

F 210

R 9953



F 210  
.R9953  
Copy 1

# FOUR ADDRESSES

by

MISS MILDRED LEWIS RUTHERFORD  
OF ATHENS GEORGIA

HISTORIAN GENERAL  
UNITED DAUGHTERS OF CONFEDERACY  
1911-1916

*Author of*  
*The South in History and Literature*  
*American Authors, &c.*



*Arranged and Printed By*  
THE MILDRED RUTHERFORD HISTORICAL CIRCLE  
1823-6 JEFFERSON BANK BUILDING : BIRMINGHAM ; ALA.





*MISS MILDRED RUTHERFORD*  
*In Costume Lecture*  
*"The South of Yesterday."*

MRS MILDRED RUTHERFORD  
in Costume Lecture  
"The South of Yesterday."



F210

.R9953



1921-22, 1923

# Address

Delivered By

Miss Mildred Lewis Rutherford

Historian General  
United Daughters of the  
Confederacy

---

The South in the Building of  
the Nation

---

Washington, D. C.  
Thursday, November 14th, 1912

COPYRIGHTED 1916

By

J. STANDISH CLARK

Gift

Author

1914 & 1923

## The South in the Building of the Nation



HERE comes to me a memory—the memory of our Dr. J. B. Lamar Curry, and what he said years ago, that history as it is now written is most unjust to the South, and history if accepted as it is written, will consign the South to infamy.

Who is responsible for the South's unwritten history? Surely we cannot blame the northern historian. His duty is and was to record the facts as they are given to him; and if we of the South have not given him these facts, how can we hold the historian of the North responsible? (Applause). The fault we find with the northern historian, (of course there are a few exceptions,) is not so much what he has said against us as what he has omitted to say. (Applause).

Unless we, Daughters of the Confederacy, will look into this matter and see where the trouble lies we will still have this history untrue to us. As long as the Book Trust controls our Boards of Education and northern text-books continue to be used in southern schools to the exclusion of southern text-books, we will realize that the history of the South will never be known to the coming generations. (Applause).

We cannot in the South compete with the North in publishing houses. Therefore, we cannot sell books at as small a cost as they can be sold by northern publishers. This throws the responsibility upon the moneyed men of the South, who have not thought it worth while to spend their means in having publishing houses for southern text-books so that we can compete in prices with northern text-books. We must not blame the manufacturer of books at the North because he is pushing his interests in the matter of his books. You would do it and I would do it.

No, Daughters of the Confederacy, too long have we been indifferent to this matter. Only within the last fifteen or twenty years have we really awakened to the fact that our history has not been written. The institutions of the South, especially the institution of slavery, about which clustered a civilization unique in the annals of history, have never been justly presented from the southern point of view. Thomas Nelson Page, more than any other one writer, has thrown side-

lights upon this institution which have revolutionized the thought of the world. And so we are greatly indebted to him!

Daughters, are the books of Thomas Nelson Page in your libraries, especially his "Old South?" Are these books given to your children to read? Are your children encouraged to read these books? If not, they should be. You cannot expect the North, and you cannot expect other nations to know by intuition the greatness of the South. Ah! how often the vision comes before me of the passing years, and I see our inertness and indifference and I see more—the future years filled with keen regret and self-reproach.

I am here tonight, Daughters, yes, daughters of Confederate heroes, to plead with you, to urge you to a more aggressive and progressive campaign in collecting and preserving this history. We have now living amongst us some who lived during the old plantation days—some who can now tell us from their own experiences what that institution of slavery was, and what it meant to them and to the negroes under their control. In those days we never thought of calling them slaves. That is a word that crept in with the abolition crusade. They were our people, our negroes, part of our very homes. There are men and women still living who know these facts and who can give them to us, but they are fast passing away, just as are the men and women who lived during the War Between the States. Are we getting from these men and women the facts which only they can give us, or are we indifferent and not willing to take time and not willing to take the trouble to get this information? Let me say tonight that if we still continue to let the years pass by, without giving attention to this subject, the history of this period will ever be unwritten.

Now you say, "What can we do?" What can we do? Anything in the world we wish to do. If there is a power that is placed in any hands, it is the power that is placed in the hands of the southern woman in her home. (Applause). That power is great enough to direct legislative bodies—and that, too, without demanding the ballot. (Applause). As you are, so is your child, and as you think, so will your husband think, (Laughter and applause) that is, if you are the right kind of mother and wife and hold the confidence and love of your husband and children. Your children are to be the future leaders of this land. Are you training these children yourself or are you relegating that power to someone else? Something is radically wrong with the education of the present day. We

are training men and women who are not loyal to the truth of history, who are not standing for law and order, and who are weak enough to be bought by the Book Trust. (Applause). Let us do quickly what we can to right it.

You may say, "Tell us the qualifications for a U. D. C. historian, and we will get to work."

I would say the first qualification for any historian is *truthfulness*. History is truth, and you must truthfully give the facts. Be as careful to give the true history of the side against us as to give our own side, then we can demand from the northern historian that he shall do the same.

The historian must never be partial—no one-sided view of any question is ever history. You realize that in our U. D. C. history there are two sides to many questions. Time has not yet settled many of these points. What we must do as historians is to carefully record the facts on both sides.

There came to me in the preparation of my volumes of history for our work such questions as these: Who was the first to propose Memorial Day? There are two sides to that question. I may think I know, but my opinion should not go down as undisputed history. The evidence as held by both parties must be recorded for the future historian. So with the question, Who first suggested the United Daughters of the Confederacy? The evidence as held by both sides must be placed side by side. Where was the Last Cabinet Meeting of the Confederacy held? Three States are claiming that honor. Where was the last battle of the War Between the States fought? Two places are claiming that. You heard today North Carolina and Alabama claiming the origin of the Confederate flag. There may be facts on both sides of these questions which an impartial historian can decide in future years better than we now can, so I beg you to be careful and don't let us think we know it all.

Then the historian must be very *patient*. The material that we are seeking is scattered far and wide. The veterans are very slow to glorify themselves, and you must tactfully draw from them the things you wish to know. Oh, great patience is required on the part of the historian!

Then you must be *bold and fearless*, daring to tell the truth even if adverse criticism comes to you for doing it. But while bold and fearless be tactful, be broad and be liberal-minded.

An historian should have with her the elements of the philosopher. It must need be that you are required to deal with the social, the economic and the political questions of the day, and you must be prepared to discuss them without passion. You must learn to hold yourself within yourself in discussing all questions of that kind.

You must have *enthusiasm*, also—that enthusiasm which will carry all with you; but, here again your enthusiasm must be tempered with good will and with fairness. Then you must be a *patriot*—because the Confederate soldier was the highest type of a patriot, (Applause) and when you are writing of him you must know what patriotism means.

And you must be *loyal to truth*—not with regard to Confederate history only, but loyal to the truth of all history. (Applause.)

What is history? I would say that it is not dates chronologically arranged, nor is it gossip about politics, nor is it descriptions of battles only. All of these things may enter into history, but I think history centers around some human event, some social movement. And to write history one must know human nature. Not only must we know the event, but we must know what caused it and all the circumstances attending it, and the motives of all the people connected with it.

The *field of history* is as broad as human life; the *qualities of history* should be truth and wisdom; the *aim of history* should be to find the truth; the *methods of the historian* should be to pursue truth and weigh it, then publish it after it is weighed. In a word, if you ask me “What is history?” I would answer, “It is getting truth.” The *sources of history* are oral or written. We have, Daughters, an opportunity today to get much of our history from oral testimony. Shall we neglect to do the thing which in a few years we cannot do?

Do you know, that the South has had a great part in the building of the nation? If you examine those text-books your children are studying you would never think it. (Laughter). And from them they will never discover it. Our institutions are very often unjustly—I should not have said unjustly, for we ourselves have never put them justly before the world—but as history stands now it is unjust to the institutions of the South.

Do you know, that in the books your children are studying and reading the institution of slavery is said to have weakened the mental faculties of the men and women of the South, making them lazy and inert? (Laughter). But history

unjustly as it has been written will by the lives of these men disprove that very statement.

Not only were we the first permanent colony that came to these shores, but more than that for it is stated upon good authority that one of our Jamestown colony was instrumental in inducing the Pilgrim Fathers to come to Plymouth Rock, and yet you and your children know all about that Plymouth Rock colony, and can answer without a moment's hesitation that it was the Mayflower that brought over the Pilgrim Fathers to this country, and few can give the names of the Good Speed, the Discovery, and the Susan Constant, the three vessels that brought the members of the Jamestown colony first to these shores. (Laughter).

Why? I will tell you why. The North has thought it worth while to preserve its history carefully, and we have not thought it worth while to have our history written. In other words your children are studying what the North says and not what the South should say.

Do you know, that most of the men who took part—a prominent part—in the building of the nation were the slaveholders that have been so maligned? When they were looking for a president of the first Continental Congress why did they go to Peyton Randolph, of Virginia, a slaveholder, to be at the head of that body? (Applause). And why, when a resolution had to be drawn that these colonies must be free and independent states, did Richard Henry Lee, another slaveholder have to write it? (Applause). Why was it when they were seeking for some one to write the Declaration of Independence, they chose Thomas Jefferson, a slaveholder? (Applause). The British Encyclopaedia, which is so unjust to the South, says it was because he was a ready writer. Compliment No. 1 that this encyclopaedia, found in every Southern library, has paid to the South.

Did not our George Mason of Virginia, give the first Declaration of Rights ever passed on this continent? Then when they were looking for a commander-in-chief of the Army, did they not choose another slaveholder, George Washington? (Applause). And when they were looking for a commander-in-chief of the Navy, was it not our James Nicholson of Virginia? And was it not John Marshall's pen that welded the states into a union? And when they were looking for men to write a paper stronger than the Articles of the Confederation, did not they first choose our James Madison to

write it—that is our Constitution before amended since the war? And when they needed Chief Justices for the government, did not our Marshall of Virginia, and Taney of Maryland, for over sixty years hold that office? And wasn't it a southern man that was made the first President of the United States? Was it not Thomas Jefferson that added the Louisiana Purchase—millions of miles of territory—to the United States; and was it not James K. Polk of Tennessee, that added the Pacific slope? Did not Virginia give to the United States, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan and a part of Minnesota? There were 15 Presidents before 1860 and 11 of them were southern men. Five of these were re-elected and every one from the South. It cannot be denied that southern men were foremost in the War of 1812, and you know it took a southern man, Francis Scott Key of Maryland, to write our National anthem—The Star Spangled Banner.

Did it not take two southern men, Taylor and Scott, to gain Mexico, and were not the men most prominent in that campaign from the South—Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, Robert E. Lee, Thomas J. Jackson, our Stonewall, Jos. E. Johnston, and A. P. Hill of Virginia, Henry R. Jackson and Josiah Tatnall of Georgia, Beauregard of Louisiana, Braxton Bragg of North Carolina, Butler and May of Maryland, and others too numerous to mention? Was it not James Monroe who bought Florida for the U. S., and it has been his Monroe Doctrine, abuse it as you may now, that has kept our America for Americans so long. And was not Sam Houston the hero of Texas, and was it not Meriwether Lewis of Virginia and William Clarke of Kentucky, who opened up the Yellowstone and the great West? (Applause).

No, we do not begin to know what part the South had in the building of the nation—not only in one direction but in many.

Let us turn to the inventors. Was it not our Cyrus McCormick of Virginia that invented the reaping machine which revolutionized harvesting?

Was it not our James Gatling of North Carolina that invented the gatling gun? Was it not our Francis Goulding of Georgia that invented the sewing machine? But history don't tell you so. (Laughter). It says Howe and Thirmonnier did it. Was it not our William Longstreet of Georgia that first suggested the application of steam as a motive power? History will not tell you that either, but will say that Fulton did it.



Was it not Watkins of Georgia who invented the cotton gin? You never heard of him before, did you? History tells you Ely Whitney invented the cotton gin. The first passenger railroad in the world was in South Carolina, and the first steamboat that ever crossed the Atlantic ocean went from Savannah, Georgia. You don't find that in northern histories, do you? Wasn't Paul Morphey the greatest chess player in the world? (Laughter). And wasn't Sidney Lanier the finest flute player ever known? Cyrus Field could not have made his cable a possibility without our Matthew Maury to devise the plans. There never was an ornithologist like our Audobon of Louisiana. And I do not believe they could have tunnelled under the Hudson without our William McAdoo of Marietta, Ga. (Laughter.) Then, again, when they wanted a leader of the Union forces in 1861 why did they go to our Robert E. Lee? And when he refused, did they not choose Winfield Scott, another southern man?

Then when we come to science and medicine, what physician has done more to alleviate the sufferings of the world than our Dr. Crawford W. Long of Georgia? (Applause.) He was without doubt the discoverer of anesthesia, and I don't believe you know all that means to you, or you would have applauded louder, and you would not allow others to try to take the honor from him, and you would have erected a monument to him long ago. Was it not our Sims of South Carolina who first suggested surgery in hospital service?

Then let us come to the question of education. If there is a thing that the South has smarted under in the false way that history has been written, it is in regard to illiteracy in the South, and I want to open your eyes a little bit along this line, and you of the South need an opening of the eyes as well as the people of the North. We do not ourselves know all that the South may claim.

Do you know, that William and Mary College at Williamsburg, Va., was the first university in the United States? Now, mind you, I did not say college, for I have no desire to take from Harvard her glory. And did you know that William and Mary was the first to receive a charter from the crown; the first to have a school of modern languages; the first to have a school of history; the first to use the honor system? And do you know, that the Georgia University, Athens, Ga., was the first State University in the U. S.? Besides this, do you know that the Wesleyan College at Macon, Ga., was the first

chartered college for women *in the world*, and that it was a Georgia woman who received the first diploma ever issued?

Do you know, that in 1673 Mosely of North Carolina, was establishing public libraries in his state, and Byrd of Westover as early as 1676 gave 39 free libraries in his state, Virginia—a veritable Carnegie, and had no strings tied to them, either. (Laughter and applause.) Why, South Carolina was having free schools as early as 1710, and I think Virginia had them before this. What nonsense to say that the South was behind the North in literary taste and culture in the days of the South of Yesterday! The first book written in America was in Virginia, and the first book printed in America was in Virginia. The libraries in the Old South contained the best books then published, and the best magazines in this country and in England were on the library tables. And as to the matter of illiteracy, since the War, just let me put this thought in your mind. It was Savannah, Ga., in the World's Almanac of 1910 or 1911, I forget which that was said to have had the lowest percent of illiteracy in the U. S., and remember, too, that Georgia's population is about half negroes.

Again, you cannot put a two-cent stamp on a letter that a southern man and a slaveholder, George Washington, does not speak to you; and you cannot handle our silver currency that another southern man and a slaveholder, Thomas Jefferson, does not speak.

No, we do not ourselves know our own greatness, and how can we expect others to know it? If time permitted I could go, on and on, giving one thing after another that would astound you; but this much I will say, that no section of the land can show greater statesmen, abler jurists, braver soldiers, purer patriots, more eminent men of letters, more skilled physicians and inventors, truer and holier divines, finer orators, and more men who have been foremost in all departments of life than our own South. (Applause.) And the time has fully come, and all sections of the country seem to have realized that the time has come, for the South to come into her own. (Applause.)

Thank God that Gov. Woodrow Wilson has been elected President of the United States (Applause)—a man who stands for all that the South stands for; a man who is above being bought; a man who will be equally just to the North as to the South. (Applause). And we of the South must stand back of him and show implicit confidence in all that he does and

says. We must be slow to join in any adverse criticism, and let him know that we believe that he is going to do the very best thing in the very best way. (Applause.) Georgia feels very proud that for the first time in history the Lady of the White House will be a Georgia daughter. (Applause.)

Now, just as the Confederate soldier returned after the war and became a peaceful citizen, because he was a hero, and could rise above the humiliation of surrender, and from a hero of war become a hero of peace, so should we, daughters of these Confederate soldiers, emulate their example. The Confederate soldier fought with honor, surrendered with honor, and abided the issue with honor. After the war he came back into the Union equal with all Union men. He is as loyal to the flag today as other Union men. It is true, he had to fight his way with shackled hands during that awful reconstruction period; but wise men of the North understand why it was a necessity then. He was compelled to establish the political supremacy of the white man in the South. (Applause.) So, too, the Ku Klux Klan was a necessity at that time, and there can come no reproach to the men of the South for resorting to that expedient.

Loyalty to the flag was shown by the South in the Spanish-American War. More soldiers in proportion to the population went from southern states than from northern states. And was not our Joe Wheeler of Alabama "the backbone of the Santiago campaign?" And was it not said of our Hobson of Alabama that he performed the most wonderful feat ever performed in naval history? And did not Willard of Maryland plant the first flag in Cuba? And was it not Tom Brumby of Georgia that raised the first flag at Manilla? And did not Anderson of Virginia fire the first salute at El Caney? And so in many ways other southern heroes have shown their loyalty to the flag.

But, does loyalty to the flag that floats above us prevent our loyalty to the Confederate flag? Not at all. That is the emblem of the South's patriotism. Four years it waved its precious folds above a righteous cause, and when we furled it, it was because we were overpowered and not because we were conquered. (Applause.) Silently and reverently we laid that flag away, that our children and children's children coming after us might revere it; it will teach to them the principles for which our fathers fought—states' rights and constitutional liberty.

Every Confederate State had a share in the War Between the States. Some states suffered more than others. Dear old Virginia was the battle ground. Ah! how Virginia suffered. Over five hundred battles were fought on Virginia's soil. But I believe North Carolina holds the palm when it comes to sacrifice. (Applause.) One-fourth of all the Confederate soldiers that were killed during the War Between the States were North Carolinians; one-fourth of all who were wounded were North Carolinians; one-third of all that died from disease were North Carolinians; and that 26th Regiment of North Carolina sustained the heaviest loss ever sustained by any regiment during the war on either side. Eight hundred fell in Pickett's charge, either killed or wounded, and only eighty were left to tell the tale. This shows how the old North State stands for bravery.

You would think from this, wouldn't you, that I am a North Carolinian? I am not, but a Georgian. (Applause.) I am Georgia born and Georgia bred, of parents Georgia born and bred—Georgian from the crown of my head to the soles of my feet, and loyal enough to old Georgia to wear tonight a velvet dress woven on a Georgia loom at Griffin. (Applause). But Georgia has so many things of which to boast she can well afford to be magnanimous to other states.

The War Between the States was a war of secession and coercion. It really came about by a different interpretation of the Constitution. The South interpreted it to mean State sovereignty. The thirteen states ratified that constitution. Why was it ratified by them at that time if they were unwilling to abide by it in later years? (Applause).

A very significant thing happened last year. The son of Harriet Beecher Stowe, Charles E. Stowe, gave a talk before the Fiske University at Nashville, Tenn., the largest college for negroes in the South, in which he said: "It is evident that there was a rebellion, but the North were the rebels, not the South. (Applause.) The South stood for state rights and slavery, both of which were distinctly entrenched within the constitution." And we have had no harsher critic of the South than Prof. Goldwin Smith, and he said that you cannot accuse the southern leaders of being rebels for "secession is not rebellion."

For seventy-three years the South stood back of this constitution to protect her rights and those rights were protected; but when Abraham Lincoln was elected on an anti-slavery

platform, without an electoral vote from the South, war was inevitable. We felt that if one state's right was interfered with, other states' rights would be. I have heard even some southern people say that the war was fought to keep our slaves. What gross ignorance! Only one-third of the men in the Confederate army ever owned a slave. Gen. Lee freed his slaves before the war began and Gen. Ulysses S. Grant did not free his until the war ended.

In 1860 there were 40 millions of people in the United States—31 millions being north of Mason's and Dixon's line. Nine millions only were in the South, and four millions of these were our negroes. That left five millions of people including young children and old men and women from which our army of 600,000 had to be chosen. The North had an army of nearly 2,800,000. Gen. Buell, a general on the other side, said, "It took a naval fleet and 15,000 men to advance upon 100 Confederates at Fort Henry. It took 60,000 men to whip 40,000 at Shiloh, and it took only 60,000 Confederates to drive back with heavy loss 115,000 at Fredericksburg, Va." (Applause).

Yes, there was a great disparity in number, but the make-up of our army was the very flower of Southern manhood; those men fought! Never in the annals of history has been recorded such devotion to duty and principles as was found in the southern soldier.

We were not then a manufacturing people, we were an agricultural people. This cannot be said about us now. So the home supplies soon gave out, and our soldiers did suffer sorely.

Half-clad, they went through storm and sleet, through shot and shell.

Half-shod, they marched through thorn and thistle and, bare-foot, scaled the mountain heights to meet the advancing foe.

Half-fed, on half rations they went without complaint and cheerfully shared their little with others in the devastated regions.

No, you will never find anything like the record of the Confederate soldiers. They surrendered when forced to surrender like heroes. Can we blame them when they wept like children?

They came back to the old South to readjust the old South to the new order of things. They do not acknowledge there is a new South. Henry Grady was a very young man when he

went to Boston and spoke of "the new South." He did not know how the people of the old South would feel about that. There is no new South. The South of today is the South of yesterday remade to fit the new order of things. And the men of today and the women of today are adjusting themselves to the old South remade.

But the time has come now when the men and women of the South can sit down quietly and discuss with the men and women of the North the War Between the States, and have no bitterness in their hearts. We could not have done this a few years ago. It only goes to prove how our people are becoming a reunited people. Our sons are marrying northern daughters; our daughters are marrying northern sons; our sons are entering the army and navy and standing side by side with the boys from the North.

Conventions, as the D. A. R., the Colonial Dames, the Women's Federation of Clubs, and religious convocations are bringing us closer together, so that we are beginning to know each other and love one the other.

I think the Spanish-American War did more than any other one thing to make us understand each other. The soldiers of the North camped in the southern states. Two regiments of Pennsylvania troops were stationed in our town, Athens, Ga. They began to understand conditions with us in Georgia, and knew better how to sympathize with us in solving those problems so perplexing to us in the South. We met those soldiers, many of the officers were invited to our homes, and so we learned to know them.

Then, too, such a speech as President Taft made to us on Tuesday night will tend greatly to make us a reunited people. (Applause.) Ah! how that touched our hearts. We can never forget it. (Applause.) We may forget many things that this Convention may bring forth, but his words will linger long in our memory. Again, words from such men as Corporal Tanner will bind us close together—men who are brave enough and true enough to their own side, and to their own principles, and yet broad enough and true enough to see our side, too. (Applause.)

And so the day is fast coming, a day of peace. God grant that peace may soon reign in all hearts, so that we may be a nation known as a God-fearing people; a people that will stand for temperance—that temperance that will not harm our brother man; a people that will stand for purity—that

purity that will make for pure manhood and womanhood; a people that will stand for honesty—that honesty of conviction and principle that will dare to do the right thing and the just thing. May we stand before all nations as the greatest people on the earth—a people that knowing right will dare to do right.

And when I urge upon you, Daughters of the Confederacy, to write the truth of history and to teach it to your children, it is with no desire to arouse in your hearts and minds nor in their hearts and minds any animosity or bitterness, but that all may intelligently comprehend the principles for which our fathers fought. Teach your children to resent their being called rebels and traitors, and let them know that our fathers fought so valiantly in order that they might preserve constitutional liberty. (Applause). We will never be condemned for being Confederates, but the whole world has a right to condemn us, if we are disloyal to truth and to our native land. (Prolonged applause).





# Address

Delivered By

Miss Mildred Lewis Rutherford

Historian General  
United Daughters of the  
Confederacy

---

Thirteen Periods of United  
States History

---

New Orleans, La.  
Thursday, November 21st, 1912

1875  
A. L. L. L.  
1875

# Thirteen Periods of United States History

## THE SOUTH'S PART IN MAKING HISTORY.



LAST year at Washington, you remember, your Historian-General sounded a very sad note; this year she is able to sound a far more cheerful one.

Twenty-one of twenty-two State Divisions have reported systematic work along historical lines; six, of the eleven States having no Divisions, have also reported progress; and some individual chapters have sent most valuable contributions recording Southern events.

This advance has been a great encouragement, and it has made me feel that if such advance continues in the same proportion each year, it will not be long before the South shall be placed where she rightly belongs in the annals of history.

I bring you this evening sixteen volumes, averaging 400 pages each, which I have prepared for you in scrap book form. These bound volumes are not for publication, but are compiled for the convenience of the future historian. I desire, after indexing them, to be permitted to place them in our Confederate Museum at Richmond, Va., so that there shall be no excuse hereafter that the truth concerning the South is not available.

As State Historian of Georgia, I have twenty-six similar volumes pertaining to Georgia history; as the historian of my own chapter I have eleven volumes concerning Athens history.

Do you not see the possibilities in our work? Each State Historian has the opportunity of compiling her own State history; each Chapter Historian, her own local history, putting it into scrap-book form, binding it, indexing it, and having it ready when it is needed.

I had hoped to bring you this evening twenty volumes instead of sixteen, but four of these volumes could not be completed because you failed to do your duty.

Our President-General urged you to send the history of your State Division—only eleven States responded, so that volume is incomplete. I urged you in my Open Letter to send information regarding the disputed points, connected with our Confederate history, also your state's part in the making of our

history, and the names of our great men of the South in Science, Art and Invention from your State. Very few responded to these requests, so the three other volumes consequently remain unfinished.

Now, Daughters of the Confederacy, while it is true that we are making an advance in collecting and preserving this history, are we really doing all that we can do? Have we in the past done all that could have been done? I answer without hesitation, I do not think so.

We are far too prone to believe that the history of the South is included in the four years of the War Between the States and the seven years of reconstruction which followed. While this is undoubtedly the pivot upon which our Southern history does turn, we should not neglect to know and to teach the events which led to this period, and the results which have followed.

To my mind there are thirteen well-defined eras or periods of United States history. In eight of these eras the South has been pre-eminent; in four the North has been pre-eminent; in one we have shared the honors.

I wish very much that time would permit me this evening to take period by period and show you just what rightfully belongs to the South. As it is, I shall only have time to give you a glimpse of the many good things that we may claim.

May I suggest that the Chapters take these Thirteen Periods for their Historical Programs next year, using these instead of a Year Book? If this is done the next Convention will report marvelous progress in a knowledge of Southern history. The amount expended in Year Books can then be given to our Arlington and Shiloh monuments, and greatly facilitate those objects.

While the Mason and Dixon line was drawn to settle a dispute between the states of Pennsylvania and Maryland regarding their boundary, I shall use that line to separate the colonies and states of the North from those of the South.

One hundred years or more had passed since Columbus discovered America, when Queen Elizabeth, realizing that Spain was not only gaining great wealth by her possessions in America, but that she was also planting a religion that was not Protestant, granted to Sir Walter Raleigh, one of her favorites, permission to organize a company for the purpose of establishing settlements in the New World in England's name. This settlement was called for the Virgin Queen, Vir-

ginia. It extended from "the northern boundary of Florida on the South to the St. Lawrence River including the Great Lakes on the North, and from the Atlantic Ocean on the East to the Great Sea on the West." So you see that every colony, at the time of the War of Independence, had practically been settled on Virginia's soil. Eight of these colonies were in the North and only five were in the South. Those in the North included in area 164,000 square miles, while those in the South included 824,000, five times the extent of territory.

Let us now begin with the *Early Colonial Period*, the first of our history.

Not only was the Jamestown colony in Virginia the *first* permanent English colony in America, but it was the *first* to have an Assembly, a written Constitution, a trial by jury, an endowed college, a school house, a school for Indians, a missionary to the Indians. *First* to have a preacher, to build a church, to have a marriage ceremony, a baptism, a Thanksgiving Day (1609), a hospital, a physician, an orphan asylum. *First* to Christianize the negro, to stand for liberty of conscience, to stand for religious freedom, to demand the right to will one's property, to have a library, to have a free library, to have a circulating library, to have free schools, to have a colonial currency, to write a book, to have a Sunday School, to have a hymn book, to have a court house, to have a post office. *First* to have a tavern, to have an iron furnace, to plant cotton, rice, indigo, potatoes, and grapes, to discover the love-apple now our tomato, to build a ship, to build a Masonic Temple, to make bricks, to leave a legacy to the poor—yes, first in many things I have not time to mention.

"Whitaker's Good Newes" was the *first* book ever written on America's soil, although it had to be printed in England. Edwin Sandys wrote the *first* book ever printed in America, although it was printed on a New England press. Dryden said Sandys was "the best versifier of his age," and Alexander Pope gave him high praise. William Strachey in 1609 wrote his "Shipwreck at Sea," which suggested to William Shakespeare his great play, "The Tempest." The first Literary Society in the United States was at Charleston in 1748 and it is in existence today.

John Smith, of the Jamestown colony, not only discovered New England and Plymouth but named them, and advised the Pilgrim Fathers to come to them! There were eleven plantations or burgesses in Virginia with negroes on them, and a

population of more than 4,000 people before the Mayflower ever sailed for America. So we must not believe that everything good and great in those early days originated in the Plymouth Rock colony, as history represents it. We have in the South the oldest city in the United States, St. Augustine, and Jamestown you know was "The Cradle of the Republic."

Had it not been for the victory at Bloody Marsh in 1742 there would have been no colonies to declare their independence. The Spaniards in Florida had fully determined to take possession of all the land claimed by the English from the boundary of Florida to the St. Lawrence River, and this they could easily have done. Oglethorpe with his brave 682 Georgians and two poorly equipped ships met 5,000 Spaniards, well-disciplined and well-equipped, with 56 ships well-provisioned at Bloody Marsh on St. Simon's Island, not far from Frederica, and trailed, for the first time on America's soil, the Spanish flag in the dust.

George Whitfield said "That victory was like one of the Bible victories where God fought the battle for His people." But for this battle there would probably have been no Bunker Hill, no Saratoga, no Cowpens, no King's Mountain, no Yorktown, and Spain would be ruling where America rules today. New York acknowledged this, Pennsylvania acknowledged it, so did New Jersey and the other colonies and wrote to Oglethorpe testifying their indebtedness to Georgia for the victory he had achieved.

Surely the South may claim to be pre-eminent in this the first period of our history!

Turning now to the second or *Later Colonial Period*. It had ever been a principle with the British government that those governing only could levy taxes. It was with this understanding that all of the colonies were settled. When England, contrary to this agreement, began her acts of oppression, such as the Importation Acts, Navigation Acts, acts forbidding the colonies to trade with the West Indies or even among themselves, the colonies began to show a spirit of resistance. But this resistance began with no thought of separation from the mother country, and this thought came only when they were denied a voice in the levying of their taxes. As far back as 1659 Gov. Fendall of Maryland, outraged by the arbitrary acts of the Lords Proprietors at a meeting held at Robert Slye's house declared Maryland a Republic. Culpepper, of North Carolina, appointed Courts of Justice and imprisoned the

president of this colony 100 years before the Declaration. In 1719 South Carolina dismissed her Lords Proprietors and chose her own governor. You well remember Nathaniel Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia, and North Carolina's trouble with her governor, and Georgia's arrest of hers.

But the "Child of Independence" was really born in 1735 when Charles Pinckney in the South Carolina Assembly said, "South Carolina has as much right to make her laws and levy her taxes as England." You were not taught that in history, were you? Your children are not being taught it now. I was taught, and so were you, that "The Child of Independence" was born twenty-six years later when James Otis, of Massachusetts protested against the "Writs of Assistance."

In 1764 when Lord Grenville, the Prime Minister of England, announced in Parliament that the American colonies must be taxed by an act of Parliament, not by colonial act, in order to defray the war debt incurred by the French and Indian wars, there arose a war cry—"Taxation without representation."

The Stamp Act Convention in New York followed. South Carolina sent Christopher Gadsden to represent her. When he said, "British lawmakers have no right to make laws for the colonies," Massachusetts publicly rebuked him for his "intemperate speech." Soon after this those brave North Carolinians seized a vessel and confiscated all the stamps she had on board.

The celebrated Tea Party then took place. By the way, history as it is now written, makes so much of this tea-party at Boston with its disguised men to throw tea overboard, and says little of that one at Charleston when the tea was thrown overboard in broad daylight by men with no disguises, and the one at Annapolis, Md., about the same time and the tea openly thrown into the sea.

Jonathan Bryan, of Savannah, called a meeting in 1769 to protest against the Stamp Act, and Gov. Wright dismissed him from the Council. The Boston Port Bill followed. Who issued the Non-Importation Act, refusing to trade with England or the West Indies until Boston was relieved? John Hanson of Maryland. Who came in loving sympathy to aid Massachusetts? The Southern colonies. Washington said, "I will equip, if need be, a regiment of soldiers at my own expense to relieve poor Massachusetts." Georgia said, "I will send her 600 barrels of rice and the equivalent of \$720 to aid

her." North Carolina said, "I will send an equivalent of \$10,000 to her," and South Carolina said, "I will also send her rice and money." George Mason wrote to his daughters in Virginia that when the services were held to pray for the relief of Massachusetts, they must go to those services in deep mourning. Patrick Henry said, "An insult to Massachusetts is an insult to Virginia!"

The ball of the Revolution really started, for this was the first public act of defiance, when Patrick Henry made that speech in the House of Burgesses in Virginia in 1774, when he said, "Cæsar had his Brutus, Charles I. had his Cromwell, and George III.—" The cry arose, "Treason! treason!" Pausing for a moment he added, "may well profit by their example. If this be treason, make the most of it." That ball continued to roll and gained an impetus until his memorable speech in the St. John Church at Richmond, beginning with, "We must fight if we would be free," and ending with those memorable words "but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." Those words "liberty or death" became the battle cry of the Revolution.

Following closely came the Mecklenburg Declaration in North Carolina, May, 1775. Then in June of the same year South Carolina declared for independence, and in July following the Liberty Boys of Savannah, Georgia, called a Congress and practically annulled the objectionable acts of Parliament, questioned the supremacy of the British crown, and advocated statehood. They erected a liberty pole, the first in the South.

But the boldest act was when in September, 1775, the Council of Safety of South Carolina, at Fort Johnson, tore down the British flag and raised the flag of South Carolina—a blue flag with a white crescent in the corner bearing the word "Liberty." When the Virginia Assembly met, Pendleton, I forget his first name, Edmund, I think, wrote a set of resolutions and, because he was presiding, asked Thomas Nelson to read them. The resolutions were to the effect that a delegate be appointed to go instructed to present at the Second Continental Congress a set of resolutions that the colonies be declared free and independent states. Richard Henry Lee was this delegate. Thus it was a Southern man offered the resolutions for freedom, (Lee); a Southern man was appointed to give the Summary of Rights to answer Lord North, (Jefferson).



A Southern man was made chairman of the Committee of Correspondence, (Dabney Carr)—remember, we had no railroads nor telegraph wires in those days—a Southern man organized the first troops for American independence (Hanson, of Maryland), a Southern man was made commander-in-chief of the army, (Washington), commander-in-chief of the navy, (James Nicholson), three Southern men were appointed to arm the colonies, and nothing could have been done had not another Southern man, (George Mason, of Virginia) given his Declaration of Rights.

So can any one dare say that the South was not pre-eminent in this the second period of our history?

The colonies would have declared for freedom earlier had not the French and Indian wars kept their thoughts at home. But even in those Indian wars, who was the hero of Kaskaskia, Cahokia and Vincennes? George Rogers Clark, of Kentucky, and but for Clark and his brave men all of that Northwest Territory would now be a part of Canada. Who were the heroes of Council Bluff? Lewis and Clark. Who were the heroes of Point Pleasant? Selby and Lewis. Who was the hero of Duquesne and Great Meadows? George Washington. And did not Burgoyne say his men feared above everything the riflemen of Daniel Morgan of the Shenandoah?

Now let us see the South's part in the *War for Independence*, the third period of our history.

We are too apt to think that this began with Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, but remember that the battles of Alamance, Lexington, Ticonderoga, Crown Point, Bunker Hill, Quebec, Moore's Bridge and Charleston, were all fought before July 4, 1776. Again, why do we find in history so much said of those 19 patriots at Lexington, and scarcely a word of those 200 patriots at Alamance? When Clinton went to South Carolina, why did he fail to seize Sullivan's Island? Ask William Thompson of South Carolina. Who refused to surrender Charleston to Gen. Prevost? Ask Col. Moultrie. Who was the hero of Fort Moultrie? Sergeant Jasper. Who was the hero of Moore's Creek Bridge? Richard Caswell. Who of Ramsour's Mill? Col. Moore.

Then for two and a half years, it is true, the war was fought on Northern soil, but Virginia troops were in every battle, our Washington was the leader after Bunker Hill, and Georgia sent the first schooner against the British, and Joseph Habersham, of Georgia, seized all the powder in the mag-

azine at Savannah, besides 14,000 pounds captured from a British ship, and sent it to be used at the Battle of Bunker Hill. North Carolina sent the powder that was used at Boston! Who was the hero of Trenton, Princeton, and Monmouth? George Washington. Who was the hero of Saratoga? Daniel Morgan of the Shenandoah. Who was promoted for bravery at the siege of Savannah? Samuel Davis, of Georgia, the father of our Jefferson Davis. Who were the heroes of Kettle Creek? Elijah Clarke and Dooly of Georgia, and Pickens of South Carolina. Who was the hero of Hanging Rock? Thomas Sumter of South Carolina. Who were the heroes of King's Mountain? Campbell of Virginia, Sevier and Selby of the Watauga Settlement. Thomas Jefferson said that was the decisive battle of the Revolution. Who was the hero of Blackstock's Ford? Thomas Sumter of South Carolina. Who were the heroes of Cowpens? Morgan and William Washington of South Carolina. Cornwallis lost one-third of his army at this battle. Who was the hero of Yorktown? Thomas Nelson of Virginia. Who was the Swamp Fox of the Revolution? Francis Marion of South Carolina. Who was the *Game Cock* of the Revolution? Thomas Sumter. Who were those Partisan Leaders that did such valiant service for Carolina and drove Lord Rawdon from Charleston? Marion, Sumter, Pickens, and Lee.

While the Americans had no regular navy, there were heroes on the sea, nevertheless. Who gained the victory over the Serapis if not John Paul Jones of North Carolina, and, finally, to whom did Cornwallis surrender? To our Washington. Five-eighths of the men who fought in the Revolution were from Southern colonies, and nearly every leader of renown was from the South.

George Bancroft, a Northern historian, said, "South Carolina endured more, suffered more, and achieved more than any of the other colonies," and Reed of Massachusetts, testified that it was the gallantry of Southern men that inspired the whole army.

This brings us to the fourth period of our history—*The Period of Adjustment*.

When the surrender took place, Cornwallis sent to Washington his sword, and Washington received it. As the soldiers marched away Washington said to his men, "Let there be no loud huzzahs, no loud acclaims, posterity will huzzah for us." Such was the magnanimity shown by our great commander.

Does this not recall to us that General Grant acted with equal magnanimity to our Gen. Lee and his barefoot Confederate braves, except there was no sword incident. Gen. Lee never offered his sword to Gen. Grant, nor did Gen. Grant demand it.

The army gathered around Washington and offered him a crown. "No," he said, "my home is my throne, my crown shall be the love of my people," and he devoted his energies to adjust the new states to their new form of government.

When the colonies renounced their allegiance to the English crown, who presided over that Continental Congress to welcome Washington in 1781 after the surrender? John Hanson, of Maryland. A committee had been appointed just after the Declaration of Independence in 1776 to prepare Articles of Confederation by which they could be governed until a more stable form of government could be established. I have never been able to find who wrote these Articles of Confederation. There is nothing strong in them, for they allowed money to be borrowed to carry on war but made no provision to pay it back. They allowed an army to be called, but provided no way to equip it. They would not allow any taxes to be levied. They allowed treaties to be made without provision to bind the nation to keep them.

The States realized their weakness and refused to sign them at first. A convention was called later, in 1777, to discuss them. Henry Laurens, of South Carolina, was made President. The States did not adopt them until 1779, and then under protest. When the Treaty of Paris was signed, 1783, giving peace to the colonies, that Treaty made each colony an independent and sovereign State, not a nation, so no State felt there was anything binding in those Articles to force payment of the war debt.

Alexander Hamilton, "The Financier of the Revolution," advised with Washington as to the propriety of calling a Convention at Annapolis to revise the Articles of Confederation. Only five States sent representatives and not one was from the South. Then Washington advised that a Convention be held at Philadelphia, and he urged all States to send delegates. Twelve States were represented. Washington was asked to preside, James Madison was made Secretary, and but for Madison, we would not today have any record of that Constitutional Convention of 1787. It was found impossible to revise the Articles of Confederation, so it was proposed to

form a National Government with executive, judicial and legislative departments. Edmund Randolph of Virginia, said "Leave out the word National." Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, (a nephew of Charles Pinckney, of 1735), said, "We must have a head," and he suggested that the head be called President. Then he also proposed that Congress be divided into the House of Representatives and a Senate. When it came to the question as to who should vote, Maryland, Rhode Island and the smaller States objected to a vote by population on the score that too much power would thus be given the larger States, especially Virginia. Virginia, magnanimous then as she ever has been magnanimous, yielded without a question her claim to all of that Northwest Territory from which were made the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan and a part of Minnesota. Then when the question of the vote of the slave-holder came, it was a Northern delegate, I think from Connecticut, who proposed that the slave-holder should have three votes for every five slaves. Thus slavery became distinctly entrenched within the U. S. Constitution, and that too at the suggestion of the North.

James Madison was the one who wrote the Constitution. Gladstone said it was the greatest State paper every written. When it was first presented for adoption, Patrick Henry said, "Who said, 'We the people?' It should be 'We the States,'" and so insistent was he that State Sovereignty should be stressed, that ten amendments became necessary before he would consent for Virginia to sign it. North Carolina waited a year before she signed it, and Rhode Island waited two years. There was never a doubt in Massachusetts's mind that the Constitution gave the right to a State to secede, if her rights were ever interfered with. Many times she threatened to secede and no other State ever questioned her right to do it. Even Daniel Webster, that great statesman of the North, so interpreted the Constitution to mean State Sovereignty.

When the question arose of paying the war debt, South Carolina and Georgia paid more than their share and more than any other State unless Massachusetts be excepted.

Do you not think then that the South was pre-eminent in this period?

May I not pause here for a moment to make a statement which I think is just? While I am lauding Southern men and the part they played in the making of the Nation, I would not have you believe that I wish to overlook the great work done

by the great men of the North, for there were great men at the North. We can never as a people forget the debt the country owes to Samuel Adams, John Hancock, Robert Morris, Washington's friend who really financed the Revolution from his own personal means, nor John Jay, Rufus King, John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, Israel Putnam, James Lawrence, Stephen Decatur, and many others, including Lafayette and our other foreign friends. But there is no danger that these men ever will be forgotten, for their deeds have been and will be always well recorded in history. What I am so earnestly stressing tonight are the unrecorded deeds of unrecorded heroes. The North is right to place before her young people the heroism, the fortitude, and the valor of the great men of the North, and so should we of the South, place before our young people the heroism, the fortitude and the valor of the men of the South.

Thomas Nelson Page says, "We are becoming more and more one people and the day is not far distant when there will be no South to demand a history." Are you willing to allow history as it is now written to go down to posterity? I am not. It represents our forefathers of the Revolution as "breeders of tyrants," "fomentors of treason," "defenders of slavery." It represents our Confederate fathers as "indolent, vain, haughty," "semi-barbarious, only saved by Northern civilization, illiterate, cruel slave drivers who strove to disrupt the Union in order to preserve the institution of slavery." That "secession was heresy, unconstitutional, untenable, and treasonable." It says also that our fathers of today are "annulling the Constitution, falsifying the ballot, and trampling under foot a weaker race because of race prejudice." It says "President Davis, Alexander Stephens, Howell Cobb, Robert Toombs and other rebels should have been hanged as traitors at the close of the Civil War."

It has been a surprise to me that a people so proud of its ancestry, so assertive of its rights, so jealous of its reputation should be so indifferent to the preservation of its history.

Do you wonder that I urged so strenuously this morning at our business meeting that we have a Chair of Southern History in the Teachers' College at Nashville, Tenn., endowed by the U. D. C.?

Ah! how I wish I could make you, Daughters of the Confederacy, realize the importance of having our Southern teachers taught the truth of Southern history. Here in our

midst Southern young men and Southern young women are teaching in Southern schools the things unjust to the South, *and do not know it*. Why? Because they were taught from Northern text-books and they think it must be right, and they are still using Northern text-books. How can we expect the writers of Northern text-books to know what we do not know ourselves? No, Daughters, it is full time for the teachers of the South to realize this injustice to the South.

You ask, "Why put that Chair of History in Tennessee?" Because Tennessee has the only Teachers' College in the South, and George Peabody who endowed it was a Marylander—only English by adoption.

I hope the day is not far distant when there shall be in every university and college in our Southland such chairs endowed by the states and named as memorials for the great *men of the South and men of the South who really know Southern history placed in charge of them*. How I should rejoice to see such a chair at our State University in Georgia and named for an honored graduate, Crawford W. Long, the discoverer of anaesthesia, the greatest boon poor suffering humanity has ever known. And Georgia is going to have it some day.

Daughters of Florida, you should do the same for your Dr. Gorrie who taught us to manufacture ice. What a boon that has been in the sick-room and the hospital service!

But I must hasten. We come now to the fifth period of our history, *The Constitutional Period*.

I tried to show you at Washington last year how large a part Southern men had in the "Building of the Nation," so I will not repeat. Much concerning that period will be found in that published Washington Address.

It was under the administrations of Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, Polk and Taylor that that vast extent of territory, 2,100,000 square miles, two-thirds of the entire area of our country, was added to the United States. Indeed no very large territory was added under any other administration, unless we except Alaska, and that was added under a "so-called" Southern President, Andrew Johnson of Tennessee. But for these wise statesmen, France, Mexico, Spain and Russia would have firm foothold in our America today.

There was only one "Era of Good Feeling," and that was in Monroe's administration. There was only one Monroe Doctrine and that came from a Virginia son. It has been the

most dominant political question of more than a century. Europe has stood before it perplexed and baffled.

It was during Southern men's administrations that the cotton gin was invented and patented by a Southern man, Joseph Watkins, of Georgia; the steamboat became a possibility from the brain of a Southern man, James Rumsey, of Maryland, or William Longstreet, of Georgia; the passenger railroad propelled by steam became a possibility in a Southern State, South Carolina; the reaping machine by a talented Southern man, revolutionizing harvesting, Cyrus McCormick, of Virginia; the civil service reform which was first suggested by a Southern woman, Miss Perkins, of South Carolina; and the sewing machine which was first invented by a Southern man and used by a Southern woman, Francis Goulding, used by his wife. The Smithsonian Institution was given to the United States by England under a Southern man's administration (Polk).

John Tyler of Virginia held the first Peace Conference. The American Navy was born under Jefferson's administration. It was Washington's far-sightedness that kept America from being involved in the French Revolution.

My! how many things we can claim for our dear old misrepresented Southland.

The following are all Southern men. Do you know from what States?

The Father of the Constitution, Madison?

The Father of his Country, Washington?

The Father of the Declaration, Jefferson?

The Father of States Rights, Patrick Henry?

The Bayard of the Revolution, John Laurens?

The Great Expounder of the Constitution, John Marshall?

The Supreme Political Thinker of the Age, George Mason?

The Cincinnatus of Mt. Vernon, Washington?

The Great Pacifier, Henry Clay?

The Great Nullifier, John C. Calhoun?

The Pathfinder of the Ocean, Matthew Maury?

Fiske, a Northern historian and so unjust in many ways to the South, says that the five men who shaped the American Nation were Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Marshall and Hamilton—four from the South.

This brings us now to the sixth period, *The Second War of Revolution, or the War of 1812.*

Have you ever seen a true history of this period? I have not. The North did not want war with England, especially the New England States. Why? Because there was at that time in Massachusetts a spy from England arranging for the annexation of the New England States to England. You know, of course, that Massachusetts threatened to secede if war with England should be declared? No one knows what took place at that Hartford Convention, for the proceedings were kept secret, but it was well understood that the New England States wished to secede. It was Henry Clay that saw the danger. Not that he thought that those States had not the right to secede, but he did not wish to see the Union destroyed, and he felt that war must be declared to prevent any future interference with American seamen. William Lowndes, of South Carolina, said, "Massachusetts must remember that injury to her commerce is also injury to the South's agriculture." It was necessary that war be declared before the New England States could secede. Fortunately Henry, the spy, turned traitor, and those states had nothing to do but to aid in carrying on the war, although the government had to compel their militia to serve in their country's defense.

James Madison was the President at this time; Henry Clay was the Speaker of the House; John C. Calhoun of South Carolina, a member of Congress; William H. Crawford of Georgia, Secretary of War; George Campbell of Tennessee, Secretary of the Treasury; and Felix Grundy of Tennessee, a member of Congress. It was Langdon Cheves of South Carolina, who offered a resolution to increase the navy by forty-five frigates and twenty-five ships of the line. The United States navy had only 16 ships, England had 830. It was John C. Calhoun who offered the resolution declaring war. James Madison was inclined to veto the bill, but Henry Clay said that it would lose him all chance for renomination by the South, so he signed it. Henry Clay was asked to be the commander-in-chief of the army, but Congress said he could not be spared as Speaker of the House. Harrison of Virginia, was put over the forces in the Northwest; Hampton, the grandfather of our Confederate Wade Hampton, over the forces in the North; Andrew Jackson in the South. Every one of the six frigates afterwards so well known in the War of 1812, among them the Constitution, Wasp, and Hornet, were built at Norfolk, Va., and built of Georgia wood!

Rogers of Maryland fired the first shot from the *President*



into the *Little Belt*. Maryland suffered most because her coast was so exposed, but she has the honor of giving to our nation its National Anthem, "Star Spangled Banner," written at this period by her son, Francis Scott Key.

Andrew Jackson was the hero of the Battle of New Orleans, the greatest victory over the British on American soil.

The histories you studied and the ones you are now allowing your children to study will tell you that nothing was achieved by the Treaty of Ghent which brought peace. Indeed, one history will tell you "The War of Independence was directed by a Higher Power, but the War of 1812 was an exhibition of unwarranted folly. It was brought on by the political ambition of such men as John C. Calhoun and Henry Clay, and the country at large has had to suffer for the personal ambition of these two political demagogues."

What ignorance! That war was just as necessary to secure freedom at sea from England's rule as the War of Independence was to gain freedom on land, and it effectually secured not only this freedom from British interference, but from interference by all other nations at sea. There can be no doubt that it increased respect abroad for the United States as a Nation, and greatly strengthened the national spirit at home. It sounded the death knell of the Federal party.

Who were the heroes of Fort Meigs, Fort Stephenson, The Battles of York and the Thames and Lundy's Lane, but Harrison, Grogan, Johnson and Scott? Who led that famous "Cockade" in 1812? Richard McRae of Virginia. See that monument at Petersburg, Va.

When the war began the British Navy was singing "Britannia Rules the Waves," but when the war ended American seamen were singing, "Hail, Columbia, Happy Land."

Was not the South pre-eminent in this period?

*The War With Mexico* is the seventh period of our history.

Have you ever asked yourself the question, "Why so many of the men who fought in the Mexican War were from the South?" It is officially stated that two-thirds were. A Southern man was in the White House, the two leaders were Southern men, and the heroes of nearly every battle were from the South. The South has been misunderstood and therefore misrepresented by the historians of this period of history.

The Missouri Compromise of 1820 left the negroes congested in the Southern States, for after Missouri was admitted as a State there could be no slaves above a certain degree of

latitude. Now there were many men in the South very anxious for the gradual emancipation of the slaves, for we were beginning to realize that under the institution of slavery the negro was the free man and the slaveholder was the slave. There were many who did not believe in slavery, but having inherited this property did not know how best to get rid of it. They realized what it has taken the North fifty years to learn, that it would never do to free them in the midst of an Anglo-Saxon race born to rule. Abraham Lincoln realized it, for he was trying in every way up to the time of his death to arrange for the colonization of the negro in Central America or Liberia. Edmund Randolph realized what it would mean. He wanted to free his slaves, but he said, "We have a wolf by the ear, to let him loose is dangerous, to hold him is equally dangerous."

Thirty-two times the Virginia Legislature tried to abolish the slave trade. Massachusetts was the first State to legislate in favor of it, and Georgia was the first State to legislate against it. There were 130 abolition societies in the U. S. before 1850, and 106 were in the South. We had 5,175 members and the North only had 1,162.

By this War with Mexico the men of the South hoped for an extension of territory so as to make the gradual emancipation of slaves a possibility.

Santa Anna had acknowledged the independence of Texas, but Mexico refused to acknowledge it, so when Texas was admitted as one of the United States, war was declared.

The independence of Texas had been gained just as the independence of the colonies, by right of arms. Can we ever forget those heroes of that conflict between Texas and Mexico? Moore, Houston, Fannin, Bowie, Crockett, Austin, Travis, Bonham, and many others equally as brave. Can we ever forget our heroes of that War with Mexico?

Who was so highly commended for engineering skill, but our beloved Robert E. Lee? Who was the hero of Buena Vista? Our Jefferson Davis. Can you not hear him now as he said, "Come, Mississippians; cowards to the rear, brave men to the front?" and those brave sons of Mississippi aided by equally brave Kentuckians followed their leader to victory. Who won Brazeto and Sacramento and captured Chihauhua? William Doniphan, "the Patrick Henry of Kentucky." Who was the hero of Chepultepec? Thomas Jackson, our Stonewall. Who were the heroes of Palo Alto, Matamoras, Resaca de la Palma? All Southern men.

Who planted the U. S. flag in the City of Mexico? Quitman of Mississippi. Who first scaled the ramparts of Monterey? Rodgers of Alabama. And was not Daniel Hill of South Carolina called the bravest soldier of that war? And who wrote "The Bivouac of the Dead," which immortalized these heroes? Theodore O'Hara of Kentucky.

Yes, Southern arms surely deserve the renown of that victory.

We are now brought to the eighth period of our history, *The South on the Defensive, or the Abolition Crusade.*

I said that the South was pre-eminent in the last period, but was she allowed to reap the reward of her victory? Not at all. Seward and other Northern politicians gathered in Convention at Pittsburg, Pa., and arranged to so legislate that no slaves should be in this newly acquired territory. This naturally made the South indignant, for she resented the many acts of injustice that had been shown to her. She had been unjustly treated in the Tariff Acts of 1830 when Hayne and Calhoun of South Carolina boldly contended for her rights. Hayne said, "It is unconstitutional for a government to make laws to enrich one section and impoverish another," and he was right. The hiding of runaway slaves, and believing their representations of plantation life rather than the representations of the Christian men of the South caused increased resentment. Thirty thousand of our negroes, the property of the planters, had been encouraged to run away and hidden from their owners by means of the so-called "Underground Railways" at the North, and sent across the line to Canada.

As in family life, a child is punished if disobedient, so in plantation life a disobedient and unruly negro had to be punished. Discipline had to be maintained on the plantation as in the home. Now it was more agreeable for that negro to run away and cross the border line where he knew he would be protected than to receive his just punishment. And it was perfectly natural for this kind of negro to exaggerate his threatened punishment. He told the abolitionists that we yoked them to plows to cultivate our fields, and the abolitionist willing to believe this did so, not realizing that the negro was our salable property and that a \$60 mule would be much cheaper for his work than a \$1200 negro. He said that we used dogs to tear their flesh when we used bloodhounds to track the runaway. If an overseer, and these overseers were rarely Southern men, whipped a negro cruelly, as did sometimes happen on the large

plantations, but not oftener than parents sometimes whip cruelly a child, that overseer was at once dismissed. Had no other reason than a selfish reason prevailed, a slaveholder could not afford to have his property injured by brutal treatment.

Harriet Beecher Stowe's "Uncle Tom's Cabin" was founded on one of these cruel misrepresentations by a negro from a Mississippi plantation. Mrs. Stowe, of course, really believed it to be true. But that book did more than any other one thing to bring on the War between the States. The South felt powerless to stem the tide of popular belief at the North, so fanatical did these political abolitionists become.

A Georgia lawyer, Thos. R. R. Cobb, brought out about this time a book, "The Law of Slavery," which really is a most remarkable production. Every available authority upon the subject of slavery among all nations was carefully studied and quoted. Coming about the time of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" it was suppressed in the North, and the war coming on prevented a second edition in the South. When William Lloyd Garrison heard that this book proved that the institution of slavery was defended by the Bible, he said, "Better then destroy the Bible," showing to what length his fanaticism led him. Fourteen Northern States passed "Personal Liberty Bills" and were violating the Fugitive Slave Law which was included in Henry Clay's Omnibus Bill. The South feeling that this Omnibus Bill was unjust to her, accepted it, hoping to bring peace, when these same Northern States, violating the law, urged the election of Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States, and he was elected without a single electoral vote from the South, the Southern States felt no right would be respected and it was full time to secede.

Yes, the North was pre-eminent in this period of our history.

The ninth period is *The War Between the States*.

Eleven States rapidly seceded and the Confederate government was formed at Montgomery, Ala. The blockade came almost with secession. Had the South found a market for her cotton and tobacco possibly the surrender would never have taken place. Or had the prisoners been exchanged as President Davis and Gen. Howell Cobb so strenuously urged, Gen. Lee would not have been obliged to surrender. Of one thing I am assured the horrors of Andersonville Prison could have been averted.

Do you ask would it have been better had the South been victorious? I must say No, God knew best. Far better to have a Nation as we now have with such a man as Woodrow Wilson at the head, supported by those strong Democratic leaders from North and South, wisely doing the things which stand for right, than to be Sovereign States, as we would have been, the prey of any petty republic which desired to interfere with us.

The war did not begin with the firing on Fort Sumter. It began when Lincoln ordered 2,400 men and 285 guns to the defense of Sumter. The surrender was not due to Federal victories, but to Confederate exhaustion. The Confederate forces were 1 to 5. One hundred and seventy-five thousand men surrendered to 1,050,000. The North lost as many men at the battles of Wilderness and Spotsylvania as were lost in the French and Indian wars, the Revolution, the War of 1812 and the Mexican War combined.

Yes, the North came out pre-eminent in this period of our history.

You know this history better probably than you do any other, so I shall rapidly pass to the next, which is the eleventh—*The Humiliated South or The Reconstruction Period.*

After the surrender the soldiers returned to their homes, where homes remained, oppressed and depressed. They literally had nothing left but the ground upon which they stood. Families scattered, negroes freed, banks closed, no currency available. The slaveholder knowing less than his overseer and slaves about the practical part of farming. The lawyer had no clients, the teacher had no pupils, the merchant had no credit, the doctor had no drugs. Ah! it was pitiful! Georgia and South Carolina suffered most on account of the desolation caused by Sherman's March to the Sea.

This was the time when those women of the Confederacy showed of what stuff they were made. They put their loving arms about those husbands and sons and they said "We are not conquered, we are just overpowered, and we think it was better that you fought, even if you did not win, than never to have fought at all. The South is going to come out all right, you wait and see." What prophets they were, for is not the South today the Nation's greatest asset?

They began to collect the bodies of the Confederate soldiers scattered over the battlefields, placing them where they could care for them, and where they could deck those graves with flowers. Then they began to erect monuments over them.

The men said, "We cannot help you, for we are under an oath of allegiance." The women said, "We are under no oath," and the work went on. Ben Butler, in Louisiana, said we should not build monuments to our Confederate dead, and so said Meade, in Georgia, but we did it anyway, didn't we? They did not know Southern women. More monuments stand to the Confederate soldier today than to any other soldier of any other nation who ever fought for any cause.

Had not Lincoln been assassinated, all would have gone well even then, for the negroes still loved their old owners, and did not wish to leave them. Indeed they were like little children, they did not know how to make a living for themselves, and they did know that "ole marster" would never let them suffer. Lincoln's death was the worst blow that could have befallen the South. Lincoln was not such a great negro lover as has been represented in history. He was Southern born and knew the true relation between the owner and his slaves. It is true he did not believe in slavery, neither did Washington, nor Jefferson, nor Mason, nor many other leading men of the South. Stonewall Jackson never owned but two slaves in his life and they begged him to buy them. But Lincoln was an intense Union man, and he determined to preserve the Union at all hazards. If he could do it with slavery, all right; if not, slavery must go. His Emancipation Proclamation did not free the negroes as a race. It freed your father's slaves, and my father's slaves, but it did not free Gen. Grant's slaves, nor the slaves in Missouri, Maryland, Kentucky, Delaware, and other States where slaves still remained after the War. This Proclamation, the result of a rash vow, was only a measure to punish the seceding States. He had said in his Inaugural Address the South need not fear his interference with their slaves. The slaves were not really freed until a Southern man, John Henderson of Missouri, proposed the 13th Amendment to the Constitution after Lincoln's death. But had Abraham Lincoln lived, he never would have stood for that Reconstruction measure of Thad Stevens. We would never have been put under military rule and divided into Districts; we would never have had the Freedman's Bureau to humiliate us; he would never have stood for social equality in the South, he knew the thought of the people too well; we would not have had that rule of the carpet-bagger and scalawag in the South, and I am perfectly sure he would never have stood for that Exodus Order of Thad Stevens's, which more than any other one thing is responsible for

the present day negro problem. That Order tore more children from their parents than was ever done in all the years of slavery by any slave block.

That Stevens saw that the negroes were remaining with their old owners and he could not accomplish the plans laid for social equality of the negro in the South. He told them if they remained with their former owners they would be made slaves again, and ordered that no two families could remain upon the same plantation. This caused a separation of families and a rending of ties and a fearful alienation between whites and blacks followed. The faithful mammies would not leave "marster's white chile," and that is the reason so many were found many years after freedom still with their former owners.

Oh! Daughters of the Confederacy, members of our Indiana Chapters, there was a friend of the South from your Indiana in those awful Reconstruction days. As our Mr. Cunningham has been instrumental in erecting a memorial to Mr. Owens who was so good to our prisoners during the War, so I would like to see you erect some memorial to that Democratic Congressman so anxious to help the South in this hour of her need. I refer to Dan Vorhees, of Indiana. He said it was a shame to make dead provinces out of living States. He said the South was a white man's country and should be kept so, but that Reconstruction Committee would not listen to his pleading.

The Ku Klux Klan was an absolute necessity in the South at this time. This Order was not composed of the "riff raff" as has been represented in history, but of the very flower of Southern manhood. The chivalry of the South demanded protection for the women and children of the South.

Yes, the North was pre-eminent in this period of our history, but does not the South stand out in no uncertain light? It has proven to the world that she can be as brave in defeat as in victory; she can stand humiliation and lawlessness with Christian resignation; she can bear and forbear, and yet suffer in silence; and while having far more to forgive and forget, she has a heart ever ready to do the things that make for peace, and stands ready today to stretch forth her hand in the true spirit of reconciliation.

The record of the Confederate soldier, the heroism of the Confederate women, the monuments erected to Southern valor have caused the whole world to be lost in admiration and wonder.

Now comes *The Second Period of Adjustment*.

It was very hard for our Southern men unused to manual labor of any kind to try to adjust themselves to the new order of things in the South. It really was easier for the women than for the men, and some men never did get adjusted, and some women have never been reconstructed.

The kitchens in the old civilization were never in the house, but some distance from it. There was no need that they should be in the house then, for there were plenty of young negroes to run back and forth with the hot waffles, the hot egg bread, the biscuits and the battercakes. But when the women of the South had to go into the kitchen after the negroes left, or had become too impertinent to be allowed around the house, the inconveniences were greatly felt. You must remember there was rarely such a thing as a cooking stove before the War. All cooking had to be done in an open fireplace, with oven and pots. There were no water works, and all water had to be drawn from the well or brought from the spring. There were no electric lights, no gas lights, no kerosene lamps even, and lard lamps were really a rarity used only by the rich. The dependence for light were wax, tallow and sperm candles. The wood had to be cut and the chips had to be picked up, and all this consumed time and required great patience. This was the beginning of the breaking up of home life in the South and it proved the death blow to the old time Southern hospitality. Things began to brighten, however, as the years rolled by, for the new homes in the South began to add the kitchen to the house and conveniences were gradually introduced, so that with gas stoves, electric plates and fireless cookers our Southern women are as independent today as the women of the North, and can cook as good a meal with as little trouble, and wash and iron too, if need be. They really have more sympathy and more patience with the negro help than the women of the North, and really are more anxious to aid the negroes in the right way.

The twelfth period is *The Industrial South or The South Coming to Her Own*.

We had been an agricultural people before the War between the States, and were satisfied to be. We never realized the possibilities in our grasp. We did not know that we had 9,000,000 horsepower in our streams of the South. We did not know that we could make anything worth while out of the cotton seed we were yearly throwing away. We did not know



that there was untold wealth lying beneath our feet, but we know it now. South Carolina first began to realize the possibilities in her cotton mills. She discovered that she was selling her cotton crop every year to Massachusetts for \$30,000,000, and Massachusetts was making it into cloth and thread and selling it for \$100,000,000. The thought came, "Why may I not keep that money in my own State?" and that is what South Carolina is doing today, and other Southern States are following her example.

I think the Spanish-American War did much to make the South realize her own powers. At least it made the two sections know each other better. That war taught us loyalty to the United States flag, which we had not loved during those four years of war, and during those seven years of Reconstruction which followed. But when our boys put on that uniform of blue, and fought under the Stars and Stripes side by side with the boys of the North we began to feel it was our flag as much as it was the flag of the North. The South showed that she was again loyal to the Union, for more volunteers from Southern States, in proportion to population, went to that war than from any of the Northern States, and our boys made themselves known, too.

Who was commander-in-chief of the Atlantic Squadron? Winfield Scott Schley. Who was made Minister to Havana? Fitzhugh Lee. Who was called "The Wizard of the Saddle?" Joe Wheeler. Who commanded the Brooklyn when Cervera's fleet was destroyed? Schley. What vessel fired the first shot of the war? The "Nashville," commanded by Maynard of Tennessee. Who fired the first shot at Manilla? Stoakley Morgan of Arkansas. Who was promoted for gallantry on the field? Micah Jenkins of South Carolina. Who shed the first blood of the war? John B. Gibbs of Virginia. Who was the first to fall in battle? Worth Bagley of North Carolina. Who was Dewey's right-hand man? Tom Brumby of Georgia. Who was the hero of Santiago Bay? Winfield S. Schley. Who was the backbone of the Santiago campaign? Joe Wheeler. Who sank the ships to block the enemy and saved the day? Hobson of Alabama. Who raised the flag at Manilla? Brumby of Georgia. Who was sent with a message to Garcia? Rowan of Virginia. Who was sent to count the ships in Santiago Bay? Victor Blue of South Carolina. Every one our Southern boys. Then who was put in command of the American troops in the Philippines? Ewell S. Otis. Who was made Governor

of the Philippines? Luke Wright of Memphis. And does this not show our boys of the South equalled in courage and heroism the boys of the North?

Who shall say then, that we did not share the honors during this period of our history?

And now we come to the thirteenth and last period of our history—*The Triumphant South*.

Do you know that three-fourths of all the cotton in the world is raised in the South? Do you know that Europe pays the South annually \$600,000,000 for her cotton, and that is only one-third of the products the South supplies to her? Yes, Cotton is King, and that American king was born in Georgia. Do you know that three-fourths of all the sulphur mined in the world comes from the South, and all used in the United States comes from Louisiana? Do you know that Louisiana sulphur mines dominate not only the sulphur trade of America, but all Europe? Do you know that three-fourths of all the coal in the U. S. is in the South? Do you know that seven-eighths of all the forest area of the United States is in the South? Do you know that the only diamond mines out of Africa are in Arkansas? Do you know that all the phosphate beds of the United States are in the South?

Do you know that Tennessee's coal is better than Pennsylvania's coal? Do you know that Georgia's marble is better than Vermont's marble? Do you know that Texas' oil wells produce annually 85,000,000 barrels of oil—far more prolific than those of Pennsylvania? Do you know that Joseph Watkins of Georgia patented the cotton gin one year before Eli Whitney? Do you know that the largest cotton warehouse in the world, covering 161 acres of land, is in Memphis, Tenn.? Do you know that Georgia mills are making velvet, and Georgia mills are making the thread from which are made those beautiful curtains in your Philadelphia homes? Do you know how many lumber mills there are in the South? Ask the *Manufacturer's Record*. I know that the largest saw mill in the United States is in Arkansas. Do you know that the largest fertilizer plant in the world is in Charleston? Do you know that the largest sulphuric acid plant is in Tennessee? Do you know that lead was first mined in Mississippi?

Do you know that our corn equals that of Iowa? our wheat that of Illinois? our oats that of Ohio? our apples those of the East? and that our Georgia peach is the best in the World?

Do you know that Dr. Seaman Knapp, for whom Tennessee's Agricultural College is named, was a Louisiana man? Do you know that the pioneer of scientific agriculture was Edmund Ruffin of Virginia? Do you know that "The Rural Philosopher" was John Taylor of Virginia? Do you know that the first professor of economics and statistics was James De Bow of Louisiana?

I do not believe you know what our Agricultural colleges are doing to make the South realize her own greatness. One county in Georgia has 41 different kinds of soil, and experts are finding out all sorts of things about our Southern soils. Why, we are furnishing food and fibre for the world, and there lies beneath our feet yet untold undeveloped wealth. The South has 55 different minerals.

We have no right to cry hard times in the South, it is a disease we have caught from others. Our nearness to Panama will make us the center of the world's trade, and Panama would not be habitable, would it, but for our William Gorgas of Alabama? As we have one-half of the sea coast of the United States, the South will be the logical point for the future naval displays of the world.

No, we do not realize our own greatness, because we do not know our own country. It is a great country this United States of ours. It spans a Continent; it is the youngest, yet it is the noblest of all the nations of the world. Nature has really seemed partial to the South, for while she has given great stretches of land to the West much of it is barren waste. While she has given great fertility to the North and East half the year, there is icy bleakness the remaining half. To the South she has given almost perpetual spring; we scarcely know when summer ends and winter begins; when winter ends and spring begins. Half way between icy bleakness and tropical heat, partaking of the advantages of both but not injured by the disadvantages of either. We have soil and climate the most wonderful in the world; rainfall abundant but not in excess. Situated in the latitude of the Holy Land we are the home of the orange, the pineapple and the banana; the home of the rose, the jasmine and the oleander; the home of the palm and the live oak and the magnolia; the home of the pomegranate, the apple, and the peach; the home of the pecan, the walnut and the chestnut, to say nothing of the watermelon, "the 'possum and the 'taters."

Bathed on the East by the Atlantic Ocean, tempered by the

warm waters of the Gulf Stream; on the South by the tepid waters of the Gulf of Mexico; on the West reaching to Mexico and California, the land of flowers; protected on the Northwest, by the grand old Rockies from Alaska's icy blasts. The Mississippi, "The Father of Rivers," flowing through our entire length of States; the Appalachian range on the eastern shore, with its highest peak in North Carolina; the Blue Ridge running toward us and ending in that geological monstrosity—our Stone Mountain of Georgia. Nature has worked wonders in our midst—the Mammoth Cave in Kentucky, the Natural Bridge in Virginia, the bottomless Blue Spring in Florida, and the Tallulah Falls of Georgia.

Are we teaching patriotism to our children? Do you ask me, "What is patriotism?" My! What magic in the word. Love and loyalty to home and country. Love as tender as that of a mother for a child; loyalty so unselfish as to forget self. Patriotism is the spark that kindles the Nation's fire; it is the fountain from which the Nation's prosperity flows; it is the helmet that shields the Nation's life; it is the shield that guards the Nation's home.

Patriotism is inborn and if you have it not, you are abnormal. (Laughter.) It should begin with love of God, then love of home, then love of country, then love of State, then love of place. America is a Christian country, ours by Divine gift. Liberty is God's acknowledgement that we are capable of receiving the gift.

Our government has no model, nothing like it in the world. A government of the people, by the people, for the people. Benjamin Hill, our "silver-tongued orator" said, "It was planned not by human wisdom but by Divine guidance. The Romans never dreamed of it; the Greeks never could have conceived it; the European mind never could have evolved it." Alexander Stephens said that the creed of patriotism is "Improvement of the mind, erection of schools and temples of learning, interest in the things that make for industry, and good will to all men!"

A patriot is one who saves his country's honor. You were patriots, Veterans, for you saved your country's honor, and now, God bless you, you have lived to see your country's triumph. Everything you fought for has been acknowledged by those against whom you fought. Even Harriet Beecher Stowe's son, Rev. Charles Stowe, has publicly said that there was a rebellion but it was the North that rebelled against the Constitu-

tion: that slavery could not have been the unmitigated evil it has been represented to be, or one could not account for the faithfulness of the slaves when the men of the South were at the front; that there was undoubtedly some good in a civilization which could produce such a beautiful Christian character as "Uncle Tom."

Veterans, "heroes in grey, with hearts of gold," it was harder to live after the war than it was to face the bullets on battlefields, wasn't it?

Yes, the South is triumphant today! She is not only the Nation's greatest asset, but she is the world's greatest asset. This is the Golden Age—an age of great power, buoyant strength, great wealth, and freedom to run an unhindered race. But we must remember that there is a danger in golden ages. Hannibal lost the fruits of his victories by the orange groves and vineyards of Campania. Mark Antony lost his by the alluring charms of a Cleopatra. Let us then beware lest greed of gold, selfishness, or intemperance engulf us. Let the public weal be as the apple of our eye. Let us keep the ballot box pure. Let duty ever be our watchword.

Sail on, thou great and mighty Ship of States, sail on over billows and through storms and seas, sail on.

May balmy breezes and gentle winds waft thee into a safe and quiet harbor. May thy keel be strong, thy sails pure and white. May duty be thy polar star. Sail on, sail on, undaunted by Mexico's threatening waves, by Panama's alluring charms, by selfish trusts, by tariff blasts, yes, by women's votes, sail on, and thou shalt surely enter into Rest and Peace, if we as patriots will only firmly stand, and knowing the right dare to maintain it.

One last word:

Now, Daughters of the Confederacy, teach, I pray you, your children this:

"Though we were overpowered, we were not degraded,  
Southern laurels have never faded;  
All is not lost unto us,  
Only baseness can undo us.  
Kneeling at your country's altar  
Teach your children not to falter  
Till the right shall rule in Dixie."



# Address

Delivered By

Miss Mildred Lewis Rutherford

Historian General  
United Daughters of the  
Confederacy

---

Wrongs of History Righted

---

Savannah, Georgia  
Friday, Nov. 13, 1914

## REFERENCES:

- I. CAUSES THAT LED TO THE WAR BETWEEN THE STATES.
  - The United States Constitution.
  - The South: Constitution and Resulting Union—Dr. J. L. M. Curry.
  - George Bancroft's United States History.
  - Life of Stonewall Jackson—Henderson.
  - The South in the Building of the Nation. 13 Vols.
  - The Abolition Crusade—Hilary Herbert.
- II. THE INSTITUTION OF SLAVERY IN THE SOUTH.
  - The Old South—Thomas Nelson Page.
  - Religion and Slavery—Rev. James H. McNeilly.
  - The Old Virginia Gentleman—Bagby.
  - History of the United States—Percy Greg.
  - The Old South and the New—Charles Morris.
  - The Story of the Confederate States—Derry.
  - Civil History of the Confederate Government—Curry.
- III. JEFFERSON DAVIS *VS.* ABRAHAM LINCOLN.
  - Davis:
    - Memoirs of Judge Reagan.
    - Higher History of the United States—H. E. Chambers.
    - The History of the Confederate States Navy—Scharff.
    - Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government—Jefferson Davis.
  - Lincoln:
    - The Life of Abraham Lincoln—Herndon, 1st ed.
    - The Life of Abraham Lincoln—Herndon & Weik.
    - The Life of Abraham Lincoln—Lamon.
    - The Life of Abraham Lincoln—Nicolay & Hay.
- IV. POLITICAL DIFFERENCES.
  - Alexander Stephens in Public and Private with Letters and Speeches—Cleveland.
  - Morse's Lincoln.
  - Congressional Records.
  - War of the Rebellion.
  - Barnes' Popular History of the United States.
  - The Confederate Veteran.
- V. BARBARA FRIETCHIE—MYTH.
  - Letters from Whittier and testimony of others who lived at that time.
- VI. ANDERSONVILLE PRISON AND TRIAL OF MAJOR WIRZ.
  - War of the Rebellion—Congressional Records.
  - Life of Benjamin H. Hill—B. H. Hill, Jr.
  - The Southern View of Andersonville—Dr. R. R. Stevenson.
  - Andersonville Prison from a Prisoner's Standpoint—James M. Page.
  - Autograph Letters from Andersonville Prisoners.
  - Letters from General Grant to General Butler, City Point, August 18, 1864.
  - Address to U. C. V. by Dr. Kerr, Corsicana, Texas.
- VII. CRUELITIES IN NORTHERN PRISONS.
  - Constitutional View of the War between the States—Alexander H. Stephens.
  - The Official Acts of the Confederate States.
  - Letters from Alexander Stephens.
    - Ulysses S. Grant.
    - Jefferson Davis.
    - Robert Ould.
    - John E. Mulford.
    - Ben. Butler.
  - Articles in "National Intelligencer," Washington, D. C.



## Wrongs Of History Righted



MY OBJECT this evening is not to stress the omissions of history, but rather to urge that some of the wrongs that have already entered history be righted. We of the South have borne too long and too patiently the many misrepresentations concerning us, and we cannot afford to be patient longer. There is hope that some of the omissions may enter future history, but what hope can there be of these misrepresentations ever being righted if we neglect to do it now? They have condemned us; they are condemning us; and they will continue to condemn us, if we longer remain indifferent. Let us remember what Dr. Curry said, "If history as now written is accepted it will consign the South to infamy."

When sons and daughters of Veterans write articles for newspapers and magazines, condemning the principles for which their Confederate fathers fought, and even stand for a changed Constitution that will overthrow the very bulwark of the South—state sovereignty—it is full time for the Daughters of the Confederacy and Veterans to become insistent that the truths of history shall be written, and that those truths shall be correctly taught in our schools and colleges.

So long as we send our Southern boys to Harvard to be taught "The Essentials of American History" by Dr. Albert Bushnell Hart, so long may we expect them to question the principles for which their fathers fought. Now understand, I do not object to Dr. Hart, who is a scholar of renown, teaching the Hamiltonian theory of the Constitution to his Northern boys, for that is as they should be taught, but our Southern boys should be sent to Southern universities to be taught the Jeffersonian theory of the Constitution. And so long as we have teachers in our educational institutions who have been taught by Dr. Hart, or by teachers who believe as Dr. Hart teaches, so long may we expect our sons and our daughters to be untrue to the South and the things for which the South stands.

The responsibility is yours, mothers and fathers, to know the training your children are receiving; to know by whom taught, whether true or false to all we hold dear. Only in this way can we stem the tide of falsehoods that have crept in, and are still creeping into the newspapers in our homes, into the books in our libraries, and into the textbooks that we are allowing to be used in our schools.

I understand that in one of our leading universities of the South during the past year two of the professors stated in their classrooms that the South had never produced a great man. Think of it! A section which gave the author of the Bill of Rights, the author of the Declaration of Independence, the author of the United States Constitution, the author of the Monroe Doctrine; a section that gave the commander of the forces of the Revolution, the leaders both on land and on sea of the War of 1812, both leaders of the War with Mexico, the leaders North and South in the War between the States, and the men most prominent in the Spanish-American War; a section that gave the first President of the United States, indeed gave twelve Presidents to the United States, as well as the President of the Confederate States; a section that gave a Robert E. Lee, and a Stonewall Jackson; a section that gave an Edgar Allan Poe and a Sidney Lanier; a section that gave a Matthew Maury and a Crawford W. Long—yes, a section that gave Woodrow Wilson, the man of the hour and the man of the age, said to have never produced a great man!

Where could these men have been educated but in some anti-South atmosphere! Shall such men as these be allowed to teach the youth of the South true history?

My object tonight is to urge you, Daughters of the Confederacy, to aid in having these wrongs of history righted, and when I urge you to do this, I urge you to do it without bitterness or prejudice or narrowness. As we demand truth and justice, that we must give. Let us be careful to rule out of our Southern textbooks anything that is unjust to the North, and justice compels me to say that wrongs to the North have at times entered into some of our books by Southern writers. Then, too, let us in our search for truth be ever ready to give authority for every statement we make, and require the same of others.

While there are many misrepresentations concerning us in the history which antedates the sixties, yet in my limited time tonight I must confine these misrepresentations to the period

which pertains to the War between the States. And, Daughters, I mean the War between the States.

Ours was not a CIVIL WAR, so let us correct that wrong first. The United States was a Republic of Sovereign States. We were not a Nation until the surrender left it impossible for a state to secede. A civil war must be in one state between two parties in that state. If we acknowledge that ours was a CIVIL WAR, we acknowledge we were a Nation, or one State in 1861 and not a Republic of Sovereign States, and therefore had no right to secede. This is what the North would like us to acknowledge.

It was not a WAR OF SECESSION as some would have us to call it. The Southern States seceded with no thought of war. They simply wished to have a government where their rights, reserved by the Constitution, should be respected. The war was caused by the North attempting to coerce us back into the Union, contrary to the Constitution, and for no reason save that the states of the South demanded their rights. If we call it a War of Secession we admit the seceding states brought on the war.

It was not a WAR OF REBELLION, for sovereign states cannot rebel, therefore secession was not rebellion. This is acknowledged now by all thinking men.

It was not a WAR OF SECTIONS. The North did not fight the South, for brothers were arrayed against brothers in many cases. There were many men of the South who enlisted on the Union side. There were many men of the North who enlisted on the Southern side. Both North and South were contending for a principle and not because they hated each other.

It was the WAR BETWEEN THE STATES, for the non-seceding States of the United States made war upon the seceding States of the United States to force them back into the Union. Please call it so, and teach it so.

## I.

A wrong to be righted must be the CAUSES THAT LED TO THE WAR BETWEEN THE STATES, for injustice is too often done us by ascribing wrong motives to our secession.

These causes far antedate the firing on Fort Sumter, so unfairly said to have begun the war. To really get at the root of the matter, we must go back to that Constitutional Convention in 1787, after the Treaty of Paris had left the Colonies free, sovereign and independent States.

Two political parties were formed at this Convention—the Federalists and Anti-Federalists. The Federalists, standing for a centralized government, were led by Alexander Hamilton, claiming that all states owed allegiance to the Federal government as the absolute head of the Nation. Now it was perfectly natural for Alexander Hamilton to take this view of the Constitution and think we were a Nation, for he was foreign born—a native of the West Indies. His father and mother before him had served a king, and while he had been sent at an early age to America to be educated, yet this love for and belief in monarchy was an inheritance.

The Anti-Federalists, later called Republicans, but far different from the anti-South party of the same name today, organized in 1854, were led by Thomas Jefferson, standing for local self-government, and the right of any state to withdraw from the Union of States, when a right reserved to it by the Constitution was interfered with. It was perfectly natural for Thomas Jefferson to have this view of the Constitution. The plantation life in the old South made every planter a law to himself, and it was this that has made Southern men ever so tenacious of their State rights. You may say, Thomas Jefferson was in Paris in 1787 and not at that Constitutional Convention. That is true, but he had well instructed Madison, Henry, Randolph and Pinckney concerning the points to be stressed before any new document was signed by Southern States. The Constitution was not fully adopted, you must remember, until after Jefferson's return.

Climate and heredity made the two sections different from the very first—the Northern colonies standing for trade, manufactures, and commerce; the Southern colonies standing for agricultural pursuits and export—but so long as a balance of power was maintained, when voting time came, all went well.

The question of slavery did not enter into the platform of the two parties at all, for all states owned slaves, the right given by the Constitution, and they saw no harm in slavery. It is true the slave trade was a source of deep concern on the part of the majority of the states, and the Southern States seemed really more concerned about this than the Northern. Georgia was the first state to legislate against the slave trade; the Carolinas legislated against it as early as 1760; Virginia, in 1778, and in all "the old mother state" legislated against it 32 times. Thomas Jefferson's original draft of the Declaration of Independence had a protest against the slave trade, and John Ad-

ams of Massachusetts, advised that it be stricken out. Massachusetts was the first state to legislate in favor of the slave trade. New Jersey was the last state to legislate against it, and New York never did legislate against it, so really Massachusetts and New York were carrying on the slave trade in violation of the United States law as late as 1860.

At a glance one may see how unjust have been the accusations concerning the South in regard to the question of slavery. The trouble really between the two political parties was caused by a different interpretation of the Constitution as to what rights were reserved to the States, and whether the Union of States was a Nation or a Republic.

The invention of the cotton gin undoubtedly led to the war. On account of a cold climate, unfavorable to the negro's physical make-up, as well as because manufacturing interests were unsuited to negro labor, the Northern States sold their slaves, in large part to the Southern planters. This gave free labor in the South, and hired labor in the North. Great prosperity came to the South when cotton could be so easily raised and ginned, and there threatened to be an over-balance of voting power by the slave States. Sectional jealousies were engendered and contentions then began.

In 1803 when a Southern President and a slaveholder, Thomas Jefferson, secured the purchase of the Louisiana Territory, that large extent of acres, more than double the area of the other States at that time, Massachusetts was filled with alarm and threatened to secede and form a Northern Confederacy, and Josiah Quincy advised it on sectional grounds. When Jefferson assured them that he was not a President of a section but the President of the whole country, and that he would not violate the Constitution by giving one section an advantage over another, Massachusetts' fears were quieted.

When in 1811 trouble arose about the United States Bank, the legislature of Pennsylvania agitated nullification as justifiable by the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions. Why later was Calhoun villified for his nullification views? Again, there was trouble in 1812 when the New England States threatened to form a Northern Confederacy if war with England was declared. The South said there would never be freedom from England on sea unless war was declared, and only the great victory at New Orleans prevented the withdrawal of the New England States at that time.

Then in 1820 when Missouri asked to come in as a slave State, and because Missouri was cut out of the Louisiana Territory, Massachusetts feared too much power to slave States and again threatened to withdraw. Thomas, of Illinois, offered a compromise measure to forbid any State above 36° 30" latitude holding slaves. This bill was finally amended to except Missouri. In Northern histories, and Southern histories have followed their lead, it has been over and over again stated, and I have myself often made the same mistake, that Henry Clay was responsible for this amendment. It worried me greatly, for it was a direct violation of the U. S. Constitution, and a flagrant interference of State's rights. I hated to think a Southern man was responsible for it. You may imagine my delight when upon reading the "Life of Henry Clay" I found that he denied having anything to do with it. He was the Speaker of the House at the time and took no part in the debates on the floor. Eminent statesmen of the South felt the injustice of this compromise and did not hesitate to say so. John C. Calhoun never was reconciled to it. But it was finally accepted, just for the sake of peace.

In 1828 and again in 1832 and 1833 Tariff Acts were passed which were unjust to the South and a direct violation of the Constitution, because they favored one section over another. These Acts were such an interference with our States' rights that Calhoun stood for nullifying them—hence he was called "The Nullifier." I have never been able to understand why Calhoun should have been so villified when he proposed a Southern Confederacy at this time and nothing was said when Massachusetts and the New England States proposed a Northern Confederacy.

John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, was one of the real prophets of the age, for everything he warned us against has actually come true, and had we heeded him many valuable lives might have been saved. The "child of secession" was really born in that contest between Robert Y. Hayne of South Carolina and Daniel Webster of Massachusetts, over the Foot Resolutions.

The unequal disbursement of the funds in the U. S. Treasury was also felt to be unjust to the South. The South was paying into the treasury two-thirds of all the money there; yet the veterans of the Revolutionary War were paid three times the amount in pensions in the North that they were in the South; the appropriations for roads, harbors and rivers amounted to

five times as much for the North as the South and the money expended for internal improvements ten times as much; twenty-three lighthouses were in the North to ten in the South, and eighteen custom houses in the North to one in the South. The sea coast of the South was 3,000 miles in extent, and that of the North only 900 miles, yet five harbors were in the North to one in the South. Under these circumstances what could the South expect in just legislation?

In 1854 when Texas asked to come into the Union as a slave State, Massachusetts said then she must withdraw, for that would give too much slave territory. When war was declared with Mexico the North had few men comparatively to volunteer and when the cause was won by Southern arms the North, by legislation, tried to manage it so that the South should have no part of the acquired territory as slave territory. In 1847 the Wilmot Proviso was proposed, but fortunately did not become a law, but it showed the tendency of the Northern mind. In 1849 gold was discovered in California and the North wanted it to be a free State. By the Missouri Compromise it should have been half slave territory as half of the State was below the degree of latitude prescribed by the Compromise. Trouble was brewing when "The Peacemaker," Henry Clay, proposed his Omnibus Bill in 1850. This included the "Five Bleeding Wounds," namely:

Let California come in as a free State.

Let Utah and New Mexico come in free or slave as they desire.

Let the slave trade be excluded from the District of Columbia.

Let Texas be paid for the territory claimed by New Mexico.

Let the Fugitive Slave Law be enforced.

Now this virtually repealed the Missouri Compromise, but still it was violating States' rights. However, it was passed in the interest of peace.

While the South knew that some of these measures were unjust, yet to get back her slaves, for at this time 30,000 had been hidden from their owners, she was willing to adopt the compromise measures that grew out of this bill. Many Southern statesmen protested against it, and it only postponed the war ten years.

In 1852 "Uncle Tom's Cabin" appeared. This was such a misrepresentation of the institution of slavery in the South

that it brought just indignation to Southern people. It was so subtly written that it made the abolition sentiment stronger at the North, and really had much to do in bringing on the war, and much to do in keeping England, France and other European countries from recognizing the Southern Confederacy. The South felt this injustice keenly.

Then in 1854 the Kansas-Nebraska Bill proposed by Stephen Douglas passed. This led to Squatter Sovereignty, another violation of the Constitution and an interference with our States' rights. There is no doubt that John Brown's Raid grew out of this bill. The first gun fired in this raid may be said to have been the first gun of the War between the States.

John Brown was "an insurrectionist, an invader of States, an encourager of arson, and a murderer"—and this is quoting entirely from Northern authority. I could never understand how God-fearing men from the pulpits in the North have said that next to the Son of God John Brown was the greatest of martyrs. It has taken all the grace of Christianity for the South to forgive and forget this. However, the Federal Government quickly punished this offender, and also decided in favor of the South when the Dred Scott case came to trial. So we began to take hope that at last the South could fall back upon her reserved rights and be protected.

Another offense then came. The slave trade was being openly violated and no action was taken by the Federal Government to prevent it. It had been decided by law that the slave trade should cease in 1808, and yet as late as 1857 it was known that 75 slave ships had sailed from Massachusetts ports, and between 1859 and '60, it was known that 85 slave ships left New York, sent out by merchants carrying 60,000 slaves to Brazil. As late as 1857 the *Chlotilde* was sent to Mobile, Ala., with 175 slaves, and the following year the New York Yacht Club sent the *Wanderer* to Brunswick, Ga., with 750 slaves, and the next year it returned with 600 slaves and sailed up the Satilla and Savannah rivers and sold this cargo in violation of the law. An attempt was made by Georgia to prosecute two Georgians who were accused of encouraging the transaction, but they could not be convicted for complicity in the scheme. If the Federal Government ever punished Massachusetts and New York for violating the law it is not so recorded.

But the act which brought things to a crisis was the election of Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States,



without even a popular vote of the North, but by the vote of the fifteen States which had stood for these repeated violations of the Constitution and continued interferences with States' rights, and the States which took out the "Personal Liberty Bills," advocating a law higher than the Constitution so that they might still hide our slaves. By this time (1860), 50,000 slaves had been hidden from us. Unfortunately, the Democratic party split, having three candidates in the field—a warning that we must hereafter heed—and allowed Lincoln to be elected on the small vote of 1,831,000. There was nothing for the South to do but secede. She saw nothing but continued violation of the Constitution by the North dominated by the policy of these fifteen States and their candidate. How could she be blamed for seceding?

DID THE SOUTHERN STATES SECEDE WITH ANY THOUGHT OF WAR? No, they simply wished to peacefully withdraw and form a government which would respect their rights as reserved by the Constitution. It would have been a stupid thing for seven States to think of fighting all of the other States in the Union. The North had the army; the North had the navy; the North had all of the arms. The South had no arms except the small number of guns that Secretary Floyd had asked for, fearing another John Brown might rise, and those Jefferson Davis, then Secretary of War, had asked for to quell the Indian uprisings. Even then the full quota of arms which rightly belonged to the South had never been asked for.

Does it not seem in reason, if the South had had a thought of war at this time she would have demanded her full share of arms and ships? The South had no materials to manufacture munitions of war. That is, she did not know that she had sulphur, saltpetre, nitre and other needful things lying undiscovered beneath her soil, but she knows it now; she then had few manufactories; she only had one Powder Mill, that at Augusta, Ga., she did not own a ship, yet her Southern men in command of ships (there were 43 captains and 62 commanders in all from the South), when the States seceded, surrendered their commissions to the U. S. Government and came home to cast their lot with their States. Had they dreamed of war, they could have brought their ships south as they had a right to do. She did not have a shipyard where a ship could even be repaired. She had only 9,000,000 people from which to draw an army, and 4,000,000 of these were her slaves, while the North had over 31,000,000 and the whole world from which to draw

recruits. Think of war? No, she never dreamed of it. Some few of her statesmen feared it, but when suggested, Robert Toombs of Georgia, said he would willingly drink every drop of blood which would be shed by war.

The South only desired to take possession of the things which were rightfully hers. Texas demanded her forts and arsenal; so did Louisiana her custom house and fort; Mississippi, Alabama, Florida and Georgia their forts and arsenals; but when South Carolina demanded Fort Sumter, to the surprise of South Carolina, it was refused. Governor Pickens at once sent a request to President Buchanan to allow the fort to be surrendered peaceably. Assurances were given that this would be, and yet the Star of the West was sent with 200 men and arms to hold the fort. The first thing that the Confederate government did was to send a committee of three to Washington to ask the peaceable surrender of Fort Sumter. They waited there three months until President Lincoln had been inaugurated and then made the request. He refused to see the committee, but through Seward, and Seward through Judge Campbell, sent to them assurances that "faith with Fort Sumter would be kept." Now Lincoln and Seward both knew that when this message was sent, seven vessels filled with armed men had already sailed to garrison the fort. When time sufficient had elapsed for the vessels to land, then Lincoln wired Gov. Pickens that he had sent these men to Sumter peacefully if allowed to land, otherwise resistance would be made. Fortunately a storm prevented the vessels reaching the fort as soon as had been expected, so General Beauregard telegraphed for permission to demand the surrender of the fort. This permission was granted by the Confederate government. Anderson said he must wait for orders from headquarters. Beauregard answered that if the fort was not surrendered by a certain time it would be fired upon. It was not surrendered, so was fired upon. The firing of the first shot at Fort Sumter did not bring on the war, but the act which made the firing necessary declared war. The call of President Lincoln for 75,000 troops to coerce the South, without Congress' consent was a violation of the Constitution. Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee and Arkansas resented this and quickly seceded. Missouri, Kentucky and Maryland wished to secede, but were not allowed to vote on secession. This act of Lincoln calling for troops was in itself a declaration of war.

WAS SECESSION REBELLION? The very fact that President Davis and the leaders of the South could not be brought to trial disproves this. Chief Justice Chase said, "If you bring these leaders to trial it will condemn the North, for by the Constitution secession is not rebellion." Wendell Phillips said, and he was no friend of the South, "Looking back upon the principles of '76 the South had a perfect right to secede." Horace Greely said so, Lincoln himself said so, and Daniel Webster had said so.

I wonder how many present here realize that there have been eight distinct secessions in the United States and very many threatened ones.

1. The thirteen colonies seceded from England and formed a Perpetual Union under the Articles of Confederation in 1776.

2. The thirteen States seceded from the Perpetual Union and formed a Republic of Sovereign States in 1787.

3. Texas seceded from Mexico and became a Republic in 1836.

4. The Abolitionists, led by William Lloyd Garrison, seceded from the Constitution at Framingham, Mass., and publicly burned it, calling it a "league with hell and covenant with death," the assembled multitude loudly applauding.

5. Eleven States seceded from the Union in 1861 and formed a Southern Confederacy.

6. The North seceded from the Constitution in 1861 when she attempted to coerce the eleven States back into the Union.

7. Under President McKinley in 1898 the United States forced Cuba to secede from Spain.

8. Under Roosevelt in 1905 the United States forced Panama to secede from Colombia.

Why should all of these secessions be justifiable save the one by the South in 1861?

WAS THE WAR FOUGHT TO HOLD OUR SLAVES? Ah! how often have we of the South had this cast into our teeth and often by some of our own Southern people. Yes, it is full time this wrong should be righted.

Had the vote been taken in 1860 there would have been more votes against the abolition of slavery in the North than in the South. There were 318,000 slaveholders or sons of slaveholders in the Northern army, men who enlisted from the Border States, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Maryland, besides those from Illinois, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware.

There were only 200,000 slaveholders in the Southern army. Only five men out of every one hundred owned slaves in the South.

There were many men among the leaders of the Northern army who owned slaves themselves or were sons of slaveholders or had married women who owned slaves. Among these may be mentioned General Winfield Scott, Commodore Farragut, General George H. Thomas, General Grant; President Lincoln's wife came from a slaveholding family, and Stephen Douglas's wife was a very large slaveholder, while many of the leaders on the Southern side did not own slaves. General Lee had freed his. General Stonewall Jackson never had owned one until husband and wife begged him to buy them to prevent separation. General Albert Sidney Johnston never owned a slave, and General William M. Browne, a member of President Davis's staff never owned a slave. No, the war was not fought to hold slaves, but a few selfish Southern people may have thought so.

General Grant said, "If I thought this war was to abolish slavery, I would resign my commission and offer my sword to the other side." The North had no thought of fighting to abolish slaves, then why should the South be troubled on that score? President Lincoln sent word to General Butler that the war was not to be fought with any idea of freeing the slaves. President Lincoln was only concerned about the extension of slavery in the new territory, and frankly confessed to Horace Greely that if the Union could be preserved with slavery he would not interfere with it. It was the preservation of the Union he so ardently desired. He had no love for the negro in his heart. Don Piatt, who stumped the State of Illinois for him in his presidential campaign in 1860, said in one of his speeches that Lincoln had no love for the negro, "Descended from the poor whites of the South he hated the negro and the negro hated him, and he was no more concerned for that wretched race than he was concerned for the horse he worked or the hog he killed."

## II.

WAS SLAVERY A CRIME AND WAS THE SLAVEHOLDER A CRIMINAL? How little the people living today know of the institution of slavery as it existed in the South before the war. I long for the eloquence of our silver-tongued orator, Benjamin H. Hill, that I might paint the picture as I remember it.

If the roll call were taken of the children in the South to-day they would in large numbers be found to be abolitionists, intense and fanatical, and in full sympathy with the Northern side. Why? Because from childhood they had been taught by teachers who believe this, and have been fed on such children's books as "The Elsie Books," Louisa Alcott's stories, and kindred ones, besides being allowed to see moving picture shows of Uncle Tom's Cabin, Sheridan's Ride, Contest between Merrimac and Monitor, and the like. Whom can you blame for this, parents, but yourselves?

Slavery was no disgrace to the owner or the owned. From time immemorial all civilized nations have been slaveholders. White, brown and black have been slaves.

Who was responsible for slavery in the United States? Spain and England.

What colony first owned slaves? The Jamestown colony.

Was there any colony or State of all the thirteen which did not own slaves? Not one. In 1776 there were 500,000 slaves in America and 300,000 were in the Northern colonies.

What was the condition of the Africans when brought to this country? Savage to the last degree, climbing cocoanut trees to get food, without thought of clothes to cover their bodies, and sometimes cannibals, and all bowing down to fetishes—sticks and stones—as acts of worship.

What laws became necessary when they reached this country? Very rigid and in the light of the present day civilization excessively cruel. A strong argument for the civilizing power of slavery would be to compare these colonial laws with the laws of 1860.

How did the Cavaliers regard slavery? They were very thankful to have a part in such a wonderful missionary and educational enterprise.

How did the Puritans regard slavery? They thanked God for the opportunity of bringing these benighted souls to a knowledge of Jesus Christ.

How did the Quakers regard the institution of slavery? They were always opposed to the holding of any human being as property, although it is stated that William Penn did once own slaves.

DOES THE BIBLE CONDEMN SLAVERY?

It certainly does not. God gave to Abraham the most explicit directions what he should do with his slaves bought with his own money, and what he should do with the ones he owned

by right of capture. (Gen. xvii.) Then our Lord healed the centurion's servant and said not a word about it being a sin to hold him in bondage. (Matt. viii.) And Paul sent Onesimus, the runaway slave, back to his master with apologies, but said nothing to Philemon about freeing him, but rather offered himself to pay his master for the time Onesimus had stolen from him. (Phil. i:18.) And Titus was the pastor of a slave church. Paul wrote him to exhort those slaves to be obedient to their masters, not to answer back again, and not to steal, but to adorn the doctrine of God their Savior in all things. (Titus ii: 9, 10.) See also Eph. vi: 5, 6, 7, 8.

Did the slaveholder in the South take an interest in the religious condition of the negro?

He certainly did. More negroes were brought to a knowledge of God and their Savior under this institution of slavery in the South than under any other missionary enterprise in the same length of time. Really more were Christianized in the 246 years of slavery than in the more than thousand years before.

In 1861 there were, by actual statistics, in the seceding States 220,000 negro Baptists, 200,000 Methodists, 31,000 Presbyterians, 7,000 Episcopalians, and 30,000 belonging to unclassified Christian churches.

The negro race should give thanks daily that they and their children are not today where their ancestors were before they came into bondage.

Was the negro happy under the institution of slavery? They were the happiest set of people on the face of the globe,—free from care or thought of food, clothes, home, or religious privileges.

The slaveholder felt a personal responsibility in caring for his slaves physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually. By the way, we never called them slaves, they were our people, our negroes, part of our very homes. I do not remember a case of consumption, or I should say now tuberculosis, among the negroes in the South. I do not recall but one crazy negro in those days. Hospitals and asylums cannot now be built fast enough to accommodate them.

I am not here to defend slavery. I would not have it back, if I could, but I do say I rejoice that my father was a slaveholder, and my grandfathers and great-grandfathers were slaveholders, and had a part in the greatest missionary and educational endeavors that the world has ever known. There

never have been such cooks, such nurses or mammies, such housemaids, such seamstresses, such spinners, such weavers, such washerwomen. There never have been such carpenters, blacksmiths, butlers, drivers, field hands, such men of all work as could be found on the old plantations. Aunt Nanny's cabin was a veritable kindergarten where the young negroes were trained to sew, to spin, to card, to weave, to wash and iron, and to nurse; where the boys were taught to shell peas, to shuck corn, to churn, to chop wood, to pick up chips, to feed pigs, to feed chickens, to hunt turkey, duck, guinea, goose and hen eggs and to make fires, and to sweep the yards.

Did the negroes hate their owners, and resent bondage? I need only to call to mind what happened when John Brown tried to make them rise and murder their masters and their master's children. I need only call to mind what happened when their masters went to battle, leaving in absolute trust "Ole Miss" and the children to their protection. I need only call to mind what happened after they were free that made Thad Stevens' Exodus Order necessary in order to tear them from their old owners. I need only call to mind the many mammies who stayed to nurse "Ole Marster's" children to the third and fourth generation.

Compare the race morally to what it was then. "Ole Marster" never allowed his negroes to have liquor unless he gave it to them. Crimes now so common were never known then. While the negro under the present system of education may know more Latin and Greek, it does not better fit him for his life work. It is true the negro did not go to school under slavery, but he was allowed to be taught, if he so desired. I have in mind a young aunt who taught three negro women every night because they wanted to read their Bibles. I have in mind my mother on the plantation surrounded every Sunday afternoon teaching to the negro children the same verses of Scripture, the same Sunday school lesson, the same hymns that she taught her own children.

As in family life a child must be punished if disobedient, so in plantation life a negro had to be punished if disobedient. Even admitting that some overseers were cruel, will the most exaggerated cases of cruelty compare with the burning of the witches at Salem or the awful conditions of the captured Africans on the slave ships, or the fearful conditions in the sweat shops of Chicago and New York today? The slave was the property of the slaveholder and a selfish reason would

have protected him if there had been no higher motive.

No, the slaveholder was no criminal and slavery under the old regime was no crime. In all the history of the world no peasantry was ever better cared for, more contented or happier. These wrongs must be righted and the Southern slaveholder defended as soon as possible.

### III.

#### JEFFERSON DAVIS VS. ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Another wrong that must be righted is this glorification of Abraham Lincoln which redounds to the villification of Jefferson Davis. Our children are having too much of it in their text-books, too much of it in the newspapers, too much of it from the pulpits.

Had President Davis died in the cold, damp cell with manacles upon him, and had President Lincoln lived, Davis would have been the saint and Lincoln the sinner. It is not fair or just because Lincoln was the martyr that attributes which he did not possess should be given to him and handed down as truthful history.

I am perfectly willing to have President Lincoln receive the praise he justly deserves, for he was a remarkable man, and I would not detract one iota from what is his due. At the same time I am not willing to ascribe attributes to President Davis which he did not possess, for he was remarkable enough without them. Both men had their weaknesses and neither should be canonized.

Lest I should be accused of partiality when their lives are placed in parallel lines, I shall only quote from the friends of each. Both had enemies, vindictive and prejudiced; both had friends, loyal and true. This contrast truthfully and faithfully drawn will throw much light upon unwritten history. If injustice to either has been done, it has not come from any desire or intention on the part of the historian, for it is truth only that is sought.

Jefferson Davis was born in Christian County, Kentucky, June 3rd, 1808.

Abraham Lincoln was born in Hardin County, Kentucky, February 12, 1809.

There was a difference of eight months in their ages; they were born about 100 miles apart in the same State—both men Kentuckians of Southern birth.



Jefferson Davis came from a home of culture, refinement, luxury and religious influence.

Abraham Lincoln came from a home of poverty, no refinement, no culture and little religious influence.

Jefferson Davis had every educational advantage in youth. His first teacher was a loving, devoted Christian mother. He was then sent to an academy, then to college, then to West Point. His ambition was to become a great military leader.

Abraham Lincoln lost his mother when quite young. He attended school for a very short time. Thomas Lincoln's second wife was a very good woman and treated the lad kindly. He was sent from home at the age of nine, and then began the struggle for life. He did all kinds of hard work; he split rails, he worked on a ferry, he clerked in a store, and had no time for study except at night after a hard day's work. Often no light by which to study save the light from the fire. His ambition made him struggle on to acquire an education under the most adverse circumstances. His desire was to become a great political leader, and if possible the President of the United States.

Jefferson Davis in personal appearance was tall, erect, lean, with features very pronounced, and determination stamped on every lineament. He was always well groomed, perfectly at ease in his manners whether in the cabin of the lowly, the home of the wealthy, or the White House of the Confederacy. He always enjoyed social life.

Abraham Lincoln was tall, with stooping shoulders, thin and bony, with prominent features, but with determination written upon every lineament. He was never well dressed, his clothes having the appearance of being thrown at him. He was always ill at ease, whether in the cabin of the lowly, the home of the wealthy, or the White House of the United States. He hated social life; if possible, avoided it.

Jefferson Davis had little humor in his nature, and resented a practical joke. Life was always very serious to him. He was dignity personified, and his soldierly bearing forbade even his most intimate friends getting very close to him.

Abraham Lincoln loved jokes, indulged in them very frequently, and often his jokes were none too refined. His friends felt very near to him and enjoyed thoroughly his humor.

Jefferson Davis was very happy in his married life. His first wife was the daughter of President Zachary Taylor, his second wife was Miss Varina Howell, the daughter of a United

States officer. His home was in Mississippi on a large plantation, surrounded by every comfort to make his life a joy. Children came into the home-nest, and his children were obedient, talented and loving. Sorrow later came from the loss of two of his boys, but he knew the source of comfort and did not rebel.

Abraham Lincoln's married life was not happy. He had three romances connected with his early days. One, Amy Rutledge, belonged to his own social circle. Had he married her possibly his whole life would have been changed, but unfortunately she died while attending school. His other loves were Mary Owens and Mary Todd. He really loved neither, but in turn addressed each, became engaged to both, but advised both not to marry him, as he did not belong to their social set. It is said that Mary Owens jilted him, which greatly mortified him, but Mary Todd agreed to marry him. The day, January 1, 1842, was appointed, the bride and attendants were waiting at the church, but no bridegroom appeared. It is said that his most intimate friends were never able to account for Lincoln's behavior upon this occasion. Mary Todd forgave him, however, and married him one year later. It was a most unfortunate marriage, for she was not suited to make him happy, and while children came into the home, there was no real joy, for that can only come from a perfectly congenial atmosphere. He, too, lost one of his sons while living at Springfield, Ill., and he became very morose and melancholy, for Herndon and Lamon both said Lincoln had no Christian faith to sustain him.

Jefferson Davis was a slaveholder, and his father before him owned slaves. He was a kind master and his negroes were devoted to him. Even after they were free, when their former master returned home from two years' confinement in prison, they climbed about his carriage, calling to him affectionately, "Howdy, Mars Jeff, howdy. We sho is glad to see you." Then falling back and wiping the tears from their eyes they were heard to say, "Lord, don't he look bad."

The testimony of his body servant, who was with him when captured, if we did not have that of Judge Reagan and other of the cabinet members, would be sufficient to refute the awful falsehood of General Wilson's telegram, that he was disguised in a woman's dress when arrested. This faithful servant said, "When we heard the Yankees coming we were skeered to death, but old Boss he walked just as straight as if he was walking the streets of Richmond with Lee and Jack-

son. He was the bravest man I ever saw. I was sho the Yankees was going to hang him, but if he ever flinched nobody ever saw him. Folks may say what they please, but Mars Jeff sho was brave.”

Abraham Lincoln belonged to the poor white class in the South, who hated the negroes and they hated him. He was no abolitionist, and this is from his own testimony. His wife came from a slaveholding family, but probably owned no slaves at the time of her marriage.

Both men served in the Black Hawk War. Lieutenant Davis mustered into service Captain Abraham Lincoln of the militia. Neither distinguished himself in any way during this war. Davis later entered the Mexican War and won great renown. At Monterey he was wounded, at Buena Vista he was a hero, and later led the troops into Mexico City with great bravery. In his military life he was known as a fine disciplinarian, and while his soldiers feared him and dared not disobey him, they thoroughly respected him.

Jefferson Davis ran for the legislature and was defeated, afterwards was elected, became United States Senator, then a member of President Pierce’s Cabinet, as Secretary of War. He successfully reorganized the army, and was the first to suggest the trans-continental railway. He then became United States Senator under President Buchanan, and made a very long speech on State Sovereignty. When he heard his State, Mississippi, had seceded, he returned to cast in his lot with her. He was made Major General of the army, just what he most desired. When the Provisional Congress of the Confederate States met at Montgomery, Ala., he was chosen President without opposition. He did not seek or desire this honor, but ever went where duty called him.

Abraham Lincoln also ran for the legislature and was defeated, but afterwards elected. He became a member of Congress in 1846. Then in 1860 was a candidate for United States President on the Republican ticket upon an anti-South platform, and was elected.

President Davis served one year as President of the Confederacy, was re-elected for the second term of six years and did the best he could combating overwhelming odds. When General Lee surrendered, he was rapidly making his way to join the last division of the army under Kirby Smith in Texas, when he was captured at Irwinton, Ga., and taken prisoner to Fortress Monroe to await trial. A reward of \$100,000 was

offered for his capture. He was put in chains and treated with great indignities. Is it to be wondered at that he felled to the floor the blacksmith who came in to rivet the chains? He remained in prison two years. The United States authorities did not heed the requests from Judge Reagan, of Texas, and General Howell Cobb, of Georgia, for an immediate trial, which they knew would exonerate him, or greater leniency in the treatment of him. When it was discovered that a trial would condemn the North, by a statement from Chief Justice Chase to this effect, he was released from prison under bond, and Horace Greeley said, "I will go on his bond that the North may seem to be magnanimous." He returned to his home at Beauvoir, Miss., a gift from a devoted friend and admirer, Mrs. Sarah Dorsey. There he lived until his death, which occurred in New Orleans in 1889. He was buried in New Orleans, and his body later removed to Richmond, Va.

As Bishop Gailor said, "For twenty years he bore the obloquy of treason at the hands of those who were afraid to try him in a court of justice. For twenty years he was disfranchised and denied the rights of citizenship. Yet he never sued for pardon, nor ever asked a favor. Lonely and crushed, with a heart broken, his life was desolated in its prime. But through it all God gave him the courage of the finest manhood, and the purest purpose, and he died, as he lived, a Christian, praying for the welfare and happiness of his people. Truly he was a man without a country, yet he had a country in the hearts of his loyal Southern people—and in that country he ruled an unconquered king."

The soldiers, who had not agreed with him in many things during the war, realized later what he had borne for the South, and turned to him then in loving affection. At Macon, the last reunion that he was able to attend, some of the soldiers thrust into his hands an old tattered and torn battle flag. Taking it in both hands, he buried his face in its folds. Strong men sank to the ground and leaned on each other's shoulders, weeping like children. They felt then, as they feel now, that while the cause was not lost, the principles for which they contended being admitted Constitutional by all right-thinking men the world over, the life of their chief had been sacrificed for it, and their hearts were breaking.

Abraham Lincoln was afraid to go to Washington, so said his friend Lamon, so intense was the feeling against him; this feeling he feared more from his enemies at the North than at

the South. Lamon, as a detective, accompanied the President, who insisted upon going in disguise. His friends felt this was a cowardly thing to do, and reproached him for it. He served four years, and was re-elected over McClellan for another term, then he was foully assassinated by John Wilkes Booth. His body was carried to Springfield, Ill. President Davis's first exclamation upon hearing the news was, "This is the worst blow that could have befallen the South."

#### IV.

##### POLITICAL DIFFERENCES.

There was a very striking likeness in many ways between these two men, which has led some to falsely suggest some degree of kinship between them.

Both believed in the constitutional rights of the States.

Both believed in the right to hold slaves by the Constitution.

Both were opposed to social and political equality for the negro.

Both believed it would be disastrous to free negroes among their former masters.

Both believed only in educating the negro along industrial lines.

Both believed in the preservation of the Union, if possible.

Lincoln believed and urged the colonization of the negro. Davis believed in the gradual emancipation of the negro. He thought the South was the logical home of the black man, and that the Southern people better understood him and were most ready to make excuses for his shortcomings. He believed that in the South the negro could always find sympathy, protection, religious instruction, work and a home.

It has always seemed to me that when birthdays are being celebrated in the South the negroes had far better celebrate Davis's birthday than Lincoln's. He was their truest friend. Besides, it was Henderson's Thirteenth Amendment after Lincoln's death that freed them. Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation did not free all the negroes, and was only made to punish the seceding States. The negroes have been kept in such ignorance along these lines, and their false worship of Lincoln is pathetic.

Did President Davis have any trouble with his Cabinet? He certainly did. Alexander Stephens, his Vice-President, frequently disagreed with him. Some of his cabinet resigned. Some accused him of being imperious and partial. George

Vest said, "Had Davis's Cabinet stood by him notwithstanding they did not agree with him, the Confederacy would not have failed." Some of President Davis's generals felt that he favored pointedly West Point men over others better fitted to command.

Did Lincoln have trouble with his Cabinet? He certainly did. Ben Wade and Henry W. Davis issued a manifesto against him. Sumner, Wade, Davis, and Chase were his "meficious foes." Lincoln was forced to appoint Chase to the office of Chief Justice in order to remove him from the Cabinet, for he was said to be "the irritating fly in the Lincoln ointment." Stanton called Lincoln "a coward and a fool." Seward said he had "a cunning that amounted to genius." Richard Dana said, "The lack of respect for the President by his Cabinet cannot be concealed." He was called "the baboon at the other end of the avenue," and "the idiot of the White House." Had not Grant succeeded in gaining a victory at Vicksburg, a movement to appoint a Dictator in Lincoln's place would have gone into effect. His Cabinet had lost confidence in his policy.

Was Davis honest and true to his convictions? If by honesty is meant taking graft or accepting bribes, he certainly could never have been accused of either. If by honesty is meant true to any principle which he knew to be right, whether it was expedient or not, he most undoubtedly was honest, and true to his convictions.

Was Abraham Lincoln honest and true to his convictions? If by being honest you mean taking graft and accepting bribes, he certainly was honest, and won the title of "Honest Abe." But if by being honest is meant true to the things he believed, then Lincoln was not.

He wrote Alexander Stephens before he was inaugurated that the slaves would be as safe under his administration as they were under that of George Washington. Did he change his mind when expedient? He told a friend in Kentucky that if he would vote for him every fugitive slave should be returned. Was it expedient to return any? At Peoria, Ill., in 1854 he said, "I acknowledge the constitutional rights of the States—not grudgingly, but fairly and fully, and I will give them any legislation for reclaiming their fugitive slaves." Did he? He said the slaveholder had a legal and a moral right to his slaves. Was he honest when he violated the Constitution by freeing some of them?

He believed at one time it would not be constitutional to coerce the States, and then later he believed it would. A friend asked why he changed his mind. He replied, "If I allow the South to secede, whence will come my revenue?"

In 1848 and in 1860 Lincoln said the Southern States had a right to secede; in 1861 he said they would be traitors and rebels if they did secede.

No, Lincoln's convictions of right or wrong changed whenever expedient.

Did President Davis ever violate the Constitution? If he did his worst enemies have never been able to discover it. Secession was not a violation of the United States Constitution. When a President of the United States offered to give him the highest office in militia military service, an honor he most desired, he refused because he said that was a gift from the State, not the government.

Did Lincoln ever violate the Constitution? Sumner said when Lincoln reinforced Fort Sumter, and called for 75,000 men without the consent of Congress, it was the greatest breach ever made in the Constitution and would hereafter give any President the liberty to declare war whenever he wished without the consent of Congress. In his inaugural address Lincoln said he had no intention to interfere with the slaves, for the South had a legal right by the Constitution to hold them. Why then did he issue his Emancipation Proclamation to free the South's slaves? Did he not violate the Constitution when he sanctioned the formation of West Virginia, a new State taken from Virginia without Virginia's consent? Did he not violate the Constitution when he suspended the writ of habeas corpus, May 10, 1861, in the Merriman case? Yes, Lincoln violated the Constitution whenever he desired.

Was Jefferson Davis humane? He certainly was. When the soldiers were returning victorious from the first Battle of Manassas, and President Davis went out to meet them, he said that he commended their humane treatment of those 10,000 prisoners of war as much as he commended their valor, great as it was. When he was urged to retaliate for alleged cruelties to our prisoners at the North, his reply was, "The inhumanity of the enemy to our prisoners can be no justification for a disregard by us of the rules of civilized war and Christianity." *The Richmond Examiner* said that this humane policy of the President would be the ruin of the Confederacy. His heart went out in agony over the suffering of the Andersonville

prisoners, and his inability to help them because of the refusal to exchange prisoners, and to send medicines.

Was Abraham Lincoln humane? When Alexander Stephens, a personal friend, went on to Washington to plead for a renewal of the cartel to exchange prisoners, owing to a congested condition at Andersonville beyond the power of the Confederate government to relieve, he put this request on the score of humanity and friendship, not as a political measure; the request was refused. When President Davis, Colonel Ould and General Howell Cobb pleaded for an exchange of prisoners at Andersonville on the plea of mercy, as the stockade was overcrowded and the water conditions bad, was the request granted? When six of the prisoners were paroled in order to go to Washington to plead for exchange, was their request even given a fair hearing? When Colonel Ould begged that medicines, which had been made contraband of war, should be sent to their own surgeons to use only for their own men, was not that request denied? When Colonel Ould asked that a vessel be sent to take the sick and wounded home, because of the lack of room, lack of cooking vessels to prepare the returned that the vessel would be filled with well men to complete that number, and although this answer went in August it was December before the vessel was sent, and that after many, many had died. When General Cobb sent the prisoners to Florida the Federal officers refused to receive them, but they were left there anyway. Was Sheridan's treatment of the women and children in the valley of the Shenandoah, or Sherman's treatment of them in Atlanta, or in his March through Georgia, or at the burning of Columbia, or Butler's treatment of the women in New Orleans humane? Yet Lincoln as Commander-in-Chief of the army, allowed it and never once reprobated it. No, Lincoln was not humane. Nevertheless, this quality has been given to him in full measure since his martyrdom.

Did Lincoln intend to free the slaves when war was declared? Certainly he did not. In his speech at Peoria, Ill., he said:

"Free them and keep them here as underlings? That would not better their condition.

"Free them and make them socially and politically our equals? My own feelings will not admit this, and I know the mass of whites North and South will not agree to this. We cannot make them our equals.



“Free them and send them to Liberia would be my first impulse, but I know if they were landed there today they would perish in ten days.

“If all earthly power were given to me I do not know what to do with slavery as it exists in the South today.

“A system of gradual emancipation seems best, and we must not too quickly judge our brethren of the South for a seeming tardiness in this matter.”

Does this seem that he had the Emancipation Proclamation or anything like it in his mind at that time?

Was Lincoln magnanimous? Yes, Lincoln was magnanimous, for there is no doubt that Grant’s magnanimity to Lee was Lincoln’s thought, not Grant’s. One who was present when Grant went to consult Lincoln about this testifies to this fact.

Was Lincoln highly extolled by his friends Herndon and Lamon before his martyrdom? No, they saw many faults in their friend Lincoln which were quickly expunged from later editions of their books. The first copies of these books were rapidly destroyed. Rare copies of them are, however, still to be found.

What were Lincoln’s views about colonization?

From the time of his election as President he was striving to find some means of colonizing the negroes. An experiment had been made of sending them to Liberia, but it was a failure, and he wished to try another colony, hoping that would be successful. He sent one colony to Cow Island under Koch as overseer, but he proved very cruel to the negroes and they begged to return. He then asked for an appropriation of money from Congress to purchase land in Central America, but Central America refused to sell and said, “Do not send the negroes here.” The North said, “Do not send the negroes here.” It was then agreed that a Black Territory should be set apart for the segregation of the negroes in Texas, Mississippi and South Carolina—but Lincoln was unhappy, and in despair he asked Ben Butler’s advice, saying, “If we turn 200,000 armed negroes in the South among their former owners, from whom we have taken their arms, it will inevitably lead to a race war. It cannot be done. The negroes must be gotten rid of.” Ben Butler said, “Why not send them to Panama to dig the canal?” Lincoln was delighted at the suggestion, and asked Butler to consult Seward at once. Only a few days later John Wilkes Booth assassinated Lincoln and one of his conspirators

wounded Seward. What would have been the result had Lincoln lived cannot be estimated. The poor negroes would possibly have been sent to that place of yellow fever and malarial dangers to perish from the face of the earth, for we had no Gorgas of Alabama to study our sanitary laws for them at that time.

By the way, another wrong of history should be corrected just here. John Wilkes Booth assassinated Lincoln because of no love that he had in his heart for the South, but because Lincoln and Seward had failed to pardon a friend of his, and failing in this promise that friend was hanged. Vengeance was vowed and vengeance was taken. There was not a true man of the South who would have tolerated such a deed as Lincoln's assassination.

What was Lincoln's Reconstruction Policy?

Lincoln's idea was to restore all the seceding States to their rights, extracting a promise that they would not secede again, and that they would free their slaves, because he had promised that in his Proclamation, then punish President Davis and the leaders. He would never have stood for Thad Stevens's policy, and Thad Stevens and his crowd knew it and rejoiced at Lincoln's death.

Now when Southern young men say "The South as well as the North is ready to admit that Lincoln is the greatest of all Americans," it is full time to call a halt. These young people have been taught to canonize Lincoln, and they must now be taught that Lincoln can never measure up to many of our great men of the South, especially to our Robert E. Lee, a man who in every department of life measured up to the highest standard. Whether as son, husband, father, soldier, teacher, master, citizen, friend, scholar, or Christian gentleman, he presented the most rounded character found in all human history. Lord Wolseley said of him: "He was a being apart and superior to all others in every way; a man with whom none I ever knew, and very few of whom I ever read are worthy to be compared; a man who was cast in a grander mould and made of finer metal than all other men."

Nor am I willing to place Lincoln ahead of our Jefferson Davis. Our Davis never stood for coarse jokes, never violated the Constitution, never stood for retaliation—Lincoln stood for all these. Nor was he even as great as many of the great men of the North. He cannot be compared to our Woodrow Wilson. Many times Lincoln had an opportunity to make

peace and he made war. Twice our Woodrow Wilson had an opportunity to plead for peace and he did it. Many times Lincoln had an opportunity to show loving kindness to humanity and many times he failed. Never has there been an opportunity for our President to show loving kindness to those in distress that he has failed.

## V.

Another wrong that must be righted is that BARBARA FRIETCHIE MYTH. Our children are reciting that poem by Whittier and are being taught that our great and good Stonewall Jackson was not only discourteous, but actually revengeful and cruel. We cannot allow this to longer remain unrighted.

I have in my possession a copy of a letter from John G. Whittier written in 1892 in which he acknowledges that he was mistaken in the name of the place where the incident took place and the person mentioned in the poem who waved the flag. He says that a United States soldier returning from the war told him the incident, and said that it happened in Maryland when Jackson's troops passed through. He supposed that it took place in Frederick, because Jackson passed through that city, so wrote to the postmaster there to inquire the name of the person connected with the flag waving. The postmaster replied that he had never heard of the incident, but that it sounded very much like Barbara Frietchie, for she was a very patriotic old woman who had lived there at that time. The name struck Whittier as suitable for a poem, so upon that authority only he wrote it.

I have in my possession a copy of a letter from a nephew of Barbara Frietchie, written in 1874, saying that at the time Stonewall Jackson passed through Frederick, Md., he was attending to his aunt's business affairs, and he knows positively that she was not able to leave her bed, much less to mount a casement to wave a flag.

I have in my possession a copy of a letter from Dr. Zacharias, her pastor, saying that the day before Stonewall Jackson passed through Frederick, he was administering, as to a dying woman, the last communion. He said he knew positively that Barbara Frietchie was not able to go to a window to wave a flag, even had Stonewall Jackson's men passed her home, which they did not.

I have in my possession a chart giving Jackson's line of

march in Frederick and the location of Barbara Frietchie's home, which was quite off the line. And yet the women of Frederick, knowing these facts, have erected a monument in the streets of that city and lately unveiled it to this falsehood in history.

The U. D. C. Daughters of Frederick protested. The Veterans of the U. C. V. in Frederick protested. The Daughters and Veterans of Maryland protested, and the *Baltimore Sun* protested, but nothing could stop it. The testimony of an old woman over 75 years old, whose memory is known to be failing, has been taken, rather than more reliable testimony. She is a niece of Barbara Frietchie, and has been fed upon this story so long that she really believes it, when her own brother's testimony disproves it. There is nothing to do but to let it be branded in history as a monument to an untruth. The mayor of Frederick was asked why he allowed it to be erected, and he said, "Because it will bring many visitors to our city." Yes, it is a monument unique in history, but does it honor, as a monument should, the memory of any one? I know Whittier would have resented it, for while we didn't agree with him on the slavery question, he was a man of deep religious convictions and a man who abhorred a sham. If Barbara Frietchie was so patriotic she would not desire an honor that falsified facts.

## VI.

Another wrong to be righted and one as much misunderstood by some of our Southern men and women as by those of other sections. I refer to the misrepresentations regarding ANDERSONVILLE PRISON, and the unfair trial given to Major Wirz, and the attempt to implicate President Davis in the atrocities, so-called, at Andersonville.

It will be needless to rehearse all the story, especially here in Savannah, for it was a Savannah woman, Mrs. L. G. Young, who wrote the resolutions to introduce in the Georgia Convention U. D. C. when it met in Macon, 1905, to erect a monument to exonerate the name of Wirz and to defend the President of the Confederacy. It was Miss Benning, of Columbus, Ga., who seconded it. It was a Savannah woman, Mrs. A. B. Hull, who was President of the Georgia Division when the monument was being erected, although it was unveiled under Miss Alice Baxter's administration. We can bear testimony to endless and vile vituperations hurled at us for daring to defend Major

Wirz and the Andersonville atrocities. But we knew that we were right and the truth of history would sustain us; and we knew the attacks came from ignorance of the facts in the case, so we tried to forgive and forget all that was said. We were sorry to stir up strife and bitterness, but right is might and must prevail.

When Senator Blaine in the United States Senate Chamber January 10, 1876, cast reproach upon President Davis for the horrors at Andersonville, it was by good Providence that a member of that Senate was Benjamin H. Hill, the confidential adviser of President Davis, and he knew every step that had been taken in the whole affair, and why it was taken. Mr. Hill answered Mr. Blaine.

That was a most remarkable speech. It refuted every accusation brought against Wirz or Davis, and silenced their defamers for a time at least.

I wish I could give Senator Hill's speech in full, but I have not the time or memory to give it, and you have not the time to listen to it. Turning to Mr. Blaine, he said: "Mr. Blaine, you said Mr. Davis was the author knowingly, deliberately, guiltily, and wilfully of the gigantic crime and murder at Andersonville. By what authority do you make this statement? One hundred and sixty witnesses were introduced during the three months' trial of Captain Wirz, and not one mentioned the name of President Davis in connection with a single atrocity. It is true that two hours before Captain Wirz's execution, parties came to Wirz's confessor saying if Wirz would implicate President Davis his sentence would be commuted. What was Wirz's reply? 'President Davis had no connection with me as to what happened at Andersonville. Besides, I would not become a traitor even to save my life.'"

"You say, Mr. Blaine, that the food was insufficient and the prisoners were starved to death. The act of the Confederate Congress reads thus: 'The rations furnished prisoners of war shall be the same in quantity and quality as those furnished to enlisted men in the army of the Confederacy.' That was the law that Mr. Davis approved.

"You say, Mr. Blaine, that Mr. Davis sent General Winder to locate a den of horrors. The official order reads thus: 'The location for the stockade shall be in a healthy locality, with plenty of pure water, with a running stream, and if possible with shade trees and near to grist and saw mills.' This doesn't sound like a den of horrors, does it?"

He then rehearsed the efforts of Vice-President Alexander Stephens, Colonel Robert Ould, General Howell Cobb, Captain Wirz, and others, who time and time again interceded for the exchange of prisoners on any terms and finally on no terms at all, if only they would receive them beyond the borders of the State, and, how every offer was rejected. He showed how medicine, made contraband of war, was denied to be used for their own men. He showed how no act of the Confederate Government was responsible for any horrors that existed at Andersonville, but that all blame must rest wholly with the war policy of the Federal Government. When General Grant was urged to exchange, his answer was, "If we commence a system of exchange we will have to fight until the whole South is exterminated. If we hold those caught they are as dead men."

## VII.

Mr. Hill continued: "You say, Mr. Blaine, that no prisoners in Northern prisons were ever maltreated. I do not care to unfold the chapters on the other side. I could produce thousands of witnesses from my own State of Georgia alone, to refute this statement."

Yes, Mr. Hill could have told of the horrors of Elmira, Rock Island, Fort Delaware, Camp Chase, and others. And he could have told how the health of Alexander Stephens, our Vice-President, was injured by confinement in Fort Warren, the dampness bringing on an attack of rheumatism from which he never recovered, and which left him a cripple for life. He could have told them how our Sidney Lanier was never a well man after that confinement in a Northern prison. He could have told of those 600 prisoners at Fort Delaware who were placed under the fire of their own men, and guarded by negro soldiers, and he could have told of horrors without end that were heaped upon our prisoners in a spirit of retaliation simply.

Mr. Hill continued, "You say, Mr. Blaine, that President Davis starved and tortured 23,500 prisoners in Southern prisons. Who, Mr. Blaine, starved 26,000 prisoners in Northern prisons? Mr. Stanton, your Secretary of War, gives these statistics, and I feel sure you will believe him, will you not? He says twelve per cent of our men died in your prisons and only nine per cent of your men died in ours. There were far more Northern men in our prisons than Southern men in your prisons. Why was this per cent of death greater at the North?"

Then turning to Mr. Blaine, Senator Hill said, "No, Mr. Blaine, I tell you this reckless misrepresentation of the South must stop right here. I put you on notice that hereafter when you make an assertion against the South you must be prepared to substantiate full proof thereof."

President Davis sent General Lee under a flag of truce to urge, in the name of humanity, that General Grant agree to an exchange of prisoners. The interview was not granted.

This is General Lee's testimony as expressed in a letter to a Philadelphia friend, who wished his view of the Andersonville affair:

"I offered General Grant to send into his lines all of the prisoners within my Department (Virginia and North Carolina), provided he would return man for man. When I notified the Confederate authorities of my proposition, I was told, if accepted they would gladly place at my disposal every man in our Southern prisons. I also made this offer to the Committee of the United States Sanitary Commission—but my propositions were not accepted.—R. E. Lee."

I wish I had time to tell you my conversation with Dr. Kerr, of Corsicana, Texas. He was one of our surgeons at Andersonville, and gave me some such valuable history concerning the conditions there. He says to his certain knowledge thirteen of the acts of cruelty brought against Captain Wirz, and accepted as truth, although absolute proofs were given to the contrary, took place when Captain Wirz was sick in bed, and some one else in charge of the prisoners. Yes, Wirz was a hero and a martyr.

Dr. Kerr says that Wirz was called hard-hearted and cruel, but he has seen the tears streaming down his face when in the hospitals watching the sufferings of those men. Not a man ever died that he did not see that his grave was distinctly marked so that his mother could come and claim that body. Did any one at Northern prisons ever do that for our Southern boys' mothers?

If the soldiers hated Wirz, as was said in the trial, why did they not kill him, for they had ample opportunity, as he never went armed. He did not even carry a pocket knife. He once laughingly said to Dr. Kerr that he had an old rusty pistol, but it would not shoot.

I have in my library a copy of a set of resolutions which those six paroled prisoners drew up when they returned from Washington, exonerating the Confederate authorities of all

blame connected with the horrors of Andersonville prison life, and testifying to the fact that the insults received at Stanton's hands were far harder to bear than anything they ever had suffered at Andersonville.

I have in my library a book written by one of the prisoners exonerating Captain Wirz and the Confederate authorities. I have in my scrap book a copy of a letter from some of the prisoners sent with a watch which they presented to Captain Wirz as a token of their appreciation of his kind treatment of them. Mrs. Perrin, his daughter, has many testimonials of this kind.

There was never any trouble about lack of provisions at Andersonville, as has been so often stated. There was an abundant supply of the rations that the soldiers and prisoners needed, but the trouble came because of the over-crowded condition of the stockade. It was made for 10,000 and in four months 29,000 were sent. There were 8,000 sick in the hospitals at one time and no medicines. There were not enough vessels in which the food could be properly prepared and served, and the Confederate authorities were powerless, for they did not have vessels with which to supply this need, nor money with which to buy them.

There were many bad men among the prisoners called "bounty jumpers," and they were killed by their own men, yet Captain Wirz was accused of their murder. Dr. Kerr said when Captain Wirz paroled those six prisoners to send them North to plead for exchange, he turned to him and said, "I wish I could parole the last one of them." At the surrender he went to Macon, relying on the honor of General Wilson's parole. Imagine his surprise when he was arrested. He was taken to trial, condemned upon suborned testimony and hanged November 6, 1865. That was the foulest blot in American history, and Mrs. Surratt's death for complicity with John Wilkes Booth may be placed beside it.

If any one questions the truth of these facts, they can be found verified in the volumes called the "War of the Rebellion," in the Congressional Library, in Washington, D. C., put there by the United States authorities.

I have also a copy of a letter from Herman A. Braum, of Milwaukee, Wis., who was a prisoner at Andersonville. After paying a tribute to Captain Wirz and exonerating the Confederate authorities he says, "I believe that there is nothing so well calculated to strengthen the faith in popular government



as the example given by the Confederacy during the war, its justice, humanity, and power. On this rests the historic fame of Jefferson Davis."

I wish I had the time to take up some other wrongs and try to right them. I had intended to say something of the Hampton Roads Conference, the Sumner-Brooks caning, and the false history about the Monitor and Merrimac. But I have detained you too long already, and I must save these for another time.

As I said before, whatever wrongs are righted, they must be righted in the proper spirit.

I know perfectly well what the young people of today will say: "We are tired of hearing of these old issues, don't resurrect them." We have listened to this too long from the young people, and we have allowed them thereby to grow up in ignorance of the truth regarding our history. We must not listen to them any longer. Justice to the living, memory of the dead, a desire that truth may prevail over error and falsehood makes me urgent to right these wrongs of history now.

Our friends from the North do not object to the truth of history provided we are fair and just. We may expect them to disagree with us at times, but that is perfectly natural for they have never heard of many of the things we claim. They, too, have been often wronged in our Southern history and we must be ready to help them to right their wrongs also. Whatever is done, let it be done in the spirit of truth and peace and love and good will.

It is all right, as President Wilson said, to plan a Lincoln Highway, and it is all right to plan a Jefferson Davis Highway. We should honor the distinguished men of our land. Enough is not done along this line. Foreign countries put us to shame. But the Lincoln Highway will not obliterate the Mason and Dixon line, as the President suggests, for that is not a line of locality or mere boundary, but it is a line of heredity. Just as long as there is pure Puritan blood in the veins of some and pure Cavalier blood in the veins of others, there will be a difference in the thoughts and ways of the people. We cannot be alike if we would. This need not cause a difference that would lead to misunderstandings, however. God grant that never again in the history of our country shall jealousies, bickerings, selfish contentions and political injustice drive us apart. Today we stand, and desire to stand a reunited people, all sections prosperous, happy, at peace and united. Yes,

united in energies, in common interests, in resources, in courage and in patriotism, dependent the one upon the other.

The eyes of the world are on us. There is no doubt that our country is the greatest, the noblest, the mightiest of all the countries of the globe, and we must rejoice at it and keep it so. We should be thankful that we are under a leader who stands for peace and whom the whole world respects, a leader who has come to us "for such a time as this"; a leader who knows no section, but who, knowing the right, dares to maintain it—a leader who has the love of the world in his heart, and would if he could have war to cease and peace and love and harmony prevail throughout the entire world.

# Address

Delivered By

Miss Mildred Lewis Rutherford

Athens, Ga.

Historian General  
United Daughters of the  
Confederacy

---

## Historical Sins of Omission and Commission

---

San Francisco, California  
Friday, Oct. 22, 1915  
Civic Auditorium Hall

## INDEX AND REFERENCES

- I. SUPREMACY OVER FRANCE, pp. 85-87.  
 Bradley's "Fight with France for North America."  
 Woodrow Wilson's "History of the American People."  
 Horace Walpole, William Makepeace Thackeray, Samuel White,  
 (English History.)
- II. SUPREMACY OF AMERICA OVER SPAIN, pp. 87-90.  
 "The South in the Building of the Nation," Vol. IV.  
 "History of the United States," Matthew Page Andrews.  
 "Winning the Oregon Country," John T. Farris.
- III. WAR OF 1812, pp. 90-92.  
 The Divine Purpose of the War of 1812—Frank Allaben.  
 The Journal of American History.  
 The South in the Building of a Nation. Vol. IV.
- IV. ROMANCES OF HISTORY, pp. 92-96.  
 "Land of Used-to-Be," Howard Meriwether Lovett.  
 "Revolutionary Reader," Sophie Lee Foster, Atlanta, Ga.  
 "Georgia's Landmarks, Memorials and Legends," Lucian Knight.  
 "The South in the Building of a Nation." Vol. IX.  
 "On the Field of Honor," Annah Robinson Watson, Memphis,  
 Tenn.  
 Camp-Fire Stories—Marie Bankston, New Orleans, La.
- V. SUMNER-BROOKS CONTROVERSY, pp. 96-98.  
 Congressional Records.  
 Speech by Howell Cobb on Sumner-Brooks Controversy.  
 The Washington Star, 1856.  
 Smyth's American Literature.  
 Richardson's American Literature.  
 British Encyclopædia.  
 Origin of the Late War—George Lunt, Boston, Mass.
- VI. HAMPTON ROADS CONFERENCE, pp. 98-100.  
 Richmond Dispatch, 1856.  
 Confederate Veteran, Nashville, Tenn.  
 Historians: Alexander H. Stephens.  
                   Francis Thorpe.  
                   Peter Hamilton.  
                   Edward Pollard.  
 Memoirs of Judge Reagan.
- VII. MONITOR AND MERRIMAC, pp. 100-103.  
 Scharff's Confederate Navy.  
 Historians: J. William Jones.  
                   Matthew Page Andrews.
- VIII. HISTORY OF THE NAVY, pp. 103-106.  
 Congressional Records.  
 Semmes Service Afloat.  
 Scharff's Confederate Navy.
- IX. WHO BURNED COLUMBIA? pp. 106-107.  
 Autobiography of Dr. Joseph LeConte.  
 Sherman's Official Reports.  
 Diary of Capt. Nichols.  
 Sherman's Confession of 1875.  
 "The New York Tribune."
- X. RECONSTRUCTION, pp. 107-111.  
 Address of Walter Henry Cook on Reconstruction.  
 Speech of Dan Voorhees on the "Plunder of Eleven States"—Congress-  
                   sional Records, 1872.  
 The Chicago Chronicle.  
 Charles Francis Adams, speeches made at Charleston and  
                   Chicago.
- XI. TEXTBOOKS, pp. 111-117.
- XII. THINGS THAT MAKE FOR PEACE, pp. 117-119.

GIFT

Author

MAR 1 1873

## Historical Sins of Omission and Commission



AT THE Savannah Convention last year you will remember that the *wrongs* of history were stressed, and a hope expressed that the *omissions* in history would be taken care of in future years.

Your historian realizes, however, that more textbooks of American history are being written today than ever before, and that it behooves us of the South to demand that the historical sins of omission shall be noted now, as well as the sins of commission. Especially is this important as it is earnestly hoped that the Chairman of the Textbook Committee, with sub-committees in every State, will examine all textbooks, not only of American history, but American literature, as well as the geographies and readers for primary and academic grades used in our Southern schools; and also inquire into texts used in the colleges in the North to which our Southern girls and boys are being sent. This is not with the expectation, or hope even, of having all of these textbooks changed, but simply to publicly note the injustices therein contained, as many teachers using these books are not themselves conscious that they are unjust, and some one must tell them about it.

**SUPREMACY OVER FRANCE.** I have been a student of history and literature for many years, yet I must confess that it came to me as a real surprise, while in London a few years ago, to learn that to a Southern man is due the English supremacy over the French in North America today.

Horace Walpole said: "A volley fired at Great Meadows in 1754 by a young American from the backwoods of Virginia set the whole world on fire. Not only England and France were affected by it, but every country in Europe was touched, and it settled forever the supremacy of the English over the French on America's soil."

William Makepeace Thackeray even went further than this. He said: "It is strange that in a savage forest a young Virginia officer should fire a shot and wake up a war which was to last sixty years and cost France all of her American colonies, and sever all of ours from us, and indeed create a great Western Republic," and later added that "George Washing-

ton was the most conspicuous character in American history."

Samuel White, another English writer, said: "In the wilds of America was raised a hero that eclipsed the glory of the Alexanders of Greece, the Cæsars of Rome, and the Hampdens of Britain."

Bradley, in his "Fight with France for North America," published by Constable & Co., London, gives a full account of this event in history and the results which followed the battle of Great Meadows.

Governor Dinwiddie, of Virginia, in 1754 learned that the French were encroaching upon Virginia's territory along the Ohio River. He sent George Washington, of Fredericksburg, Va., to demand that the French withdraw their forces. They refused, and Washington was then sent to force them. He surprised them at Great Meadows, killed their leader, Jumonville, and captured all of his men. Upon Jumonville's body were found important papers which caused England and France to take definite action.

This battle of Great Meadows was in reality only a skirmish, but see the results. Fort Duquesne fell, Niagara and Ticonderoga were taken, the Acadians were driven from Nova Scotia, Lake George was cleared, Crown Point strengthened, Montcalm defeated at Quebec, Montreal fell, and the Peace of Paris signed in 1763.

What did the English gain? Canada, Nova Scotia, Cape Breton Island, the islands in the St. Lawrence, the river and harbor of Mobile, all disputed territory between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi, and free navigation of the Mississippi River—and that volley was fired by our George Washington of Virginia.

I certainly call this one of the historical sins of omission. Why? Because our American historians give this credit to an Englishman, Wolfe, at the Heights of Abraham.

Parkman says, "The victory of Wolfe marks an epoch than which none is more fruitful of grand results."

Knox says, "The victory of Wolfe was the most important event in modern history."

Fiske says, "The victory of Wolfe marks the greatest turning point as yet discovered in modern history."

Jones, in the History of North America, certainly gives Washington no credit. Nor do Dinwiddie, Ridpath, Hale Barnes and others.

Even Green says, "With the triumph of Wolfe on the Heights of Abraham began the history of the United States."

Of all American histories that I have examined, Woodrow Wilson in his "History of the American People," is the only one who gives the credit to George Washington, and Mr. Wilson, too, must have gone to English sources.

It was another Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, who secured the Louisiana Purchase from the French. What was gained by that transaction? All the territory from the Gulf of Mexico on the south, and the Mississippi River on the east, to the Rocky Mountains on the West. The "Father of Waters" was left to flow unhindered to the sea.

Just here is an opportunity to pay tribute where tribute is due. It was a Northern man, not a Southern man, Robert R. Livingston, of New York, with James Monroe, of Virginia, who manipulated this Louisiana Purchase with Talleyrand in France, and made it possible for Thomas Jefferson to complete it.

**SUPREMACY OVER SPAIN.** Still another historical sin of omission that must not be overlooked. How did we gain supremacy over Spain in North America if not through Southern statesmen? The first permanent settlements were of course by the Spaniards; the second were by the French, and the third by the English. Therefore to Spain belongs the credit of the oldest city in the United States, St. Augustine in Florida, the oldest church in Pensacola, Florida, and the oldest house in the United States in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

The Spaniards in Florida became very troublesome to the Carolinas and to Georgia in Colonial days. Finally, in 1742, and that was much earlier than the Battle of Great Meadows, they determined to take possession of all of the land on the eastern shore from the boundary of Florida on the south to the St. Lawrence River on the north, from sea to sea, which included all land claimed by the thirteen colonies. Their plan was to conquer colony by colony, and this would not have been difficult, and the colonists knew it, for they were weak in military strength, and also weakened constantly by repeated attacks from the Indians. So with fifty-six vessels well-armed and well-provisioned, and 5,000 well-equipped men the Spaniards started out with a feeling of absolute victory. The "Baby Colony," Georgia, was nearest and weakest. The first attack was at Frederica on St. Simon's Island.

Oglethorpe had only two poorly armed and provisioned ships, but he had 682 brave Georgians and they taught the Spaniards a lesson that day at Bloody Marsh which they never forgot. These Georgians trailed in the dust the Spanish flag for the first time on America's soil, and never again did Spain trouble the colonies along the eastern shores. To James Oglethorpe, Noble Jones, and two brave Scotch Highlanders, Sutherland and Mackay, is due the credit of this victory. Bloody Marsh is one of the decisive battles of modern history, for it unquestionably turned back the tide of Spanish invasion and gave the Anglo-Saxon race supremacy in North America. With what result? THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—for, but for that victory there would possibly have been no colonies to declare their independence. Yet we find that battle but slightly noticed outside of the local history of the State.

Then the Treaty at Coleraine in 1796, secured through Governor James Jackson of Georgia, all of the territory now included in Alabama and Mississippi, from Spanish rule. Think what Alabama and Mississippi mean to us!

The Mexican Cession by Nicholas Trist of Virginia in 1848, and the Gadsden Purchase by James Gadsden of South Carolina in 1853 included more land than was in the Louisiana Purchase. It extended from the Rockies to the Golden Gate and opened up all of the Pacific Coast. We who are here this evening truly rejoice that it is not a part of Mexico today.

Then Oregon was added to the United States under a Southern President, James K. Polk. What was secured? A tract of land 300,000 square miles in extent, including Idaho, Oregon, Washington, parts of Montana and Wyoming, and the Puget Sound. Think of all that the Puget Sound has meant to us in Oriental trade! Here again we must do justice. It was Dr. Marcus Whitman, a Presbyterian missionary from one of the Northern States who traveled 3,500 miles to intercede with President Polk, and that, possibly, was the strongest influence in bringing about this purchase.

Canada would undoubtedly have been annexed to the United States in 1812 had it not been for New England opposition.

You may ask, why were Southern men most interested in territorial expansion? Northern historians will tell you it was for slavery extension only, but the slave-holders of the South never dreamed of putting their slaves in deserts and ice-bound lands, free or not free. They knew they could not stand a cold



climate. The truth is they had caught the vision that materialized in the Monroe Doctrine that unless Americans should secure America for Americans only, they would be like Europe is today made up of small monarchies and republics of all sorts of nationalities.

Northern statesmen did not see any commercial advantage in taking care of such "wastes of land." Daniel Webster, the greatest of their statesmen, and we may add one of the greatest of all statesmen, thought it unwise. He said: "What do we want with this vast worthless area, this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts, of whirling sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts, or those endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their very base with eternal snow? What can we ever do with the Western coast of 8,000 miles, rockbound, cheerless, uninviting, and not a harbor on it? Mr. President, I will never vote one cent from the public treasury to place the Pacific one inch nearer to Boston than it now is."

Was it not Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, to whom we are indebted for the first suggestion of the trans-continental railroad? How could we have been here this evening but for that!

Again, what does that cross mean that stands yonder in the Golden Gate Park, but that an English explorer came over as early as 1579 and laid first claim to this land.

And did not John C. Calhoun, as Secretary of State under President Polk, plan to have the Republic of Texas taken from Spanish rule and placed under the protection of the United States? Think what Texas means to us today!

Would not Florida, our "Land of Flowers," be possibly under Spanish rule today had not James Monroe, at the psychological moment, arranged to have it bought by the United States? Nearly 59,000 square miles secured at 13 cents per acre because Ferdinand VII. was in financial straits.

And was it not through Lewis and Clark, two Southern explorers, that the Yellowstone was discovered and the Bible introduced to the Indians in the West?

Was it not Andrew Johnson of North Carolina, who secured Alaska from Russia? However, justice here must be done, for it was a Northern man who urged it, William H. Seward. Alaska is now destined to be one of the greatest assets of the United States, yet many Northern statesmen op-

posed its purchase, and said, "It is a country fit only for a polar bear garden."

These omissions must enter history, and we of the South are the ones to see to it.

WAR OF 1812. The history concerning the War of 1812 has always been most unjust to the South. Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, R. M. Johnson, and other Southern men saw the necessity for that war; Southern men planned it; Southern men urged it, and Southern men largely fought it.

You may recall that at New Orleans in my "Thirteen Periods of United States History" I called attention to this fact. I have recently read an article, "The Divine Purpose of the War of 1812," written by the Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of American History, Frank Allaben, which makes me feel that I must again stress this wrong to the South. While I cannot read the article, nor quote from it in full, I shall make copious extracts from it. It is fine! Read it, if you can, for yourselves.

The writer said that the things we fought for, and the gains we stipulated are not even mentioned, much less included, in that Treaty of Ghent which ended this war, but in spite of that, they are written in golden fire across the face of Heaven.

By that war, God taught England that we were free. She did not seem to know this before. She had hoped to confine us to that narrow strip of land on the eastern shore; she hoped some day she would resubjugate us, and not until our little navy beat her large navy at her own game in this War of 1812 did she realize that our freedom was a fact, and a fact that we demanded must be respected. Bolling Hall of Georgia, a member of Congress in 1812, wrote to his friend Zach Lamar of Milledgeville, Ga.: "England up to this time has captured and condemned 917 American vessels with their cargoes, and impressed over 5,000 American seamen. She should be compelled to grant what she has hitherto refused. It is the opposition of New England that keeps the British government from doing us justice." Southern statesmen you see wanted war.

By that war, God preserved our Union by securing the control of the Great Lakes and the Northwest, which England was holding for her Indian allies. We must be just here, and give credit for winning the control of Lake Erie where credit is due, not to a Southern man, but to Oliver Hazard Perry of Rhode Island, and the control of Lake Champlain not to a Southern man, but to Thomas Macdonough of Delaware.

By that war, God prevented the Union from being dissolved, for you remember that the New England States at that Hartford Convention were planning to secede, and an agent was there arranging for an alliance with England again, and the formation of a Northern Confederacy was only prevented by the declaration of peace.

By that war, God made our struggle the decisive war of history in vindicating the rights of international peace. Up to this time, it had been the custom, if two nations came to blows, all other nations must take sides and join one or the other.

Heaven had already inspired our George Washington to see that our path of safety lay in steering clear of entangling alliances. He then planned our treaties of neutrality. He appointed Edmund Randolph of Virginia, to draw up a Proclamation of Neutral Laws in 1793. This paper is one of the milestones in the progress of civilization. It is true that it was ridiculed by foreign nations, and it was disregarded at home, but British statesmen have since declared that the principles therein set forth "represented the high water mark of international law." This document was rewritten in the time of Madison, and enacted by Congress, and is today the law of the land, and indeed the law of the civilized world. It is back of this law that our President is standing today, and if we will let him alone he can enforce that law and not bring a clash of arms as we were compelled to do in 1812.

You remember that Washington declined to give aid to France when the French Revolution came on, and he was declared ungrateful because France had aided us in our Revolution, not only by personal volunteer service but by loans of money. By the way, Benjamin Franklin in history gets the credit of negotiating this loan for us, but French history gives the credit to John Laurens of South Carolina, which is another omission in our history. Washington, however, was too wise to get a young Republic involved in foreign disputes, so when Louis XVI. was executed in 1793, or thereabout, he brought forth our treaty of neutrality. Guizot, the French historian says: "Washington did two of the greatest things which in politics it is permitted man to attempt. He maintained by peace the independence of the country which he had conquered by war."

England growled and winced, but bided her time. Afterwards when England and France were locked in arms for world supremacy, and infamous Orders in Council came from

London, and perfidious Decrees from Berlin and Milan, England and Napoleon said any nation remaining neutral at that time should forfeit her rights on the sea, and subject her ships and commerce to confiscation.

Our flag then floated over every sea, and we were an object lesson to the world. France and England envied and feared us, and set their mighty powers to grind us between them.

Mr. Allaben goes on to say, "Then came forth a ruddy little David (the United States) against these two Goliaths (England and France), and taking three little stones (Jefferson, Madison and Monroe) from the brook of Freedom, defended our rights, and established the principle that a nation could remain neutral and at peace." No such civilizing documents as these three men are responsible for, defining the rights of neutrals, can be found in the archives of any other nation on the face of the globe, and they show that we have the right to quarantine war just as we would any other pest and thus keep our country at peace.

When The Hague treaties were signed a few years ago, (you will see this in the May number of the *North American Review* of that year), the Monroe Doctrine was then and there safeguarded, and that means non-interference with foreign politics on our part, and non-interference on this hemisphere with our affairs on the part of foreign nations.

Yes, the history of the War of 1812 must be rewritten, and full justice given to us of the South.

ROMANCES OF HISTORY. Other omissions, but of far less historical importance, should also be noticed. I refer to the romances of Southern history, for romances have always had a powerful effect upon the youthful hearts and minds of our land.

One would suppose from reading history as written today that Paul Revere was the only hero of Revolutionary days. It is true, he did ride a fine horse twenty miles over a fine road, in fine weather, not to warn the Americans of the British approach, (for they knew that already) but simply to tell whether they would come by sea or land. I have heard he was paid to do this, and the receipt for the money is in one of the museums in Boston.

How far more heroic was the ride of John Jouett of Virginia, who when he learned that Tarleton's men were planning an attack upon the Virginia Assembly at Charlottesville,

rode forty miles between midnight and daybreak to carry the news. With what result? Monticello would be in ashes today, and we might have had no Patrick Henry to be the "Father of State Rights," and no Thomas Jefferson to be the founder of the University of Virginia, or to plan the Louisiana Purchase, and probably no James Madison to write the United States Constitution.

Nor is Paul Revere's ride as heroic as that of Edward Lacy of South Carolina, who when he learned that Ferguson's men were planning an attack on King's Mountain, rode thirty miles after midnight to warn Shelby, Sevier and Campbell. With what results? King's Mountain was an American victory, not an English, and that was said to have been the turning point of the American Revolution.

Nor can it compare with the ride of Sam Dale of Mississippi. The Secretary of War sent to the Governor of Georgia at Milledgeville a dispatch to be delivered at once to General Andrew Jackson at New Orleans. Dale offered to deliver it. He mounted Paddy, a little Georgia pony, and rode 500 miles in eight days to New Orleans. The great battle was then raging and he was not able to see General Jackson until after midnight. "The answer must be returned tomorrow," he said. "I will take it," replied Dale. The General ordered relays of horses for his use but Dale refused, saying, "I will ride my Georgia pony, Paddy." And he did ride the 500 miles in eight days, but was so nearly frozen when he reached Milledgeville that he had to be literally lifted from his pony. That is what I call heroism!

Nor can Revere's ride compare with the ride of Ruth Sevier, the daughter of "Bonny Kate" Sherrill, who when she learned from an Indian playmate that the Indians and Tories were planning an attack upon the Watauga Settlement, mounted a one-eyed, sore-back horse, and with only a rope for a bridle, rode miles through dark forests, waded deep creeks, and passed British spies, and thus saved Tennessee in her hour of danger.

Nor is Paul Revere's ride equal in heroism to that of Agnes Hobson, who carried important dispatches from Governor Heard of Georgia to General Nathaniel Greene in South Carolina. Hiding these papers in her hair, and disguising herself as an old country woman, she mounted Silverheels, the Governor's horse, and for three days, spending the nights at farm houses in the enemy's territory, she actually took her life in

her hands for love of her country, and safely delivered the dispatches to our American commander. Then what about Emily Geiger of South Carolina? When they sent for a woman to search her she read the dispatches, chewed up the papers and swallowed them.

To read history as it is written today one would think that the freckle-face Molly Pitcher was the only woman who ever performed any heroic deed in time of war. She was heroic and was made a sergeant in the U. S. Army, an unusual honor for a woman. But did we not have a Captain Sally Tompkins in our War Between the States, and yet nothing is told about her? She maintained a hospital in Virginia at her own expense and cared for over 1300 Confederate soldiers.

Except in local history we do not hear of our red-headed, cross-eyed Nancy Hart of Georgia. She not only poured a ladle of boiling lye soap into the eyes of a peeping Tory, but she held six at bay with one of their own guns (they did not know where she was looking) until her husband and sons had been called from the field. The bones of these six Tories were found a few years ago near her home in Elbert county, and yet it is recorded in history that she was a myth. Four of her relatives are members of our D. A. R. Chapter.

Why not tell of Kate Barry and Kitty Carleton and their faith in prayer, and of many others truly as heroic.

Lovett's LAND OF USED-TO-BE would make a charming reader for our Southern schools. Too little is known of our Indian legends, for the story of our Nacoochee and her lover would be as thrilling as any Hiawatha and his old Nakomis, if only a Longfellow would write in poetic strains about them. Nowhere are Indian names and legends as wonderfully entrancing as in the land of the Cherokees, the Creeks, the Seminoles, the Chickasaws, the Choctaws and the Catawbias. Mrs. Foster, of the D. A. R., has a fine Revolutionary Reader that should be in our Southern schools. Lucian Knight, the State Historian of Georgia, has done so much to place these romances of history ready for our use, and Dr. B. F. Riley's Romances of Alabama gives a great deal of Indian history.

Then the "Camp Fire Stories," by Marie Bankston, of New Orleans, and "On the Field of Honor," by Annah Robinson Watson, of Memphis, Tenn., give the touch to Confederate days. Where in all history can be found braver deeds than were performed by our Confederate heroes? Every man and woman in those days did heroic deeds.

Our faithful slaves were heroic, too. Why not tell of Mammy Kate, who carried in her clothes basket her young master from his prison cell, and of Daddy Cyrus, who placed his "old Marster's" best wine before the Tories while he slipped out to cut the ropes which bound his master ready for the gallows?

COLONIAL DAMES AND D. A. R. I must pause here to commend the work that is being done and has been done by the Colonial Dames and Daughters of the Revolution. They have unearthed more Southern history than can be estimated, by delving into old letters, court records, and family wills and deeds, searching for ancestral connections. I never hear of their marking historic spots that I do not feel a spirit of thanksgiving for these noble organizations. Historical tradition and historical memories, if noble, are worthy to be commemorated.

While it is true they are dealing with past history, they are not sitting by any means with folded hands weeping over their dead ancestors, but are fully alive and alert and like the Federation of Women's Clubs and Daughters of the Confederacy are looking after the education of our needy sons and daughters of the South.

But to return to the omissions. I have never seen the justice in making so much of the Boston Tea Party where men at night disguised as Indians threw the chests of tea overboard, and little outside of local history said of the 257 chests of tea thrown overboard at Charleston, S. C., by men without disguises in broad daylight. And this happened at other places too, in the South. Why has not that Edenton Tea Party in North Carolina entered history? Fifty-one women met at Mrs. Elizabeth King's home and organized the "Daughters of Liberty," the *first patriotic organization for women in the world*, and resolved to drink no tea nor wear clothes that came from England until the obnoxious tax on tea was withdrawn.

Where except in local history is found the notice of the "Peggy Stewart," whose owner, Anthony Stewart, burned the vessel with its entire cargo in the presence of his daughter, Peggy, for whom the vessel was named, because some of the obnoxious tea was aboard? This took place at Annapolis, Maryland.

Where, too, do we find the "Diligence" and "Viper," bearing the hated stamps, were not allowed to land, and what Governor was buried in effigy because he planned to store in

his house the hated stamps? Had these things transpired in New England every line of history would have been well presented long ago. And New England is right to keep her history straight. Too long have we allowed these romances of history to be overlooked and omitted. We must not allow it longer.

SINS OF COMMISSION. Let us turn now to some of the historical sins of commission, some wrongs that still need to be righted.

I did not have time in Savannah to speak of the wrongs concerning the Sumner-Brooks difficulty, the Hampton Roads Conference, and the truth concerning the Merrimac and Monitor, so we will take these first.

SUMNER-BROOKS CONTROVERSY. Now what about that Sumner-Brooks controversy? "In the Senate Chamber May, 1856, Charles Sumner of Massachusetts for six days heaped abuse upon abuse upon Andrew Pickens of South Carolina about the slavery question.

Preston Brooks, a representative from the same State, a relative of Judge Butler, heard of this attack and waited until the Senate adjourned to call Mr. Sumner to account for his statements. Not finding him, he returned to the Senate Chamber, where he found him in conversation with some lady friends. Taking his seat in full view of Mr. Sumner, he waited until the ladies retired, then he deliberately rose and approaching the Senator said: "I have read your speech and I have come to the conclusion that you were guilty of a gross libel upon my State and have wantonly insulted my absent gray-haired relative, Judge Butler, and I feel myself under obligation to inflict upon you a punishment for this libel and insult." (This does not look like "a sly and cowardly attack from the back," as has been represented in history.)

"Sumner attempting to rise, Brooks struck him on the head with his gutta percha cane, and continued to strike until the cane was broken by the blows. Sumner trying to dodge the blows fell to the floor, then Brooks discontinued to strike. When Sumner's friends rallied around him, Brooks withdrew, but did not leave the Senate Chamber until Sumner had been removed to an anteroom."

This is the story as it appeared in *The Washington Star* the next day.

Let us see how it has come down to us through history and literature. Smyth in his *American Literature* says,



"Brooks beat Sumner over his head with a bludgeon." The Encyclopedia Britannica says, "Brooks dealt almost death blows from which Sumner never fully recovered." Lyman Abbott referred to it as "a brutal assault, dastardly and cowardly. For an armed man to attack an unarmed man in my opinion is contrary to any code of morality."

Brooks was not armed except with a cane. Sumner was his superior in weight and strength. Did the provocation justify the chastisement?

Lewis Cass, of Massachusetts, the "Nestor of the Senate," declared that Sumner's speech was, "the most un-American and unpatriotic speech that ever grated on the ears of any members of that high body." Dargan, the historian, says, "Sumner's speech was full of the vilest vituperation." Brooks said, "I would have forfeited my own self respect, and the good opinion of my countrymen had I failed to resent his insults."

Rhodes, the historian, says: "Brooks' conduct in the House of Representatives for three years had been that of a gentleman. He was courteous, accomplished, warm hearted, hot-blooded, dear as a friend, but fearful as an enemy."

There is no doubt that Sumner's political friends used this attack to further his advancement. Richardson in his American Literature says, "This assault of Brooks made Sumner more prominent in the anti-slavery contest." George Lunt, a Massachusetts Senator, said: "The unlucky blow, afterwards inflicted by Mr. Brooks of South Carolina upon Mr. Sumner in the Senate Chamber, gave a prominence which there is no reason to suppose that he would otherwise have acquired. It elicited sympathy enough to receive an indulgence to his extreme views from persons to whom these views had hitherto been most repulsive. Except for that blow there is every ground for believing that Mr. Sumner's official career would have ended with the first senatorial term." A Harvard professor said, "Mr. Sumner's vituperation was intolerable."

A resolution was offered in the House to expel Mr. Brooks for this attack. Howell Cobb, of Georgia, defended him on the ground that the attack was not made while the Senate was in session, and that the Constitution gave authority to deal with members only under those circumstances, and that being a member of Congress did not throw an egis of protection about any member out of Congressional hours.

Messrs. Keitt and Edmondson were threatened with expulsion also because they knew that Mr. Brooks was to make this

attack and did not warn Mr. Sumner of it. Mr. Cobb argued that it was not incumbent upon these gentlemen to betray a breach of confidence.

If I remember correctly, Mr. Brooks was allowed to make a speech in his own defense, then taking up his hat he walked out of the House never to return unless recalled. He was later recalled.

HAMPTON ROADS CONFERENCE. Let us look into that Hampton Roads Conference. Mexico was giving trouble in 1865, and Francis P. Blair, Sr., conceived the idea that if peace could be declared between the North and the South, and both armies marched against Mexico the two sections could thus be sooner brought together by having a common interest. At his suggestion President Davis and his Cabinet appointed three Commissioners, Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia, R. L. M. Hunter of Virginia, and John Campbell of Alabama, to meet with President Lincoln and Mr. Seward to discuss terms of peace. President Lincoln would not consent for the Commissioners sent by the Confederate government to come to Washington City, for that would be an acknowledgement of the Confederacy. Therefore it was agreed that they should meet at Hampton Roads, February 3rd, 1865. President Lincoln and Mr. Seward came on the "River Queen" to meet the delegation from the Confederate States. The Commissioners were given no authority to accept terms of unconditional surrender, they demanded a recognition of the Confederate States. Lincoln's only terms were unconditional surrender. There was no discussion about slaves and payment for them, nor about Union, nor that other things would be granted. Mr. Stephens said in a letter to his friend, Stephen W. Blount, of Texas: "How can any sane person be expected to believe that any such proposition was made by President Lincoln to the Confederate Commissioners, or was submitted to the Confederate government and rejected by either?"

The Conference was informal, no official reports were made of it. It was short and had no practical results. In *The Richmond Dispatch* dated February 8th, 1865, is this item of news: "President Davis yesterday submitted to Congress the report of the peace Commissioners. The report is brief. Lincoln offered no terms that could be listened to for a moment, in fact nothing short of unconditional submission."

It has been stated by many eminent men of the South that Mr. Stephens told them personally that Mr. Lincoln said,

“Write Union and I will make any other terms you suggest,” and also told them that “he would pay \$400,000,000 for the slaves of the South.” I have in my library a copy of Judge Reagan’s testimony refuting this. He was the last surviving member of the Confederate Cabinet, and was present when the Commissioners made their report.

I have a copy of the testimony of Senator Vest of Missouri, denying that any such report was made by the Commissioners. He was the last surviving member of the Confederate Senate. I have copies of Alexander Stephens’ denial over and over again, to Governor Garland of Arkansas, to Senator Orr of South Carolina, to Representative Sexton of Texas, and others, that any such offer was made to the Commissioners. The matter was agitated evidently by enemies of President Davis to arouse prejudice against him. Lincoln did propose an amendment to pay for slaves, but it was for the slaves in the border States. It never reached Congress because of Lincoln’s death.

The misunderstanding in regard to Mr. Stephens must have arisen from repeating some private interview with President Lincoln later. It certainly was not at Hampton Roads Conference.

Francis Thorpe, the historian, says that President Lincoln did not intend to go to that Conference until General Grant telegraphed him that the intentions of the Confederate Commissioners were good and their desires sincere to restore peace and Union. He had fully instructed Seward what to say: “Do not assume to definitely consummate anything.”

“Make known three things as indispensable:

1st. The complete restoration of National authority.

2nd. No receding from the slavery question as assumed in my late annual message, and in preceding documents.

3rd. No cessation of hostilities short of end of war and disbanding of hostile troops.”

The Confederate Commissioners would not agree to these terms. Lincoln reiterated that it was an impossibility for the United States to enter into any agreement with parties in arms against it. Mr. Stephens reminded the President of the doctrine of State Sovereignty and the right of the States to secede. The President advised him to go back to Georgia and ratify the proposed Thirteenth Amendment.

Pollard said: “It was merely a device hit upon by Governor Vance and President Davis to reawaken the military passions of the South, in order that a desire to continue the

war would be strengthened, and that President Davis really wished the demands for peace to be rejected." And Pollard goes on to say that when President Davis heard the report from the Commissioners he burst into threats against Lincoln, saying that the Confederacy in less than twelve months would compel the Yankees to sue for peace on Confederate terms. Those who knew President Davis know the falsity of such statements. No, we have too long and too patiently borne the misrepresentations regarding this matter, and must demand that they be righted.

WHAT ABOUT THE MERRIMAC AND THE MONITOR? *History is all wrong about this matter.* The idea of an ironclad vessel originated in the brain of John L. Porter of Portsmouth, Va., in 1846. There had been ironclad floating batteries before this time, but no self-propelling ironclad vessel. In 1861 Secretary Mallory of the Confederate Navy ordered a board of engineers, Porter, Williamson and Brooke, to decide upon the feasibility of building a vessel after Porter's plans. Friends of Lieutenant Brooke claimed that his plans were the ones accepted, and Pollard's history has also been misleading along this line. (See Scharff's Confederate Navy, p. 151.)

The Merrimac was converted into an ironclad at Engineer Williamson's suggestion according to John L. Porter's plans. She had been raised by the State of Virginia because of obstructed navigation. When she was ready to be floated the name was changed to Virginia by the Secretary of Navy, but to avoid confusion I shall continue to speak of her as the Merrimac.

Captain Buchanan was placed in command. On the 8th of March she steamed from the Navy Yard to attack the vessels in Hampton Roads. She looked like a sunken house with the roof above the tide. From Hampton Roads she steamed to Newport News. The Congress first fired upon her, then the Cumberland. She made directly for the Cumberland, striking her a deadly blow with her ram, opening a large hole in her side, then demanded the surrender of that ship. A small leak was in the Merrimac, but she speedily turned upon the Congress and the shells from the ironclad soon disabled her. After an hour's fire from the Merrimac, she too was forced to surrender. The Raleigh, the Henry, the Jamestown and the Teaser were the Merrimac's wooden helpers. The flag of truce was raised and hostilities ceased.

While under the flag of truce and both sides were looking after the wounded, the Federals on shore fired and wounded Captain Buchanan and Lieutenant Minor. Lieutenant Catesby Jones then assumed command of the Merrimac, and Captain Buchanan instructed him to set fire to the Congress. Darkness coming on, the Merrimac anchored at Sewall's Point for the night.

When the news reached the North consternation seized the minds of the people, and they felt the crisis of the war was at hand. "The enemy," they said, "have a vessel impervious to shot and which can go where she pleases."

Lincoln called a Cabinet meeting. Mr. Stanton said: "The Merrimac will change the whole course of the war. She will destroy every vessel of our navy. It is not unlikely that a cannon ball from one of her guns will fall upon the White House before we leave this room." Lincoln did not share Stanton's extravagant apprehensions, but there is no doubt it was a night of anxiety, of terror, of bewilderment, seldom witnessed before.

On that night there steamed into Hampton Roads a curious looking vessel called the "Yankee Cheese Box." It was the Monitor from New York.

On the next day, March 9th, the Commander of the Merrimac decided to complete the destruction of the Minnesota, when suddenly the Merrimac grounded and remained so for some time. The Monitor was advancing upon her when the Merrimac opened fire but with no effect. Straight on she came, throwing heavy missiles against the Merrimac's sides as she circled around her. For hours the vessels, almost touching each other, continued to pour broadside after broadside into each other without effect. The Monitor fired shot and shell, but the Merrimac had only shell. Both vessels seemed invulnerable. There is no doubt that the Monitor fought bravely. The Merrimac ran aground again, but soon floated and tried to run down the Monitor. Once her bow was pressing against the Monitor's side, but she careened, and by a caprice of fortune, as it seemed, the engines of the Merrimac instead of pressing on were reversed and the two vessels separated. A shell from the Merrimac struck the pilot house of the Monitor, and disabled her commander, Lieutenant John L. Worden, then the Monitor withdrew to shoal water and the Merrimac could not follow and waited. But the Monitor never again offered or accepted a challenge to fight the Merrimac, and two or three

times later the challenge was sent. The Merrimac waited for about an hour, and as no Monitor came, she steamed to the Navy Yard for fear later she could not cross the bar. *She withdrew amid the applause of thousands as testified by those who witnessed the triumph.*

The Captain of the Minnesota, G. J. Van Brunt, in his official report says: "The Monitor steamed out of range of shot towards Old Point Comfort, and the Virginia, having waited in vain for three-quarters of an hour for her antagonist to return, retired to Norfolk."

Captain E. V. White, an engineer on board the Merrimac said: "We wished to repeat the battle, but the Monitor withdrew from the field and refused to fight again, and I say this in positive contradiction of those statements made in the school histories of today." Then he further stated that while attending a Cyclorama in New York, the manager made statements that were untrue, and he interrupted him, saying that he was an officer on board the Merrimac and knew that his statements were untrue. At the close of the entertainment the manager asked for a private interview with him and acknowledged that his statements were false, but said to make his show popular at the North he was forced to say what he did.

It was April before the Merrimac had completed some alterations, then she steamed down to Hampton Roads under Commodore Tatnall to engage and capture the Monitor. She was afraid to go too close to shallow water, but dared and challenged the Monitor to come out and fight. Not even the capture of two brigs and a schooner, the Thomas Jefferson, and the hoisting of the Confederate flag on these captured ships, which must have been a humiliation to her, would tempt the Monitor to move. Had she taken the dare, she would undoubtedly have been captured, and she knew it. She had received orders from Washington not to risk another encounter. Twice she refused the challenge from the Merrimac. Seeing there was no chance for a fight, the Merrimac returned to Sewall's Point and anchored.

The truth of this can be testified to by both English and French men-of-war anchored at Hampton Roads. They witnessed the whole affair. The Vanderbilt, a fast merchant vessel near the Monitor, also remained inactive.

Captain Eggleston's testimony was that, "The Monitor was worsted and fled for safety to shallow water, and sought protection under the guns of Fortress Monroe."

J. William Jones, the historian, says: "The Confederates were obliged to destroy the ironclad Merrimac, *which had won so signal a victory at Hampton Roads.*"

The Federal Government offered large rewards to any one who would destroy the Merrimac. The U. S. Navy blocked the Potomac to keep her from going to Washington. When May 1st an order came for the Confederates to evacuate Norfolk, Commodore Tatnall tried to make her sea-worthy in stormy weather and take her to the Georgia coast, but finding he could not, he decided to blow her up rather than allow her to fall into the enemy's hands. Whether this was wisest or not is a question, but the Confederate government exonerated Commodore Tatnall from all blame.

It becomes our duty to see that the truth of this is put into the books our young people are studying, and the Cyclorama and moving picture shows falsely representing this event should be forced to correct the falsehoods portrayed, or not allowed to present it.

That contest marked a new era in maritime warfare. The great naval battles of the world heretofore had been fought with wooden vessels, but the ironclad principle embodied in the Merrimac is now used in all the navies of the world.

Think of all accomplished by the Merrimac and her wooden helpers in two days, March 8th and 9th, 1862. She encountered, defied and defeated 2,890 men and captured 230 guns. She burned the Congress, sunk the Cumberland, riddled the Minnesota, drove off the Roanoke, peppered the St. Lawrence, disabled three gunboats, silenced the Fortress Monroe, challenged the Monitor and kept her under the guns of Fortress Monroe. Had she been able to go up the James River McClellan could not have changed his base at Harrison's Landing, and his army would have been at the mercy of the Confederate forces.

The Monitor did not long survive the Merrimac. She went to sea after her rival was blown up and foundered off the coast of Cape Hatteras.

HISTORY OF THE NAVY. The history of the Navy and the part Southern men had in it should be classed as historical sins of omission to be righted. Did not John Paul Jones of Fredricksburg, Va., on July 4th, 1777 hoist on his ship "The Ranger," *the first American flag to float over an American war vessel?*

Did not Stephen Decatur of Maryland return with the first prize captured from the French in 1798, and did not this act inspire confidence in creating a Federal Navy? Was not Benjamin Stoddard of Maryland the first Secretary of that Navy?

Where in all naval history do you find a greater hero than William Lewis Herndon of Fredericksburg, Va.? The story of the Titanic set the minds of the world wild with consternation. Why has so little been said of the sinking of the "Central America" in 1857? On the way to Havana with 501 passengers on board, crew included, a storm was encountered, and 426 went to a watery grave, Captain Herndon among them. The Titanic was three hours sinking, the Central America three days and three nights. There was no wireless telegraphy then. The only hope was a passing vessel. Captain Herndon's cheerful spirit never left him. He kept everyone on board buoyed up with the hope of a passing boat. This kept the women and children brave. The women begged to relieve the tired and exhausted men. There was not the slightest disorder when on the third day a brig was signalled, the life boats were lowered and into them the women and children were put to buffet, it seemed in vain, against the tempestuous waves. They did reach the shore in safety.

Captain Herndon, after the life boats had been lowered, sent by the last one to leave the boat his watch to his wife as the only legacy in earthly possessions, donned his full uniform and calmly awaited death. Some few were saved from the wreck, and testified that perfect order reigned on board to the last. Truly that was

"The knightliest of the knightly race,  
That since the days of old,  
Have kept the lamp of chivalry  
Alight in hearts of gold."

The Congressional Records will give you Senator Benjamin's report, Congress' action and Seward's resolution. His fellow officers erected a monument at Annapolis to his memory.

One of Captain Herndon's children became the wife of a President of the United States, Chester A. Arthur, and Herndon himself was brother-in-law to our Matthew Fontaine Maury.

In 1862 the "Ariel," owned by Commodore Vanderbilt was seized by the Alabama off the coast of Cuba. She had on board 140 Federal officers and men, a battalion of marines, besides



300 other passengers, among them many women and children. Raphael Semmes was the commander of the Alabama. He could not take the "Ariel's" passengers on board the Alabama. The idea of sinking the vessel was never thought of. He sent word to the women and children that no harm should be done, as they were greatly frightened because they were told that they had fallen into the hands of a pirate. He promised that not an article belonging to any passenger should even be touched. The soldiers were paroled, and the "Ariel" released under bond from Commodore Vanderbilt, a bond that was never paid, however, and then the Alabama steamed away. How different was this policy from present day war policy.

The first successful submarine that was ever constructed was in Charleston Harbor, February 17th, 1864. This was the "Little David" of Hundley. It was cigar shaped, 30 or 35 feet long, and 7½ feet deep. She torpedoed the "Housatonic" and sunk her. Then the "Little David" sank too, the cause unknown. Years after she was found and raised.

What cruiser can show a record like the Shenandoah? She was in the Arctic Ocean when the surrender came. In eight months she captured 38 vessels, valued at \$1,000,000. Six were released on bond and 32 destroyed. She visited every ocean except the Antarctic, and was the only vessel that carried *the Confederate flag around the world*, and floated that flag six months after the surrender. *She fired the last gun of the Confederacy*, June 22nd, 1865. She went 58,000 miles in thirteen months without a serious mishap. She first learned of the surrender August 2nd, 1865. She decided then to go to England, and November 6th, 1865, she steamed up the river Mersey with the Confederate flag flying and gave herself up to the British Government.

The Sumter under our Raphael Semmes captured in two days seven ships loaded with sugar and molasses, and in twenty-eight days captured nine more.

When Admiral Semmes took charge of the Alabama the Sumter was sold to England and remained at Gibraltar.

No, there is such ignorance of the South's Navy, and what was accomplished by it, that it reflects upon the South, as well as the North. I wonder how many here present know that the Navy Yard was once in Charlotte, N. C. Yes, in an inland city, far away from the sea, where no ships could land or be repaired, and yet in that Navy Yard guns were cast, and gun carriages and other implements of war constructed for the land

forces, as well as for the Navy. When Norfolk surrendered this move seemed necessary. I wish that we could put Scharff's History of the Navy into every library of the South.

Last year I asked for sketches of Confederate surgeons for that volume of history, and some of you never heeded the request. Now this year I ask for sketches of men of the Navy for another volume, and I hope to be more successful. Do not allow one heroic deed to pass unrecorded.

WHO BURNED COLUMBIA? Historians still continue unblushingly to quote Sherman's official report in regard to this matter, in spite of Sherman's own acknowledgement that he falsified in making this report. He first said: "I disclaim on the part of my army any agency in the fire, but on the contrary claim that we saved what of Columbia remained unconsumed. And now without hesitancy I charge Wade Hampton with having burned his own city of Columbia." Men and women who were in Columbia at the time declared this was absolutely false, and were laughed at for their denial. The Federal troops came into the city early, at 3 A. M. February 17th, 1865, and the Confederate troops withdrew. There was no sign of burning cotton, anywhere as had been charged. One of General Hampton's officers, Lieutenant Milford Overby, 9th Ky. Cav., saw General Hampton's order to his men that no cotton should be fired for fear of burning the city. He said he could testify that he was the last Confederate soldier in the city and no cotton was burning when he left.

Dr. Joseph LeConte, in his autobiography, said: "While General Sherman had promised protection to the city, a Colonel quartered in my brother John LeConte's house, hinted that rockets would be the signal for the destruction of the city, and others so testified. At 7 P. M. the rockets were fired and the burning of Columbia began." Sherman's aide-de-camp, Major Nichols, in his diary said that the city was not fired until evening. Now that was fifteen hours after every Confederate had left.

In spite of these testimonies statements continue to be made that Sherman's troops did not burn Columbia. In 1875 General Wade Hampton demanded that the United States Senate should investigate the matter, and General Sherman did not wish such investigation, but made another official statement, which should have put forever at rest any other statement to the contrary. He said: "In my official report of the conflagration I distinctly charged it to General Wade Hamp-

ton, and now confess I did so pointedly to shake the faith of his people in him, for he was in my opinion a braggart and professed to be the special champion of South Carolina." This is found in General Sherman's book published in 1875. Later he added, "Columbia was burned rather by accident than design," but how does he account for the sky-rockets?

The truth of the matter is that British subjects began to demand payment for their cotton. If Federal troops burned it, the United States government would have to pay for that cotton. If Confederates burned it South Carolina would be responsible. When an investigation was urged the matter was dropped upon Sherman's confession. It has never been ascertained if Britain's cotton was ever paid for, but it can be stated South Carolina was never asked to do it.

Whitelaw Reid, of Ohio, editor of *The New York Tribune*, said, "The burning of Columbia was the most monstrous barbarity of Sherman's barbarous march."

RECONSTRUCTION IN THE SOUTH. I come to a period of history about which the South still feels sore, and a period I fain would pass without a comment. I refer to the Reconstruction Period following the War between the States. But since so many are writing to your Historian to ask how far the story of that period is truthfully represented in the new play "The Birth of the Nation," she feels it is best to give authentic facts. Thomas Dixon in his *Clansman* has been brave enough to faithfully give the picture of the conditions then, and for this he has been greatly maligned, but the half he has never told. Thomas Nelson Page in his "Red Rock" has given but a faint picture of those days.

"The Birth of the Nation," is not altogether a true presentation of Reconstruction Days, for it does not tell the half of the story. The humiliation and mortification endured by the men and women of the South at that time can never be told by a picture film. Still it is teaching history. I feared to see it, for I did not wish to live over again those awful experiences even through a moving picture show. I never heard of a Ku Klux being killed, especially by a negro. Their superstitious fear lest they should forever be haunted by his spirit would have made them afraid to do it. In this respect the representation is misleading, but the South owes a debt of gratitude to Mr. Griffith for having the South's side presented in this period of our history. This presentation is opening the eyes of the North.

Lest our Northern friends may think we have taken advantage of this opportunity to give vent to our feelings from the Southern point of view and what we may say will seem to be from prejudice, I shall only quote from fair-minded men of the North, not of the South, nor will I even tell you the worst things these men of the North have said.

I shall first quote from Walter Henry Cook, a professor in the Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, a Northern man by birth and education, one who is trying to read history with his heart as well as his eyes: "The Northern soldier returned to his home to find every comfort and convenience. The North was more prosperous than when the war began. Manufactures had increased; railroads had opened up the West; immigrants were supplying labor for factory and farm, and while the most destructive war in the history of the world had taken place yet an increase in wealth, population and power had been the result.

"What a contrast to the South! The Southern soldier returned defeated, sorrowful, ill-clad, ill-fed, sick in mind and body, to find the South desolate and prostrate. The whole economic system had been destroyed or confiscated. Factories in ashes, railroads in ruin, bonds useless, currency valueless, a pitiable condition!

"A new economic system could have been built up by the men and women of the South with freed slaves had they been let alone. The policy of Thad Stevens and Charles Sumner after Lincoln's death stirred up ex-slaves to hate the white men of the South, especially when they preached a gospel of social equality for which the men of the South would not stand under any circumstances."

The next quotation is from Dan Voorhees, Representative for many years, and later a United States Senator from Indiana. In his speech "Plunder of Eleven States," made in the House of Representatives, March 23rd, 1872, he pictures well the animus of Reconstruction. He said, "From turret to foundation you tore down the government of eleven States. You left not one stone upon another. You not only destroyed their local laws, but you trampled upon their ruins. You called Conventions to frame new Constitutions for these old States. You not only said who should be elected to rule over these States, but you said who should elect them. You fixed the quality and the color of the voters. You purged the ballot box of intelligence and virtue, and in their stead you placed the most ignor-

ant and unqualified race in the world to rule over these people." Then taking State by State he showed what Thad Stevens' policy had done.

"Let the great State of Georgia speak first," he said. "You permitted her to stand up and start in her new career, but seeing some flaw in your handiwork, you again destroyed and again reconstructed her State government. You clung to her throat; you battered her features out of shape and recognition, determined that your party should have undisputed possession and enjoyment of her offices, her honors, and her substance. Then bound hand and foot you handed her over to the rapacity of robbers. Her prolific and unbounded resources inflamed their desires.

"In 1861 Georgia was free from debt. Taxes were light as air. The burdens of government were easy upon her citizens. Her credit stood high, and when the war closed she was still free from indebtedness. After six years of Republican rule you present her, to the horror of the world, loaded with a debt of \$50,000,000, and the crime against Georgia is the crime this same party has committed against the other Southern States. Your work of destruction was more fatal than a scourge of pestilence, war or famine.

"Rufus B. Bullock, Governor of Georgia, dictated the legislation of Congress, and the great commonwealth of Georgia was cursed by his presence. With such a Governor, and such a Legislature in perfect harmony, morally and politically, their career will go down to posterity without a rival for infamous administrations of the world. That Governor served three years and then absconded with all of the gains. The Legislature of two years spent \$100,000 more than had been spent during any eight previous years. They even put the children's money, laid aside for education of white and black, into their own pockets."

When Senator Voorhees came to South Carolina, the proud land of Marion and Sumter, his indignation seems to have reached its pinnacle.

"There is no form of ruin to which she has not fallen a prey, no curse with which she has not been baptized, no cup of humiliation and suffering her people have not drained to the dregs. There she stands the result of your handiwork bankrupt in money, ruined in credit, her bonds hawked about the streets at ten cents on the dollar, her prosperity blighted at home and abroad, without peace, happiness, or hope. There

she stands with her skeleton frame admonishing all the world of the loathsome consequences of a government fashioned in hate and fanaticism, and founded upon the ignorant and vicious classes of manhood. Her sins may have been many and deep, and the color of scarlet, yet they will become as white as snow in comparison with those you have committed against her in the hour of her helplessness and distress."

Then he took in like manner State after State, and wound up with this: "I challenge the darkest annals of the human race for a parallel to the robberies which have been perpetrated on these eleven American States. Had you sown seeds of kindness and good will they would long ere this have blossomed into prosperity and peace. Had you sown seeds of honor, you would have reaped a golden harvest of contentment and obedience. Had you extended your charities and your justice to a distressed people you would have awakened a grateful affection in return. But as you planted in hate and nurtured in corruption so have been the fruits which you have gathered."

I return now to quote from Walter Cook in regard to Reconstruction graft. Governor Warmouth of Louisiana accumulated one and a half million in four years on a salary of \$8,000 a year. Governor Moses of South Carolina acknowledged that he had accepted \$65,000 in bribes. Governor Clayton of Arkansas said he intended to people the State with negroes. The carpetbag government of Florida stole meat and flour given for helpless women and children. In North Carolina and Alabama negro convicts were made justices of the peace, men who were unable to read or write. In the South Carolina Legislature 94 black men were members. The Speaker of the House, the Clerk of the House, the doorkeeper, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and the Chaplain, were all black men and some of them could neither read nor write."

The next is an extract from *The Chicago Chronicle*, written by a Northern man:

"The Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution grew out of a spirit of revenge, for the purpose of punishing the Southern people. It became a part of the Constitution by fraud and force to secure the results of war. The war was not fought to secure negro suffrage.

"The history of the world may be searched in vain for a parallel to the spirit of savagery which it inflicted upon a defeated and impoverished people, the unspeakably barbarous

rule of a servile race just liberated from bondage. Negro suffrage was a crime against the white people of the South. It was a crime against the blacks of the South. It was a crime against the whole citizenship of the Republic. Political power was never conferred upon a race so poorly equipped to receive it."

Now a last quotation from Charles Francis Adams, the grandson of John Quincy Adams: "I have ever been one of those who have thought extremely severe measures were dealt the Southern people after the Civil War, measures of unprecedented severity. The Southern community was not only desolated during the war but \$3,000,000,000 of property confiscated after the war. I am not aware that history records a similar act superadded to the destruction and desolation of war."

Again: "Their manumitted slaves belonging to an inferior and alien race, were enfranchised and put in control of the whole administration. Is there a similar case recorded in history? If so I have never heard of it. It was simply a case of insane procedure, and naturally resulted in disaster. We stabbed the South to the quick, and during all the years of reconstruction turned the dagger round and round in the festering wound. If the South had been permitted to secede slavery would have died a natural death."

The United States government is the only government that ever freed her slaves without giving just compensation for them.

Dr. Wyeth in his "With Sabre and Scalpel," published by Harper & Brothers, New York, says, "None but those who went through this period have any conception of it. Defeat on battlefield brought no dishonor, but all manner of oppressions, with poverty and enforced domination of a race lately in slavery brought humiliation and required a courage little less than superhuman."

The North said the Freedman's Bureau was necessary to protect the negro. The South said the Ku Klux Klan was necessary to protect the white woman.

The trouble arose from interference on the part of the scalawags and carpetbaggers in our midst, and they were the ones to be dealt with first to keep the negroes in their rightful place.

Mrs. Rose's "Ku Klux Klan" is authority on this subject. Put that book into your schools.

TEXTBOOKS. Why should we be so intent upon the truth of history being put into the textbooks taught in our schools? Be-

cause history as now written is stirring up discord and causing bitterness. It is stated upon good authority that in private schools in the South 81 per cent. use histories which misrepresent the South, 17 per cent. of these omit most important history pertaining to the South. The South resents these falsehoods, and that part of the North ignorant of our side resents our resentment. Peace can be brought into the hearts of both only when a clear, plain, fair, truthful and unprejudiced history shall be given, and that is what we as U. D. C. are trying to give.

It is the custom of your historian to publish in local papers bits of history as gathered, especially disputed points in history, inviting criticisms and correction, so that the mistakes can be corrected during the lifetime of those who have made the history. Every historian is liable to mistakes. I have made many myself, but gladly have I welcomed the corrections when proofs accompanied the correction.

One may ask, "Have any histories true to the South been written by Northern historians?" How glad I am to say "Yes," and I wish I had the means to place copies of these in our Southern as well as Northern schools. George Lunt, of Boston, Mass., in "The Origin of the Late War," written in 1865, and published by D. Appleton & Co., of New York, has given as fair and just a presentation of the causes leading to our War between the States as any Southern person could desire. He was opposed to slavery, but he did not hesitate to show that by the Constitution the North had no right to interfere, and that it was a question that the slaveholders themselves only could settle. He showed how the South's rights had been interfered with in the Tariff Acts and by other unjust discriminations, and was honest enough to fairly present both sides of the causes that forced the South to secede. General John W. Tench, of Florida, allowed me to see a copy of this book. I fear it is out of print. Dan Voorhees, of Indiana, in his speeches has righted the South in Reconstruction history. Charles Francis Adams has tried to do us justice in regard to our Constitutional rights. Hamilton Mabie has done much to right the injustice to the South in literature.

It was a Northern historian who said: "Eliminate the achievements of Virginia's great men, and you nearly unmake American history. Theirs were the brains that conceived, theirs the hands that constructed our National system, and formed the foundation upon which have been builded Ameri-



can greatness and glory." Why is it these men have done the South justice? Because they have taken the trouble to investigate the truth concerning us.

Patriotic men and women of the North as well as of the South are demanding true history, and our sectional differences will disappear when we succeed in getting down to the truth of history.

The trouble with most of the textbooks on history is that they treat mainly of current events preceding and during the War between the States, hence they are records of excited passions, embittered prejudices, and extravagant utterances of the masses of people on both sides, and few go into a philosophical review of the causes leading to the war, and how that war might have been prevented. The historians of today desirous of steering clear of those questions which embitter, omit so much that should be there, and the injustice to the South is more now in these omissions than what is really said against us.

Horace Greely, considered the fairest writer to the South of his day, in his "American Conflict," stresses the war as "a culmination of a strife for more than a century over negro slavery." That is not true. Slavery may have been, and undoubtedly was, an occasion of war, but it was not the real cause. The real cause was a different and directly opposite view as to the nature of the government of the United States. The Southern States withdrew for better protection, which the government was not giving as guaranteed by the Constitution. Then the Federal government denied their right to withdraw, and the war was to coerce them back into the Union. The South resisted them in defense of rights given them not only by the United States Constitution but by the Declaration of 1776. There really were more slave-holders in the Northern army than in the Confederate army.

Dr. Curry, in his Southern States of the American Union, says, "History, poetry, romance, art, and public opinion have been most unjust to the South. If the true record be given, the South is rich in patriotism, in intellectual force, in civic and military achievements, in heroism, in honorable and sagacious statesmanship, but if history as now written is accepted it will consign the South to infamy." Shall we accept it? I say we must not.

One college in the South had students who were too patriotic to study history unjust to the South. They were the chil-

dren of Confederate heroes. The textbook in use said, "Jefferson Davis was a man of small calibre and should have been hanged as a traitor." They sent a committee to the teacher to request that the textbook be changed. She refused on the ground of expense. They preferred the request to the President of the college, and he refused. They then applied to the Trustees and they refused. In a quiet, dignified manner, with no spirit of insubordination, they kindled a bonfire on the campus and into it every copy of that history was thrown. The authorities were taught a lesson—not one member of that class was expelled.

A grandmother teaching a grandson his geography lesson discovered in that lesson that her own brother was called a traitor because of his prominence in secession, and the statement made that he and all other rebels like him should have been hanged. She appealed to the Board of Education to exclude the book from the school, but the answer came that the expense to parents would be too great, but they ordered that particular leaf in the textbook to be cut out. Was that grandmother satisfied? Not at all.

A textbook now used largely in Southern schools contains this statement: "It is impossible for the student of history today to feel otherwise than that the cause for which the South fought was unworthy." Do you think such teaching as that is calculated to make our young people true to the cause for which their fathers and grandfathers fought?

A veteran came to me with tears streaming from his eyes, saying: "What can we do? My granddaughter came home from school and said, 'Grandpa, our teacher said today that the slaveholders beat their slaves until the blood fairly gushed out of their backs, and I was ashamed to tell them my grandfather ever owned slaves.'"

While traveling in the West I met a gentleman who said to me, "Miss Rutherford, my father was a Confederate soldier. He was killed at Shiloh, but had he lived I am sure he would have regretted having fought on the wrong side." My answer was, "Far more probably he would regret having a son so disloyal to the principles for which he was willing to give his life."

Imagine the indignation of a party of Southern tourists when they found in a London hotel in a copy of *The British Weekly*, giving James Russell Lowell as authority, the following statement: "The aristocracy of the South has added nothing to the requirements of civilization except the carrying of

bowie knives and the chewing of tobacco, the hightoned Southern gentleman being not only quadruminous, but quid-ruminant." And again quoting from the same authority, also found in *The British Weekly*: "During the late American war, the Southern women wore personal ornaments made of the bones of their buried foe, and the prisoners were starved that their scalps should be used as trophies."

Matthew Maury's name is omitted from the list of great scientists found in the Congressional Library. Why? Because he espoused the Confederate cause.

In a textbook on history is found this statement: "The Confederacy was now placed before the civilized world as the champion of the detested institution of slavery. The Southern people under this institution were daily growing morally, mentally and physically weaker."

Another textbook refers to "the clemency of the North in not hanging Robert E. Lee and Jefferson Davis." The names of the authors of these books are not given because of the advertisement. A lesson was learned when we attacked a certain history by name several years ago.

Let me assure you that we are not demanding textbooks written wholly, nor printed wholly by Southern writers; but we do recommend, where Southern men have invested their capital in publishing houses for southern textbooks, as the B. F. Johnson Co., in Richmond, and can compete in quality and price with northern firms, that Boards of Education in the South should give preference to the southern publishers. We shall not be free in the South so long as we are bound hand and foot by the Book Trust, and so long as there are men living amongst us willing to be bribed.

When I attacked the Book Trust in Washington City, in 1912, a gentleman wrote to me offering his aid in investigating this question of bribery. He said: "With your permission I wish to lay before you the root of the trouble as I see it. The teachers and officials are not so much to blame as certain big lawyers and politicians in the South. Some of these are sons of Confederate soldiers, I am sorry to say, but they are employed by the Book Trust to continue the use of books unjust to the South, because those books having been condemned thirty or forty years ago, no royalty is paid upon them, and the cost of manufacture is very small. This is kept a secret of course, and these lawyers and politicians stultify themselves by accepting large fees, in reality they are bribes,

to keep these books in the schools, and I have proof in hand where from \$5,000 to \$40,000 have been paid for such service. Of course, all of this can only be stopped when a responsible body like the Daughters of the Confederacy or Confederate Veterans take it in hand. When they do, there is a *great cloud of witnesses that can be produced.*" Now this is the work our Textbook Committee must take in hand next year.

If you will look into the compilations of American Literature in your libraries you will find that the Southern writers have never had their due. For instance in Stedman's and Hutchinson's Library of American Literature *fifty* pages are given to Walt Whitman, and *five* lines to our Henry Timrod. Richardson in his American Literature gives *forty* pages to Fenimore Cooper, and only *four* pages to our William Gilmore Sims. Pattee in his literature gives as many pages to William Dean Howells as he does to Paul Hamilton Hayne, Joel Chandler Harris, the Uncle Remus unique in literature, and George W. Cable, and he does not even mention Father Ryan and James Barron Hope. Pancoast gives page after page to E. P. Roe, and does not mention James Lane Allen and Robert Burns Wilson. John R. Thompson, the intimate friend of Thackeray and Tennyson, is rarely found in any American poetical compilation. In Masterpieces of American Literature, published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., no mention is made of Edgar Allen Poe, "the master of style and literary imagery," while much space is given to O'Reilly's Puritan.

Now in your libraries also are textbooks and books of fiction equally as unjust to the South and you do not know it. We must know our own history and literature. If we of the South are not sufficiently interested in the history of the South to see that it is taught correctly we will continue to be misrepresented. The newspapers and magazines of the North and West are now daily misrepresenting us. Just a few weeks ago *The Chicago Tribune* said: "The South is a region of illiteracy, blatant self-righteousness, and until better blood is introduced the South will remain a reproach and a danger to the American republic."

Many histories now in use stress three things which they call "salient facts"—we fought to hold our slaves; we were brutal to the Andersonville prisoners; and we were whipped.

The sooner we know our own history and teach it, the sooner will such misrepresentations cease. While we pity the ignorance which brought forth these statements we cannot rely

upon pity to correct them. We of the South must do it, and do it quickly. Is not this argument sufficient to show the need of a Chair of Southern History and Literature in our Teachers College?

The fairminded North will be glad to know the truth concerning us. Then let us give it to them. You may ask, "How can this best be done?" I reply, "Only by a systematic study of our own history and conditions."

May I urge that in your libraries, public and private, school and university, two sets of books be placed? Only in this way can your children know what the South may claim. These books are in several volumes, and you cannot expect to get something for nothing, but they will not cost you as much as those histories and encyclopædias there in your libraries today that are teaching untruths concerning the South. These two sets of books I wish you to place in your homes are "The South in the Building of a Nation," sold by J. S. Clark, Birmingham, Ala., and "The Library of Southern Literature," sold by Martin, Hoyt & Company, of Atlanta. One supplements the other.

The writing of essays on subjects pertaining to Southern history has been of untold advantage. I can speak for my own State, where nearly 7,000 school children have been reached this year by the subject, "The Causes that Led to the War Between the States."

THINGS THAT MAKE FOR PEACE. Among my volumes of U. D. C. history is one called "The Things that Make for Peace." In this volume is placed everything beautiful and magnanimous that I find said or done by one side for the other side.

For instance, Col. James Sample, of the Grand Army of the Republic, has sent me copies of articles that he has written, one refuting the charge that President Davis was arrested in woman's clothes, the other refuting the charge that Senator Hepburn made in the United States Senate in regard to General Lee's acceptance of pay from the United States government after he had cast his lot with the Confederate cause.

I have in this volume all of the data regarding the monument that our Mr. Cunningham was instrumental in having erected to Mr. Owen, the officer who was kind to him and other prisoners when in a Northern prison.

I have the testimony of the Vermont teacher, who said her pastor had urged her to accept a position in the South that she might be a missionary to the benighted blacks of the South, but

she was returning now to be a missionary to the benighted whites of Vermont.

I have in it also the tributes to Captain Wirz from soldiers that were in Andersonville Prison, testifying to his uniform courteous treatment of them. I have a copy of the letter accompanying the watch they presented to him for his kindness.

I have also an account of one of President Davis' old political enemies, one prominent in the John Brown affair, being received as a guest at Beauvoir, and a copy of a letter from him testifying to the injustice that had been done to President Davis.

I have the tribute to the Southern gentleman by one of the Federal generals who was placed in Georgia when the South was under military rule. He said he had asked to be placed in the South in order to humiliate those slave-drivers of the South, but he wished now to testify that he had found those slaveholders types of the finest Christian manhood.

I have Henry Grady's New England speech, and Henry Watterson's tribute to Abraham Lincoln, General John B. Gordon's tribute to Northern valor, and many others of like spirit.

I have Lee's reply when the mother requested him to teach her boy to hate the Yankees. "Madam, take your boy home. We do not teach our boys to hate."

I have letters from many G. A. R. men commending the spirit of "Wrongs of History Righted," and offering to aid me in righting other wrongs.

I have requests from negro teachers at the head of schools asking for copies of "Wrongs of History Righted" to give to their teachers. I never open that book that I do not feel that the spirit of Sumner Cunningham is brooding about me. Are you taking his Veteran?

I have great faith to believe that all will be well in the end, and my faith is greatly strengthened as I see a growing desire on the part of our own people to study history and find out the truth of history. Bitterness and sectionalism will pass away when the whole truth is known.

Let us have patience and have faith in our Nation. Let us believe that liberty is a God-given gift and cannot fail. Let us have faith in the loyal natural heart of America, and believe that sooner or later all wrongs will be righted, all evil will be uprooted.

Clouds will cross the heavens, but let us not forget that the sun still shines.

Society is out of joint. Things do need adjustment, threatening evils, social and political are near, but let us be patient, for if honest hearts are aroused against these evils they must give way before an indignant people, and order and peace will be restored under the guiding hand of a great and loving Jehovah.







LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 441 015 4





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 441 015 4 ●