refugees. The black response was unanimous: "The way we can best take care of ourselves is to have land.... We want to be placed on land until we are able to buy it, and make it our own." Consequently, in January, 1865, Sherman designated for the exclusive settlement of blacks the South Carolina-Georgia Sea Islands and the coastal area from Charleston to Jacksonville, extending 30 miles inland. Black families were permitted to settle 40 acres under "possessory titles" that subsequently were to be regulated by Congress. By June, 1865, forty thousand blacks, under the supervision of General Rufus Saxton, had colonized the region set aside by Sherman.

At Davis Bend, Mississippi, a peninsula extending into the Mississippi River 25 miles south of Vicksburg, nearly two thousand freedmen had been resettled on more than 5,000 acres of prime plantation land in 1864 and 1865. This agricultural community had been protected from guerrilla raids by the Union military and allowed to govern itself. The blacks had administered their own judicial system, managed their economic affairs, and provided welfare services for the elderly, sick, and orphaned. In 1865 the community had a net profit of \$159,200 from its agricultural production. More importantly, the colonists had revealed that a communal approach to agriculture, based on voluntary partnerships and sharing of the land, was a workable and even desirable alternative to small and scattered individual holdings.

These experiments in black land ownership were soon aborted by President Andrew Johnson. Four of the six antebellum plantations that comprised the bulk of Davis Bend were restored to their original owners in 1865. Within the next two years the other plantations, which belonged to the family of Jefferson Davis, were also returned. Through another lavish use of his pardoning powers, Johnson dispossessed from the land those blacks who had taken the government at its word and settled in the coastal strip south of Charleston. The freedmen protested to no avail that "to turn us off from the land that the Government has allowed us to occupy, is nothing less than returning us to involuntary servitude." Abolitionists bitterly denounced Johnson's policy, and General Saxton, then commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau in South Carolina, had to be removed from office before Johnson's orders could be carried out. But in the end the blacks lost most of the land to its former owners.

As compensation for their expulsion from land they had controlled at the end of the war, the freedmen received the unfulfilled promise of land reform written into the bill establishing the Freedmen's Bureau in March, 1865. The Bureau was given supervision over the abandoned and confiscated Southern land held by the federal government and was authorized to divide this land among the freedmen and "loyal refugees," with the provision that the land might be purchased under "such title thereto as the United States can convey." However, as noted previously, the government did not have complete title to these lands, which were claimed by the legal heirs of former rebels. The rebels themselves were pardoned in wholesale numbers by Johnson under terms that included the full restitution of property rights. Moreover, the Bureau never controlled enough land to take more than a token step toward its redistribution. At most, the Bureau could have provided about one-quarter of the ex-slave population with family garden plots of 5 acres each.

Additional confiscations after the war were out of the question. The egalitarian arguments of Thaddeus Stevens in favor of dividing the landed estates of the wealthiest seventy thousand Confederates into 40-acre farms for freedmen were futile. Insisting that the economic substructure of the South had to be reshaped radically if a biracial democracy were ever to emerge, he rhetorically asked, "How can republican institutions, free schools, free churches, free social intercourse exist in a mingled community of nabobs and serfs?" In 1867 the confiscation proposal of Stevens received only thirty-seven affirmative votes in the House. Congress settled for two far more moderate measures. It gave the dispossessed freedmen in the region encompassed by Sherman's Order No. 15 the option of leasing government-owned land on the Sea Islands. The lessees had a six-year option to purchase up to 20 acres at \$1.50 per acre. Second, the Homestead Act was extended to cover the public domain in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, and the settlement of these lands was to be closed until January 1, 1867, to anyone who had supported the rebellion. Very little fertile acreage was made available by this legislation, and few freedmen benefited from it.

Blacks yearned for land and argued eloquently that they had a morally legitimate claim to a fair share in the estates of their former masters. Writing in the *Philadelphia Christian Recorder* in June, 1863, a North Carolina black reasoned that "if the strict law of right and justice is to be observed, the country around me, or the Sunny South, is the entailed inheritance of the Americans of African descent, purchased by the invaluable labor of our

ancestors, through a life of tears and groans, under the lash and the yoke of tyranny." Nevertheless, this moral claim was denied.

Reliance on the federal government clearly had been a weak and ineffectual prop for black aspirations to land ownership. Yet the freedmen had no other alternatives open to them. Any forcible seizure of the land had to rest on an independent base of political, and especially, military power. Such a base had never developed, because the slaves had been able to achieve their freedom without resorting to revolutionary violence. Without their own armed forces independent of white control, and without a cadre of leaders responsive to the needs of a revolutionary organization, the freedmen could not compel whites, whether Unionists or Confederates, to consider seriously their demands for land. Quite to the contrary, most whites saw little reason to respect any black program, because they perceived the freedmen as passive agents even in their own emancipation. "What have the negroes done to secure freedom at this time, when the course of their masters seems especially to invite them to strike for liberty?" Senator Cowan of Pennsylvania asked early in the war. "Nothing; they simply rely on their masters with a sort of blind instinct." Edward Dicey, the English observer, agreed. "I should think more highly of the Negro race than I do, if I believed there was any probability that, unarmed and unassisted by white men, they would rise against their owners." Thus, while tending to congratulate themselves on their benevolence in bestowing freedom upon a race that they believed was too weak and docile to fight for its own freedom, Northern whites were unresponsive to what they saw as ungrateful and unreasonable black demands for land during and after the war.

To be sure, sparks of revolutionary agitation over the land question did flare up in 1865 and 1866. The implicit belief of freedmen that they had a right to the land had been reinforced not only by Sherman's order but also by warnings in the Confederate press that Southern defeat meant confiscation of the plantations and their division among the ex-slaves. When black expectations were thwarted in 1865, many freedmen refused to surrender the farms they had gained during the war. When the pardoned planters returned to reclaim their estates on the Sea Islands, the blacks armed themselves with whatever weapons they could find. The planters were forced to leave and were admonished: "You had better go back to Charleston, and go to work there, and if you can do nothing else, you can pick oysters and earn your living as the loyal people have done — by the sweat of their brows." This militancy, as well as the extremely heavy concentration of freedmen on the Sea Islands and the nucleus of black ownership that dated back to the tax sales of 1863 and 1864, influenced the conciliatory response of Congress. Black ownership of tax lands was confirmed, leases on confiscated lands were converted to full ownership, and the remaining government lands on the islands were offered to the freedmen at \$1.50 per acre. Consequently, the proportion of black ownership of farms in this region was the highest in the postwar South.

Elsewhere in the South, black militancy was in vain. Scattered incidents of armed attempts to seize or protect landholdings were reported, but they were quickly put down by either Southern whites or the federal military. Moreover, blacks were driven off the land if they balked at accepting white control. The freedmen were relatively defenseless because of the rapid demobilization of the Union army. By June 1, 1866, the combined strength of the regular army and the volunteers was fewer than seventy thousand men. In particular, the removal of the black troops deprived the freedmen of their sole potential military allies. Whites in both sections accused these soldiers of fomenting discontent among the ex-slaves over the land issue. Advised by Grant to withdraw black regiments because they "demoralize [black] labor," and urged to do so by Southern whites who feared that the ex-slaves would turn to the black military for the leadership of a mass uprising, Johnson reduced the army of occupation to a skeletal force within a year. In the meantime, as former Confederates gained control of the state governments under the Johnson guidelines, the freedmen were disarmed, first forcibly and then under the legal cover of the Black Codes, which prohibited black ownership of weapons.

The potential (and it was never more than that) for a revolution to gain land was gone by 1866. Although the freedmen would try to withhold their labor in an effort to gain higher wages or a better sharecropping arrangement, their position was barely above that of serfdom. An abolitionist who traveled in the South in 1866, the Reverend John Savary, was struck by the resignation of those who had once dared to hope that the rewards of freedom might be commensurate with the sacrifices of slavery. The freedmen "appear to have neither mind nor hope above their present condition, and will continue to work on from day to day, and from year to year, without more than enough to keep soul and body together." In the future, black spokesmen and their white allies could but repeat the obvious — the legal bonds of slavery had been dissolved, only to be replaced by the economic bonds of poverty and exploitation.

The Ambivalence of Reunification

The Civil War was the terrible price that Americans paid for the inadequacies of the Constitution. Fundamentally flawed by the ambiguity of dual sovereignty and by the absurdity of excluding the black tenth of the population from the protection of the Bill of Rights, the antebellum Union collapsed during the secession crisis from the weight of its own contradictions. As its minimal objective, the ensuing war of reunification had to establish whether sovereignty ultimately rested with a national government or with the states. To the extent that the slaves had to be freed in order to achieve a Union victory, emancipation became a war aim after 1863. Victory, attained at the cost of more than six hundred thousand war dead, was possible only through a radical restructuring of the definition and application of national power. Yet, and this was the enduring tragedy of the Civil War, the political revolution was arrested. Once the military confrontation had been resolved in favor of the Union, the political implementation of power again became imprisoned in a traditional constitutional framework that precluded the effective use of centralized power. Reconstruction would be aborted, not so much by the lack of idealism or commitment as by the failure to conceive a philosophy of national power capable of administering the vast social and economic changes wrought by the war.

As Lincoln put it so well in 1862, "The dogmas of the quiet past, are inadequate to the stormy present.... As our case is new, so we must think anew, and act anew." It was this recognition of the need for far-reaching changes, as well as his skill in exercising the war-making powers of the executive, that made Lincoln a great wartime president. Under his leadership, although not always at his initiative, the United States became a nation in the full meaning of the word. Emancipation, by destroying the legal power of the master class over slaves, made all Americans direct subjects of the government; the draft embodied the principle of compulsory military service; the Legal Tender Acts created government-controlled currency and credit; and the heavy wartime taxes on producers and consumers extracted financial support for the bureaucratic and military machinery of the government. By exercising for the first time federal controls over the lives of individual citizens, these four war measures amounted to a revolution in the application of national power. But this revolution was justified and supported only in the context of a military emergency. Having established by 1865 the permanence of the Union, most Northerners balked at any extension of the nationalistic concepts and controls that had been indispensable for victory. In particular, few Northerners could conceive of the need for a peacetime nationalism under which the federal government would assume responsibility for rebuilding the South and integrating the freedmen into American society.

This failure of imagination ensured a bitter legacy of hatred in the postwar years. Reunification brought together in a common experience the victors, the defeated, and the former slaves. For the nation to be successfully reconstructed, the distinctions between these groups had to be eliminated. Reconciliation between Unionists and Confederates would be all the

more difficult because these groups lacked a common external enemy against whom they could unite. Whereas the perceived threat of aggressive Communism allied the United States after World War II with the same Axis powers it had been instrumental in defeating, no such foreign menace was present to drive together the American belligerents after the Civil War. Spain would eventually perform this function, but not until the late 1890's.

Another deterrent to reconciliation was the lack of a formal peace treaty. Without this ritualistic release of war hatreds the antagonisms between Unionists and Confederates continued to fester. The South did not know exactly what terms of submission would be demanded by the North, which in turn never had the gratification of receiving concrete assurances that the South recognized its defeat. All that had been established in 1865 was that the South had been militarily defeated and had lost slavery. Left unsettled were the future status of the freedmen, the extent of the Southern defeat, and the meaning of the Northern victory — in short, the overriding issue of what the war in fact had settled.

In time an accommodation was worked out in which the North specified its minimum guarantees of victory. Immediately after the war Southern whites insisted on turning to ex-Confederates for their leadership. They harassed wartime Unionists and attempted to reduce the freedmen to a submissive rural peasantry with few political or civil rights. These actions, openly encouraged and supported by Northern Democrats and by President Johnson, convinced the majority of Northerners that their sacrifices might have been in vain, that they had won the war only to face the immediate danger of losing the peace. Consequently, Congress formulated and then compelled ratification of what amounted to a peace treaty — the Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments. These measures, when added to the Thirteenth Amendment, which was in the process of ratification at the war's end, freed the blacks, invested them with national citizenship, and granted them suffrage. As the price of readmission to the Union, the rebel states had to acquiesce in this new legal definition of black status, repudiate their war debts, and accept as a penalty the temporary loss of office-holding and voting rights by former Confederate officials.

Measured by its leniency and speed in restoring the seceded states to the Union, this peace package was an undoubted success. Not a single Confederate was executed for political crimes. By 1868 most of the Southern states had been accepted back into the Union, and by 1870 the Union was again intact. Northerners felt they had received confirmation of their original belief that secession had been a great aberration, an inexplicable form of mass delusion on the part of Southerners who would eventually come to their senses and seek to rejoin the best and most democratic government on earth. It seemed as if Lincoln had been correct when he had told the Maryland Union Committee in November, 1864, that "those who had differed from us and opposed us would see that it was better for their own good that they had been defeated, rather than to have been successful."

Nevertheless, these amendments failed both as a catharsis for the hostilities of the war years and as an institutional framework that would aid blacks in the transition from slavery to freedom. In the spring of 1865 Southern whites had been prostrate, expecting the worst from their conquerors. "A joyless future of probable ignominy, poverty, and want is all that spreads before us," lamented Eva B. Jones of Augusta, Georgia. "We are scattered, stunned, the remnant of heart left alive in us filled with brotherly hate," noted Mrs. Chesnut. "We sit and wait until the drunken tailor who rules the United States of America issues a proclamation and defines our anomalous position." But the Southern position was not immediately defined. Although no Southerners were shot as soldiers or hung as political traitors, the uncertainty in existence at the war's end persisted through the rest of the decade. Because Northern peace terms were not presented quickly and dramatically in 1865, but instead were issued piecemeal over a period of four years, the agony of agreeing on these terms was continually re-enacted. Repeatedly Southerners felt aggrieved because additional demands were being forced on them, whereas Northerners were frustrated over what they saw as the absence of true repentance.

However, quite aside from the question of the timing of the peace terms was the problem of implementation. The North undoubtedly could have forced more strenuous terms on the South if it had moved immediately in 1865, but this would not necessarily have resulted in Southern acceptance of these conditions. Southerners, both black and white, had to be re-educated if the dehumanizing attitudes and racist assumptions of slavery were ever to be removed and if blacks were to be provided with the skills necessary for a successful adjustment to freedom. This re-education had to be imposed from without by the federal government, and it had to be a long-range commitment. It could be accomplished not in a year but only after a generation of sustained effort backed by military force. Tragically, not only was the North ill prepared and unequipped for such an unprecedented use of federal police power, but most Northerners were incapable of conceiving of the need for such power.

With the exception of the use of the army to coerce compliance with the Military Reconstruction Act of 1867, military reconstruction was more fiction than fact, a failure because of its brevity more than its brutality. Federal troop strength in the postwar South hovered just above ten thousand men, enough of a force to be an irritant to Southern whites and a reminder of their defeat, but far too small to constitute an effective army of occupation. Real police power was exercised by white sheriffs in rural areas who were supported by paramilitary organizations along the lines of the Ku Klux Klan. These organizations, instruments of community violence and intimidation, were an almost spontaneous Southern reinstatement of police control over the blacks.

The Freedmen's Bureau was as far as Congress would go in assuming national responsibility for a welfare role in the postwar South. The Bureau issued some 21 million rations to refugees of both races, treated nearly half a million cases of illness, established more than forty hospitals, and spent more on educational facilities than \$5 million. In the context of the limited government assumptions of antebellum Americans, the Bureau was indeed revolutionary. Moreover, as an emergency relief agency, a temporary shield for the legal rights of the freedmen, and a regulatory mechanism for stabilizing the plantation labor market, the Bureau was a success. But when set against the widespread poverty and devastation of the South, the achievements of the Bureau appear distinctly limited. Most of its programs had been phased out in the late 1860's, and the agency was formally disbanded in 1872. In the interval, the Bureau had barely touched the most pressing of all Southern problems, that of the overwhelming need for capital with which to finance economic recovery and redevelopment.

Lincoln saw this need and proposed the only major plan that would have pumped capital into the South for rehabilitation. At a cabinet meeting in early February, 1865, he submitted to Congress a draft of a joint resolution calling for the executive issuance of \$400 million in 6 per cent government bonds to all 16 slave states (including West Virginia) in proportion to the number of slaves resident in those states in 1860. Half of the bonds would be issued on the condition that the Confederacy submitted to federal authority by April 1, 1865; the second installment would be paid once all resistance ceased, provided that the Thirteenth Amendment freeing the slaves was ratified by the requisite number of states by July 1, 1865. For once Lincoln misread the temper of his party. However appealing his proposal was as a means of ending the war through negotiations rather than unconditional surrender, and however shrewd an attempt it was to give the South an economic stake in a reunited government and thereby create a centrist Whiggish party led by a bisecting coalition of the propertied classes, his plan met with little support. Union armies were on the verge of victory regardless of any negotiations, and Republicans were shocked at what appeared to be an unnecessary and perhaps immoral recognition that slave interests should receive special considerations by the very government that the planters were pledged to destroy. Gideon Welles, the Secretary of the Navy, summed up the reaction of the cabinet when he wrote, "The earnest desire of the President to conciliate and effect peace was manifest, but there may be such a thing as so overdoing as to cause a distrust or adverse feeling."

Congressional Republicans were as concerned as Lincoln with ensuring the majority status of their party under peacetime conditions. Lincoln had been a minority president in 1860, elected with but 39 per cent of the popular vote, and his re-election over the Democratic candidate, George McClellan, clearly had occurred under abnormal circumstances. Indeed, without the soldier vote in such pivotal states as Indiana and Pennsylvania, Lincoln might well have been defeated in 1864. Because it was implicitly understood that after the war the seceded states eventually would be restored to their former position in the Union, the Republicans faced the dilemma of balancing a military victory with the retention of political power in a restored Union in which they might well be a minority party. Lincoln's solution was a revival of Whiggery through an alliance of planters and Northern businessmen who would supervise a national commitment to rehabilitate the Southern economy. Most congressional Republicans, while Lincoln was alive but especially after President Andrew Johnson had estranged himself from his nominal party through his refusal to cooperate in any readjustment policy, sought to protect their party and the fruits of victory by enfranchising the freedmen and disfranchising some of the Southern whites. This effort to create a new balance of power, commonly called Radical Reconstruction, was supported initially by a Northern public anxious to create in some form a "more perfect" Union than the one that had collapsed in 1860. However, without the economic pragmatism that was at the heart of Lincoln's plan in 1865, this effort would be an exercise in futility.

The minimum condition for Radical Reconstruction to have succeeded in the postwar South was economic stability. The very term "reconstruction" would be a misnomer unless the agents of Republican control could in fact rebuild what the war had destroyed. The "carpetbaggers," the pejorative label pinned on Northerners resident in the South after the war who entered politics as Republicans, were small-risk capitalists who did bring in some entrepreneurial capital. Nonetheless, without access to large-scale capital funds from the North, either public or private, the carpetbaggers themselves became an unsettling element, hated by Southern whites as protectors of the black man's newly won status and as symbols of exploitative Yankee domination. The "scalawags," former Southern Whigs and Unionists who looked to the Republican party for stability and Northern capital, were likewise miscast as reconstructionists. Denounced by their fellow Southerners as traitors to their race and to the South, discredited for their failure to restore the economy, and blamed for the heavy postwar taxes that had to be levied to begin rebuilding the South, the scalawags shed their Republicanism in the early 1870's. The freedmen, the major prop of the Republican governments in the South, had nothing but their vote to bring to reconstruction. Although blacks made immense strides in literacy and in structuring a community life centered around church organizations, they remained an economically vulnerable, impoverished class whose very freedom reminded whites of what the South had lost in the war.

Radical Reconstruction was formally ended in 1877, when, as part of the price for his presidency, Rutherford B. Hayes removed the last federal troops from the South. Despite laying a foundation for social democracy in the South, Radical Reconstruction had failed, and its failure called into question the whole meaning of the war. Had it been fought, as Lincoln and the North had originally insisted and as Johnson and Northern Democrats persisted in arguing, to restore the Union as it was in 1860? If so, then the experiment in reconstruction from 1865 to 1877 was the more tragic for having been conceived in the first place. Or had the war, once emancipation became a condition of victory, taken on revolutionary characteristics that would remold Southern society and integrate the former slaves into American society? If this were the case, the tragedy of Radical Reconstruction lay in the refusal of Northerners to grant the federal government the power to make it a success.

Americans could never decide on the meaning of their civil war, and their indecision was reflected in the ambivalence of reunification. On the one hand, Northerners wanted assurance that the Union they had fought to preserve was indeed mankind's last, best hope, and Southern efforts to re-enter the Union as quickly as possible after their defeat offered

just such assurance. On the other hand, Northerners did not want readmission to involve sacrificing the interests of either Southerners who had stood by the Union during the war or those blacks whose freedom both removed the root cause of sectional discord and promised that the restored Union would be a "more perfect" one. Reconciling these conflicting attitudes toward the settlement of the war was the in-but-out interpretation of the status of the seceded states. As geographical entities, these states were viewed as having never left the Union, but as political bodies they theoretically had forfeited their rights and were to be reconstructed under a republican form of government. Although the in-but-out approach was a necessary compromise tailored to the mood of Northerners at the end of the war, in practical terms it stymied any revolutionary application of national power. No state boundaries were obliterated and no uniform, positive system of national law was proclaimed. Indeed traditional state-federal relations were re-established before the end of the 1860's, and Southern whites were already using their control of federal courts in the reconstructed states as a constitutional means of undermining black civil rights.

A revolution was spawned in the Civil War, but it was not a political one. Democrats in both the North and the South were never reconciled to the social and economic transformations of the war. Their rearguard efforts to immobilize political nationalism and to entrust power to white majorities on the local level resulted in major victories even before the Republicans acknowledged the defeat of Reconstruction in the aftermath of the presidential election of 1876. The Republicans did embrace the changes of the war years, but they failed to translate their commitment to change into a program of action. Although the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth amendments declared both the end of dual sovereignty and the subordination of the states to national authority, the incipient political nationalism was negated by the failure to entrust the federal government with institutions of centralized power. No enforcement machinery was established to implement the civil rights promised blacks in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments. No federal agencies were created to rebuild the South, and the radical governments lacked the capital means to do so. Not until 1950 would the South's relative share of per capita national income climb back to its 1860 level. This overriding fact of poverty in the postwar South would exacerbate race relations as whites continued to equate their economic plight with the black man's freedom.

The revolutionary legacy of the war was not the ideals of Radical Reconstruction, however important a precedent they set for the future, but the impetus given to industrial capitalism. The partnership of the federal government with Northern businessmen that was necessary to win the war was not dissolved in 1865. The retention of protective tariffs and federal subsidies for internal improvements was coupled with a quick removal of wartime business taxes. The national banking system remained under the control of New York City bankers who would exercise an imperial domination over the economies of the South and the West. Above all, the expanded credit base created by the federal government would continue to fuel industrial development. Industrialization and urbanization would be as much consequences of the war as the freeing of the slaves. Southerners, recalling the Northern confiscation of the capital they had invested in their slaves and the Confederate war effort, would understandably attribute much of the North's postwar prosperity to their own defeat.

Lincoln's America would remain a bitterly divided nation. Unionists, Confederates, and freedmen were not reconciled so much as they learned to coexist. The revolution in political attitudes that was necessary if economic resources were ever to be harnessed to national reunification never occurred, or at best was aborted when the war was over. Fearful that the federal government might limit their freedom to compete in an expanding economy, Americans had insisted during the Jacksonian period that power devolve into the hands of first the states and then individual entrepreneurs. Despite a temporary reversal of this process during the Civil War, social planning, or even the exercise of power through national agencies, remained unthinkable. With no culturally sanctioned sources of public power to act as a counterweight to the immense private sources of economic power created by

industrial capitalism, and with no administrative framework with which to cope with the social dislocations of the war, postwar America was as incapable of democratizing economic growth as it was of integrating the ex-slaves into American life with any measure of equality. The same gap between the decentralized political philosophy of Jacksonian America and the concentration of economic power in Lincoln's America that resulted in a generation of rapid industrialization and urbanization unrestrained by government controls or any notion of the public welfare would also make a mockery of Reconstruction — an experiment that failed because Americans could not summon the imagination to embrace any fundamental changes in the Constitution. The very lack of centralized power that made secession conceivable was also to ensure that the postwar settlement would eventually lead to the abandonment of the blacks. The power vacuum that existed in the South during the era of Reconstruction enabled the defeated Confederates to maneuver until they secured peace on their own terms. By the 1880's Northern and Southern whites were in near agreement that Reconstruction, with its uncertain commitment to racial democracy, had been a tragic mistake. Southern whites gained through peace what they had felt they could obtain only through war — full control over their region's black minority without any federal interference. In perhaps the greatest irony of the war, the North won the battles but the South dictated the peace terms.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION / STUDY QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the aspirations of the ex-Confederates and the methods they employed to reestablish control of their world. Why were they ultimately successful in reestablishing their power?
2. Is it fair to say that while the Confederacy was militarily defeated in the Civil War, its supporters were able to win a limited political victory during Reconstruction?

FURTHER READING

General Studies

- Dan T. Carter, *When the War Was Over: The Failure of Self-Reconstruction in the South, 1865–1867* (1985).
- E. Merton Coulter, *The South During Reconstruction, 1865–1877* (1947).
- Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863–1877* (1988).
- Leon Litwack, *Been in the Storm So Long: The Aftermath of Slavery* (1979).
- Michael Perman, *Emancipation and Reconstruction, 1862–1879* (1987).
- Michael Perman, *Reunion without Compromise: The South and Reconstruction, 1865–1868* (1973).
- Michael Perman, *The Road to Redemption: Southern Politics, 1869–1879* (1984).
- George C. Rable, *But There Was No Peace: The Role of Violence in the Politics of Reconstruction* (1984).
- James Roark, *Masters without Slaves: Southern Planters in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (1977).
- Allen W. Trelease, *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction* (1971).
- Joel Williamson, *The Crucible of Race: Black/White Relations in the American South since Emancipation* (1984).

Southern Reconstruction Politics

- Richard H. Abbott, *The Republican Party and the South, 1855–1877: The First Southern Strategy* (1986).
- James Alex Baggett, *The Scalawags: Southern Dissenters in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (2003).
- Dan T. Carter, *When the War Was Over: The Failure of Self-Reconstruction in the South, 1865–1867* (1985).
- Richard N. Current, *Those Terrible Carpetbaggers: A Reinterpretation* (1988).
- Richard O. Curry, ed., *Radicalism, Racism, and Party Realignment: The Border States during Reconstruction* (1969).
- Steven Hahn, *A Nation under Our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South, from Slavery to the Great Migration* (2003).
- Gordon H. McKinney, *Southern Mountain Republicans, 1865–1900: Politics and the Appalachian Community* (1978).
- Otto H. Olsen, ed., *Reconstruction and Redemption in the South* (1980).
- Michael Perman, *Reunion without Compromise: The South and Reconstruction, 1865–1868* (1973).
- Michael Perman, *The Road to Redemption: Southern Politics, 1869–1879* (1984).
- Howard N. Rabinowitz, *Southern Black Leaders of the Reconstruction* (1982).
- George C. Rable, *But There Was No Peace: The Role of Violence in the Politics of Reconstruction* (1984).
- Terry L. Seip, *The South Returns to Congress: Men, Economic Measures, and Intersectional Relationships, 1868–1879* (1983).

Occupation and Freedmen's Bureau

- Paul A. Cimbala, *Under the Guardianship of the Nation: The Freedmen's Bureau and the Reconstruction of Georgia, 1865–1870* (1997).
- Paul A. Cimbala and Randall Miller, eds., *The Freedmen's Bureau and Reconstruction: Reconsiderations* (1999).
- Barry A. Crouch, *The Freedmen's Bureau and Black Texans* (1992).
- Randy Finley, *From Slavery to Uncertain Freedom: The Freedmen's Bureau in Arkansas, 1865–1869* (1996).
- Donald G. Nieman, *To Set the Laws in Motion: The Freedmen's Bureau and the Legal Rights of Blacks, 1865–1868* (1979).
- Claude Oubre, *Forty Acres and a Mule: The Freedmen's Bureau and Black Land Ownership* (1978).

Southern State Political Studies

- Randolph B. Campbell, *Grass-Roots Reconstruction in Texas, 1865–1880* (1997).
- Alan Conway, *The Reconstruction of Georgia* (1966).
- William McKee Evans, *Ballots and Fence Rails: Reconstruction on the Lower Cape Fear* (1967).
- William C. Harris, *The Day of the Carpetbagger: Republican Reconstruction in Mississippi* (1979).
- William C. Harris, *Presidential Reconstruction in Mississippi* (1967).
- Jack P. Maddex, *The Virginia Conservatives, 1867–1879: A Study in Reconstruction Politics* (1970).
- Carl M. Moneyhon, *The Impact of the Civil War and Reconstruction on Arkansas: Persistence in the Midst of Ruin* (1994).
- Elizabeth Studley Nathans, *Losing the Peace: Georgia Republicans and Reconstruction, 1865–1871* (1964).
- Jerrell Shofner, *Nor Is It Over Yet: Florida and the Era of Reconstruction, 1863–1877* (1974).
- Joe Gray Taylor, *Louisiana Reconstructed, 1863–1877* (1974).
- Ted Tunnell, *Crucible of Reconstruction: War, Radicalism, and Race in Louisiana, 1862–1877* (1984).
- Sarah Woolfolk Wiggins, *The Scalawag in Alabama Politics, 1865–1881* (1977).
- Richard Zuczek, *State of Rebellion: Reconstruction in South Carolina* (1996).

Society and Economy

- Peter W. Bardaglio, *Reconstructing the Household: Families, Sex, and Law in the Nineteenth-Century South* (1995).

PERMISSIONS AND CITATION INFORMATION

Every effort has been made to cite completely the original source material for each document and article included in this collection. In the event that something has inadvertently been used or cited incorrectly, every effort will be made in subsequent editions to rectify the error.

DOCUMENTS

- 1-1 United States Constitution, 1787.
- 1-2 The Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions of 1798.
- 1-3 Thomas Jefferson to John Holmes, April 22, 1820, The Thomas Jefferson Papers, The Library of Congress.
- 1-4 John C. Calhoun, "The South Carolina Exposition and Protest", December 19, 1828 can be found in *The Papers of John C. Calhoun Vol. 10, 1825 to 1829*, Clyde N. Wilson and W. Edwin Hemphill, eds. (Columbia, University of South Carolina Press, 1977)
- 2-1 Reprinted by permission of the publisher from *Cannibals All! OR Slaves without Masters* and by George Fitzhugh, edited by C. Vann Woodward, pp. 15-18, Cambridge Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Copyright © 1960, 1988 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. Originally published in 1857.
- 2-1 Fitzhugh, George. *Sociology for the South or Failure of Free Society* (New York: Burt Franklin), 1965. Originally published in 1854.
- 2-2 Helper, Hinton Rowan. *The Impending Crisis of the South: How To Meet It* (New York: Collier Books) 1963. Originally published in 1857.
- 2-3 Southern editorials produced by Lloyd Benson, Department of History, Furman University, Reprinted with permission. <http://facweb.furman.edu/~benson/docs/>
- 2-4 Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, The Dred Scott Decision, 1857. *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 60 U.S. 393 (1856).
- 2-5 Southern Editorials on the Dred Scott Decision produced by Lloyd Benson, Department of History, Furman University, Reprinted with permission. <http://facweb.furman.edu/~benson/docs/>
- 2-6 Southern Editorials on John Brown's Raid produced by Lloyd Benson, Department of History, Furman University, Reprinted with permission. <http://facweb.furman.edu/~benson/docs/>
- 3-1 *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist, His Letters, Papers, and Speeches*, Collected and Edited by Dunbar Rowland, Mississippi Department of Archives, Jackson, MS, 1923, Vol. V, p. 40-45.
- 3-3 Moore, Frank, ed. *The Rebellion Record: A Diary of American Events* (11 vol.; New York, 1861-1863; 1864-1868), Selections taken from Supplement to Vol. 1, pp. 362-68.
- 3-4 Richard M. Johnston and William H. Browne, *Life of Alexander H. Stephens*, (Philadelphia, 1878).
- 3-5 Ordinances of Secession from Official Records, Ser. IV, vol. 1.
- 3-6 Declarations of Causes of Seceding States:
 - a. South Carolina: J. A. May and J. R. Faunt, *South Carolina Secedes* (Columbia, University of South Carolina Press) 1960.
 - b. Mississippi: "Journal of the State Convention" (Jackson: E. Barksdale, State Printer) 1861.
 - c. Georgia: Official Records, Series IV, vol 1.
 - d. Texas: Winkler, E.W., ed. *Journal of the Secession Convention of Texas*, pp. 61-66.
- 3-7 State of South Carolina, *Journal of the Convention of the People of South Carolina, Held in 1860, 1861, and 1862, Together with the Ordinances, Reports, Resolutions, etc.* (Columbia: R. W. Gibbes, Printer to the Convention, 1862, 467-476). Transcribed and reverse-order proofread by Lloyd Benson, Furman University. <http://facweb.furman.edu/~benson/docs/>

- 3-8 Chesnut, Mary Boykin. *A Diary from Dixie*, Isabella D. Martin and Myrta Lockett Avery, eds. (New York: D. Appleton & Co.), 1905. Selections from p. 32-40.
- 4-1 selections from The Constitution of the Confederate States of America, 1861.
- 4-2 Jefferson Davis's Inaugural Address, February 18, 1861, *Official Record*, Series IV, vol.1.
- 4-3 Richardson, James D., ed. *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Confederacy*, vol. 1 (Nashville: United States Publishing Company, 1905), pp. 63-66. This excerpt can also be found in Gienapp, William E. *The Civil War and Reconstruction: A Documentary Collection* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co.) 2001.
- 5-1 Songs were originally published in 1904. They can also be found in Wharton, H.M. *War Songs and Poems of the Southern Confederacy, 1861-1865*, (Edison, NJ: Castle Books) 2000.
- 5-2 & 5-3 The Pierson Letters, The Rosemonde E. and Emile Kuntz Collection, Special Collections, Tulane University Library. Reprinted with permission. Selections can also be found in Thomas W. Cutrer and T. Michael Parrish, eds. *Brothers in Gray: The Civil War Letters of the Pierson Family* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press) 1997.
- 5-4 "Shepherd Pryor to his Wife" (February 12, 1862) The Georgia State Department of Archives and History, Atlanta, GA. Selections can also be found in Lane, Mills, ed. "Dear Mother: Don't Grieve about me. If I get killed, I'll only be dead.": *Letters from Georgia Soldiers in the Civil War* (Savannah: Beehive Press) 1977.
- 5-5 & 5-6 Moseley, Ronald, ed. *The Stilwell Letters: A Georgian in Longstreet's Corps, Army of Northern Virginia* (Macon: Mercer University Press) 2002.
- 5-7 Gordon, Gen. John B. *Reminiscences of the Civil War*. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons) 1903. Selections can also be found in Compager, Henry Steele, ed. *The Blue and the Gray: The Story of the Civil War Told by Participants*, two volumes in one (New York: Fairfax Press) 1982.
- 5-8 Cumming, Kate. *Kate: The Journal of a Confederate Nurse*. Richard Barksdale Harwell, ed. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press) 1987.
- 5-9 The Emancipation Proclamation, January 1, 1863.
- 6-1 McCarthy, Carlton. *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia, 1861-1865*. (Richmond: Carlton McCarthy & Co.) 1882. Selections from p. 16-28. Selections can also be found in Thomas W. Cutrer and T. Michael Parrish, eds. *Brothers in Gray: The Civil War Letters of the Pierson Family* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press) 1997.
- 6-2 Deavenport, Thomas Hopkins. *Diaries*, (Nashville: Tennessee State Archives) n.d. Selections can also be found in Woodhead, Henry, ed. *Voices of the Civil War: Atlanta* (Alexandria, VA: Time-Life Books) 1996.
- 6-3 Comer Family Papers, 1860-1864. Compiled by Elizabeth Pauk. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, Wilson Library, Southern Historical Collection. Selections can also be found in Woodhead, Henry, ed. *Voices of the Civil War: Atlanta* (Alexandria, VA: Time-Life Books) 1996.
- 6-4 Cooper, James Litton. "The Civil War Diary of Captain James Litton Cooper, September 30, 1861 to January, 1865", Alderson, William T., ed. *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, June 1956. Selections can also be found in Woodhead, Henry, ed. *Voices of the Civil War: Atlanta* (Alexandria, VA: Time-Life Books) 1996.
- 6-5 Benjamin Mobley to His Parents (August 25, 1861), Emory University archives, Atlanta, GA. Selections can also be found in Lane, Mills, ed. "Dear Mother: Don't Grieve about me. If I get killed, I'll only be dead.": *Letters from Georgia Soldiers in the Civil War* (Savannah: Beehive Press) 1977.
- 6-6 Madison Kilpatrick to His Wife (October 17, 1864), Georgia State Department of Archives and History, Atlanta, GA. Selections can also be found in Lane, Mills, ed. "Dear Mother: Don't Grieve about me. If I get killed, I'll only be dead.": *Letters from Georgia Soldiers in the Civil War* (Savannah: Beehive Press) 1977.
- 6-7 Originally published 1881. Watkins, Sam R. Co. *Aytch: A Side Show of the Big Show* (New York: Collier Books, 1970). Selections taken from pp. 48-49.
- 7-1 Mrs. Louticia Jackson to Asbury H. Jackson, August 23, 1863. Edward Harden Papers, Duke University. Selections can also be found in Wolock, Nancy. *Early American Women: A Documentary History: 1600-1900* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing) 1992.

- 7-2 Loughborough, Mrs. James M. *My Cave Life in Vicksburg*. (Little Rock: Kellogg Print Company) 1882. Selections can also be found in Gragg, Rod. *The Illustrated Confederate Reader*. (New York: Harper & Row Publishers), 1989.
- 7-3 Mrs. Henrietta E. Lee's Letter to General David Hunter On the Burning of Her House, Southern Historical Society Papers, Vol. VIII, no. 5 (May 1880), pp. 215-216. Selections also found in: Gragg, Rod. *The Illustrated Confederate Reader*. (New York: Harper & Row Publishers), 1989.
- 7-4 Letters of Eva B. Jones to her mother, Mary Jones. The Charles Colcock Jones Papers, TM 129, Tulane University, Manuscripts Department, Howard-Tilton Memorial Library. These letters can also be found in Robert Manson Myers, ed., *The Children of Pride: A True Story of Georgia and the Civil War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 1273-1276, 1280-1281.
- 7-5 *A Woman's Wartime Journal: An Account of Sherman's Devastation of a Southern Plantation*, Dolly Sumner Lunt Burge, Jan 1864-April 1865, Used with permission of Documenting the American South, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Libraries.
- 8-1 WPA Slave Narratives (St. Clair Shores, MI: Scholarly Press, Inc.) 1976. Part I, p. 248-53. Selections can also be found in: Gragg, Rod. *The Illustrated Confederate Reader*. (New York: Harper & Row Publishers), 1989.
- 8-2 Daniel Heyward Trezevant Papers, MS Vol. 1865, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina. Selections also found in: Gragg, Rod. *The Illustrated Confederate Reader*. (New York: Harper & Row Publishers), 1989.
- 8-3 H.S. Beals to Maj. Gen. Butler 10 Dec 1863. Letters, Orders and Telegrams Received by Lt. Col. J.B. Kimsman, ser. 4108, Ft. Monroe VA Dept. of Negro Affairs, RG 105 [A-7838]. Selections can also be found in Berlin, Ira, ed. *Freedom: A Documentary History of Emancipation, 1861-1867*, Series II, "The Black Military Experience" (New York: Cambridge University Press) 1982.
- 8-4 Statement by Major Jno. C. Chadwick, 3 Oct 1863, Letters Received, ser. 360, Colored Troops Division, RG 94 [B-32]. Selections can also be found in Berlin, Ira, ed. *Freedom: A Documentary History of Emancipation, 1861-1867*, Series II, "The Black Military Experience" (New York: Cambridge University Press) 1982.
- 8-5 Col. James C. Beecher to Brig. Genl. Edward A. Wild, 13 Sept 1863, Letters Received, 35th USCI, Regimental Books & Papers USCT, RG 94 [G-182]. Selections can also be found in Berlin, Ira, ed. *Freedom: A Documentary History of Emancipation, 1861-1867*, Series II, "The Black Military Experience" (New York: Cambridge University Press) 1982.
- 8-6 Affidavit of Private Joseph Howard, 30 Jan 1865, enclosed in Col. R.D. Mussey to Capt. C.P. Brown, 31 Jan 1865, M-2, 1865, Letters Received by Adjutant General L. Thomas, ser. 363, Colored Troops Division, RG 94 [V-88]. Selections can also be found in Berlin, Ira, ed. *Freedom: A Documentary History of Emancipation, 1861-1867*, Series II, "The Black Military Experience" (New York: Cambridge University Press) 1982.
- 9-1 Cumming, Kate. *Kate: The Journal of a Confederate Nurse*. Richard Barksdale Harwell, ed. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press) 1987.
- 9-2 Moseley, Ronald, ed. *The Stilwell Letters: A Georgian in Longstreet's Corps, Army of Northern Virginia* (Macon: Mercer University Press) 2002.
- 9-3 First Confederate Conscription Law, April 16, 1862, in *Statutes at Large of the Confederate States of America*, Matthews, James M. ed., Richmond, 1862. I Congress, 1 Session, chapter XXXI. Selection can also be found in Vandiver, Frank E. *Basic History of the Confederacy* (Princeton, NJ: D.Van Nostrand Company, Inc.) 1962.
- 9-4 The Twenty Negro Law, in *Public Laws of the Confederate States of America, Passed at the Second Session of the First Congress*, Matthews, James M. ed. (Richmond: R.M.Smith, 1862), p. 77-79.
- 9-5 Act Regulating Impressments, March 26, 1863, in *Statutes at Large of the Confederate States of America*, Matthews, James M. ed. (Richmond, 1863) I Congress, 3 Session, chapter X. Selection can also be found in Vandiver, Frank E. *Basic History of the Confederacy* (Princeton, NJ: D.Van Nostrand Company, Inc.) 1962.
- 9-6 Hague, Parthenia Antoinette. *A Blocaded Family: Life in Southern Alabama during the Civil War* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin & Co.) 1888. Selection can also be found in Compager, Henry Steele, ed. *The Blue and Gray: The Story of the Civil War Told by Participants*, two volumes in one (New York: Fairfax Press) 1982.

- 9-7 Jones, John B. *A Rebel War Clerk's Diary at the Confederate State's Capital* vol I & II, passim (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co.) 1866.
- 10-1 Deavenport, Thomas Hopkins. *Diaries*, (Nashville: Tennessee State Archives) n.d. Selections can also be found in Woodhead, Henry, ed. *Voices of the Civil War: Atlanta* (Alexandria, VA: Time-Life Books) 1996.
- 10-2 Originally published 1881. Watkins, Sam R. Co. *Aytch: A Side Show of the Big Show* (New York: Collier Books, 1970). Selections taken from p. 109.
- 10-3 Cumming, Kate. *Kate: The Journal of a Confederate Nurse*. Richard Barksdale Harwell, ed. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press) 1987.
- 10-4 & 10-5 *Official Records*, Series I Vol. XLVII, p. 1270-71; Series I Vol. XLVII pp.1191-2, respectively. Selections can also be found in Van Noppen, I.W. *The South: A Documentary History* (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc.) 1958.
- 10-6 Wm. H. Lee to J. Davis, 4 May 1861, #957 1861, Letters Received, ser. 5, Sec. War, RG109 [F-33]. Selections can also be found in Berlin, Ira, ed. *Freedom: A Documentary History of Emancipation, 1861-1867*, Series II, "The Black Military Experience" (New York: Cambridge University Press) 1982.
- 10-7 Excerpt from John J. Cheatham to Hon. L.P. Walker, 4 May 1861, #605 1861, Letters Received, ser. 5, Sec. War, RG109 [F-127]. Selections can also be found in Berlin, Ira, ed. *Freedom: A Documentary History of Emancipation, 1861-1867*, Series II, "The Black Military Experience" (New York: Cambridge University Press) 1982.
- 10-8 An Act to Increase the Military Force of the Confederate States, March 13, 1865, *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (127 vols. And index; Washington, 1880-1901), Series IV, vol. 3, p. 1161. Selection can also be found in Vandiver, Frank E. *Basic History of the Confederacy* (Princeton, NJ: D.Van Nostrand Company, Inc.) 1962.
- 10-9 Richardson, ed. *Messages and Papers of the Confederacy*, vol. 1, 568 ff.
- 11-1 Younger, Edward, ed. *Inside the Confederate Government: The Diary of Robert Garlick Hill Kean* (New York: Oxford University Press) 1957, p. 243-245. By permission of Oxford University Press, Inc".
- 11-2 Robert E. Lee's Farewell Address in Lee, Jr., Robert E. *Recollection and Letters of General Lee* (New York: Doubleday & Page) 1904.
- 11-3 Cumming, Kate. *Kate: The Journal of a Confederate Nurse*. Richard Barksdale Harwell, ed. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press) 1987.
- 12-1 The Constitution of the United States, Amendments 13, 14, 15
- 12-2 *Condition of the South*, Senate Executive Document No. 2, 39 Congress, 1 Session, p. 92-93. Selection also found in Elizabeth Cobbs Hoffman and Jon Gjerde, eds. *Major Problems in American History, volume I to 1877* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.) 2002.
- 12-3 The testimony of Forrest and Gordon are from the *Reports of the Committees for the House of Representatives for Affairs in the Insurrectionary States*, 42nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1871-72, I, 449-53. Text also found in Wish, Harvey ed. *Reconstruction in the South, 1865-1877: First-Hand Accounts of the American Southland After the Civil War by Northerners and Southerners* (New York: Noonday Press) 1965.
- 12-4 *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision, 163 U.S. 537, 1896.
- 13-2 Stephens, Alexander. *A Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States* (Philadelphia: 1868-70), I, p. 9-12. Excerpt also found in Stamp, Kenneth M., ed. *The Causes of the Civil War, 3rd Revised edition* (New York: Touchstone Books) 1991.
- 13-3 Davis, Jefferson. *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government* (New York) 1881, Volume I, p. 77-85. Excerpt also found in Stamp, Kenneth M., ed. *The Causes of the Civil War, 3rd Revised edition* (New York: Touchstone Books) 1991.
- 13-4 Heffner, David. "Old South, New South Clash on Vanderbilt's Campus: Decision to Change Building's Name Lands University in Legal Battle." *Black Issues in Higher Education* Publication Date 2/27/2003, Date Accessed 5/5/2006, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0DXK/is_1_20/ai_98539913/print.
- 13-5 Jaschik, Scott. "Confederates Defeat Vanderbilt." *Inside Higher Ed*, Publication Date 5/5/2005, Date Accessed 5/5/2006. <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2005/05/05/vanderbilt>. Reprinted by permission of the author.

- 13-6 Jaschik, Scott. "Lost Cause at Vanderbilt." *Inside Higher Ed*, Publication Date 7/13/2005, Date Accessed 5/5/2006. <http://insidehighered.com/news/2005/07/13/vandy>. Reprinted by permission of the author.
- 13-7 "Lee Statue Vandalized." Date Accessed 05/05/2006. <http://vaudc.org/vandalism/>.
- 13-8 "Open Season on General Lee." Date Accessed 05/05/2006. <http://users.erols.com/va-udc/lee-torched.html>.
- 13-9 Denney, Pamela. "Monumental Battle: Answers to the Confederate Parks Controversy Aren't Inscribed in Black and White." *Memphis Flyer Online*. Publication Date 8/19/2005, Date Accessed 5/5/2006. <http://www.memphisflyer.com/memphis/memphis/content?oid=9940>.
- 13-10 Davis, Chris. "Deconstruction." *Memphis Flyer Online*. Publication date 6/21/2005, Date Accessed 5/5/2006. <http://www.memphisflyer.com/content?oid=9644>.
- 13-11 "NCAA Won't Expand Confederate Flag Ban," Associated Press Online, January 23, 2007. Reprinted with permission.
- 13-12 "Kids Home-Schooled After Confederate Flag Dispute," Associated Press State & Local Wire, November 11, 2006. Reprinted with permission.
- 13-13 Stephanie Garry, "Florida Museum Exhibit Showing Confederate Flag, Gallows Rekindles Debate," *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, March 18, 2007. Reprinted with permission.
- 13-14 "Defining the Confederate Flag," October 22, 2006. Copyright, *The Birmingham News*, © 2007. All rights reserved. Reprinted with permission.

ESSAYS

- 1-1 Morgan, Edmund S. "Slavery and Freedom: The American Paradox", *Journal of American History*, 59(1), 1972. Copyright © 1972 Organization of American Historians (<http://www.oah.org/>), Reprinted with permission.
- 1-2 Fehrenbacher, Don. *The South and Three Sectional Crises*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press) Copyright © 1980. Reprinted with permission.
- 2-1 Barney, William. *The Road to Secession: A New Perspective on the Old South*, (New York: Praeger) Copyright © 1972. Reprinted by permission of the author.
- 2-2 Owsley, Frank L. "The Fundamental Cause of the Civil War: Egocentric Sectionalism," *Journal of Southern History*, VII, No.1 (February 1941), 3-18. Reprinted with permission.
- 3-1 Abrahamson, James. L. *The Men of Secession and Civil War, 1859-1861*, SR Books, an imprint of Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc. Copyright © 2000. Reprinted with permission.
- 3-2 Dumond, Dwight Lowell, ed. *Southern Editorials on Secession* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith) 1964.
- 4-1 Rable, George C., *The Confederate Republic: A Revolution against Politics*, Copyright © 1994 by the University of North Carolina Press. Used by permission of the publisher. www.uncpress.unc.edu
- 4-2 From *The Burden of Confederate Diplomacy*, by Charles Hubbard. Copyright © 1998 by the University of Tennessee Press. Reprinted with permission.
- 5-1 From *The Antietam Campaign*, edited by Gary W. Gallagher. Copyright © 1999 by the University of North Carolina Press. Used by permission of the publisher.
- 5-2 McMurry, Richard M. *Two Great Rebel Armies: An Essay in Confederate Military History*, pp. 87-105, The University of North Carolina Press. Copyright © 1996 Used by permission of the publisher. www.uncpress.unc.edu
- 6-1 Burnham, Philip. "The Andersonvilles of the North" in Cowley, Robert, ed. *With My Face to the Enemy: Perspectives on the Civil War* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons) 2001.
- 6-2 Shattuck, Gardiner H. *A Shield and a Hiding Place: The Religious Life of the Civil War Armies*, Mercer University Press, Copyright © 1988. Reprinted with permission of the publisher.
- 7-1 From *A Woman's War: Southern Women, Civil War, and the Confederate Legacy*, Edward Campbell and Kym Rice, editors. (Richmond and Charlottesville: The Museum of the Confederacy and the University Press of Virginia) Copyright © 1997 by Edward Campbell. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

- 7-2 From *The Collapse of the Confederacy*, Mark Grimsley and Brooks Simpson, editors. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press) Copyright © 2001. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.
- 8-1 From *A Woman's War: Southern Women, Civil War, and the Confederate Legacy*, Edward Campbell and Kym Rice, editors. (Richmond and Charlottesville: The Museum of the Confederacy and the University Press of Virginia) Copyright © 1997 by Edward Campbell. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.
- 8-2 Jimerson, Randall C. *The Private Civil War: Popular Thought during the Sectional Conflict* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press) Copyright © 1988. Reprinted with permission of the publisher.
- 9-1 Escott, Paul D. *After Secession: Jefferson Davis and the Failure of Confederate Nationalism* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press) Copyright © 1978. Reprinted with permission of the publisher.
- 9-2 From *The Collapse of the Confederacy*, Mark Grimsley and Brooks D. Simpson, editors (Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press) Copyright © 2001. Reprinted with permission of the publisher.
- 10-1 "The Confederate Experience", from *Civil War Soldiers: Their Expectations and Their Experiences* by Reid Mitchell, Copyright © 1988, by Reid Mitchell. Used by Permission of Viking Penguin, a division of Penguin Group (USA) Inc.
- 10-2 "I Have to Make the Best of What I Have," from *The Spotsylvania Campaign: Military Campaigns of the Civil War*, ed. by Gary W. Gallagher, Copyright © 1998. Used by permission of The University of North Carolina Press.
- 11-1 McPherson, James M., "American Victory, American Defeat," from *Why the Confederacy Lost*, edited by Gabor S. Boritt, Copyright © 1992. Used by permission of Oxford University Press.
- 11-2 "Why the South Lost the Civil War," Interviews by Carl Zebrowski, from *American History*, October 1995.
- 12-1 Barney, William. *The Road to Secession: A New Perspective on the Old South*, (New York: Praeger) Copyright © 1972. Reprinted by permission of the author.
- 12-2 From *Masters without Slaves: Southern Planters in the Civil War and Reconstruction*, by James L. Roark. Copyright © 1977 by W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. Used by permission of W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- 13-1 "Jubal A. Early, the Lost Cause, and Civil War History: A Persistent Legacy", Chapter 2 in Gary W. Gallagher and Alan T. Nolan, eds. *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press) 2000. p. 35-45. Reprinted with permission of the publisher.
- 13-2 Linenthal, Edward T. "Healing and History: The Dilemmas of Interpretation", *Rally on Higher Ground: The National Park Service Symposium on the Civil War*. Last Modified 5/17/2001, Date Accessed 5/5/2006. http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/rthg/chap3b.htm.

INDEX

Entries in boldface denote excerpts.

36°-30' restriction, 30, 63, 66, 109

A

- "A Woman's War: Southern Women in the Civil War," 262-271
- Abolitionism, 47, 112
- Calhoun on, 11
- and secession, 89
- in South, 69
- targeting of South Carolina by, 70
- Toomb's denunciation of, 93
- vs. expansionism, 66
- vulgar language and vilification of South by, 80
- Abrahamsom, James L., "Alexander Stephens, Deep South Secession, and the Failure of Unionism," 125-132
- Act Regulating Impressments, 326-328
- Adams, John Quincy, opposition to Texas annexation, 64
- African-American experience, 287-288
- closing of schools for free black children, 297
- documents, 288-292
- essays, 292-319
- evacuation and resettlement, 298
- and perceptions of deficient intelligence and moral principle, 303
- and Southern beliefs about black character, 302
- and Union beliefs about black inferiority, laziness, docility, 301
- African-American females
- beatings and rape by Union army, 270
- Butler's solution to, 300-301
- at Camp Nelson, 299
- as contraband, 292, 293, 296
- demands for wages, 269
- evacuation and resettlement patterns, 298
- forced abandonment of children, 299
- generosity of black troops toward contraband, 299
- inability to find work as freewomen, 296-297
- opportunities for greater freedom, 262, 263
- as own agents for change, 301
- perception as non-women, 301
- plantation reconstruction on backs of, 300
- postwar work for, 299-300
- separation from husbands after emancipation, 268
- treatment by abusive soldiers and quartermasters, 300
- Union army attitudes towards, 295
- Union atrocities against, 288
- Union soldiers' rape of, 385
- African-Americans
- as Confederate combat soldiers, 287
- forced recruitment into Union army, 288, 290
- percentage of Confederate population, 287
- Agrarian revolution, in Reconstruction era, 437
- Agricultural capital, postwar shortages, 442
- Agricultural products, Confederate impressment of, 322
- Agriculture, 47
- concerns of soldiers, 224, 229, 230
- Confederacy as, 147
- and cotton diplomacy, 172
- damage due to slave desertions, 309-310
- Davis' preoccupation with, 149
- and decline of agriculture from decreased slave supervision, 287
- as hardest-hit postwar sector, 440
- and political conservatism, 1
- slowness of postwar recovery, 440
- South's dedication to, 1, 6
- Aid societies, 264, 267
- Akin, Mary, 355
- Alabama
- cooperationists vs. secessionists, 127
- end of Republican rule in, 438
- postwar fall in land values, 438
- secession of, 83, 125, 134-135, 136
- secession ordinance, 97-98
- Alamo, historic memory and, 480
- "Alexander Stephens, Deep South Secession, and the Failure of Unionism, 125-132
- Alien and Sedition Acts, 2, 4, 77
- American paradox, slavery and freedom as, 13, 14-26
- American Revolution, 1
- appropriation of ideology by Confederacy, 155, 156
- comparisons to Army of Northern Virginia, 197
- Confederate flag allusions to, 474
- Confederate soldiers' identification with, 179, 410
- internal disunity in, 408, 409
- Pierson's allusions to, 184