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Executive Summary

This is one of two reports for subcommittee 1 which summarizes the pros of renaming J.E.B. Stuart High School.

The name “J.E.B. Stuart” does not reflect the values of our community as expressed by our student leaders, parents, and by the Fairfax County School Board that has affirmed a “commitment to maintaining a safe, inclusive and welcome learning environment for all children in our public school system...” as stated in the “Fairfax County Statement on Diversity and Inclusion.” It is antithetical to Fairfax County’s policy and position on diversity and inclusion to continue to have a school in our community named after a man who took up arms in defense of the enslavement of four million people and their descendants.

While many Confederate apologists have tried to argue that the Civil War was not about the right to continue to enslave Americans of African ancestry, statements by Confederate leaders and documents of the Confederate government make clear that central reasons the Confederacy was formed and the Confederate army started the war in South Carolina was to preserve the autonomy to maintain an economy based on slave labor. It was about money and the slaves were a valuable commodity.

It is also clear that Fairfax County actively and affirmatively supported Richmond’s efforts to resist, circumvent, and discourage integration. Richmond did not force FCPS to name its two new high schools after Confederate military heroes, something which Fairfax County had never done before.

Several supporters of retaining “Stuart High School” disingenuously claim that changing the name of one high school would inevitably require the School Board to change the name of other schools named after slave owners. This is false. We do not oppose “Stuart” because Mr. Stuart was a slave-owner -- not a worthy thing to have been; we object to honoring him because he took up arms against the United State in the cause of slavery, and his name represents the Confederate cause.

Retiring the name “Stuart” would not, and should not, “erase history.” Diplomas, and distinctions achieved by our students will be retained and celebrated. It is however, an opportunity to teach history more fully and to unite our community behind our values, which means recognizing and celebrating the contributions of all citizens, including women, girls, and people of color to our community, state and country. Re-christening “Stuart” would provide an ideal and rare opportunity to bring us together as a community to stand for and reflect who we are – an “inclusive and welcome learning environment for all children.”

This decision rests with each member of the School Board, who by his or her vote on June 22, will affirm the values of our community in the twenty first century.
Virginia

So much of what is great and so much of what is heartbreaking in American history began in Virginia. In our state, the drive for independence, democracy, and religious freedom coexisted with ethnic cleansing, slavery, segregation, homophobia, racism and sexism. Virginia’s inability to move beyond these inclinations led to civil war and a loss of national leadership. National acquiescence to these evils threatened America’s role as the leader of “the Free World.”

For almost a century, following the end of Reconstruction, Virginia committed itself to Jim Crow and white supremacy. Regrettably, in Plessy v. Ferguson, the U.S. Supreme Court endorsed “separate but equal” facilities and opportunities, to the disadvantage of all of our citizens, especially to those of African ancestry.

In 1924, at the height of the eugenics movement, in an effort to protect the “purity of the white race” the Virginia legislature passed the “Racial Integrity Act” which made it illegal for any student of any known African ancestry to attend a school reserved for European Americans.

Racial segregation in public hotels and transportation was unavoidably bound up with segregation in education, discrimination in employment, and political disenfranchisement. Racism and sexism permeated society.

In 1951, a courageous young Virginian - Barbara Johns - acted to end school segregation in Prince Edward County and throughout the South. The resulting court case, bundled with the well-known, “Brown v. Topeka Board of Education”, culminated in the 1954 Supreme Court finding that segregation in education was illegal. Since segregated schools were central to segregated society, this ruling inevitably led to desegregation in transportation and legislation prohibiting discrimination in housing and employment.

It is essential to recognize that women and girls as community leaders, plaintiffs, and pioneering students played vital roles in creating the more open and just society many of us enjoy today. In addition to Barbara Johns, this long list includes Linda Brown, Rosa Parks, Atherine Lucy, Vivian Malone (Jones), Charlayne Hunter (Gault), Elizabeth Eckford, Mildred Loving, and six year old Ruby Bridges. With the exception of Rosa Parks and Mildred Loving, these great American heroes are not generally remembered for their courage and contribution to our country.

For almost a century, beginning in 1870, Fairfax County maintained separate and unequal systems, one for European Americans and another for African Americans and mixed race students. For eighty-four of these of these years, our county did not provide a high school for non-white students. Luther Jackson Middle School opened its doors to black children in 1954. Separate but equal.
Even after the 1954 Supreme County decision outlawing segregated schools, Virginia and Fairfax County continued to resist integration. This effort, announced by Senator Harry F. Byrd in 1956, was known as “Massive Resistance.”

While Confederate apologists argue that Richmond required Fairfax County to resist integration, a careful reading of the record clearly indicates that Fairfax County, on its own accord, actively opposed obeying the Supreme Court. The newspaper articles included as appendices to this report document the path Fairfax County was on and the resistance to integration that was pervasive in our community.

**Article after article describes that Fairfax County in 1959, 1960 was resisting integration and established “separate but equal” policies. Many articles that describe this, some from local and some from national papers, are included in the appendix of this report, on pages 182-198.**

Although some jurisdictions, including Norfolk, Charlottesville and Warren County, tried to comply with the Supreme Court’s rulings, despite Richmond’s opposition, Fairfax County did not. Neither Virginia’s governors nor legislature required the Fairfax County School Board to name two new high schools after Confederate idols, Robert E. Lee and J.E.B. Stuart. **Given our county’s determined resistance to integration, the assertion that the naming of a high school in honor of a Confederate general had nothing to do with the School Board’s opposition to integration is an assault on logic and reason.**

“The naming of schools after Confederate figures is particularly rich with symbolism because of the South’s slow move to integrate. Many schools were named after the United States Supreme Court ruled segregated schools unconstitutional in 1954 but before the departure of whites left many inner city schools with a black majority.”

As one black father, speaking in favor of retiring the name “J.E.B. Stuart High School,” asked at the community meeting on May 23, 2017, “Is it not the better course of action to correct a mistake and do what is right?”

**The Civil War was fought to preserve slavery and white supremacy.**

At the Virginia secession convention of 1861, pro-secession delegates made quite clear the only two issues of concern were the preservation of slavery and the threat to white supremacy they felt inevitable if slaves were freed. Speaker Henry L Benning made clear in his speech before the convention what he believed were the dire consequences for Virginia should the institution of slavery be abolished, “…the black race will be in large majority, and then we will have black governors, black legislatures, black juries, black everything…Is it to be supposed that the white race will stand that?” (Charles B. Dew, *Apostles of Disunion: Southern Secession Commissioners*

---

and the Causes of the Civil War, University Press of Virginia, 2001). Benning merely echoed the sentiments of pro secession supporters (fire breathers) at other southern conventions, and from a famous speech of the newly elected Vice President of the Confederacy, Alexander Stephens. In describing the new Confederate Republic he declared, “… its foundations are laid, its corner- stone rests upon the great truth, that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery -- subordination to the superior race -- is his natural and normal condition” (Alexander Stephens, “Corner Stone Speech”, Savannah, Georgia, March 21, 1861, https://www.ucs.louisiana.edu/~ras2777/amgov/stephens.html).

The Declaration of Causes of Secession, the Constitution of the Confederate States, and Jefferson Davis’ message to Congress in 1861 all describe in great detail that the men writing those documents were carefully building a country that would enslave four million people and their descendants. The appendix includes all of these documents, pages 111-143 and the language that describes their beliefs and their laws is highlighted in yellow.

For example, Article IV, section 3 of the Confederate Constitution reads:

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

Jefferson Davis wrote in his letter to Congress:

In the meantime, under the mild and genial climate of the Southern States and the increasing care and attention for the wellbeing and comfort of the laboring class, dictated alike by interest and humanity, the African slaves had augmented in number from about 600,000, at the date of the adoption of the constitutional compact, to upward of 4,000,000. In moral and social condition they had been elevated from brutal savages into docile, intelligent, and civilized agricultural laborers, and supplied not only with bodily comforts but with careful religious instruction. Under the supervision of a superior race their labor had been so directed as not only to allow a gradual and marked amelioration of their own condition, but to convert hundreds of thousands of square miles of the wilderness into cultivated lands covered with a prosperous people; towns and cities had sprung into existence, and had rapidly increased in wealth and population under the social system of the South; the white population of the Southern slaveholding States had augmented from about 1,250,000 at the date of the adoption of the Constitution to more than 8,500,000 in 1860; and the productions of the South in cotton, rice, sugar, and tobacco, for the full development and continuance of which the labor of African slaves was and is indispensable, had swollen to an amount which formed nearly three-fourths of
the exports of the whole United States and had become absolutely necessary to
the wants of civilized man.

J.E.B. Stuart could not help but be aware of this as he tendered his resignation from the United
States Army, May 3, 1861. He would have followed the newspapers of the day, corresponded
with family back home in Virginia, and engaged in the undoubtedly intense conversations in the
officer’s mess of his station barracks in St Louis. The arguments of the secession commissioners,
and the speeches of the Confederacy’s government officials did not mention taxes or tariffs or
even state’s rights as grievances justifying fracturing the United States. Instead, they
exclusively focused on what they perceived as an imminent threat to their “peculiar
institution”, and the implication that equal rights for blacks necessarily would follow
emancipation. When Stuart offered his service to the newly formed Confederate Republic, he
undoubtedly was also aware that he would effectively renounce his American citizenship in
favor of Confederate Republic citizenship. As a former army officer Stuart also understood that
the firing on Fort Sumter on April 12, 1861 meant his service in the Army of Virginia
represented an act of treason.

Article 3 of the US Constitution specifically labels the taking of arms against the United States
Government an act of treason.

Stuart served as a prominent general in the Army of Virginia cavalry. In this position, he
developed the role of the Virginia cavalry as the eyes of the army and as “raiders” for badly
needed supplies and war materials. It was in this capacity, and to keep Federal forces off
balance following Lee’s retreat from the Antietam Battlefield, Sept 17, 1862, that Lee
dispatched Stuart on a raid into Pennsylvania. On October 9, 1862, Stuart and 1,800 of his best
soldiers crossed the Potomac River into Maryland and headed for Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.
Army of Virginia intelligence had identified Chambersburg as a major federal army supplies
depot which was lightly defended. Upon entering Chambersburg, Stuart dispatched his troops
to hunt down blacks in the surrounding communities and chain them for the trip back to
Virginia. Locals reported witnessing between 12 and 50 blacks captured by Stuart’s Raiders (Ted
Alexander, *A Regular Slave Hunt: The Army of Northern Virginia and Black Civilians in the
Gettysburg Campaign*, North & South, September 2001, Vol. 4, Number 7). Several articles
describing these Confederate attacks on freed and escaped black people are included in the
appendix of this report, page 163-181.

Virginia was, according to the census of 1860, the most populous of all the slave states (NY,
PA, and OH were by far the most populated of the 36 states at the time) and VA also had the
most residents living in slavery in the whole country, just under half a million people, 31% of
the population living in slavery. Georgia comes in second place, and Mississippi in third place,
compared with VA, for the total number of people living in slavery. South Carolina is in first
place for the greatest percentage of people living in slavery, relative to the total population –
57%, a majority. Overall, 39% of the population of the Confederate states were enslaved
people.
A little bit of quick excel spreadsheet manipulation shows that a minority of the population in the confederate states were slaveholders, and, turns out, also had the right to vote. 9% in MS and SC, and just 5% in VA.

Too bad everyone didn’t have the right to vote.

Women made up pretty much half of the population in VA in 1860, according to the Federal Census, 550,000 women to 558,000 men. They also couldn’t vote.


The Lost Cause of the Confederacy is Meant to Romanticize the Civil War

When JEB Stuart was mortally wounded at the Battle of Yellow Tavern, he had ignored two previous federal offers of pardon if he laid down his arms. On his death bed, witnesses claimed he uttered his satisfaction at giving his life for his new country. As Secession Commissioner John Smith Preston pointed out to the Virginia convention in 1861, “there can never again be a reconstruction of the late Federal Union”. (Dew, P. 71)

The name JEB Stuart on our school honors and reveres a man who committed unrepentant treason against his country. His defense of the institution of slavery and white supremacy, resulted in the death of 620,000 and wounding of thousands of Americans. When the Fairfax County School Board (FCSB) chose to name the new whites only school, they were aware of the connotation of the name as a celebration of the Confederacy and segregation. In case anyone missed their point, they chose a raider mascot – a confederate soldier waving a rebel battle flag. The rebel battle flag had not flown widely on government facilities throughout the south prior to its adoption in the early 1950s as the symbol of segregation and in Virginia adoption of the mass resistance strategy.

Several articles on the Lost Cause of the Confederacy are included in the appendix of this report, pages 157-162.

Opportunities

The last couple of years have seen a large number of schools and governments reaffirming their commitments to diversity and inclusion. FCPS and Fairfax County have also clearly made this a priority. And choosing to rename Stuart HS will signal that the FCPS School Board recognizes the important to stand against the values of the Confederacy which included racism, white supremacy, and slavery. A decision to rename the school will also signal that FCPS School recognizes its past defiance to desegregation and equal education of the 1950’s Fairfax County and the Commonwealth of Virginia represented by the naming of this school in 1959.
New Orleans, Charlottesville, Richmond

As we learn more of our history and see clearly what the past held, we are witnessing and participating in a national movement to remove Confederate symbols and names from schools, in New Orleans, in Charlottesville, in Henrico County, and even in Texas. Articles are attached to this report that describe the movement and the renaming of schools all over the country. As stated so eloquently by the mayor of New Orleans upon removing confederate statues from the streets there, “’’We have not erased history; we are becoming part of the city’s history by righting the wrong image these monuments represent and crafting a better, more complete future for all our children and for future generations…we now have a chance to create not only new symbols, but to do it together, as one people.’’” See appendix, page 18 to read his full speech.

“As part of its work, the Committee to Establish Principles on Renaming [at Yale] studied similar conversations about naming and commemoration that have arisen in recent years at institutions such as Georgetown University, Harvard Law School, Princeton University, and the University of Texas at Austin. At these and other institutions of higher learning, certain names have changed, while others have not. Yale has learned from these situations while, necessarily, charting its own course.”2

The appendix of this report includes articles on the renaming of schools in VA and TX and throughout the country, see pages 26-46.

Parts of our history should not make us proud, but we can learn from them. Slavery and an economy based on slave labor, an inhumane and brutal life for millions, was debated and normalized by the founding fathers of the United States in the 17th Century, and the confederacy, a minority of the population, declared a war to preserve it in 1861, a war to sustain the enslavement of 4 million people and their descendants, a war that killed 620,000 people and became the legacy of Jim Crow, “separate but equal” access to an education and economic success, the “searing truth” of our history and the “searing truth” of our present. It is ingrained in our culture, our economy and our society.

FCPS Position on Diversity and Inclusion: A Safe and Inclusive Environment
Such commitments are clearly at odds with recent commitments to diversity and inclusion made by both FCPS and Fairfax County. Such commitments are clearly at odds with the FCPS Portrait of a Graduate, as an Ethical and Global Citizen, which commits to instill these values in a FCPS graduate:

2 http://news.yale.edu/2017/02/11/yale-change-calhoun-college-s-name-honor-grace-murray-hopper-0
1. Acknowledges and understands diverse perspectives and cultures when considering local, national, and world issues
2. Understands the foundations of our country and values our rights, privileges, and responsibilities
3. Demonstrates empathy, compassion, and respect for others

Such a commitment is also at odds with the Fairfax County School Board’s decision on April 6, 2017 to endorse the “Fairfax County Statement on Diversity and Inclusion.” The statement affirms Fairfax County’s strong commitment to maintaining a community culture that values and celebrates the similarities as well as the differences among our neighbors and affirms a commitment to a safe, inclusive, and welcoming learning environment for all children in our public schools.

Fairfax County Public School’s supports and endorses the “Fairfax County Statement on Diversity and Inclusion,” Fairfax County’s strong commitment to maintaining a community culture that values and celebrates the similarities as well as the differences among our neighbors and affirms a commitment to a safe, inclusive, and welcoming learning environment for all children in our public schools.

As stated by Judge Martin F. Clark of Patrick County VA, public spaces should be “fair and utterly neutral. In my estimation, the portrait of a uniformed Confederate general—and a slave owner himself—does not comport with that essential standard.” For this reason, he removed a picture of JEB Stuart from his courtroom.

Taylor Reveley, the president of The College of William & Mary, echoed Judge Clark’s sentiments when he removed Confederate symbols from the Wren Building and relocated them to the school library “to join other historic artifacts describing William and Mary’s past.” He said he made the changes to make W&M more welcoming. “We are an institution deeply rooted in history and committed to understanding our part in it,” he said.

Changing the name to a name that inspires our students, clearly presents FCPS with the opportunity to demonstrate the priority of these important values, equality and safety.

**Voices for Name Change**

Inspiration leads to innovation. And our students are inspired to live by the values of Fairfax County – to create a safe, inclusive and welcome learning environment.

**Students for Change: I am not a Raider**

In May of 2015, five students at J.E.B. Stuart High School united to change the name of their school. Some were motivated after a history lesson about racism in Virginia during the Civil Rights Movement led them to reflect on their school’s name, and others were moved by their

---

3 [http://www.richmond.com/news/local/education/w-m-to-remove-replace-confederate-emblems/article_a1c43521-09ba-5f9d-a2d2-0bfb1af8c372.html](http://www.richmond.com/news/local/education/w-m-to-remove-replace-confederate-emblems/article_a1c43521-09ba-5f9d-a2d2-0bfb1af8c372.html)
long-standing feelings of frustration with the Confederate symbols honored through and representing their school.

Students had met with their principal, begun working on a short documentary about the name of J.E.B. Stuart High School, and set up a meeting with their district’s school board member by the time of the Charleston Massacre on June 17, 2015. This event sparked discussions about the name of J.E.B. Stuart High School and led alumni and other students to speak out about their support. Over the summer, Students for Change united with Alumni for Change, the Fairfax County NAACP, and other community groups to advance their advocacy.

In June of 2016 the original 5 students all graduated. A group of 3 other students, only sophomores at the time, established a Social Justice Club. The original group of students and this group had worked together before, and when the original group graduated this group took over the leadership effort. They have continued to work with the NAACP, SuRJ NOVA, the Tinner Hill Foundation and other local groups to advance their cause.

Parent and student public statements and testimonies are attached, beginning on page 65.

The Way Forward: A Valuable and Uncommon Opportunity to Inspire

A decision by the School Board to retire the name of “J.E.B. Start High School” would create new opportunities:

Naming a school - like choosing a textbook or writing a curriculum - is an educational decision. It can provide values, information and motivate students to learn, achieve and serve our community and country.

Rebranding would encourage a deeper and more comprehensive study and understanding of Virginia history, especially the contributions of women, girls and people of color to our community, state and nation.

A new appropriate name should provide an occasion to unify our community and affirm that Fairfax County values and promotes gender and racial equality. This is very important, especially since earlier school boards did not see fit to name one of our county’s twenty-six high schools after a female or person of color.

It would be a wasted educational opportunity if the School Board should replace the name “Stuart” with a place name such as “Munson Hill,” or “Peace Valley” or “High School Twenty-Eight.” Such names neither teach nor inspire. It could, moreover, encourage calls to rename all Fairfax County schools, now named after a person, after the communities they serve.

Re-christening this high school with an inspiring name would encourage greater private financial support for our high school. The national movement to remove Confederate symbols from public spaces is mission-driven and has the potential to draw our community together for
a purpose that demonstrates our commitment to equality, a commitment that many share across the county, the state, and the country.

Supporters of the name change share frustrations with the hostility and divisiveness of this debate, but hope that people recognize that these are not mandatory in this important discussion about the school's name, and that people on both sides of the issue have contributed to this tone.

We hope people understand that we are not advocating for county funds to be spent on a name change. We share concern for budget problems in the community. While these are important to discuss, the ad hoc committee and this subcommittee are sponsored by FCPS to focus on the possible renaming.

Many people from the other side are trying to create the impression that supporters of the name change do not care about other problems at the school. This is not true, and we hope that this report will present a productive discussion about whether or not the school should be renamed, as the county intended.

Renaming JEB Stuart High School would provide each member of the School Board to stand up for the beliefs of our community, our school, our School Board, Fairfax County, and our country.

Should those in opposition to the name change prevail, if they can prove more residents of Fairfax County or the Stuart pyramid support them? Do we ignore what is happening across the rest of the country? Do we ignore the searing truth of our history and place men who fought to preserve the enslavement of 4 million people and their descendants literally on pedestals and put their names on buildings? Or do we face the searing truth and place those monuments in museums and continue to preserve their memory in history books and dissertations and the study of our past?

Do we do what some say is the will of the majority, what they claim is popular?

Do we do what is easy, or do we do what is right?

Our priorities are clear – stand up for the values we teach in FCPS: diversity, inclusion, and access to education for all, not the values of the confederacy that “equality of all men, irrespective of race or color is a doctrine at war with nature, in opposition to the experience of mankind, and in violation of the plainest revelations of Divine Law.” Many in our community choose to not send their children to J.E.B. Stuart HS because of the demographics of our population, echoing the sentiments of 150 years ago. FCPS stands for equality and embraces diversity and inclusion.

To quote a friend, the good guys won the Civil War.

Thankfully, the men, a minority of the population who gave only themselves the right to vote,
the 750,000 men who fought to preserve the enslavement of 4 million people and their
descendants, men who started a war that killed 620,000 people and became the legacy of Jim
Crow -- “separate but equal” access to an education and economic success, the “searing truth”
of our history and the “searing truth” of our present, men some have literally put on pedestals
and whose names some have placed on buildings and schools, lost their fight. It is time to face
the "searing truth" and place monuments to them in museums, to remove their names from
our schools, and to continue to preserve the memory and study of their fight in historic
battlefields, history books, dissertations, and the study of our past.

Appendices
Appendix FCPS Statement on Diversity and Inclusion

https://www.fcps.edu/news/fairfax-county-school-board-formally-supports-countys-statement-
diversity-and-inclusion

Fairfax County School Board Formally Supports County’s Statement on Diversity
and Inclusion
News Release
APRIL 07, 2017

The Fairfax County School Board voted to formally support and endorse the “Fairfax
County Statement on Diversity and Inclusion,” approved by the Board of Supervisors,
at its business meeting on April 6. The statement affirms Fairfax County’s strong
commitment to maintaining a community culture that values and celebrates the
similarities as well as the differences among our neighbors and affirms a
commitment to a safe, inclusive, and welcoming learning environment for all
children in our public schools.

Fairfax County Statement on Diversity and Inclusion
April 4, 2017

Today, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors voted to adopt the following
resolution:

Whereas, Fairfax County is and will continue to be a County that exemplifies values
of respect and acceptance;
Whereas, we welcome and celebrate one another’s differences and cultural backgrounds; 

Whereas, while immigration is a federal matter, Fairfax County does partner with federal authorities on serious criminal matters when required; 

Whereas, we do not ask, nor do we have the resources for, our police officers to become immigration officials, nor for Fairfax County to assume the responsibilities of federal immigration officials; 

Whereas, Fairfax County Police successfully engage in community policing, which requires the trust of residents who are not afraid to call law enforcement if their safety is at risk, or to report information that may help to solve a crime; 

Whereas, it is the responsibility of our police officers to ensure the safety of Fairfax County residents through community policing rather than through immigration enforcement; 

Whereas, Fairfax County Public Schools complies with the federally mandated requirements that we educate all children, regardless of immigration status; 

Whereas, the School Board is committed to maintaining a safe, inclusive and welcoming learning environment for all children in our public school system and Fairfax County Public Schools values the richly diverse backgrounds of our students and families; 

Whereas, Fairfax County’s diversity makes our community strong and vibrant, and we are proud of what every resident has to offer; 

Therefore, be it resolved that the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors does hereby affirm our strong commitment to maintaining a community culture that values and celebrates the similarities as well as the differences among our neighbors.
Appendix FCPS Portrait of a Graduate

https://www.fcps.edu/about-fcps/portrait-graduate

In 2014, FCPS adopted the Portrait of a Graduate to answer this question: What are the skills necessary for success for all children in this rapidly changing, increasingly diverse, and interconnected world? Portrait of a Graduate moves FCPS students and staff members to look beyond the high-stakes testing environment and to help our students develop skills so they can be successful in the workforce of the future.

What skills does a student need to become a successful Portrait of a Graduate?

Communicator

- Applies effective reading skills to acquire knowledge and broaden perspectives.
- Employs active listening strategies to advance understanding.
- Speaks in a purposeful manner to inform, influence, motivate, or entertain listeners.
- Incorporates effective writing skills for various purposes and audiences to convey understanding and concepts.
- Uses technological skills and contemporary digital tools to explore and exchange ideas.

Collaborator

- Respects divergent thinking to engage others in thoughtful discussion.
- Demonstrates the ability to work interdependently within a group to promote learning, increase productivity, and achieve common goals.
- Analyzes and constructs arguments and positions to ensure examination of a full range of viewpoints.
- Seeks and uses feedback from others to adapt ideas and persist in accomplishing difficult tasks.

Ethical and Global Citizen

- Acknowledges and understands diverse perspectives and cultures when considering local, national, and world issues.
- Contributes to solutions that benefit the broader community.
- Communicates effectively in multiple languages to make meaningful connections.
- Promotes environmental stewardship.
- Understands the foundations of our country and values our rights, privileges, and responsibilities.
- Demonstrates empathy, compassion, and respect for others.
- Acts responsibly and ethically to build trust and lead.

Creative and Critical Thinker

- Engages in problem solving, inquiry, and design of innovative solutions to overcome obstacles to improve outcomes.
- Uses information in novel and creative ways to strengthen comprehension and deepen awareness.
• Demonstrates divergent and ingenious thought to enhance the design-build process.
• Expresses thought, ideas, and emotions meaningfully through the arts.
• Evaluates ideas and information sources for validity, relevance, and impact.
• Reasons through and weighs evidence to reach conclusions.

Goal-Directed and Resilient Individual

• Engages in healthy and positive practices and relationships to promote overall physical and mental well-being.
• Persists to accomplish difficult tasks and to overcome academic and personal barriers to meet goals.
• Uses time and financial resources wisely to set goals, complete tasks, and manage projects.
• Shows strong understanding and belief of self to engage in reflection for individual improvement and advocacy.
Thank you for coming.

The soul of our beloved City is deeply rooted in a history that has evolved over thousands of years; rooted in a diverse people who have been here together every step of the way – for both good and for ill.

It is a history that holds in its heart the stories of Native Americans: the Choctaw, Houma Nation, the Chitimacha. Of Hernando de Soto, Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle, the Acadians, the Islenos, the enslaved people from Senegambia, Free People of Color, the Haitians, the Germans, both the empires of France and Spain. The Italians, the Irish, the Cubans, the south and central Americans, the Vietnamese and so many more.

You see: New Orleans is truly a city of many nations, a melting pot, a bubbling cauldron of many cultures.

There is no other place quite like it in the world that so eloquently exemplifies the uniquely American motto: e pluribus unum — out of many we are one.

But there are also other truths about our city that we must confront. New Orleans was America’s largest slave market: a port where hundreds of thousands of souls were brought, sold and shipped up the Mississippi River to lives of forced labor of misery of rape, of torture.

America was the place where nearly 4,000 of our fellow citizens were lynched, 540 alone in Louisiana; where the courts enshrined ‘separate but equal’; where Freedom riders coming to New Orleans were beaten to a bloody pulp.

So when people say to me that the monuments in question are history, well what I just described is real history as well, and it is the searing truth.

And it immediately begs the questions: why there are no slave ship monuments, no prominent markers on public land to remember the lynchings or the slave blocks; nothing to remember this long chapter of our lives; the pain, the sacrifice, the shame ... all of it happening on the soil of New Orleans.
So for those self-appointed defenders of history and the monuments, they are eerily silent on what amounts to this historical malfeasance, a lie by omission.

There is a difference between remembrance of history and reverence of it. For America and New Orleans, it has been a long, winding road, marked by great tragedy and great triumph. But we cannot be afraid of our truth.

As President George W. Bush said at the dedication ceremony for the National Museum of African American History & Culture, “A great nation does not hide its history. It faces its flaws and corrects them.”

So today I want to speak about why we chose to remove these four monuments to the Lost Cause of the Confederacy, but also how and why this process can move us towards healing and understanding of each other.

So, let’s start with the facts.

The historic record is clear: the Robert E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, and P.G.T. Beauregard statues were not erected just to honor these men, but as part of the movement which became known as The Cult of the Lost Cause. This ‘cult’ had one goal — through monuments and through other means — to rewrite history to hide the truth, which is that the Confederacy was on the wrong side of humanity.

First erected over 166 years after the founding of our city and 19 years after the end of the Civil War, the monuments that we took down were meant to rebrand the history of our city and the ideals of a defeated Confederacy.

It is self-evident that these men did not fight for the United States of America. They fought against it. They may have been warriors, but in this cause they were not patriots.

These statues are not just stone and metal. They are not just innocent remembrances of a benign history. These monuments purposefully celebrate a fictional, sanitized Confederacy; ignoring the death, ignoring the enslavement, and the terror that it actually stood for.

After the Civil War, these statues were a part of that terrorism as much as a burning cross on someone’s lawn; they were erected purposefully to send a strong message to all who walked in their shadows about who was still in charge in this city.

Should you have further doubt about the true goals of the Confederacy, in the very weeks before the war broke out, the Vice President of the Confederacy, Alexander Stephens,
made it clear that the Confederate cause was about maintaining slavery and white supremacy.

He said in his now famous ‘Cornerstone speech’ that the Confederacy’s “cornerstone rests upon the great truth, that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery — subordination to the superior race — is his natural and normal condition. This, our new government, is the first, in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth.”

Now, with these shocking words still ringing in your ears, I want to try to gently peel from your hands the grip on a false narrative of our history that I think weakens us and make straight a wrong turn we made many years ago so we can more closely connect with integrity to the founding principles of our nation and forge a clearer and straighter path toward a better city and more perfect union.

Last year, President Barack Obama echoed these sentiments about the need to contextualize and remember all of our history. He recalled a piece of stone, a slave auction block engraved with a marker commemorating a single moment in 1830 when Andrew Jackson and Henry Clay stood and spoke from it.

President Obama said, “Consider what this artifact tells us about history … on a stone where day after day for years, men and women … bound and bought and sold and bid like cattle on a stone worn down by the tragedy of over a thousand bare feet. For a long time the only thing we considered important, the singular thing we once chose to commemorate as history with a plaque were the unmemorable speeches of two powerful men.”

A piece of stone – one stone. Both stories were history. One story told. One story forgotten or maybe even purposefully ignored.

As clear as it is for me today … for a long time, even though I grew up in one of New Orleans’ most diverse neighborhoods, even with my family’s long proud history of fighting for civil rights … I must have passed by those monuments a million times without giving them a second thought.

So I am not judging anybody, I am not judging people. We all take our own journey on race. I just hope people listen like I did when my dear friend Wynton Marsalis helped me see the truth. He asked me to think about all the people who have left New Orleans because of our exclusionary attitudes.
Another friend asked me to consider these four monuments from the perspective of an African American mother or father trying to explain to their fifth grade daughter who Robert E. Lee is and why he stands atop of our beautiful city. Can you do it?

Can you look into that young girl’s eyes and convince her that Robert E. Lee is there to encourage her? Do you think she will feel inspired and hopeful by that story? Do these monuments help her see a future with limitless potential? Have you ever thought that if her potential is limited, yours and mine are too?

We all know the answer to these very simple questions.

When you look into this child’s eyes is the moment when the searing truth comes into focus for us. This is the moment when we know what is right and what we must do. We can’t walk away from this truth.

And I knew that taking down the monuments was going to be tough, but you elected me to do the right thing, not the easy thing and this is what that looks like. So relocating these Confederate monuments is not about taking something away from someone else. This is not about politics, this is not about blame or retaliation. This is not a naïve quest to solve all our problems at once.

This is, however, about showing the whole world that we as a city and as a people are able to acknowledge, understand, reconcile and, most importantly, choose a better future for ourselves, making straight what has been crooked and making right what was wrong.

Otherwise, we will continue to pay a price with discord, with division, and yes, with violence.

To literally put the confederacy on a pedestal in our most prominent places of honor is an inaccurate recitation of our full past, it is an affront to our present, and it is a bad prescription for our future.

History cannot be changed. It cannot be moved like a statue. What is done is done. The Civil War is over, and the Confederacy lost and we are better for it. Surely we are far enough removed from this dark time to acknowledge that the cause of the Confederacy was wrong.

And in the second decade of the 21st century, asking African Americans — or anyone else — to drive by property that they own; occupied by reverential statues of men who fought to destroy the country and deny that person’s humanity seems perverse and absurd.
Centuries-old wounds are still raw because they never healed right in the first place.

Here is the essential truth: we are better together than we are apart. Indivisibility is our essence. Isn’t this the gift that the people of New Orleans have given to the world?

We radiate beauty and grace in our food, in our music, in our architecture, in our joy of life, in our celebration of death; in everything that we do. We gave the world this funky thing called jazz; the most uniquely American art form that is developed across the ages from different cultures.

Think about second lines, think about Mardi Gras, think about muffaletta, think about the Saints, gumbo, red beans and rice. By God, just think. All we hold dear is created by throwing everything in the pot; creating, producing something better; everything a product of our historic diversity.

We are proof that out of many we are one — and better for it! Out of many we are one — and we really do love it!

And yet, we still seem to find so many excuses for not doing the right thing. Again, remember President Bush’s words, “A great nation does not hide its history. It faces its flaws and corrects them.”

We forget, we deny how much we really depend on each other, how much we need each other. We justify our silence and inaction by manufacturing noble causes that marinate in historical denial. We still find a way to say “wait, not so fast.”

But like Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. said, “wait has almost always meant never.”

We can’t wait any longer. We need to change. And we need to change now. No more waiting. This is not just about statues, this is about our attitudes and behavior as well. If we take these statues down and don’t change to become a more open and inclusive society this would have all been in vain.

While some have driven by these monuments every day and either revered their beauty or failed to see them at all, many of our neighbors and fellow Americans see them very clearly. Many are painfully aware of the long shadows their presence casts, not only literally but figuratively. And they clearly receive the message that the Confederacy and the cult of the lost cause intended to deliver.
Earlier this week, as the cult of the lost cause statue of P.G.T Beauregard came down, world renowned musician Terence Blanchard stood watch, his wife Robin and their two beautiful daughters at their side.

Terence went to a high school on the edge of City Park named after one of America’s greatest heroes and patriots, John F. Kennedy. But to get there he had to pass by this monument to a man who fought to deny him his humanity.

He said, “I’ve never looked at them as a source of pride … it’s always made me feel as if they were put there by people who don’t respect us. This is something I never thought I’d see in my lifetime. It’s a sign that the world is changing.”

Yes, Terence, it is, and it is long overdue.

Now is the time to send a new message to the next generation of New Orleanians who can follow in Terence and Robin’s remarkable footsteps.

A message about the future, about the next 300 years and beyond; let us not miss this opportunity New Orleans and let us help the rest of the country do the same. Because now is the time for choosing. Now is the time to actually make this the City we always should have been, had we gotten it right in the first place.

We should stop for a moment and ask ourselves — at this point in our history, after Katrina, after Rita, after Ike, after Gustav, after the national recession, after the BP oil catastrophe and after the tornado — if presented with the opportunity to build monuments that told our story or to curate these particular spaces … would these monuments be what we want the world to see? Is this really our story?

We have not erased history; we are becoming part of the city’s history by righting the wrong image these monuments represent and crafting a better, more complete future for all our children and for future generations.

And unlike when these Confederate monuments were first erected as symbols of white supremacy, we now have a chance to create not only new symbols, but to do it together, as one people.

In our blessed land we all come to the table of democracy as equals.

We have to reaffirm our commitment to a future where each citizen is guaranteed the uniquely American gifts of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.
That is what really makes America great and today it is more important than ever to hold fast to these values and together say a self-evident truth that out of many we are one. That is why today we reclaim these spaces for the United States of America.

Because we are one nation, not two; indivisible with liberty and justice for all, not some. We all are part of one nation, all pledging allegiance to one flag, the flag of the United States of America. And New Orleanians are in, all of the way.

It is in this union and in this truth that real patriotism is rooted and flourishes.

Instead of revering a 4-year brief historical aberration that was called the Confederacy we can celebrate all 300 years of our rich, diverse history as a place named New Orleans and set the tone for the next 300 years.

After decades of public debate, of anger, of anxiety, of anticipation, of humiliation and of frustration. After public hearings and approvals from three separate community led commissions. After two robust public hearings and a 6-1 vote by the duly elected New Orleans City Council. After review by 13 different federal and state judges. The full weight of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government has been brought to bear and the monuments in accordance with the law have been removed.

So now is the time to come together and heal and focus on our larger task. Not only building new symbols, but making this city a beautiful manifestation of what is possible and what we as a people can become.

Let us remember what the once exiled, imprisoned and now universally loved Nelson Mandela and what he said after the fall of apartheid. “If the pain has often been unbearable and the revelations shocking to all of us, it is because they indeed bring us the beginnings of a common understanding of what happened and a steady restoration of the nation’s humanity.”

So before we part let us again state the truth clearly.

The Confederacy was on the wrong side of history and humanity. It sought to tear apart our nation and subjugate our fellow Americans to slavery. This is the history we should never forget and one that we should never again put on a pedestal to be revered.

As a community, we must recognize the significance of removing New Orleans’ Confederate monuments. It is our acknowledgment that now is the time to take stock of, and then move past, a painful part of our history. Anything less would render generations of courageous struggle and soul-searching a truly lost cause.
Anything less would fall short of the immortal words of our greatest President Abraham Lincoln, who with an open heart and clarity of purpose calls on us today to unite as one people when he said:

“With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation’s wounds, to do all which may achieve and cherish: a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.”

Thank you.
Appendix Renaming Byrd Middle School in VA

Richmond Times Dispatch dot com


March 2016

“Henrico School Board votes to rename Byrd Middle School”

In a unanimous vote Thursday, the Henrico County School Board agreed to strip the name of the late Sen. Harry Flood Byrd Sr. from a middle school because of his opposition to desegregation.

“This school has prospered in diversity, and it’s the diversity that Byrd fought,” School Board Chairwoman Michelle F. “Micky” Ogburn said. “No other school in Henrico is named after a person who believed in different schools for our children based on the color of their skin.”

Recently, school officials estimated it could cost $136,000 for new signs and other items if the name were changed. That figure includes more than $88,000 for athletics — uniforms, equipment bags and other materials.

[SB member] Marshall suggested changing only what is immediately essential at first and asked school officials to provide a list of priorities.
Appendix Renaming Jefferson Davis Highway in Alexandria in 2017

Advisory Group to Seek New Names for Jefferson Davis Highway in Alexandria

For Immediate Release: May 19, 2017

Alexandria City Manager Mark B. Jinks has announced the appointment of an Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Renaming Jefferson Davis Highway, which will solicit public feedback and consider potential new names for a portion of U.S. Route 1. In September 2016, the Alexandria City Council voted unanimously to begin the process of renaming Jefferson Davis Highway in Alexandria.

The Advisory Group plans to hold its first meeting in June, followed by a public survey over the summer to seek naming suggestions. Additional details will be posted at www.alexandriava.gov/JeffersonDavisHighway in the coming months as they are developed by the group.

The members of the Advisory Group are Laurie MacNamara (chair), a member of the City’s Budget and Fiscal Affairs Advisory Committee; Lynnwood Campbell, board chair of Senior Services of Alexandria; Gerry Laporte, former president of the Arlington Historical Society; and Elmer Lowe, Sr., former president of the Arlington branch of the NAACP. While the Arlington County Board has not formally considered a name change, Arlington representatives were selected to provide input on potential new names for the continuous stretch of road in both localities.

For media inquiries, contact Craig T. Fifer, Director of Communications and Public Information, at craig.fifer@alexandriava.gov or 703.746.3965.

This news release is available at www.alexandriava.gov/97890.

https://www.alexandriava.gov/JeffersonDavisHighway
Appendix Renaming Schools in TX in 2016
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https://www.texastribune.org/2016/08/14/school-year-begins-communities-take-stock-confeder/

“10 Texas School Names Honoring Confederates Have Changed. At Least 24 Haven't.”

Oliver Hill, 81, grew up in segregated San Antonio. He graduated in 1952 from the all-black Phillis Wheatley High School, named for the famous poet who was brought to America as a slave. When Robert E. Lee High School opened across town in 1958 honoring the Confederate general, Hill viewed the name as a deliberate reminder to black San Antonians that the city did not belong to them.

Of the 29 schools on the Tribune list, five have been changed; five that were not on the list have also been changed.

Tense debates have raged at Texas schools over the proper place of Confederate names in the public landscape. But many other districts have not considered any changes.

BY ISABELLE TAFT AUG. 14, 2016 12 AM

Russell Lee Elementary was named Robert E. Lee Elementary when it opened in 1939. This year, the Austin ISD Board of Trustees voted to rename the school, making it one of 10 Texas schools that will bear new names when classes begin later this month. The banner shown above replaced art deco-style letters that spelled out "Robert E. Lee." Qiling Wang/The Texas Tribune

Oliver Hill, 81, grew up in segregated San Antonio. He graduated in 1952 from the all-black Phillis Wheatley High School, named for the famous poet who was brought to America as a slave. When Robert E. Lee High School opened across town in 1958
honoring the Confederate general, Hill viewed the name as a deliberate reminder to black San Antonians that the city did not belong to them.

So last year, when the North East ISD board of trustees considered changing the name of Robert E. Lee High School, it seemed to Hill like an opportunity to right an old injustice. He delivered a speech at the board’s August meeting urging the change. In December, after months of public comments and debate, the board voted 5-2 to keep the school’s name the same.

"They haven’t walked in my shoes," Hill said of those who wanted to keep Lee's name. "They don’t understand what I go through when I walk past those things."

North East ISD’s debate was one of several explosive deliberations about the names of Confederates on public schools that unfolded across Texas during the last academic year, in the wake of the massacre in Charleston of nine African-American worshippers by a man who revered the Confederacy. When classes start later this month across Texas, 10 schools in Austin, Dallas and Houston will welcome students to the new academic year with new names, leaving at least 24 that still bear the names of Confederates.

The Texas Tribune thanks its sponsors. Become one.

Of 20 school districts where The Texas Tribune has confirmed there is at least one school named for a Confederate leader, the North East ISD board is the only one that has formally considered a name change and voted against it, according to spokespeople for the districts.

Though the particulars differ, the fundamental issues at stake in each community are the same. How should we evaluate historical figures? Who is entitled to make those evaluations? Where is the line between remembering and commemorating? Can society repudiate the Confederacy but still decorate public spaces with allusions to its heroes? And in every case, battles over school name changes have been fraught and emotional, sometimes leading to allegations on both sides of bullying, rescinded birthday party invitations and grocery store parking lot confrontations.

Efforts to rename schools that pay homage to Confederates have made headlines across the country. Public symbols of veneration for the Confederacy have also been reconsidered at UT-Austin, which removed of a statue of Jefferson Davis last August, and House Speaker Joe Straus charged the Texas House Administration Committee with reviewing Confederate statues on the Capitol grounds.

But in the vast majority of Texas school districts with at least one school named for a Confederate, no one has formally raised the issue of renaming. Last summer, The Tribune identified 29 schools named for Lee, Confederate President Jefferson Davis, Gen. Thomas Jonathan "Stonewall" Jackson and Gen. Albert Sidney Johnston. The list did not include Confederates such as John H. Reagan, the Confederacy's postmaster general, General John B. Hood, or Maj. Richard Dowling, all of whom had at least one
school named for them in Texas. Of the 29 schools on the Tribune list, five have been changed; five that were not on the list have also been changed.

From Eagle Pass ISD along the border with Mexico, where 100 percent of students at Robert E. Lee Elementary are non-white, to Amarillo ISD in the panhandle, Confederate names still sprawl across school walls and letterhead.

“The topic has never come up,” said Mario Zavala, a spokesman for Denton ISD, which includes Lee Elementary. Lee’s website says that the school is named for Robert E. Lee, “a legendary general for the Confederacy during the Civil War.”

“The topic has never come up.”— Mario Zavala, spokesman for Denton ISD

The battle for a name

The name change decision involving the largest number of schools came in Houston, where the school board voted this spring to change the names of eight schools. Supporters applauded the board’s decisive action; detractors lamented the lack of community input and argued that the board’s decision created a false equivalence between figures like Lee and Davis, and Sidney Lanier, a Georgian best known for his literary work after he served in the Confederate army. The rancor culminated in a lawsuit against the board this summer, charging that the board did not follow proper procedure and failed to inform the community about the cost of the action.

Adrienne Murry, a Bob Lanier Middle School (formerly Sidney Lanier Middle School) parent who is a plaintiff in the lawsuit against HISD, said the board disregarded the wishes of students, parents and alumni who wanted to keep the school names the same. Lanier’s new name honors a former Houston mayor.

“I think we set a dangerous precedent if we start a witch hunt for anyone who served in the Confederacy at all,” Murry told the Tribune. “We live in the South, quite frankly. To say that a man from Georgia wouldn’t have stepped up to defend his land is very naive.”

Rhonda Skillern-Jones, a board member who championed the name changes, is not persuaded by arguments that Lanier’s Confederate service was an insignificant part of his life.

“He was a poet that fought as a Confederate soldier,” Skillern-Jones said. “He’s a Confederate soldier. He fought for the Confederacy.”

Murry’s lawsuit is seeking an injunction to forestall the name changes and force the board to redo the process. After the HISD board approved $1.2 million at its meeting last week to pay for the renamings, interim superintendent Ken Huewitt said the funding decision addressed the concerns raised in the lawsuit. A ruling in the suit is expected sometime in the next month, according to Murry and Arturo Michel, a lawyer representing HISD in the suit.
In Austin and Dallas, school boards voted to rename a single school each — Dallas’ John B. Hood Middle School became Piedmont Global Academy, and Austin’s Robert E. Lee Elementary became Russell Lee Elementary — and only after the school communities had debated the issue and asked the board to act.

In Dallas, students at John B. Hood Middle School held a vote to get rid of the name. Then they held another vote to pick the new name, Piedmont Global Academy. The board of trustees approved their decision.

In Austin, parents in the city’s Hyde Park neighborhood held numerous meetings to discuss changing the name and fought for the board to vote for a new name: Russell Lee, in honor of the documentary photographer who recorded life during the Great Depression and lived in Austin for decades. According to parents on both sides of the issue, the yearlong process quickly turned tense.

“White-hot” and “rough” are the adjectives Laurie Marchant, a Lee Elementary alumna who attended the school in the late 1970s and early 80s, and parent of a current Lee student, chose. Marchant supported the name change.

“Ugly” and “uncomfortable” are how Caroline Roberts, a former Lee parent who helped author a petition seeking to designate the school, built in 1939, as a historical landmark, remembers the meetings about the name change. People who felt like she did— that Lee was a "respectable man" and changing the school’s name would be an attempt to erase the past— were "blacklisted." Roberts says she was called names and confronted by other Lee parents in public. She has decided to withdraw her twin 8-year-old sons from AISD and homeschool them instead.

At Lee, the renaming issue also brought in Austinites who had no connection to the school. Robert Reed, a fitness instructor, learned that the topic would be discussed at a March board meeting from one of his clients, a parent at Lee, where the majority of students are white. Reed was one of the only African-Americans to speak at the meeting.

“My great grandfather was a slave,” Reed said at the meeting. “Robert E. Lee would have fought to keep my great grandfather a slave. And you can sit here and talk about all the tremendous things he did. I’m sure he never forgot Mother’s Day. But the bottom line is he fought to keep slaves in bondage.”

“Robert E. Lee would have fought to keep my great grandfather a slave. ... I’m sure he never forgot Mother’s Day. But the bottom line is he fought to keep slaves in bondage.”— Robert Reed, Austin resident

The school-by-school approach there and in Dallas has created inconsistencies. Austin has stripped “Robert E.” from its school list, but it has no formal plans at the moment to rename Lanier or Reagan High Schools. Dallas has scrubbed off the name of Hood, but the board has not formally considered renaming Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, or Albert Sidney Johnston Elementary Schools, according to district spokesman Andre Riley.
Lew Blackburn, president of the Dallas board of trustees, said most parents and students don’t think much about their school’s name.

“When I go to PTA meetings or I talk to staff, I talk to parents, I’ve asked, ‘Would you want to see the name of this school changed?’” Blackburn said. “And they kind of look at me like, ‘For what?’”

"Symbols matter"

To Jacqueline Jones, chair of the history department at UT-Austin, and a specialist in the Civil War, race and slavery, there’s a simple answer to the question Blackburn has heard: "Symbols matter."

"Of all the really sterling, inspirational figures of American history, to have to say this building is named for someone who took up arms against the U.S. and also fought so that other people would be held as slaves," Jones said, "What kind of message does that send?"

She acknowledged that there are cases that raise challenging questions: people like Sidney Lanier, for example. That's why debates about venerated historical figures are valuable, she said — and why it is disappointing that many districts have not had any discussion of the issue.

That might be because the war's most famous events took place far from Texas, so its legacy could feel less immediate to some Texans, Jones said.

Bob Geske, a member of the El Paso ISD board of trustees, said he thinks his community's orientation toward the border and the Southwest, rather than the Southeast, could be one reason no one has called to rename the district’s Robert E. Lee Elementary.

"El Paso is 86 percent Hispanic," Geske said. "This is our heritage, not the Civil War. Maybe it is the lithium in the water, our geography, or just plain ambivalence, but that war is very seldom discussed."

To Jones, it's only a matter of time before people call for other schools named for Confederates to change.

“I think that as long as these men are honored in this way, there will be protests,” Jones said. “They might flare up and then die out. But I don’t think we’ve seen the end of it.”
Appendix Renaming Schools as early as 2003

Another Move to Erase a Confederate Name From a Public School

By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS DEC. 27, 2003

Numerous public schools in the 11 former Confederate states are named for Civil War leaders from the South. But some people are arguing that memorializing men who defended a system that perpetuated slavery should not be allowed at public schools where thousands of black children are educated.

At Jefferson Davis Middle School here a petition drive seeks to erase the name of the slave-owning Confederate president from the school.

Opinion is mixed, and it is not necessarily divided along racial lines. "If it had been up to Robert E. Lee, these kids wouldn't be going to school as they are today," said the civil rights leader Julian Bond, now a history professor at the University of Virginia. "They can't help but wonder about honoring a man who wanted to keep them in servitude."

That argument is not accepted universally among Southern black educators, including the school superintendent in Petersburg, Va., where about 80 percent of the 36,000 residents are black. Three schools in the city, 23 miles south of Richmond, carry the names of Confederates.

"It's not the name on the outside of the building that negatively affects the attitudes of the students inside," Superintendent Lloyd Hamlin said. "If the attitudes outside of the building are acceptable, then the name is immaterial."

The National Center for Education Statistics lists 19 schools named for Robert E. Lee, 9 for Stonewall Jackson and 5 for Davis.

The symbols and the names of the Confederacy remain powerful reminders of the South's history of slavery and the war to end it. States, communities and institutions continue to debate what is a proper display of that heritage.

Students in South Carolina have been punished for wearing Confederate battle flag T-shirts to school. The town of Clarksdale, Miss., permanently lowered the state's flag, which has a Confederate emblem in one corner, to recognize "the pain and suffering it has symbolized for many years."

In the most sweeping change, the Orleans Parish School Board in Louisiana gave new names to schools once named for historical figures who owned slaves. George Washington Elementary School was renamed for Dr. Charles Richard Drew, a black surgeon who organized blood banks during World War II.

In Gadsden, Ala., however, officials have resisted efforts to rename a middle school named for Nathan Bedford Forrest, a Confederate general and early backer of the Ku Klux Klan.
The naming of schools after Confederate figures is particularly rich with symbolism because of the South's slow move to integrate. Many schools were named after the United States Supreme Court ruled segregated schools unconstitutional in 1954 but before the departure of whites left many inner city schools with a black majority.

Erenestine Harrison, who started the petition drive to rename Jefferson Davis Middle School here, attended Hampton's segregated public schools. She moved north in 1967 and was struck by the school names upon her return seven years ago to Hampton, a city of 146,000 people at the mouth of Chesapeake Bay. Educated as a psychologist, Ms. Harrison has worked in the city schools as a substitute teacher.

"If I were a kid, especially a teenager, I would be ashamed to tell a friend that I went to Jefferson Davis," said Ms. Harrison, 55. "Basically, those guys fought for slavery."
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Removing Racist Symbols Isn’t a Denial of History
By Christopher Phelps
JANUARY 08, 2016 (professor of American Studies in England)
Chronicle of higher Ed
http://chronicle.com/article/Removing-Racist-Symbols/234862/

Discusses S. Africa and apartheid, in the US where the “Confederate flag did not serve as a harmless relic of a long-dead past but sustained present-day racist violence.”

At Yale, a campaign demands renaming one residential college for someone other than John C. Calhoun, an antebellum senator from South Carolina who supported slavery. At Princeton, a sit-in prompted the university to agree to contemplate stripping all buildings of the name of Woodrow Wilson, a former president of both that university and the United States; Wilson introduced Jim Crow segregation at the federal level. At Harvard Law School, the "Royall Must Fall" campaign objects to the school’s crest, which is adapted from the coat of arms of the slave-owning Royall family.

By Christopher Phelps JANUARY 08, 2016

Across the world, campus symbols from the epoch of avowed white supremacy have come under sharp criticism from students and their allies.

At the University of Cape Town, academically the highest-ranked institution in Africa, a "Rhodes Must Fall" campaign last year compelled the removal of a monument to Cecil Rhodes, the diamond-mining baron, British imperialist, and progenitor of South Africa’s system of apartheid. Students splattered the statue with buckets of excrement and paint.

Emboldened by Cape Town, students in England — their organizers originating from formerly colonized regions of the world — have faulted Rhodes’s legacy at Oxford University as well, prompting Oriel College to agree to removal of a plaque praising him for "great services rendered." Students now are calling for removal of a Rhodes statue as well.

In the United States, a Black Lives Matter generation has entered college challenging comparable symbols. They are motivated by recent events from Ferguson, Mo., to Charleston, S.C., where the Confederate flag did not serve as a harmless relic of a long-dead past but sustained present-day racist violence.

At Yale, a campaign demands renaming one residential college for someone other than John C. Calhoun, an antebellum senator from South Carolina who supported slavery. At Princeton, a sit-in prompted the university to agree to contemplate stripping all buildings of the name of Woodrow Wilson, a former president of both that university and the United States. At Harvard Law School, the "Royall Must Fall" campaign objects to the school’s crest, which is adapted from the coat of arms of the slave-owning Royall family.
Critics of these efforts have objected that protesters’ logic would require colleges to scrub themselves of all traces of anyone who was a slave owner or racist — or, reductio ad absurdum, anyone at all with flaws. In this view, the new student activism is an exercise in "moral vanity," a charge leveled against the Oxford campaigners by Tony Abbott, a former Australian prime minister and Rhodes Scholar.

Yet the specific historical figures under protest in these controversies are well-selected. They have engendered controversy for good reason, for they not only reflected the norms of their day but also actively shaped social mores from positions of power. Rhodes was the archetypal "white man’s burden" colonialist. Wilson introduced Jim Crow segregation at the federal level. Calhoun was the slaveholding South’s foremost ideologist and politician. The Royall family did not merely own slaves but traded in them.

Whatever else they did or thought, men such as Royall, Calhoun, Rhodes, and Wilson were decisive, unapologetic architects of systems premised on racial exploitation. They played substantial parts in creating the world of inequality that we have inherited.

It has been further suggested that in order to be consistent, Oxford would have to eliminate all symbols of feudal despotism. But that argument is casuistic. Unlike racism, there is no practical danger today of a revived absolutist monarchy or serfdom, which is why students aren’t moved to demand such changes.

Another, much stronger argument made by those who hesitate to eliminate symbols of the past is that history cannot be comprehended if erased. The past should not be wiped away, runs this line of thought. Leaving it intact can remind us of the need to transcend it.

This position is sophisticated in that it concedes that racial injustice is embedded in institutional histories, admirable in that it does not patronize students, and welcome in that it upholds the value of historical knowledge in a society all too obsessed with the present.

As a historian who deeply values the study of the past, and who frequently laments the amnesia of our times, I appreciate any good defense of the value of historical memory. But I am troubled by this particular invocation of history and wish to offer a dissenting viewpoint. (I should disclose that while I have no personal stake in any specific controversy over campus symbols, I do have a daughter at Yale residing in Calhoun College, and she favors its renaming.)

History is one thing, memorials another. As tributes, memorials are selective, affirmative representations. When a university names a building after someone or erects a statue to that person, it bestows honor and legitimacy. The imprimatur of an institution of higher education affords the subject respect, dignity, and authority. This makes memorials every bit as much about values, status quo, and future as about remembrance.

We intuit the value of preserving a site such as Auschwitz-Birkenau on the grounds that no one should ever forget the Holocaust, but we appreciate the Allied policy of the denazification of Germany, which included painting over swastikas and discarding innumerable portraits of Hitler. Those impulses are not contradictory.

Memorials are not, by and large, erected after long and careful study of the past. Universities do not typically make decisions about how to name sports centers, libraries, dining halls, dormitories, or
classrooms in consultation with panels of historians. Let's be honest: Who has a building named after him or a statue made of him is a reflection of power and wealth.

That is why we now find ourselves discussing men of the clout of Calhoun and Wilson, or the class of Royall and Rhodes. Whether we consider a mogul's bequests to be philanthropy or whitewashing, we should not take their statues or coats of arms as equivalents of biographies. There is a salient difference between a Rhodes bust placed in a museum and a marker celebrating his life displayed in the center of campus.

History is a process of cognition and revision — literally, re-seeing — of the past. From time to time, one or another circle of historians is characterized as "revisionist," but in actuality all historians are revisionists, writing from the vantage point of their own lives and times even as they aspire to objectivity.

This does not make history subjective. It must be sustained by evidence and held to the test of others’ scrutiny. That is how consensuses emerge about what took place and why. In that way, our understanding of history changes over time, often as dramatically as that history itself. To reconsider, to recast, is the essence of historical practice. It follows that altering how we present the past through commemorative symbols is not ahistorical. It is akin to what historians do. No historian now writes about slavery in the way historians did a century ago.

A reconsideration of memorials and symbols poses no danger to freedom. A university can uphold academic freedom and freedom of expression while at the same time seeking to avoid implicitly exclusionary or bigotry-laced signs and legacies in its official infrastructure.

It is imperative for students to confront slavery and Jim Crow in the classroom, with instructors assigning writings by proponents of those systems, as I did this past term, for example, by having my "History of American Capitalism" class read James Henry Hammond’s "Cotton Is King" speech in the Senate.

Such recognition of the historical significance of white supremacy is perfectly compatible with believing that institutions should not give it credence in their memorials — precisely in order that openly white-supremacist society not be permitted to reconstitute itself.

What is erasure in one sense can in another and more important sense be an acknowledgment and validation of the past. When a building named for an arch-advocate of slavery is accorded another name, it pays respect to the lives of those whom he condemned to be owned. When the University of Illinois retired its pseudo-Indian mascot Chief Illiniwek, the decision reflected the increased awareness of such misappropriation and stereotyping born of a deeper appreciation of Native American history.

We lament the Taliban’s destruction of the Buddhas of Bamiyan, but the changes that students want on campuses today do not involve entities imbued with sacred qualities. Nor are those symbols ancient. Calhoun College, for example, was named in 1933; Oxford’s Rhodes statue was erected in 1911. In historical terms, the period since then is the blink of an eye.

Examples abound of demolitions widely taken as acts of liberation, not cultural boorishness. The Hungarian rebels who toppled statues of Stalin in 1956 are celebrated, not accused of desecrating history. Similarly, there has been no outcry against Ukraine’s recent dismantling of more than 800
statues of Lenin, a measure taken in response to the provocations of Putin’s Russia. (Most of the works were consigned to museums, it appears, although a clever artist converted one into Darth Vader.)

Just as in certain contexts erasure is a sign of memory, so can memorials be a form of forgetting. Insofar as relics of the era of overt white supremacy may represent an institution’s failure to look itself in the mirror and adopt inclusive symbols so as to welcome all prospective students and academics, the symbols are indicators of an institutional blind spot. To remove them does not vitiate history; on the contrary, it represents a more thorough coming to terms with the past and its legacies, a refusal to forget.

Eliminating dubious memorials is hardly a sufficient measure in itself. Those calling for symbolic transformations also typically seek allocations of resources to end institutional racism. They know, however, that how a university defines, names, and represents itself is not immaterial, that emblems convey an essence.

The impetus to alter our symbols is compelling when they are challenged by students of color who view them as signs of an institution’s failure to be sufficiently inclusive, something they can attest to in their own daily experience.

Yes, we should see history as irreducibly contradictory, bloody, and shot through with injustice — as well as with courageous resistance to oppression. Yes, we should acknowledge that we ourselves are flawed. But in no way do such insights dictate that our institutions permanently consecrate white supremacy in their architecture and traditions.

The students who call upon universities to adopt new symbols reflective of democratic values are not erasing history. They want us to grasp it.

Correction (1/13/2016, 5:25 p.m.): Because of an editing error, this essay originally referred to "an institution's failure to be insufficiently inclusive." It should have said "an institution's failure to be sufficiently inclusive." The text has been revised accordingly.

Christopher Phelps is an associate professor of American studies at the University of Nottingham, in England, and co-author, with Howard Brick, of Radicals in America: The U.S. Left Since the Second World War (Cambridge University Press, 2015).

A version of this article appeared in the January 29, 2016 issue.
Yale to change Calhoun College’s name to honor Grace Murray Hopper

February 11, 2017

Calhoun College will be renamed in honor of Grace Murray Hopper, a trailblazing computer scientist who also served as a rear admiral in the U.S. Navy. (Image of Hopper from the public domain)

Yale President Peter Salovey announced today that the university would rename Calhoun College, one of 12 undergraduate residential colleges, to honor one of Yale’s most distinguished graduates, Grace Murray Hopper ’30 M.A., ’34 Ph.D., by renaming the college for her.

Salovey made the decision with the university’s board of trustees — the Yale Corporation — at its most recent meeting. “The decision to change a college’s name is not one we take lightly, but John C. Calhoun’s legacy as a white supremacist and a national leader who passionately promoted slavery as a ‘positive good’ fundamentally conflicts with Yale’s mission and values,” Salovey said. “I have asked Jonathan Holloway, dean of Yale College, and Julia Adams, the head of Calhoun College, to determine when this change best can be put into effect.”

This decision overrides Salovey’s announcement in April of last year that the name of Calhoun College would remain. “At that time, as now, I was committed to confronting, not erasing, our history. I was concerned about inviting a series of name changes that would obscure Yale’s past,” said Salovey. “These concerns remain paramount, but we have since established an enduring set of principles that address them. The principles establish a strong presumption against renaming buildings, ensure respect for our past, and enable thoughtful review of any future requests for change.”

In August, Salovey asked John Witt ’94 B.A., ’99 J.D., ’00 Ph.D., the Allen H. Duffy Class of 1960 Professor of Law and professor of history, to chair a Committee to Establish Principles on Renaming. After this committee completed its work, three advisers — G. Leonard Baker ’64 B.A. (Calhoun College); John Lewis Gaddis, the Robert A. Lovett Professor of Military and Naval History; and Jacqueline Goldsby, professor of English, African American Studies, and American Studies and chair of the Department of African American Studies — were charged with applying the Witt committee’s principles to the name of Calhoun College. The thoughtful and instructive reports produced by these two distinguished groups are available here: http://president.yale.edu/decision-name-calhoun-college.
As part of its work, the Committee to Establish Principles on Renaming studied similar conversations about naming and commemoration that have arisen in recent years at institutions such as Georgetown University, Harvard Law School, Princeton University, and the University of Texas at Austin. At these and other institutions of higher learning, certain names have changed, while others have not. Yale has learned from these situations while, necessarily, charting its own course, said Salovey.

The Witt committee outlines four principles that should guide any consideration of renaming: (1) whether the namesake’s principal legacy fundamentally conflicts with the university’s mission; (2) whether that principal legacy was contested during the namesake’s lifetime; (3) the reasons the university honored that person; and (4) whether the building so named plays a substantial role in forming community at Yale. In considering these principles, it became clear that Calhoun College presents an exceptionally strong case — perhaps uniquely strong — that allows it to overcome the powerful presumption against renaming articulated in the report, said the president.

Understanding Calhoun’s legacy

The name of Calhoun College has long been a subject of discussion and controversy on the Yale campus. John C. Calhoun 1804 B.A., 1822 LL.D. served the United States as vice president, secretary of state, secretary of war, and a U.S. senator. Yet he leaves behind the legacy of a leading statesman who used his office to advocate ardently for slavery and white supremacy.

When he learned of Calhoun’s death, Benjamin Silliman Sr. 1796 B.A., 1799 M.A., professor of chemistry at Yale and the namesake of another residential college, mourned the passing of his contemporary while immediately condemning his legacy:

“[Calhoun] in a great measure changed the state of opinion and the manner of speaking and writing upon this subject in the South, until we have come to present to the world the mortifying and disgraceful spectacle of a great republic — and the only real republic in the world — standing forth in vindication of slavery, without prospect of, or wish for, its extinction. If the views of Mr. Calhoun, and of those who think with him, are to prevail, slavery is to be sustained on this great continent forever.”

Silliman’s conviction (shared by many other Americans) that Calhoun was one of the more influential champions of slavery and white supremacy speaks across the generations to us today, said Salovey. As a national leader, Calhoun helped enshrine his racist views in American policy, transforming them into consequential actions. And while other southern statesmen and slaveholders treated slavery as a “necessary evil,” Calhoun insisted it was a “positive good,” beneficial to enslaved people and essential to republican institutions. The legacy that Silliman decried was that of a man who shaped “the state of opinion” on this issue — ensuring that slavery not only survived, but expanded across North America.

This principal legacy of Calhoun — and the indelible imprint he has left on American history conflicts fundamentally with the values Yale has long championed, said Salovey: “Unlike other namesakes on our campus, he distinguished himself not in spite of these views but because of them.” Although it is not clear exactly how Calhoun’s proslavery and racist views figured in the 1931 naming decision, depictions in the college celebrating plantation life and the “Old South” suggest that Calhoun was honored not simply as a statesman and political theorist but in full contemplation of his unique place in the history of slavery, said the president. “As the Witt report reminds us, honoring a namesake whose legacy so sharply conflicts with the university’s values should weigh especially heavily when the name adorns a
residential college, which plays a key role in forming community at Yale. Moreover, unlike, for example, Elihu Yale, who made a gift that supported the founding of our university, or other namesakes who have close historical connections to Yale, Calhoun has no similarly strong association with our campus. Removing Calhoun’s name in no way weakens our commitment to honoring those who have made major contributions to the life and mission of Yale — another principle described in the Witt report.”

The presidential advisers found “no Witt Committee principles that weigh heavily against renaming,” “three committee principles that weigh heavily toward renaming, and a fourth that suggests the need to rename.” The advisers recommended unanimously that the name of Calhoun College be changed.

“It is now clear to me, too, that the name of Calhoun College must change. Yale has changed magnificently over the past 300 years and will continue to evolve long after our time; today we have the opportunity to move the university forward in a way that reinforces our mission and core values,” said Salovey.

“In making this change, we must be vigilant not to erase the past,” said Salovey. “To that end, we will not remove symbols of Calhoun from elsewhere on our campus, and we will develop a plan to memorialize the fact that Calhoun was a residential college name for 86 years. Furthermore, alumni of the college may continue to associate themselves with the name Calhoun College or they may choose to claim Grace Hopper College as their own. As the Witt report states, ‘A university ought not erase the historical record. But a great university will rightly decide what to commemorate and what to honor, subject always to the obligation not to efface the history that informs the world in which we live.’”

**A legacy of innovation and service: Grace Murray Hopper**

In selecting a new name for the college at the corner of College and Elm streets, Yale honors the life and legacy of Grace Murray Hopper. Hopper “was an exemplar of achievement in her field and service to her country,” said Salovey. “As we considered potential namesakes, the trustees and I benefited from hundreds of unique naming suggestions made by alumni, faculty, students, and staff who either advocated for a name change to this college or submitted ideas for the names of the two new residential colleges. This community input was indispensable: Hopper’s name was mentioned by more individuals than any other, reflecting the strong feeling within our community that her achievements and life of service reflect Yale’s mission and core values.”
Hopper believed that computers would someday be widely used and helped to make them more user friendly. (Courtesy of the Computer History Museum)

A trailblazing computer scientist, brilliant mathematician and teacher, and dedicated public servant, Hopper received a master’s degree (1930) and a Ph.D. (1934) in mathematics. She taught mathematics at Vassar for nearly a decade before enlisting in the U.S. Navy, where she used her mathematical knowledge to fight fascism during World War II. A collaborator on the earliest computers, Hopper made her greatest contributions in the realm of software. In 1952 she and her team developed the first computer language “compiler,” which would make it possible to write programs for multiple computers rather than a single machine. Hopper then pioneered the development of word-based computer languages, and she was instrumental in developing COBOL, the most widely used computer language in the world by the 1970s. Hopper’s groundbreaking work helped make computers more accessible to a wider range of users and vastly expanded their application. A naval reservist for 20 years, she was recalled to active service at the age of 60. Hopper retired as a rear admiral at the age of 79, the oldest serving officer in the U.S. armed forces at that time.

Read more about Grace Murray Hopper’s life and legacy.

The recipient of Yale’s Wilbur Lucius Cross Medal, the National Medal of Technology, and the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the nation’s highest civilian honor, “Amazing Grace” Hopper was a visionary in the world of technology. At a time when computers were bulky machines limited to a handful of research laboratories, Hopper understood that they would one day be ubiquitous, and she dedicated her long career to ensuring they were useful, accessible, and responsive to human needs. “An extraordinary mathematician and a senior naval officer, Hopper achieved eminence in fields historically dominated by men,” said Salovey. “Today, her principal legacy is all around us — embodied in the life-enhancing technology she knew would become commonplace. Grace Murray Hopper College thus honors her spirit of innovation and public service while looking fearlessly to the future.”

“The Calhoun issue is complex. There are substantive arguments on all sides. Good people — moral and principled people — can and will disagree about it,” said the president. “These disagreements, however great they may seem, should not prevent us from finding common ground. Our bonds as Yalies are
greater than our opinions about a name or a building. Those bonds ensure that we will continue together the great work of “improving the world today and for future generations through outstanding research and scholarship, education, preservation, and practice.”[iii] This is our common ground.


**Correction:** An earlier version of this story incorrectly stated that Hopper had received a Ph.D. in "mathematics and mathematical physics." Her doctorate was only in the former.
Appendix Georgetown University Renames Buildings Named After Slaveowners


Georgetown University To Rename Buildings Named After Slaveowners

November 16, 2015 4:26 PM ET

Heard on All Things Considered

MICHAEL POPE

Georgetown University is renaming two campus buildings in a bow to student concerns. The buildings are named for past Georgetown presidents who organized the sale of slaves to help pay off campus debt in the 1830s.

ARI SHAPIRO, HOST:

Georgetown University here in Washington is one of many U.S. campuses seeing protests over race relations. The Jesuit school is one of a handful of colleges that were financed in part by the sale of slaves. After a protest last week, university officials have accepted students' demands for action. Michael Pope of member station WAMU has the story.

MICHAEL POPE, BYLINE: Many students here say they were disappointed to learn that two buildings on Georgetown's campus have a dark history. The buildings were named in honor of former university presidents who financed a capital campaigned by selling 272 slaves. Several students staged a sit-in last week, and over the weekend university officials took action to strip the buildings of their names. Junior Alexa Pereda says she agrees with the decision.

ALEXA PEREDA: I think that the students were really able to make a stance for the issue and bring change to something that they thought was unjust.

POPE: Back in August, Georgetown's president put together a working group to examine the history and make recommendations for the future. That group is led by history professor David Collins.

DAVID COLLINS: One of the things that we're learning in the United States in general is how much of a connection there is between our institutions of higher learning and slaveholding.

POPE: Georgetown is not alone. Many institutions of higher learning were financed in part by the sale of slaves. But junior Carl Thomas says he's not sure changing the names of buildings is necessary.

CARL THOMAS: We got to remember that a lot of people, even, like, people like Thomas Jefferson and all that were men on their times. So even though it was wrong in our eyes now, it wasn't necessarily wrong then.

POPE: For now, the buildings here have new interim names - Freedom Hall and Remembrance Hall. That's until Georgetown decides what to call them permanently. For NPR News, I'm Michael Pope in Washington.
The College of William and Mary has removed a Confederate plaque from the historic Wren Building and will replace Confederate images on its ceremonial mace to make the college “welcoming to everyone,” W&M President W. Taylor Reveley III told the campus community Friday.

The plaque, which contains the Confederate battle flag and the names of faculty and students who left the college to fight for the Confederacy, has been moved to special collections in Swem Library “to join other historic artifacts describing William and Mary’s past,” Reveley said in an email message.

It will be replaced with a plaque that gives “as complete an account as research permits of all the William and Mary people who fought on both sides of the Civil War,” he said.
The mace, however, is “a living artifact,” Reveley said, with precedence for being changed and will continue to be used in ceremonial events.

The Confederate battle flag and seal on the mace will be replaced with new emblems that have yet to be determined but will reflect the college’s history, including the Civil War, he said.

“It is time for change,” his message said.

Reveley said he made the changes to make W&M more welcoming. “We are also an institution deeply rooted in history and committed to understanding our part in it,” he said.

“We do not seek to put William and Mary’s part in the Civil War out of sight or mind. The college barely survived the physical, financial and human carnage of that conflict. Nor do we seek to avoid examining and learning from William and Mary’s role in slavery, secession and segregation,” his message said.

He said he made the decision in consultation with the board of visitors and believes the changes “will allow William and Mary to move forward together without ignoring our past.”

W&M spokesman Brian Whitson said the college recently had been questioned about the plaque, but discussions already were underway about whether it should be removed.

The discussions began several weeks ago, he said, but he was not sure of the timing in relation to Gov. Terry McAuliffe’s decision in June to remove the emblem from the Sons of Confederate Veterans license plate.

Whitson said he doubted many people were aware that the mace included an image of the battle flag.
“It was a small part of the piece,” he said by email. During the discussion, “it became clear this was the right decision. As the president said, we don’t plan to ignore our past — we must acknowledge and learn from it while being deliberate and thoughtful about the values we project.”

The mace, a gift of alumni, students and faculty in 1923, also includes other emblems from W&M’s history and is changed when the name of each new college president and chancellor is engraved on it.

In 1938, the seal on top of the mace was replaced when W&M, which was founded in 1693, put back in use its original coat of arms from 1694.

The committee that created the mace wished it to be “owned in common by all former, present and future students” and to “prove of incomparable value in bringing home to countless generations the full conception of the part the College of William and Mary has played in the life of the nation,” Reveley said.

The mace, traditionally used during convocation, Charter Day and commencement ceremonies, has a ring of nine emblems reflecting different eras of college history, including the flag and arms of Great Britain.

The Confederate plaque was erected in 1914 by the board and alumni to recognize students and faculty who left in 1861 to fight for the Confederacy.

Other plaques in the entrance hallway of the Wren Building honor the college’s soldiers from other wars, from the Revolutionary War to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

But in a Q&A posted on W&M’s website to accompany Reveley’s announcement, the college said the Confederate plaque is not a memorial because not all those named died in the war. Also, it does not name anyone who fought for the
Union, including the original commanding general of the U.S. Army during the Civil War, Winfield Scott.

The last major change at the Wren Building generated major protests when Reveley’s predecessor, Gene R. Nichol, decided in 2006 to remove a 2-foot brass cross from the altar to make the Wren Chapel welcoming to people of all religious beliefs.

“These were different decisions by different presidents under different circumstances,” Whitson said.

Confederate images are coming down across the South, and W&M’s Q&A to explain the decision said it has become clear that the battle flag “has been turned irreparably into a symbol of racial hatred.”

“Thus, it has no place in our ceremonial occasions or on a wall of our most iconic building.”
Appendix Apologies for Slavery in the US

On February 24, 2007, the Virginia General Assembly passed House Joint Resolution Number 728 acknowledging "with profound regret the involuntary servitude of Africans and the exploitation of Native Americans, and call for reconciliation among all Virginians". With the passing of this resolution, Virginia became the first state to acknowledge through the state's governing body their state’s negative involvement in slavery. The passing of this resolution was in anticipation of the 400th anniversary commemoration of the founding of Jamestown, Virginia (the first permanent English settlement in North America), which was an early colonial slave port. Apologies have also been issued by Alabama, Florida, Maryland, North Carolina and New Jersey.

On July 30, 2008, the United States House of Representatives passed a resolution apologizing for American slavery and subsequent discriminatory laws.

The U.S. Senate unanimously passed a similar resolution on June 18, 2009, apologizing for the "fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery". It also explicitly states that it cannot be used for restitution claims.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slavery_in_the_United_States
Appendix Confederate Monuments in New Orleans

Here’s why the Confederate monuments in New Orleans must come down

January 13, 2016

Last month, the New Orleans City Council voted to take down four monuments honoring the Confederacy and its heroes, resulting in a federal court challenge by preservation groups and a chapter of the Sons of Confederate Veterans.

This week, the Southern Poverty Law Center and several New Orleans lawyers filed an amicus brief (PDF) in the case that provides a fascinating historical account of the monuments’ connections to the region’s shameful history of violence and terror in support of white supremacy.

Read some of the more important excerpts of the brief below:

The Civil War Was A Violent, Treasonous Campaign Of Terror To Preserve Slavery And White Supremacy; White Terror And Domination Continued After The Civil War

The monuments at issue in this case honor and glorify the Southern Confederacy. Therefore, it is with the Confederacy that this analysis must begin.

Louisiana’s antebellum economy and social order were rooted in the twin institutions of African slavery and white supremacy. In 1860, Louisiana had a total population of 708,002, of which 47 percent were enslaved, and the entire pre-war Louisiana legal system was based on maintaining white supremacy in every phase of life. In its colonial days, the 1724 Code Noir disenfranchised all blacks; when Louisiana became a state in 1812 its constitution limited the right to vote to free white male citizens who owned property or paid taxes. Subsequent laws limited voting to free white males until after the Civil War. As respected Louisiana federal jurist Judge John Minor Wisdom pointed out over fifty years ago, Louisiana social history is rooted in “the dominant white citizens’ firm determination to maintain white supremacy in state and local governments by denying to Negroes the right to vote.”

The Confederate cause in the Civil War was a tremendously violent campaign to hold onto this legal institution of white supremacy. The historical record is clear that the Southern states seceded from the
Union and engaged in a treasonous war against the United States government because they were determined to retain the legal right to own, buy, sell, and sexually and physically abuse black human beings. There is no historical basis for the position that the Civil War was fought over anything other than the South’s determination to retain the institution of chattel slavery. “Beyond ideology lay naked economic and political interests because southern white elites needed cheap labor akin to that provided by slaves if they were to remain a ruling aristocracy.”

Indeed, Louisiana representatives openly identified slavery as the reason for secession:

As a separate republic, Louisiana remembers too well the whisperings of European diplomacy for the abolition of slavery in the times of annexation not to be apprehensive of bolder demonstrations from the same quarter and the North in this country. The people of the slave holding States are bound together by the same necessity and determination to preserve African slavery.

Slavery and the supremacy of whites was the essence of the struggle.

Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution of the Confederate States stated:

In all such territory the institution of negro slavery, as it now exists in the Confederate States, shall be recognized and protected by Congress and by the Territorial government; and the inhabitants of the several Confederate States and Territories shall have the right to take to such Territory any slaves lawfully held by them in any of the States or Territories of the Confederate States.

The Confederates lost. The violence and terror of the Civil War resulted in massive death and damage to the country. About 750,000 people died in the Civil War, leaving hundreds of thousands of widows and orphans. As a result of that defeat, Louisiana was faced with a new power bloc in voting—its African American population, who comprised nearly half of its census. Though clearly reluctant to do so, Louisiana authorized black men to vote.

The losers of the Civil War, however, were not prepared to give up their political power, their way of life, or their property. Many of the former Confederates took on armed resistance against the new regime, and by 1898, white Louisiana managed by politics, violence and terror to reinstitute white supremacy in political power and daily life. Black voters, who had only been allowed to vote since 1865, were officially disenfranchised again through an amendment to the state constitution that erected educational, literacy, and property qualifications for those who wished to vote unless exempted by the grandfather clause. This act of racist disenfranchisement was done openly. The chair of the 1898 convention declared: “We meet here to establish the supremacy of the white race, and the white race constitutes the Democratic party of this State.”

As Judge Minor pointed out in his 1963 opinion, “[t]he Convention of 1898 interpreted its mandate from the people to be, to disfranchise as many Negroes as and as few whites as possible.” The constitutional amendment had its intended effect of reducing black voters from 130,344 in 1897 to 5,320 in 1900. By 1910, black voter registration had been further reduced to 730 people in Louisiana, or less than 0.5 per cent. White supremacy was back; black citizens were again subordinated and suppressed.
The white South also sought to revise the history of the Civil War by creating a new and inaccurate narrative that 1) cast the Confederacy as a noble and praiseworthy cause; 2) denied the central role that slavery played in causing the Civil War; and 3) downplayed the brutal reality of American slavery.

“In this revision of the past, the antebellum South was recalled as a benevolent, orderly society that pitted its noble values against the aggressive greed of northern industrial society. Denying slavery as the root cause of the war, the proponents of the Lost Cause achieved an ideological victory – even as the South was defeated in the war – by shaping the popular memory of the conflict. In the process, this ideological victory helped insure widespread American acceptance of the South’s justification for the racial status quo.” — Eric Foner, Forever Free: The Story of Emancipation & Reconstruction 216 (2005).

This distortion of history, crafted by white southerners, is a phenomenon that historians now call the Cult of the Lost Cause.

According to documents filed with the National Register of Historic Places:

The Cult of the Lost Cause has its roots in the Southern search for justification and the need to find a substitute for victory in the Civil War. In attempting to deal with defeat, Southerners created an image of the war as a great heroic epic. A major theme in the Cult of the Lost Cause was the clash of two civilizations, one inferior to the other. The North, ‘invigorated’ by constant struggle with nature, had become materialistic, grasping for wealth and power. The South had a ‘more generous climate’, which had led to a finer society based upon ‘veracity and honor in man, chastity and fidelity in women.’ Like tragic heroes, Southerners had waged a noble but doomed struggle to preserve their superior civilization. There was an element of chivalry in the way the South had fought, achieving noteworthy victories against staggering odds. This was the ‘Lost Cause’ as the late nineteenth century saw it, and a whole generation of Southerners set about glorifying and celebrating it. Glorification took many forms, including speeches, organizations such as the United Confederate Veterans and the United Daughters of the Confederacy, reunions, publications, holidays such as Lee's birthday, and innumerable memorials.

The six main assertions of the Cult are:

Secession, not slavery, caused the Civil War; African Americans were “faithful slaves,” loyal to their masters and the Confederate cause and unprepared for the responsibilities of freedom; the Confederacy was defeated militarily only because of the Union’s overwhelming advantages in men and resources; Confederate soldiers were heroic and saintly; the most heroic and saintly of all Confederates, perhaps of all Americans, was Robert E. Lee; and Southern women were loyal to the Confederate cause and sanctified by the sacrifice of their loved ones.

This was the “Lost Cause” as the late nineteenth century saw it, and a whole generation of Southerners set about glorifying and celebrating it. Glorification took many forms, including speeches, organizations such as the United Confederate Veterans and the United Daughters of the Confederacy, reunions, publications, holidays such as Lee’s birthday, and innumerable memorials.

The Cult of the Lost Cause continued to dominate Southern cultural history in the early twentieth century, and it is indeed still alive and well today. If the Court has the occasion to review the public hearings held by the City of New Orleans over the removal of these statues, it will find nearly every one of the core assertions of the Cult of the Lost Cause was repeated, often more than once, by the white southerners who objected to the removal of these monuments.
Moreover, three of the statues at issue in this case have been described by the Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation, and Tourism as THE major monuments in New Orleans representing the Cult of the Lost Cause—the monuments of Robert E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, and P.G.T. Beauregard. It is not by accident that these three monuments were erected and venerated. They were elevated to honor the violent, treasonous war to retain white supremacy and to legitimize those who continue to seek it.

The Cult of the Lost Cause is not, as its past and present advocates contend, a benevolent historical tribute to Confederate veterans. Rather, the Cult of the Lost Cause was at the heart of the ideology of the Ku Klux Klan and other white supremacy groups that portrayed the emancipated African American as a threat to democracy and white womanhood. It also sought to return Louisiana to its pre-Civil War days of total white control and supremacy.

This is the historical context in which these monuments to white supremacy were erected and are maintained. This context is essential to this court’s evaluation of whether these monuments should continue to stand in New Orleans.

Robert E. Lee: Slave Owner, Slave Abuser, Confederate General And Leader Of Violent War To Maintain White Supremacy, Traitor

The statue of Robert E. Lee epitomizes the glorification and celebration of white supremacy and the elevation of false myths about the Civil War that romanticize the Confederacy and mute the horrors of slavery.

Lee was “loyal to slavery and disloyal to his country.” As a decades-long slave-owner who physically abused his slaves and used them as servants throughout the Civil War, Lee decided to leave his post with the United States Army in 1861 to become a leader of the cause of white supremacy. Lee chose to join the Confederacy despite the fact that many members of his own family supported the United States and honored their oaths of office to the military. Thus, pursuant to Article III, Section 3, Clause 1, of the U.S. Constitution, Lee engaged in treason against the United States. Far from being a revered figure, Robert E. Lee has been condemned for his “racist and dishonorable conduct” even by students of Washington and Lee University in Virginia, a school once presided over by Lee himself.
Robert E. Lee Monument closeup, Lee Circle, New Orleans, Louisiana

The Lee Monument was erected to propagate the Cult of the Lost Cause and its desire to remake the image of the Civil War as “a great heroic epic” wherein the South “waged a noble but doomed struggle to preserve their superior civilization.” Conceived between 1870 and 1876, when the trauma of defeat was still fresh in the South, a monument honoring “the most heroic and saintly of all Confederates, perhaps of all Americans . . .” was wholly consistent with the tenets of the Cult of the Lost Cause.

In the historical documents filed with the National Register of Historic Places regarding this statue, the record is clear that the Lee monument was constructed and honored as a central aspect of the Cult of the Lost Cause:

The Lee Monument is of regional significance in the cultural history of the South because it is a tangible symbol of the views of the majority of southerners during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In general, the monument represents what is known as the Cult of the Lost Cause. More particularly, it stands for a central aspect of the cult -- the deification of General Robert E. Lee.

The National Register document concludes by saying:

In many ways Robert E. Lee was the centerpiece of the cult. He was arguably the most venerated Civil War figure in the South, and by the twentieth century had become a national hero. Indeed, he assumed an almost Christ-like stature. Monuments to Lee embody the highest aspirations of the Lost Cause cult. They, along with monuments to other southern Civil War figures, are the most tangible reminders of this extremely important and pervasive phenomenon.

Erecting statues to Robert E. Lee and others was part of the Lost Cause in all its myths, rituals, and symbols and helped Confederates deal with the trauma of defeat. These symbols of white supremacy helped reinstitute unity among ex-Confederates. Admiration of Lee and others was at the heart of the movement to reclaim mythologized glories and power.

Jefferson Davis: Slave Owner, Racist, President Of The Confederacy, Traitor

Jefferson Davis was a slave-owning racist and traitor who led an unsuccessful insurrection against the United States. He is quoted as saying, “African slavery, as it exists in the United States, is a moral, a social, and a political blessing.” According to Davis, “its origin was Divine decree,” and the slave trade had been a blessing for the African, bringing him out of ignorance and degradation to a land of Christian enlightenment where the slave “entered the temple of civilization.” It was all by divine ordination that the black man had been made “a servant of servants.” Davis was also adamant that white supremacy over African Americans was key to the identity and place of white people:
You too know, that among us, white men have an equality resulting from a presence of a lower caste, which cannot exist where white men fill the position here occupied by the servile race. The mechanic who comes among us, employing the less intellectual labor of the African, takes the position which only a master-workman occupies where all the mechanics are white, and therefore it is that our mechanics hold their position of absolute equality among us.

Davis owned dozens of slaves, and as a U.S. Senator, he was an ardent defender of slavery and the rights of southern states to allow it. Davis argued in Congress that the Missouri Compromise threatened to take away his constitutional right as a slave owner to move about the country with his property.

Davis was elected president of the Confederate states on February 8, 1861. Under Article III, Section 3, Clause 1, of the U.S. Constitution, Davis engaged in treason against the United States. Davis defended slavery as a moral and social good, and he fought a monstrous war to maintain it.

His writings demonstrate that he remained racist and pro-slavery to the end of his life. Davis, like Robert E. Lee, became a hero of the Lost Cause in the post-Civil War south. To further demonstrate the nefarious purpose of this statue, one must only look at the fact that, as Plaintiffs themselves point out, the Davis monument association was organized in 1898, immediately after the disenfranchisement of African American voters, and was erected on the fiftieth anniversary of Davis’ inauguration as president of the Confederacy. From its inception, the monument was intended to broadcast white opposition to the advancement of rights for African Americans.

P.G.T. Beauregard: Confederate General, Slave Owner, Deserter, Traitor

P.G.T. Beauregard, born in St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana, was the Confederacy’s first hero when he presided over the surrender of United States troops at Fort Sumter. He is probably best known as the designer of the Confederate flag, the Southern Cross, in 1861.

Under Article III, Section 3, Clause 1, of the U.S. Constitution, Beauregard engaged in treason against the United States. After the war, Beauregard asked for a pardon, but only after writing Robert E. Lee and complaining “it is hard to ask pardon of an adversary you despise.” He subsequently signed a loyalty oath to the U.S. to retain his citizenship and make sure he was not prosecuted or charged with deserting his post at West Point.

Beauregard’s family owned slaves and he rented slaves to serve him during his time in the military. Though he later was an advocate for equal rights, his monument honors him as a Confederate general. The monument, completed and dedicated in 1915, bears the inscription “GT Beauregard, 1818-1893, General CSA 1861-1865.”
Documents filed with the National Register of Historic Places Database indicate that the statue is another of three Louisiana monuments to the Cult of the Lost Cause:

The General Beauregard Equestrian Statue is of statewide cultural significance as one of three major Louisiana monuments representing what is known by historians as the Cult of the Lost Cause. The other two statues, both also located in New Orleans, depict Robert E. Lee and Jefferson Davis. Statues of this type are tangible symbols of a state of mind which was powerful and pervasive throughout the South well into the twentieth century (and some would say even today).

The National Register further states, “the deification of Southern heroes such as Beauregard and Robert E. Lee has continued to the present.”

When the Beauregard statue was dedicated, the glorification of Beauregard’s white supremacist past was exemplified by the following remarks from Judge John St. Paul: “Well, indeed, may they worship at his shrine, for he was one, and not the least, of that galaxy of heroic men whose glorious deeds have placed their age and the struggle in which they took part among the grandest that adorn the annals of all times.” As these remarks illustrate, the Beauregard statue lionizes one of the main champions of the Confederacy.

“Liberty” Monument: Violent Terrorist Resistance To Integrated Government

The so-called Liberty Monument honors the violent post-Civil War White League, a Louisiana white supremacist paramilitary terrorist organization. The White League, closely connected to the Ku Klux Klan, was the military arm of the Lost Cause movement in Louisiana which sought to reverse the loss of white supremacy. As eminent historian Eric Foner explains: “[t]he White League was formed with the avowed purpose of restoring white supremacy, by violent means if necessary.” The White League spread terror and assassinations across Louisiana before attempting to overthrow the lawful government of New Orleans in September 1874 by murdering New Orleans police officers and seizing government buildings.

The Louisiana White League emerged as “one of the most brutal white supremacist organizations in all of Reconstruction,” assassinating officeholders in Ouachita, Red River, Caddo, Natchitoches, and East Baton Rouge Parishes and engaging in several massacres across Louisiana. In April 1873, the illegal white militia attacked and murdered a hundred black Louisiana soldiers, half in cold blood after they had surrendered, in the Colfax Massacre in Grant Parish, Louisiana. Following another attack in Natchitoches, in August 1874, the White League murdered four blacks and six whites in the Coushatta Massacre in an attempt to overthrow the Republican government in northwest Louisiana. In 1875, U.S. General Philip Sheridan wrote a telegram to the U.S. Secretary of War describing the violence and terror
of the White League: “I think the terrorism now existing in Louisiana, Mississippi and Arkansas could be entirely removed and confidence and fair dealing established by the arrest and control of the ringleaders of the armed White Leaguers.”

On September 14, 1874, in what has been called the Battle of Liberty Place, thousands of members of the Crescent City White League, including many Confederate veterans, challenged Louisiana’s integrated Reconstruction government by attacking and killing New Orleans police officers and inflicting 100 casualties. They captured the statehouse, the armory, and downtown New Orleans for days until retreating in the face of newly arrived federal troops.

The Liberty Monument was erected in 1891 to commemorate the Battle of Liberty Place and honor the members of the White League who murdered police officers and took over the City of New Orleans all in an attempt to undo the effects of the Civil War. At this time, the White League was so powerful that it had a member on the U.S. Supreme Court, and in 1891 veterans of the White League Liberty Place battle openly lynched eleven Sicilian men and used the lynching as a way to raise money to build the monument.

![Image of the Liberty Monument inscription](image)

The Monuments Have Kept Alive The Confederacy’s Legacy Of Racial Oppression

Far from inert structures honoring a dead past, the monuments at issue have continuously served as a rallying point in efforts to entrench white political power and reaffirm the values of white supremacy. For example, in 1896, former members of the White League and young members of the city’s white elite staged mass rallies at the Liberty monument, repeatedly invoking the memory of the men who had fought there. Three days later, they led a procession that began at Lee Circle and ended at Liberty Monument. This show of power succeeded in pressuring local political representatives to negotiate with White League leaders, eventually allowing for the election of Walter Flower, the son of a White League veteran, as mayor. Additionally, in 1904, there were further rallies at the Liberty Place Monument to replace nominating conventions with a “white primary” that would have allowed only white voters to participate.

In 1932, a new inscription was added to the monument which read: “United States troops took over the state government and reinstated the usurpers but the national election in November 1876 recognized white supremacy and gave us our state.”

As one historian has noted, “[a]s rhetoric, the September Fourteenth tradition persisted well into the latter half of the twentieth century.” Celebrations of the monument grew particularly fervent during the civil rights movement. For example, in 1948, a large group of arch-segregationists gathered at the monument on the battle’s anniversary, and Congressman Eddie Herbert stated, “[i]t is one of history’s
tragedies that we are gathered here at a time when the ideals for which the men of 1874 fought are being viciously attacked again on all fronts,” and exhorted that “the struggle for home rule must be won again.”

In 1955, a year after the Supreme Court’s decision in Brown v. Board of Education to desegregate public schools, a book entitled The Battle of Liberty Place, written by Stuart Landry and funded by many prominent white families in New Orleans, was published, characterizing the terrorism of 1874 as one of the highest achievements of the white race. Dedicated to “The Memory of the Heroes of the Fourteenth of September, whose Patriotism should be an Inspiration, not only to their Descendants, but to all Louisianans of Good Intent,” the book justified the organization of the Ku Klux Klan and other secret societies as a legitimate way to protect the rights of white people against the “carpetbaggers, scalawags, ignorant freedmen and rascally Southerners who joined in with these others to direct and control the newly enfranchised colored people for plunder and power.”

More recently, in the early 1990s, the monument became a rallying point for the Ku Klux Klan and David Duke when one of Duke’s supporters sued the City of New Orleans to restore the monument after it had been removed and placed in storage due to street repairs.

The Lee monument has also provided a site for white supremacists to celebrate their cause well into the twentieth century. In 1922, a poem published in the Times-Picayune sang the statue’s praises, reading: “He stands calm and firm... / watching with prophetic eyes / His beloved Southland: seeing in her / Cleaner American stock the saving strain / Which yet will right the balance / ‘Twixt conflicting alien hordes / And hold straight the course / Of America’s Ship of State / Toward the ultimate goal / Of a homogenous people...” In 1972, several prominent Louisiana segregationists, including Addison Roswell Thompson, who had previously run for state governor and mayor of New Orleans, celebrated Lee’s birthday by draping a Confederate flag at the foot of the monument and setting out their Klan robes. The incident escalated into a racial confrontation with several black passersby. David Duke was among those jailed for “inciting to riot.”

These episodes show that by designating multiple places throughout New Orleans to publicly honor those that championed racism and oppression, the monuments have and continue to perpetuate belief, support, and pride in the Confederacy’s “Lost Cause,” and its vision of white supremacy.

Plaintiff Sons Of Confederacy Beauregard Camp No. 130

If there is any more need to prove that this matter is about preservation of white supremacy, the Court should take note that Beauregard Camp No. 130, Inc. is a named plaintiff in this case.
Plaintiff is a chapter of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, which describes the Civil War as an honorable fight for liberty and freedom to such an extent that they call it the Second American Revolution.

In the complaint, Beauregard Camp describes itself as “an autonomous, local chapter of the Sons of Confederate Veterans,’’ and was “chartered in 1899 to preserve the memory and good name of General P.G.T. Beauregard, General Robert E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, and all Confederate veterans and elected civil servants who served honorably in the Civil War.” Plaintiff admits it played an active leading role in creating, funding, and erecting the Beauregard and Jefferson Davis monuments.

The Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV) is a membership-based organization consisting of local chapters called “camps” that are located across the country. The group valorizes the service of Confederate veterans and their cause, writing that they “personified the best qualities of America” and that the “[t]he preservation of liberty and freedom was the motivating factor in the South’s decision to fight the Second American Revolution.” Founded in 1896 in Richmond, Virginia, the SCV reports that it has approximately 30,000 members. There are over thirty camps in Louisiana. Membership is open to any male who can provide documentation proving he is a descendant of a Confederate soldier or sailor.

The SCV states publicly that it has a “strictly enforced ‘hate’ policy” which requires that anyone with ties to any racist organization or hate group must be denied membership or immediately expelled. Prohibited organizations include the Ku Klux Klan, American Nazi Party, the National Alliance, or any organization expressing racist ideals or violent overthrow of the United States government.

According to the Southern Poverty Law Center (“SPLC”), however, in the past fifteen years the SCV has been riven by an “internal civil war” which continues to this day between those espousing racist beliefs (many of whom are closely aligned with white supremacist groups and individuals) and “history clubbers” whose primary interest is preserving and celebrating the history of the Confederacy.

For instance, Kirk Lyons is an active and prominent member of the SCV, holding a leadership position in the SCV’s youth camp and recently represented the organization in a failed lawsuit to prevent the removal of a statue of Jefferson Davis from the campus of the University of Texas. Mr. Lyons is also the chief trial counsel for the Southern Legal Resource Center, a pro-Confederate organization that he and his brother-in-law founded in 1996 that has defended the flying of the Confederate flag in a number of court disputes. Lyons previously defended a former Klan leader and the leader of an anti-Semitic group called Posse Comitatus, in addition to having been married in an Aryan Nation compound. Lyons has led efforts to turn SCV towards extreme-right political activism. The SPLC reports that in 2000 he stated alongside former Klan leader David Duke that the SCV needed to get rid of its “Grannies” and “bed-wetters” and said: “[t]he civil rights movement I am trying to form seeks a revolution. . . . We seek nothing more than a return to a godly, stable, tradition-based society with no ‘Northernisms’ attached, a hierarchical society, a majority European-derived country.”

Another such extremist is Ron G. Wilson, who was elected in 2002 to serve as SCV’s commander in chief—the group’s highest office. During his two years in office, Wilson suspended around 300 members for publicly criticizing racism within the group. Many of these members had been associated with an anti-racist offshoot of the SCV, called Save the Sons of Confederate Veterans. Wilson appointed Lyons to the SCV’s Long-Range Planning Committee. His election set off a struggle over the SCV that has reportedly led to the loss of thousands of its more moderate members.
In 2004, Denne Sweeney took over as national leader and continued Wilson’s policies and also permanently expelled the 300 men suspended by Wilson. Sweeney implemented measures that favored the influence of radical elements of the SCV. After Sweeney prevailed over moderates who challenged his decisions in a lawsuit, the rift between radical and moderate members of the SCV deepened, and some former members started new groups meant to be non-racist history clubs.

Despite its official rejection of overtly racist ideology, the group’s work and the legacy it seeks to preserve is deeply intertwined with white supremacy. To illustrate this point, in 2000, the SVC’s Selma, Alabama, chapter erected a monument to noted KKK member and Confederate general, Nathan Bedford Forrest. The monument is located in a large cemetery in Selma—a site that is deeply significant in the Civil Rights Movement—in a part of the cemetery dedicated to Confederate soldiers. A picture of the monument is available online.

After the shooting of unarmed African Americans in Charleston, the group issued a public statement condemning the act and decrying racism (while also accusing its “politically correct opponents” of attempting to politicize the tragedy). However, despite these initial statements, the SCV has played a prominent role in organizing other pro-Confederate flag movements in the wake of the Charleston killings.

Although the Sons of Confederate Veterans has disavowed racism in its official pronouncements in recent years, the group is still deeply invested in elevating and legitimizing its version of the Confederacy’s “history” and “traditions,” which implicate an inherently racist, white supremacist vision of society.

This plaintiff is a living current example of the Cult of the Lost Cause and the glorification of the violent racist Civil War which was fought to preserve the enslavement of millions of African Americans. They call the Civil War the “Second American Revolution” and praise as honorable the people who committed treason.

The fact that the plaintiff in this case is a chapter of the SCV demonstrates why the City of New Orleans not only has the right to take down these statues, but why they must.

Conclusion

The statues at issue in this case honor and glorify treasonous white supremacists who would likely be charged as terrorists today. Their violent actions supported white supremacy and the continued enslavement of millions of people. The monuments erected in their “honor” were constructed and maintained in a deliberate effort to perpetuate historical myths of southern glory when black people
were property to be used and abused. By enshrining a patently false version of history, the monuments have helped keep these myths and the oppression they justify alive.

These statutes fit exactly into Section 146-611 (b) of the New Orleans Code of Ordinances which authorizes the City Council to remove statues from public property when those statues are a nuisance:

The thing honors, praises, or fosters ideologies which are in conflict with the requirements of equal protection for citizens as provided by the constitution and laws of the United States, the state, or the laws of the city and gives honor or praise to those who participated in the killing of public employees of the city or the state or suggests the supremacy of one ethnic, religious, or racial group over any other, or gives honor or praise to any violent actions taken wrongfully against citizens of the city to promote ethnic, religious or racial superiority of any group.

The monuments foster ideologies which are in direct conflict with the requirements of equal protection of our citizens. They honor the killing of public employees. And they honor and praise violent actions that were taken to promote white supremacy, the racial superiority of a group of whites who fought our nation’s most violent and bloody war.

Not only can the City of New Orleans remove these statues, it must.

For a full listing of footnotes and references please see the amicus brief (PDF) as it was filed.
Appendix Public Testimony

Ariana Habibi, JEB Stuart Student
Ariana Habibi Community Meeting May 18

Hello everyone,

My name is Ariana Habibi and I am a junior at Stuart High School.

I support the effort to rename J.E.B. Stuart High School because I have long-since felt bothered by my school’s name, mascot, and colors.

When I meet students from other Fairfax County schools, it is inevitable that the question of “Where do you go to school?” will come up in conversation, and I am always embarrassed to answer with “Stuart High”. This is not because I am ashamed of my peers or of my teachers - if anything, I am extremely proud to be a member of such a diverse and capable community - but rather because I am ashamed to have to say that I attend a school named after a Confederate leader and traitor to the United States.

It is difficult to express the pride I feel for my school through the Confederate symbols that currently represent it - symbols whose message I disagree with and am embarrassed by. When I attend sports events, I am not sure how I should cheer on our team - do I say something along the lines of “Go Stuart!” or “Go Raiders!” when I know full-well who J.E.B. Stuart and his raiders were, and the atrocities they committed? When I want to purchase spirit wear to show my school pride, do I simply disregard the fact that the school symbol used to hold a Confederate flag - something that is so deeply immersed in hatred, racism, and bigotry?

As a student, I find that it is unfair that simply attending my designated public school puts me in this position. I want to be able to cheer on my friends and wear a school shirt without feeling as though I am compromising the moral beliefs that are so important to me. Though it is admittedly true that some other students may be able to look past the historical and ethical implications of a name and mascot, I cannot.

Future students shouldn’t have to feel the shame I do, and so should be able to attend a school without a name intended to discriminate and exclude. In order for our school to embrace its own culture, we need a symbol that accurately represents who we are, not a Confederate general who stood adamantly for the segregation of society.

The effort to rename buildings and statues established in honor of the Confederacy, as well as the effort to take down Confederate flags, is a movement that is occurring nationwide. The momentum we need for change is happening everywhere. In this sense, the situation with J.E.B. Stuart is not special or unique, but rather a step towards a more accepting society and a step towards attempting to rectify the wrongs of the past. And so, change is necessary, and the time for change is now.
Julia Clarke Statement at community meeting 5/18/17

My name is Julia Clark, I’m a sophomore at J.E.B. Stuart High school. I believe that the name of a high school should be an inspiration to the students. JEB Stuart is a man who gave up his commission in the United States Army to fight against freedom for African Americans. He fought to preserve the enslavement of 4 million people, this does not inspire at all. Some argue that the Civil War was not primarily about slavery. Yet Virginia, in its Secession Ordinance, specifically declared that the federal government pursued policies “not only to the injury of the people of Virginia, but to the oppression of the Southern Slaveholding States.” Other rebel states made the same argument in their ordinances.

But I’m here today to tell you what it’s like to be a student of color at a school named after a racist. As a person of color, discrimination is all around me. In the media, in politics, and throughout the world. But discrimination should have no place in my school. Not only is it offensive that my school is named after a white supremacist, it is also degrading and dehumanizing. They say we’ve come far, but the name of my school is a testament of how far we still have to go. When some of my fellow classmates found out I was active in the Name change movement, many of them mocked me in class saying things like, “Black people
should just deal with racism”, “if I was black I wouldn’t be upset”, “Just give up”, and “Stop being such an angry black girl”. But I admit it, I am an angry black girl, I’m angry because we are told that every student should feel welcomed and comfortable at school but that is only a reality for some students.

I run track and every Tuesday and Thursday I walk into the weight room to see a giant mural of J.E.B. Stuart painted on the wall in front of me. He’s portrayed like a hero, with bulging muscles, a powerful pose, a regal face, and red, white, and blue flowing behind him. This sends a message to me that General Stuart and what he fought for is deemed heroic and patriotic. My ancestors being bought and sold like cattle is ok because J.E.B Stuart was a “patriot”. I love my school, I love my friends, my teachers, and my coaches. But JEB Stuart will never be an appropriate name. We’re such a diverse school so why isn’t our name something we are proud of? Something that celebrates our diversity instead of dividing us. Something that represents our entire community instead of representing the oppression of a race. With all the hate that we see in our world today I believe we need to send a message of love, tolerance, community, and empowerment. We need to show that we as a community will not discriminate because of gender, religion, race, or anything else. I’m tired (SO TIRED) of being treated like a second-class student in a place where I should feel respected and safe. It's time to change the name of JEB Stuart High school.
Hello. My name is Lidia Amanuel, and I am a senior at J.E.B. Stuart High School. I am speaking here this evening to encourage the modification of the facilities renaming policy.

Along with the name J.E.B. Stuart comes a history of inequality, racism and oppression. This history cannot be undone nor forgotten. Such an identity misrepresents the students and faculty that make up my high school family. My high school is a diverse institution with an international student body. Two-thirds of the students are second language learners from over 70 countries. I myself am of Eritrean origin. Many of us do not identify with the ideals that JEB Stuart and the confederacy stood for. We believe that the name of the school should reflect those who are dedicated to and uphold the highest ideals of freedom, justice and civil rights for all.

With changing the school name comes a profound avenue for education and reflection. This change is imperative to reversing the original message that was sent to people of color and revive, but certainly not erase, the true history. This course of education and means of obtaining justice is only a part of the journey of the movement to bring racial justice, but would be a remarkable one for our school.

School names are more than words on a building; they are identifiers of the students and employees within them. In this case, the name of my school inaccurately represents who we are as individuals and as a community. School names are meant to be honorable, representing ideals to which students can aspire. Just as naming a school for a Confederate soldier would be inappropriate today because you do not want to send the message that Confederate ideals are respectable, it is wrong not to change the name of my school now.

Like many of the thousands of students of color at the high school, I love my school and am excited to receive an incredible education. However, my values are challenged as I am forced to celebrate the Confederacy to express my love for my school. We hope to change the name of our school to better reflect the positive learning environment and accepting atmosphere we enter every morning.

This is why I need you to vote in favor of the proposed change to the facilities renaming policy, to end the message of oppression and resulting desensitization to racism that the symbols currently representing my school carry. The modification of this policy will make it possible for Fairfax County to discontinue its tolerance of institutionalized racism. Please help make this happen.

Thank you.
Hello. I just graduated from J.E.B. Stuart High School and will forever be grateful for the wonderful experiences I had there. Our diverse community, as all of us would tell you, provides an invaluable experience, showing us the vast cultures and perspectives our world offers. High school also fostered my love of serving needs in my community through activities like serving as president of my class, tutoring with the Math Honor Society, and advocating for my school’s name to be changed. I want what is best for my community in every way, and its name should be changed because no school should honor someone’s service to an effort to create a nation where enslaving people could be legal, and no students should have to be represented by symbols of this racist effort.

Even though the May 23rd meeting and survey analysis showed that community engagement was not successful in representing our entire, diverse community, one third of respondents still expressed that J.E.B. Stuart High School needs a name change, and most of those who were opposed or neutral cited financial concerns. The proposed resolution appropriately responds to these results by creating a workgroup that will utilize strategic planning and fundraising resources, such as the Change.org petition and dedicated alumni, to ensure that otherwise unavailable money is brought into our school by this important act. I am also glad that the resolution recognizes that we must take efforts to preserve both the history of J.E.B. Stuart and our school in new ways. Although some are complacent to continue ignoring the racism of our school’s current name because changing it is not the most convenient option, this wrong should and can be righted.

Change the name so that FCPS can represent thousands and thousands of future students with the inclusiveness it now embraces instead of the inequality of our area’s past.
Marley Finley ‘16

Hello. I am a recent graduate of J.E.B. Stuart High School here to express my strong belief that the students in Glasgow Middle School, Bailey’s Elementary School, and other elementary schools in our pyramid should never have to attend a high school with a name that honors someone’s service to the Confederacy. While some of my peers and community members are complacent to ignore our school’s unfitting name because changing it is not the most convenient option, many of us want to see this wrong righted.

Community engagement, while clearly not representative of our entire community, still showed that one third of respondents think the name should to be changed. Most of the 56% who opposed the name change or remained neutral said that they would not want to see money put toward a name change that could be put toward our school’s other needs.

I am glad that this concern has been raised because it is true that our community has many needs that myself, other students, teachers, and parents work hard to address every year. But the fact that a name change is not free does not mean it cannot happen. The resolution appropriately calls for a workgroup that will focus on using fundraising and strategic planning to implement the name change in a way that brings otherwise unavailable money into our community.

Other claims that our school does not need a new name because our student body is diverse and inclusive fail to recognize that any school named to honor someone’s leadership in the Confederacy has a problem. FCPS should uphold and represent its students with the acceptance it now embraces instead of the inequality of our areas past.

Lastly, there are some who claim that Stuart’s charisma, skills, and strategizing should be honored, regardless of the cause to which they
contributed. But by that logic, we would commend terrorists for bravery and ingenuity. The Confederacy fought for racism, and J.E.B. Stuart fought for the Confederacy. He even captured eight free black men from the north and brought them into the south to be enslaved during this service.

Change the name because otherwise, the Confederacy will continue to live

I just graduated from J.E.B. Stuart High School. As both those supporting and opposing the name change will tell you, we love, perhaps more than anything, our diverse student body. While our school does not escape all of the racism that our society continues to work against, we do have a wonderful sense of inclusiveness. We wholeheartedly embrace our differences, eager to tell everyone that National Geographic once called us the most diverse school in the country. But, we still need our school’s name to be changed.

Our school’s name honors J.E.B. Stuart’s Confederate leadership. As FCPS teaches students as early as elementary school, the Confederacy sought to create a nation where slavery could be legal, where African Americans could continue to be treated as property, instead of people. This racism that General Stuart fought and died for should not be honored, and should not be used to represent a student body.

I appreciate that people have voiced the important need to implement a name change in a way that respects our community’s many other areas of need. The proposed work group not only addresses this concern, instructing for strategic planning and fundraising, but also ensures that both the history of our school and of J.E.B. Stuart will be remembered. Change the name so that FCPS can represent thousands and thousands of future students with the inclusiveness it now embraces instead of the inequality of our area’s past.
Tim Beres, Parent

Tim Beres email to School Board 5/18/2016

It is time to change the name of Jeb Stuart High School. By now we all know the malicious context in which the school was named. With this understanding (and in the context of the Charleston shooting and the acknowledgement throughout the south of the racist and harmful meaning of the symbol of the Confederate flag) isn’t it time to let go of Virginia’s racist past? Clearly, Fairfax County does not believe that children of color are inferior human beings who shouldn’t go to school with white children. The county has a diverse population and does its best to educate each and every child. With this in mind, shouldn't we tear down the symbols that were purposely put up by those who did not believe every child in Virginia deserved an equal education? If the Governor of South Carolina can stand for putting away the Confederate flag can’t we put away our Confederate generals? It is time to move on and show our children that the traitorous, racist “Southern cause” is dead as is its segregationist legacy.

It is an insult to our immigrant students who fought hard to be in the United States, whose parents sacrificed for them to be here to go to a school named after someone who waged war for the express purpose of not being a part of the United States. It is tremendously ironic that the children who did so much to be a part of the United States go to a school named after a person who literally fought for its destruction. Sometimes we forget that well over three hundred thousand Union Soldiers gave their lives to save our country, to stop its destruction by Southern traitors so we could have ONE nation.

The name of the school should be offensive to anyone who loves the United States, and hates bigotry. It is a symbol of a racist past that needs to be put to rest. We don’t even need to debate the merits of Jeb Stuart himself if we just recognize that the reason for naming the new school after the general was done with malicious intent. It was meant to hurt and still does. It is time to do the right thing.

Recently, cost has been brought forward as a reason not to change the name of Jeb Stuart High School. This is a red herring and typical of arguments not to change things that are morally wrong. These were literally the arguments that were made not to end slavery and not to end segregation. Sometimes doing the right thing costs money. If every Jeb Stuart uniform, marquee, chair, and sports floor had the confederate flag on it I believe we would pay to have them removed. Jeb Stuart was the living embodiment of what the Confederate flag represents. He fought, killed, and died for that flag. Having his name on the school is no different than flying the Confederate flag. Costs can be absorbed over time – symbols and names can be phased out over time. The school board has the opportunity to undo a great wrong that was done to the people and especially the children of Fairfax County. Do the right thing and atone for the previous board’s malicious naming of these high schools. This is your opportunity to be on the right side of history – unlike those Confederate generals who are being honored by having schools in our county named after them.
PS – I was at the museum in Gettysburg this past weekend and Jeb Stuart is featured prominently, so there should be no concern that those of us in favor of re-naming these schools are trying to change or erase history.

Sincerely,

Tim Beres
Parent of a 10th grade student at Jeb Stuart and a 7th grade student at Glasgow Middle School
July 28, 2016

TO: Esteemed members of the Fairfax County School Board

My name is Andrew Ratliff. I live in the Stuart High School community and my wife and I are parents of a rising 9th grader and a rising 11th grader at Stuart. I write to you in support of re-branding J.E.B. Stuart High School. Below I explain why, and have added some supporting documents referenced in my letter.

“You can’t erase history!”

This is a common refrain from those who resist changing the name of J.E.B Stuart High School. They are absolutely correct – you cannot erase history! When you take the metal letters off the brick wall of the high school originally intended to be called “Munson Hill High School”, you don’t erase history.

In fact, those in opposition have never effectively shown how history is “erased”, ”ignored”, “white-washed”, “re-written”, or “changed” by re-branding the school with a more appropriate name. In over a year of hearing this reflexive response, no one has yet explained how this action will suddenly render history inaccessible.

In today’s digital age, history is not only more easily accessible, we have so much more of it at our fingertips, whether it is Civil War history from the 19th Century, or the history of Civil Rights and archived Fairfax County records in the 20th Century. In fact, it is a direct result of this increased level of access to historical documents that we now know much more about both periods in our country’s and commonwealth’s histories. Armed with this expanded knowledge, it is becoming increasingly difficult to justify having a tax-payer funded school named after a Confederate General. Countless books have been written about the War Between the States, collections of personal letters from the 1860s have been digitized, tens of thousands of photos have been scanned and posted, every edition of the Washington Post and Evening Star from the 1950s is available online, and the county’s own School Board minutes can be read from the comfort of one’s home.

Civil War History

There can be no doubt that the Confederate States’ decision to secede from the Union was primarily about the Southern States’ rights to preserve the “curious institution of slavery” and the supremacy of the white race, as evidenced in their declarations (attached below). These documents are instantly accessible.
online from multiple sources. There’s no alternate interpretation of the intent behind their decision to dissolve the Union, despite the attempts of some to deny what’s plainly written in those documents. When Stuart made the opposite choice of his father-in-law, he chose to defend Virginia’s curious institution of slavery and the white supremacy that was used to justify it. He chose to wage war against the United States of America. By any reasonable definition, and despite whatever gallantry or tactical strategic genius he is believed to have had, this was a treasonous act.

Stuart’s primary claim to fame in the immediate area of the high school was a brief 2-month period in a 48-month long war. After sneaking away from Munson’s and Mason’s Hills in the middle of the night in September 1861, his only other claim to fame in the region was for “harassing” federal troops and “raiding” their supplies – in short, “terrorism” and “thievery”.

Civil Rights History
Contemporary news articles from the 1950s give us a deeper understanding about the context in which the School Board at the time was operating. There were tremendous pressures from the federal government following Brown v. Board, from the State government’s official opposition to integration, and from the taxpaying residents of Fairfax County. The board was not operating in some vacuum, oblivious to the court case being held just a few miles away, nor could they be unaware of Virginia’s official position of defiance of federally-mandated integration.

In 1955, the School Board formed the Committee on Desegregation, and was assailed by members of the community for having a committee named in such a way that presumes an outcome. They were forced to change the name of the committee. Washington Post article attached below. (Ironically, we are seeing a remarkably familiar reaction by a faction of the community today, regarding the formation and name of a committee to deal with changing the name of J.E.B. Stuart High School.)

In 1956, the U.S. Representative from Virginia, Howard Smith, drafted the “Southern Manifesto” (attached below) which was eventually signed by 89 Representatives and 19 Senators, to use "all lawful means" to reverse the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. This portion of that document should sound particularly familiar to the current School Board, as it is mirrored in the arguments of the group currently opposing the name change:
‘It is destroying the amicable relations between the white and Negro races that have been created through 90 years of patient effort by the good people of both races. It has planted hatred and suspicion where there has been heretofore friendship and understanding.

Without regard to the consent of the governed, outside mediators are threatening immediate and revolutionary changes in our public schools systems.”

Directly resulting from this manifesto of defiance, was the State of Virginia’s official policy of “Massive Resistance”, which is well documented in newspaper articles from the period. The State intended to resist integration, including shutting down schools to prevent it. This put the Fairfax County School Board in a very difficult position, as it was clear by early 1958 that the court case at the U.S. District Court in Alexandria was going to result in the admittance of black students to Arlington County’s Stratford Junior High School, thereby opening the door to State-wide integration. The abrupt decision by the School Board at the time to dispense with the standard naming process for high schools occurred at exactly the same time period. While there is nothing specifically in the minutes indicating a deliberate rationale to do this as a deterrent to incoming blacks or as a “poke in the eye” to the federal government, there is also nothing in the minutes indicating that this was done as part of the Centennial of the Civil War. There is simply no contemporary account of the Centennial being a motivation, but plenty of circumstantial and documentary evidence of Massive Resistance and the “curious timing” of the decision to change both the rules and the intended name of Munson Hill High School.

Blacks were not even admitted to Stuart until 1961, but before that happened, Superintendent Woodson recommended the school board segregate interscholastic athletics, citing “problems of a social and athletic activities induced by desegregation”. The board voted 4-3 in November 1960 to do just that. They also voted 6-1 to bar “stags” from school-sponsored dances. (See attachment below)

Time for Action
No one is attempting to re-write or erase history by asking for the name to change. What we are doing is asking for today’s school board, facing similar pressures from a portion of the community resisting change, to make the right choice to finally correct a 57-year injustice. Make history!

Members of the community in opposition are asking for more time to deliberate, delay, and influence, while attacking board members and inundating the board with “facts” designed to re-frame the arguments of proponents for changing the name, and diverting attention away from the primary issue with diversionary strawmen arguments about a romanticized and mythical version of Stuart, or how the country was different in the 1860s. The country was also different in the 1950s. It’s 2016, now, and in today’s inclusive and diverse climate, honoring a symbol of the Confederacy on a tax-payer funded public school is simply inappropriate. 57 years is long enough.

While community engagement is an important process, and surveys might give the current board some data, neither should prevent the board from taking long-overdue corrective action. Alums are going to be predisposed to vote “no” to a name change due to a sentimental attachment to their alma mater that often conflicts with their progressive views about equal rights. The community most negatively-impacted by
the symbolism of a school named to honor a Confederate general are grossly underrepresented in any such survey. Blacks account for less than 10% of the population of Fairfax County, so even if every black alum, current student, and household in the pyramid voted for changing the name, the survey results would not represent their views. The name does not need to change for the benefit of white alums of the school, so a survey of their views is immaterial. This effort is about giving the aggrieved minority a voice, and removing a lingering remnant of white supremacist symbolism from a place of learning.

The answer to one simple question should inform the present School Board on how to proceed:

“Would the School Board find it appropriate to name a new Fairfax County High School after a Confederate warrior today?”

I’m fairly confident, the answer would be “NO!” CHANGE THE NAME!

With deepest respect and sincerity,

ANDREW RATLIFF
Declaration of the Immediate Causes Which Induce and Justify the Secession of South Carolina From the Federal Union

December 24, 1860

The People of the State of South Carolina, in Convention assembled, on the 26th day of April, A.D., 1852, declared that the frequent violations of the Constitution of the United States, by the Federal Government, and its encroachments upon the reserved rights of the States, fully justified this State in then withdrawing from the Federal Union; but in deference to the opinions and wishes of the other slaveholding States, she forbore at that time to exercise this right. Since that time, these encroachments have continued to increase, and further forbearance ceases to be a virtue....

In the year 1765, that portion of the British Empire embracing Great Britain, undertook to make laws for the government of that portion composed of the thirteen American Colonies. A struggle for the right of self-government ensued, which resulted, on the 4th July, 1776, in a Declaration by the Colonies, "that they are, and of right ought to be, FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES...."

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

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

Thus were established the two great principles asserted by the Colonies, namely: the right of a State to govern itself; and the right of a people to abolish a Government when it becomes destructive of the ends for which it is instituted....

In 1787, Deputies were appointed by the States to revise the Articles of Confederation, and...these Deputies recommended, for the adoption of the States...the Constitution of the United States.

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

By this Constitution, certain duties were imposed upon the several States, and the exercise of certain of their powers were restrained, which necessarily implied their continued existence as sovereign States. But, to remove all doubt, an amendment was added, which declared that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people....

We hold that the mode of its [the United States's] formation subjects it to a...fundamental principle: the law of compact. We maintain that in every compact between two or more parties, the obligation is mutual; that the failure of one of the contracting parties to perform a material part of the agreement, entirely releases the obligation of the
other.... We assert, that fourteen of the States have deliberately refused for years past to fulfill their constitutional obligations....

The Constitution of the United States, in its 4th Article, provides as follows:

"No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

But an increasing hostility on the part of the non-slaveholding States to the Institution of slavery has led to a disregard of their obligations.... [The northern] States...have enacted laws which either nullify the Acts of Congress, or render useless any attempt to execute them.... Thus the constitutional compact has been deliberately broken....

The right of property in slaves was recognized by giving to free persons distinct political rights, by giving them the right to represent, and burthening them with direct taxes for three-fifths of their slaves; by authorizing the importation of slaves for twenty years; and by stipulating for the rendition of fugitives from labor.

Those [non-slaveholding] States have assumed the right of deciding upon the propriety of our domestic institutions; and have denied the rights of property established in fifteen of the States and recognized by the Constitution; they have denounced as sinful the institution of Slavery; they have permitted the open establishment among them of societies, whose avowed object is to disturb the peace...property of the citizens of other States. They have encouraged and assisted thousands of our slaves to leave their homes; and those who remain, have been incited by emissaries, books and pictures to servile insurrection.

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

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

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

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

Declaration of the Causes of Secession, Georgia

January 29, 1861

The people of Georgia having dissolved their political connection with the Government of the United States of America, present to their confederates and the world the causes which have led to the separation. For the last ten
years we have had numerous and serious causes of complaint against our non-slave-holding confederate States with reference to the subject of African slavery. They have endeavored to weaken our security, to disturb our domestic peace and tranquility, and persistently refused to comply with their express constitutional obligations to us in reference to that property, and by the use of their power in the Federal Government have striven to deprive us of an equal enjoyment of the common Territories of the Republic....

A brief history of the rise, progress, and policy of anti-slavery and the political organization into whose hands the administration of the Federal Government has been committed will fully justify the pronounced verdict of the people of Georgia. The party of Lincoln, called the Republican party, under its present name and organization, is of recent origin. It is admitted to be an anti-slavery party. While it attracts to itself by its creed the scattered advocates of exploded political heresies, of condemned theories in political economy, the advocates of commercial restrictions, of protection, of special privileges, of waste and corruption in the administration of Government, anti-slavery is its mission and its purpose. By anti-slavery it is made a power in the state. The question of slavery was the great difficulty in the way of the formation of the Constitution. While the subordination and the political and social inequality of the African race was fully conceded by all, it was plainly apparent that slavery would soon disappear from what are now the non-slave-holding States of the original thirteen. The opposition to slavery was then, as now, general in those States and the Constitution was made with direct reference to that fact. But a distinct abolition party was not formed in the United States for more than half a century after the Government went into operation. The main reason was that the North, even if united, could not control both branches of the Legislature during any portion of that time. Therefore such an organization must have resulted either in utter failure or in the total overthrow of the Government. The material prosperity of the North was greatly dependent on the Federal Government; that of the South not at all. In the first years of the Republic the navigating, commercial, and manufacturing interests of the North began to seek profit and aggrandizement at the expense of the agricultural interests. Even the owners of fishing smacks sought and obtained bounties for pursuing their own business (which yet continue), and $500,000 is now paid them annually out of the Treasury. The navigating interests begged for protection against foreign shipbuilders and against competition in the coasting trade. Congress granted both requests, and by prohibitory acts gave an absolute monopoly of this business to each of their interests, which they enjoy without diminution to this day. Not content with these great and unjust advantages, they have sought to throw the legitimate burden of their business as much as possible upon the public; they have succeeded in throwing the cost of light-houses, buoys, and the maintenance of their seamen upon the Treasury, and the Government now pays above $2,000,000 annually for the support of these objects. These interests, in connection with the commercial and manufacturing classes, have also succeeded, by means of subventions to mail steamers and the reduction in postage, in relieving their business from the payment of about $7,000,000 annually, throwing it upon the public Treasury under the name of postal deficiency. The manufacturing interests entered into the same struggle early, and has clamored steadily for Government bounties and special favors. This interest was confined mainly to the Eastern and Middle non-slave-holding States... They pleaded in their favor the infancy of their business in this country, the scarcity of labor and capital, the hostile legislation of other countries toward them, the great necessity of their fabrics in the time of war, and the necessity of high duties to pay the debt incurred in our war for independence. These reasons prevailed, and they received for many years enormous bounties by the general acquiescence of the whole country.

...After having enjoyed protection to the extent of from 15 to 200 per cent. upon their entire business for above thirty years, the act of 1846 was passed. It avoided sudden change, but the principle was settled, and free trade, low duties, and economy in public expenditures was the verdict of the American people. The South and the Northwestern States sustained this policy. There was but small hope of its reversal; upon the direct issue, none at all.

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

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

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

The prohibition of slavery in the Territories is the cardinal principle of this organization.

...For twenty years past the abolitionists and their allies in the Northern States have been engaged in constant efforts to subvert our institutions and to excite insurrection and servile war among us. They have sent emissaries among us for the accomplishment of these purposes. Some of these efforts have received the public sanction of a majority of the leading men of the Republican party in the national councils, the same men who are now proposed as our rulers. These efforts have in one instance led to the actual invasion of one of the slave-holding States and those of the murderers and incendiaries who escaped public justice by flight have found fraternal protection among our Northern confederates.

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

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

A Declaration of the Immediate Causes which Induce and Justify the Secession of the State of Mississippi from the Federal Union. (1861)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It tramples the original equality of the South under foot.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Utter subjugation awaits us in the Union, if we should consent longer to remain in it. It is not a matter of choice, but of necessity. We must either submit to degradation, and to the loss of property worth four billions of money, or we must secede from the Union framed by our fathers, to secure this as well as every other species of property. For far less cause than this, our fathers separated from the Crown of England.
Our decision is made. We follow in their footsteps. We embrace the alternative of separation; and for the reasons here stated, we resolve to maintain our rights with the full consciousness of the justice of our course and the undoubting belief of our ability to maintain it.

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

February 2, 1861

...Texas abandoned her separate national existence and consented to become one of the Confederated Union to promote her welfare, insure domestic tranquility and secure more substantially the blessings of peace and liberty to her people. She was received into the confederacy with her own constitution, under the guarantee of the federal constitution and the compact of annexation, that she should enjoy these blessings. She was received as a commonwealth holding, maintaining and protecting the institution known as negro slavery-- the servitude of the African to the white race within her limits-- a relation that had existed from the first settlement of her wilderness by the white race, and which her people intended should exist in all future time. Her institutions and geographical position established the strongest ties between her and other slave-holding States of the confederacy. Those ties have been strengthened by association. But what has been the course of the government of the United States, and of the people and authorities of the non-slave-holding States, since our connection with them?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bowing to the demands of a citizens' group, the Fairfax County School Board last night renamed its recently established "desegregation committee" to "the Committee on Segregation."

The action was taken after Paul Sweeney, a member of the Virginia Citizens' Committee for Better Schools, submitted a resolution protesting that the word "desegregation" implied the board was planning to take steps to integrate white and Negro students in Fairfax County schools. "We meant to imply no such thing," said Robert F. Davis, board chairman. He added, "We want to equip ourselves with facts so that we can intelligently fight desegregation if we have to."

Both Davis and the chairman of the board's committee, Fred W. Robinson, told the citizens' group that each was opposed to mixing races in Virginia schools.

Robinson said he had not yet appointed any members to his committee and added that he did not know when he would. He said it would be a biracial committee "if it appears that questions will arise affecting both races."

The resolution presented by the citizens' group set out that the school board had no authority to appoint a committee on integration "inasmuch as the power of the state of Virginia to segregate the races in the public schools has long been a part of its sovereign and reserved power." It also stated that "no courts, including the Supreme Court, has power to invade and nullify these sovereign powers."

Also presented to the board by the citizens' group was a petition bearing the names of 75 Fairfax County presidents protesting the racial study committee.

In other business, the board awarded a contract, subject to the approval of the Federal Government, for a four-room addition to Belvedere School. The low bid of $69,400 was submitted by Karl K. Rosti of Falls Church. Six other bids ranging to $76,235 were received.

2 Indicted in U. S. Land Ad Fraud

CHICAGO, Sept. 20 — A Federal Grand Jury today indicted two California men in connection with an alleged fraudulent mail and radio advertising scheme involving the sale of Government-owned land in Nevada.

Prosecutors said Louis R. Green, 27, of Pacific Palisades, Calif., and Jack M. Goodman, 39, of Los Angeles, set up the United Land Filling Service and seduced investors to believe they could purchase five acres of
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The Southern Manifesto

Declaration of Constitutional Principles

The unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court in the public school cases is now bearing the fruit always produced when men substitute naked power for established law. The Founding Fathers gave us a Constitution of checks and balances because they realized the inescapable lesson of history that no man or group of men can be safely entrusted with unlimited power. They framed this Constitution with its provisions for change by amendment in order to secure the fundamentals of government against the dangers of temporary popular passion or the personal predilections of public officeholders.

We regard the decisions of the Supreme Court in the school cases as a clear abuse of judicial power. It climaxes a trend in the Federal Judiciary undertaking to legislate, in derogation of the authority of Congress, and to encroach upon the reserved rights of the States and the people.

The original Constitution does not mention education. Neither does the 14th Amendment nor any other amendment. The debates preceding the submission of the 14th Amendment clearly show that there was no intent that it should affect the system of education maintained by the States.

The very Congress which proposed the amendment subsequently provided for segregated schools in the District of Columbia.

When the amendment was adopted in 1868, there were 37 States of the Union. Every one of the 26 States that had any substantial racial differences among its people, either approved the operation of segregated schools already in existence or subsequently established such schools by action of the same law-making body which considered the 14th Amendment.

As admitted by the Supreme Court in the public school case (Brown v. Board of Education), the doctrine of separate but equal schools "apparently originated in Roberts v. City of Boston(1849), upholding school segregation against attack as being violative of a State constitutional guarantee of equality." This constitutional doctrine began in the North, not in the South, and it was followed not only in Massachusetts, but in Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania and other northern states until they, exercising their rights as states through the constitutional processes of local self-government, changed their school systems.
In the case of Plessy v. Ferguson in 1896 the Supreme Court expressly declared that under the 14th Amendment no person was denied any of his rights if the States provided separate but equal facilities. This decision has been followed in many other cases. It is notable that the Supreme Court, speaking through Chief Justice Taft, a former President of the United States, unanimously declared in 1927 in Lum v. Rice that the "separate but equal" principle is "within the discretion of the State in regulating its public schools and does not conflict with the 14th Amendment."

This interpretation, restated time and again, became a part of the life of the people of many of the States and confirmed their habits, traditions, and way of life. It is founded on elemental humanity and commonsense, for parents should not be deprived by Government of the right to direct the lives and education of their own children.

Though there has been no constitutional amendment or act of Congress changing this established legal principle almost a century old, the Supreme Court of the United States, with no legal basis for such action, undertook to exercise their naked judicial power and substituted their personal political and social ideas for the established law of the land.

This unwarranted exercise of power by the Court, contrary to the Constitution, is creating chaos and confusion in the States principally affected. It is destroying the amicable relations between the white and Negro races that have been created through 90 years of patient effort by the good people of both races. It has planted hatred and suspicion where there has been heretofore friendship and understanding.

Without regard to the consent of the governed, outside mediators are threatening immediate and revolutionary changes in our public schools systems. If done, this is certain to destroy the system of public education in some of the States.

With the gravest concern for the explosive and dangerous condition created by this decision and inflamed by outside meddlers:

We reaffirm our reliance on the Constitution as the fundamental law of the land.

We decry the Supreme Court's encroachment on the rights reserved to the States and to the people, contrary to established law, and to the Constitution.
We commend the motives of those States which have declared the intention to resist forced integration by any lawful means.

We appeal to the States and people who are not directly affected by these decisions to consider the constitutional principles involved against the time when they too, on issues vital to them may be the victims of judicial encroachment.

Even though we constitute a minority in the present Congress, we have full faith that a majority of the American people believe in the dual system of government which has enabled us to achieve our greatness and will in time demand that the reserved rights of the States and of the people be made secure against judicial usurpation.

We pledge ourselves to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision which is contrary to the Constitution and to prevent the use of force in its implementation.

In this trying period, as we all seek to right this wrong, we appeal to our people not to be provoked by the agitators and troublemakers invading our States and to scrupulously refrain from disorder and lawless acts.

Signed by:

Members of the United States Senate


Members of the United States House of Representatives


Tennessee: James B. Frazier, Jr., Tom Murray, Jere Cooper, Clifford Davis.

Texas: Wright Patman, John Dowdy, Walter Rogers, O.C. Fisher, Martin Dies.

Appendix Renaming schools in Texas

Houston, Texas to rename schools to remove Confederate references

Posted at 11:06 pm on January 14, 2016

http://twitchy.com/2016/01/14/houston-texas-to-rename-schools-to-remove-confederate-references/

HISD board votes to rename 4 schools named after Confederate loyalists

By Ericka Mellon

Updated 8:43 pm, Thursday, January 14, 2016


“Now, a committee at each school, including a teacher, student, parent and alumni, will be charged with proposing a new name. The policy calls for the superintendent then to make recommendations to the board for a vote – to take place in May, according to the meeting agenda.”
Appendix Spreadsheet of States in 1861, Sorted by Number of Slaves

Virginia was the most populous state in the United States in 1861 and was also the state with the greatest number of slaves.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION</th>
<th>SLAVES</th>
<th>% Slaves</th>
<th>FREE</th>
<th>% Free</th>
<th>SLAVEOWNERS</th>
<th>% Slaveowners</th>
<th># OF FAMILIES</th>
<th>% OF FAMILIES OWNING SLAVES</th>
<th>SLAVES AS a % OF POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>1,596,318</td>
<td>490,865</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1,105,453</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>52,128</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>201,523</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>1,057,286</td>
<td>462,198</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>595,088</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41,084</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>109,919</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>791,305</td>
<td>436,631</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>354,674</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30,943</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>63,015</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>964,201</td>
<td>435,080</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>529,121</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33,730</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>96,603</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>703,708</td>
<td>402,406</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>301,302</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26,701</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>58,642</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>708,002</td>
<td>331,726</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>376,276</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>22,033</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>74,725</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>992,622</td>
<td>331,059</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>661,563</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>34,658</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>125,090</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>1,109,801</td>
<td>275,719</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>834,082</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>36,844</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>149,335</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>1,155,684</td>
<td>225,483</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>930,201</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>38,654</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>166,321</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>604,215</td>
<td>182,566</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>421,649</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21,878</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>76,781</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>1,182,012</td>
<td>114,931</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,067,081</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>24,320</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>192,073</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>435,450</td>
<td>111,115</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>324,335</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>11,481</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>57,244</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td>687,049</td>
<td>87,189</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>599,860</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13,783</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>110,278</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>140,424</td>
<td>61,745</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>78,679</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>5,152</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15,090</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>112,216</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>110,418</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18,966</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>28,841</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28,826</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>107,206</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>107,204</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21,912</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>379,985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>379,994</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>98,767</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>460,138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>460,147</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>94,831</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>1,711,942</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,711,951</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>315,539</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>1,350,419</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,350,428</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>248,664</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>674,904</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>674,913</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>124,098</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td>628,270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>628,279</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>120,863</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>1,231,057</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,231,066</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>251,287</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>749,104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>749,113</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>144,761</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>172,014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>172,023</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37,319</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>TOTAL POPULATION</td>
<td>SLAVES</td>
<td>% Slaves</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>% Free</td>
<td>SLAVEOWNERS</td>
<td>% Slaveowners</td>
<td># OF FAMILIES</td>
<td>% OF FAMILIES OWNING SLAVES</td>
<td>SLAVES AS a % OF POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>6,848</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6,857</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>326,064</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>326,073</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>69,018</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>672,035</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>672,017</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>130,348</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>3,880,726</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3,880,735</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>758,420</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>2,339,502</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,339,511</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>434,134</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>52,456</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52,465</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11,063</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>2,906,206</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,906,215</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>524,558</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td>174,611</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>174,620</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35,209</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td>315,089</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>315,098</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63,781</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>775,872</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>775,881</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>147,473</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,183,582</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,950,528</strong></td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,233,198</strong></td>
<td><strong>87%</strong></td>
<td><strong>393,975</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,155,608</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Human Chattle

Slave trader's business in Atlanta, Georgia, 1864.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slavery_in_the_United_States
Appendix Pictures of Slaves

Slaves on J. J. Smith’s cotton plantation near Beaufort, South Carolina, photographed by Timothy O'Sullivan standing before their quarters in 1862

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slavery_in_the_United_States
Appendix Robert E. Lee on Slavery

Robert E. Lee wrote in 1856:

There are few, I believe, in this enlightened age, who will not acknowledge that slavery as an institution is a moral and political evil. It is idle to expatiate on its disadvantages. I think it is a greater evil to the white than to the colored race. While my feelings are strongly enlisted in behalf of the latter, my sympathies are more deeply engaged for the former. The blacks are immeasurably better off here than in Africa, morally, physically, and socially. The painful discipline they are undergoing is necessary for their further instruction as a race, and will prepare them, I hope, for better things. How long their servitude may be necessary is known and ordered by a merciful Providence.

The **Commonwealth of Virginia** was a prominent part of the **Confederate States** during the **American Civil War**. As a slave-holding state, it held a **state convention** to deal with the secession crisis, and voted against secession on 4 April 1861. Opinion shifted after 15 April, when U.S. President **Abraham Lincoln** called for troops from all states still in the **Union** to put down the rebellion, following the capture of **Fort Sumter**, and the Virginia convention voted to declare secession from the Union. (In the Western counties, where there was little slavery, pro-Union sentiment remained strong, and they presently seceded from Virginia as a separate Union state, West Virginia.)
In May, it was decided to move the Confederate capital from Montgomery, Alabama, to Richmond, in part because the defense of Virginia's capital was deemed vital to the Confederacy's survival. On 24 May, the U.S. Army moved into northern Virginia and captured Alexandria without a fight.

Most of the battles in the Eastern Theater of the American Civil War took place in Virginia because the Confederacy had to defend its national capital at Richmond, and public opinion in the North demanded that the Union move "On to Richmond!" The successes of Robert E. Lee in defending Richmond is a central theme of the military history of the war. The White House of the Confederacy, located a few blocks north of the State Capitol, was home to the family of Confederate leader Jefferson Davis.

Prewar tensions[edit]

On October 16, 1859, the radical abolitionist John Brown led a group of 22 men in a raid on the Federal Arsenal in Harpers Ferry, Virginia. U.S. troops, led by Robert E. Lee, responded and quelled the raid. Subsequently, John Brown was tried and executed by hanging in Charles Town on December 2, 1859.

In 1860 the Democratic Party split into northern and southern factions over the issue of slavery in the territories and Stephen Douglas' support for popular sovereignty; after failing in both Charleston and Baltimore to nominate a single candidate acceptable to the South, Southern Democrats held their convention in Richmond, Virginia on June 26, 1860 and nominated John C. Breckinridge as their party candidate for President.[1]

When Republican Abraham Lincoln was elected as U.S. president, Virginians were concerned about the implications for their state. While a majority of the state would look for compromises to the sectional differences, most people also opposed any restrictions on slaveholders' rights.[2] As the state watched to see what South Carolina would do, many Unionists felt that the greatest danger to the state came not from the North but from "rash secession" by the lower South.[3]

Secession[edit]

See also: Origins of the American Civil War
An 1861 Confederate recruiting poster from Virginia, urging men to join the Confederate cause and fight off the U.S. Army, which it refers to as the "Abolition foes".

Call for secession convention[edit]

On November 15, 1860 Virginia Governor John Letcher called for a special session of the Virginia General Assembly to consider, among other issues, the creation of a secession convention. The legislature convened on January 7 and approved the convention on January 14. On January 19 the General Assembly called for a national Peace Conference, led by Virginia's former President of the United States, John Tyler, to be held in Washington on February 4, the same date that elections were scheduled for delegates to the secession convention.[4]

The election of convention delegates drew 145,700 voters who elected, by county, 152 representatives. Thirty of these delegates were secessionists, thirty were unionists, and ninety-two were moderates who were not clearly identified with either of the first two groups. Nevertheless, advocates of immediate secession were clearly outnumbered.[5] Simultaneous to this election, six southern slave states formed the Confederate States on February 4.

According to one Virginian teacher, William M. Thompson, who would later become a Confederate cavalryman, the declaring of secession by the slave states was necessary to preserve slavery as well as prevent marriages between freedmen and the white "daughters of the South", saying that civil war would be more preferable:

Better, far better! Endure all the horrors of civil war than to see the dusky sons of Ham leading the fair daughters of the South to the altar.

— William M. Thompson, letter to Warner A. Thompson, (February 2, 1861).[6][7]

Secession convention[edit]

The Virginia Secession Convention of 1861 met on February 13 at the Richmond Mechanics Institute located at Ninth and Main Street in Richmond. One of the convention's first actions was to create a 21-member Federal Relations Committee charged with reaching a compromise to the sectional differences as they affected Virginia.[8] The committee was made up of 4 secessionists, 10 moderates and 7 unionists.[9] At first there was no urgency to the convention's deliberations as all sides felt that time only aided their cause. In addition, there were hopes that the Peace Conference of 1861 on January 19, led by Virginia's former President of the United States, John Tyler, might resolve the crisis by, in historian Edward L. Ayers's words, "guaranteeing the safety of slavery forever and the right to expand slavery in the territories below the Missouri Compromise line."[10] With the failure of the Peace Conference at the end of February,[11] moderates in the convention began to waver in their support for unionism.[12] Unionist support by many was further eroded for many Virginians by Lincoln's March 4 First Inaugural address which they felt was "argumentative, if not defiant."[13] Throughout the state there was evidence that support for secession was growing.[14]

At the Virginian secession convention in February 1861, Georgian Henry Lewis Benning, who would later go on to join the Confederate army as an officer, delivered a speech in which gave his reasoning for the urging of secession from the Union, appealing to ethnic prejudices and pro-slavery sentiments to present his case, saying that were the slave states to remain in the Union, their slaves would ultimately end up being freed by the anti-slavery Republican Party. He stated that he would rather be stricken with illness and starvation than to see African Americans liberated from slavery and be given equality as citizens:
What was the reason that induced Georgia to take the step of secession? This reason may be summed up in one single proposition. It was a conviction, a deep conviction on the part of Georgia, that a separation from the North-was the only thing that could prevent the abolition of her slavery. ... If things are allowed to go on as they are, it is certain that slavery is to be abolished. By the time the north shall have attained the power, the black race will be in a large majority, and then we will have black governors, black legislatures, black juries, black everything. Is it to be supposed that the white race will stand for that? It is not a supposable case ... war will break out everywhere like hidden fire from the earth, and it is probable that the white race, being superior in every respect, may push the other back. ... we will be overpowered and our men will be compelled to wander like vagabonds all over the earth; and as for our women, the horrors of their state we cannot contemplate in imagination. That is the fate which abolition will bring upon the white race. ... We will be completely exterminated, and the land will be left in the possession of the blacks, and then it will go back to a wilderness and become another Africa... Suppose they elevated Charles Sumner to the presidency? Suppose they elevated Fred Douglass, your escaped slave, to the presidency? What would be your position in such an event? I say give me pestilence and famine sooner than that.

— Henry Lewis Benning, speech to the Virginia Convention, February 18, 1861.

The Federal Relations Committee made its report to the convention on March 9. The fourteen proposals defended both slavery and states' rights while calling for a meeting of the eight slave states still in the Union to present a united front for compromise. From March 15 through April 14 the convention debated these proposals one by one. During the debate on the resolutions, the sixth resolution calling for a peaceful solution and maintenance of the Union came up for discussion on April 4. Lewis Edwin Harvie of Amelia County offered a substitute resolution calling for immediate secession. This was voted down by 88 to 45 and the next day the convention continued its debate. Approval of the last proposal came on April 12. The goal of the unionist faction after this approval was to adjourn the convention until October, allowing time for both the convention of the slave states and Virginia's congressional elections in May which, they hoped, would produce a stronger mandate for compromise.

One delegate reiterated the state's cause of secession and the purpose of the convention:

Sir, the great question which is now uprooting this Government to its foundation – the great question which underlies all our deliberations here, is the question of African slavery.

— Thomas F. Goode, speech to the Virginia Secession Convention, (March 28, 1861).

Mississippian Fulton Anderson told the convention that the Republicans were hostile to the slave states, accusing the Republican Party of having an "unrelenting and eternal hostility to the institution of slavery."

Ultimately, the convention declared that slavery should continue, and that it should be extended into U.S. territories:

**Proposals Adopted by the Virginia Convention of 1861**

The first resolution asserted states' rights *per se*; the second was for retention of slavery; the third opposed sectional parties; the fourth called for equal recognition of slavery in both territories and non-slave states; the fifth demanded the removal of federal forts and troops from seceded states; the sixth hoped for a peaceable adjustment of grievances and maintaining the Union; the seventh called for Constitutional amendments to remedy federal and state disputes; the eighth recognized the right of secession; the ninth said the federal government had no authority over seceded states since it refused to recognize their withdrawal; the tenth said the federal government was empowered to recognize the Confederate States; the
eleventh was an appeal to Virginia’s sister states; the twelfth asserted Virginia’s willingness to wait a reasonable period of time for an answer to its propositions, providing no one resorted to force against the seceded states; the thirteenth asked United States and Confederate States governments to remain peaceful; and the fourteenth asked the border slave states to meet in conference to consider Virginia’s resolutions and to join in Virginia’s appeal to the North.

At the same time, Unionists were concerned about the continued presence of U.S. forces at Fort Sumter despite assurances communicated informally to them by U.S. Secretary of State William Seward that it would be abandoned. Lincoln and Seward were also concerned that the Virginia convention was still in session as of the first of April while secession sentiment was growing. At Lincoln’s invitation, unionist John B. Baldwin of Augusta County, met with Lincoln on April 4. Baldwin explained that the unionists needed the evacuation of Fort Sumter, a national convention to debate the sectional differences, and a commitment by Lincoln to support constitutional protections for southern rights. Over Lincoln’s skepticism, Baldwin argued that Virginia would be out of the Union within forty-eight hours if either side fired a shot at the fort. By some accounts, Lincoln offered to evacuate Fort Sumter if the Virginia convention would adjourn.

On April 6, amid rumors that the North was preparing for war, the convention voted by a narrow 63-57 to send a three-man delegation to Washington to determine from Lincoln what his intentions were. However, due to bad weather the delegation did not arrive in Washington until April 12. They learned of the attack on Fort Sumter from Lincoln, and the President advised them of his intent to hold the fort and respond to force with force. Reading from a prepared text to prevent any misinterpretations of his intent, Lincoln told them that he had made it clear in his inaugural address that the forts and arsenals in the South were government property and “if ... an unprovoked assault has been made upon Fort Sumter, I shall hold myself at liberty to re-possess, if I can, like places which have been seized before the Government was devolved upon me.”

The pro-Union sentiment in Virginia was further weakened after the April 12 Confederate attack upon Fort Sumter. Richmond reacted with large public demonstrations in support of the Confederacy on April 13 when it first received the news of the attack. A Richmond newspaper described the scene in Richmond on the 13th:

"Saturday night the offices of the Dispatch, Enquirer and Examiner, the banking house of Enders, Sutton & Co., the Edgemont House, and sundry other public and private places, testified to the general joy by brilliant illuminations. Hardly less than ten thousand persons were on Main street, between 8th and 14th, at one time. Speeches were delivered at the Spottwood House, at the Dispatch corner, in front of the Enquirer office, at the Exchange Hotel, and other places. Bonfires were lighted at nearly every corner of every principal street in the city, and the light of beacon fires could be seen burning on Union and Church Hills. The effect of the illumination was grand and imposing. The triumph of truth and justice over wrong and attempted insult was never more heartily appreciated by a spontaneous uprising of the people. Soon the Southern wind will sweep away with the resistless force of a tornado, all vestige of sympathy or desire of co-operation with a tyrant who, under false pretences, in the name of a once glorious, but now broken and destroyed Union, attempts to rivet on us the chains of a despicable and ignoble vassalage. Virginia is moving." The convention reconvened on April 13 to reconsider Virginia’s position, given the outbreak of hostilities. With Virginia still in a delicate balance, with no firm determination yet to secede, sentiment turned more strongly toward secession on April 15, following President Abraham Lincoln’s call to all states that had not declared a secession, including Virginia, for troops to assist in halting the insurrection and recovering the captured forts.
War Department, Washington, April 15, 1861. To His Excellency the Governor of Virginia: Sir: Under the act of Congress for calling forth "militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, repel invasions, etc.," approved February 28, 1795, I have the honor to request your Excellency to cause to be immediately detached from the militia of your State the quota designated in the table below, to serve as infantry or rifleman for the period of three months, unless sooner discharged. Your Excellency will please communicate to me the time, at or about, which your quota will be expected at its rendezvous, as it will be met as soon as practicable by an officer to muster it into the service and pay of the United States.

— Simon Cameron, Secretary of War.

The quota for Virginia attached called for three regiments of 2,340 men to rendezvous at Staunton, Wheeling and Gordonsville. Governor Letcher and the recently reconvened Virginia Secession Convention considered this request from Lincoln "for troops to invade and coerce" lacking in constitutional authority, and out of scope of the Act of 1795. Governor Letcher's "reply to that call wrought an immediate change in the current of public opinion in Virginia", whereupon he issued the following reply:

Executive Department, Richmond, Va., April 15, 1861. Hon. Simon Cameron, Secretary of War: Sir: I have received your telegram of the 15th, the genuineness of which I doubted. Since that time I have received your communications mailed the same day, in which I am requested to detach from the militia of the State of Virginia "the quota assigned in a table," which you append, "to serve as infantry or rifleman for the period of three months, unless sooner discharged." In reply to this communication, I have only to say that the militia of Virginia will not be furnished to the powers at Washington for any such use or purpose as they have in view. Your object is to subjugate the Southern States, and a requisition made upon me for such an object - an object, in my judgment, not within the purview of the Constitution or the act of 1795 - will not be complied with. You have chosen to inaugurate civil war, and, having done so, we will meet it in a spirit as determined as the administration has exhibited toward the South.

— Respectfully, John Letcher

Thereafter, the secession convention voted on April 17, provisionally, to secede, on the condition of ratification by a statewide referendum. That same day, the convention adopted an ordinance of secession, in which it stated the immediate cause of Virginia's declaring of secession, "the oppression of the Southern slave-holding States". E.L. Ayers, who felt that "even Fort Sumter might have passed, however, had Lincoln not called for the arming of volunteers", wrote of the convention's final decision:

The decision came from what seemed to many white Virginians the unavoidable logic of the situation: Virginia was a slave state; the Republicans had announced their intention of limiting slavery; slavery was protected by the sovereignty of the state; an attack on that sovereignty by military force was an assault on the freedom of property and political representation that sovereignty embodied. When the federal government protected the freedom and future of slavery by recognizing the sovereignty of the states, Virginia's Unionists could tolerate the insult the Republicans represented; when the federal government rejected that sovereignty, the threat could no longer be denied even by those who loved the Union.

The Governor of Virginia immediately began mobilizing the Virginia State Militia to strategic points around the state. Former Governor Henry Wise had arranged with militia officers on April 16, before the final vote, to seize the United States arsenal at Harpers Ferry and the Gosport Navy Yard in Norfolk. On April 17 in the debate over secession Wise announced to the convention that these events were already in motion. On April 18 the arsenal was captured and most of the machinery was moved to Richmond. At Gosport, the Union
Navy, believing that several thousand militia were headed their way, evacuated and abandoned Norfolk, Virginia and the navy yard, burning and torching as many of the ships and facilities as possible.[37]

Colonel Robert E. Lee resigned his U.S. Army commission, turning down an offer of command of the Union army. He would ultimately join the Confederate army instead.

Secession[edit]

"How Virginia Was Voted Out Of The Union" - appeared in the northern journal Harpers Weekly, June 15, 1861

Virginia's ordinance of secession was ratified in a referendum held on May 23, 1861, by a vote of 132,201 to 37,451.[34][38]

The Confederate Congress proclaimed Richmond to be new capital of the Confederacy and Confederate troops moved into northern Virginia before the referendum was held. The actual number of votes for or against secession are unknown since votes in many counties in northwestern and eastern Virginia (where most of Virginia's unionists lived) were "discarded or lost." Governor Letcher "estimated" the vote for these areas.[39][40][41]

The reaction to the referendum was swift on both sides. Confederate troops shut down the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, one of Washington City's two rail links to Ohio and points west. The next day, the U.S. Army moved into northern Virginia. With both armies now in northern Virginia, the stage was set for war. In June, Virginian unionists met at the Wheeling Convention to set up the Restored Government of Virginia. Francis Pierpont was elected governor. The restored government raised troops to defend the Union and appointed two Senators to the United States Senate. It resided in Wheeling until August 1863 when it moved to Alexandria with West Virginia's admittance to the Union. During the summer of 1861, parts of the northern, western and eastern Virginia, including the Baltimore and Ohio railroad, were returned to Union control. Norfolk returned to union control in May 1862. These areas would be administered by the Restored Government of Virginia, with the northwestern counties later becoming the new state of West Virginia. In April 1865, Francis Pierpont and the Restored Government of Virginia moved to Richmond.
In 1894, Virginian and former Confederate soldier John S. Mosby, reflecting back on his role in the war, stated in a letter to friend that "I've always understood that we went to war on account of the thing we quarreled with the North about. I've never heard of any other cause of quarrel than slavery."[44][44]

Strategic significance[edit]

Virginia's strategic resources played a key role in dictating the objectives of the war there. Its agricultural and industrial capacity, and the means of transporting this production, were major strategic targets for attack by Union forces and defense by Confederate forces throughout the war.

Richmond[edit]

Main article: Richmond in the American Civil War

Tredegar Iron Works, Richmond, Virginia, April 1865

The Confederate need for war materiel played a very significant role in its decision to move its capital from Montgomery, Alabama to Richmond in May 1861, despite its dangerous northern location 100 miles south of the United States capital in Washington, DC. It was mainly for this industrial reason that the Confederates fought so hard to defend the city. The capital of the Confederacy could easily be moved again if necessary, but Richmond's industry and factories could not be moved.

Richmond was the only large-scale industrial city controlled by the Confederacy during most of the Civil War. The city's warehouses were the supply and logistical center for Confederate forces. The city's Tredegar Iron Works, the 3rd largest foundry in the United States at the start of the war, produced most of the Confederate artillery, including a number of giant rail-mounted siege cannons. The company also manufactured railroad locomotives, boxcars and rails, as well as steam propulsion plants and iron plating for warships. Richmond's factories also produced guns, bullets, tents, uniforms, harnesses, leather goods, swords, bayonets, and other war materiel. A number of textile plants, flour mills, brick factories, newspapers and book publishers were located in Richmond. Richmond had shipyards too, although they were smaller than the shipyards controlled by the Union in Norfolk, Virginia.

The city's loss to the Union army in April 1865 made a Union victory in the Civil War inevitable. With Virginia firmly under Union control, including the industrial centers of Richmond, Petersburg and Norfolk, the mostly rural and agricultural deep south lacked the industry needed to supply the Confederate war effort.

Other locations[edit]

At the outbreak of the war Petersburg, Virginia was second only to Richmond among Virginia cities in terms of population and industrialization. The juncture of five railroads, it provided the only continuous rail link to the Deep South. Located 20 miles (32 km) south of Richmond, its defense was a top priority; the day that Petersburg fell, Richmond fell with it.

In the western portion of the state (as defined today), the Shenandoah Valley was considered the "Breadbasket of the Confederacy". The valley was connected to Richmond via the Virginia Central Railroad and the James River and Kanawha Canal.

The Blue Ridge mountains and similar sites had long been mined for iron, and (though as the war progressed, shortages in manpower limited their production). In southwest Virginia, the large salt works
at Saltville provided a key source of salt to the Confederacy, essential in preserving food for use by the army. It was the target of two battles.

Virginia during the war[edit]

Further information: Eastern Theater of the American Civil War

The first and last significant battles of the war were held in Virginia, the first being the First Battle of Bull Run and the last being the Battle of Appomattox Courthouse.

From May 1861 to April 1865, Richmond was the capital of the Confederacy. The White House of the Confederacy, located a few blocks north of the State Capital, was home to the family of Confederate President Jefferson Davis.

1861[edit]

Main article: Manassas Campaign

The first major battle of the Civil War occurred on July 21, 1861. Union forces attempted to take control of the railroad junction at Manassas for use as a supply line, but the Confederate Army had moved its forces by train to meet the Union. The Confederates won the First Battle of Bull Run (known as "First Battle of Manassas" in southern naming convention) and the year went on without a major fight.

1862[edit]

Main articles: Peninsula Campaign, Jackson's Valley Campaign, Northern Virginia Campaign, and Battle of Fredericksburg

Union general George B. McClellan was forced to retreat from Richmond by Robert E. Lee's army. Union general Pope was defeated at the Second Battle of Manassas. Following the one-sided Confederate victory Battle of Fredericksburg.

1863[edit]

Main article: Battle of Chancellorsville

When fighting resumed in the spring of 1863, Union general Hooker was defeated at Chancellorsville by Lee's army.

1864–65[edit]

Main articles: Overland Campaign, Bermuda Hundred Campaign, Valley Campaigns of 1864, Richmond-Petersburg Campaign, and Appomattox Campaign

Ulysses Grant's Overland Campaign was fought in Virginia. The campaign included battles of attrition at the Wilderness, Spotsylvania and Cold Harbor and ended with the Siege of Petersburg and Confederate defeat.

In September 1864, the Southern Punch, a newspaper based in Richmond, reiterated the Confederacy's cause:
... WE ARE FIGHTING FOR INDEPENDENCE THAT OUR GREAT AND NECESSARY DOMESTIC INSTITUTION OF SLAVERY SHALL BE PRESERVED, and for the preservation of other institutions of which slavery is the ground work...

— “The New Heresy”, Southern Punch, (September 19, 1864), emphasis added. [44][45]

In April 1865, the Confederate regime fled Richmond as U.S. forces approached the city. As the Confederates fled, they set fire to Richmond’s public works to prevent them from being used by U.S. forces. A fire set in Richmond by the retreating Confederate army burned 25 percent of the city before being put out by the Union Army. It was the Union Army that saved the city from widespread conflagration and ruin. As a result, Richmond emerged from the Civil War as an economic powerhouse, with most of its buildings and factories undamaged.

West Virginia splits[edit]

See also: Virginia Conventions § Wheeling Conventions of 1861, Restored government of Virginia, and West Virginia in the American Civil War

Statehood referendum Oct. 24, 1861

The western counties could not tolerate the Confederacy; they formed a pro Union state government of Virginia in 1861 (recognized by Washington), then with its permission formed the new state of West Virginia in 1863.

At the Richmond secession convention on April 17, 1861, the delegates from western counties were 17 in favor and 30 against secession. From May to August 1861, a series of Unionist conventions met in Wheeling; the Second Wheeling Convention constituted itself as a legislative body called the Restored Government of Virginia. It declared Virginia was still in the Union but that the state offices were vacant without the office holders’ oath required in Article VI of the U.S. Constitution, and it elected Francis H. Pierpont as the new governor. This body gained formal recognition by the Lincoln administration on July 4. Congress seated the Restored Government’s U.S. Senators and Representatives in the 37th Congress.

On August 20 the Wheeling body passed an ordinance for the creation of a separate state; it was put to public vote on Oct. 24. The vote was in favor of the new state of West Virginia, distinct from the Pierpont government, which persisted at Alexandria as the civil government for Virginia until the end of the war. Congress and Lincoln approved, then after providing for gradual emancipation of slaves in the new state constitution, West Virginia became the 35th state on June 20, 1863. After statehood was achieved, the counties of Jefferson and Berkeley were annexed to the new state late in 1863. Congress continued to seat the Restored Government’s U.S. Senators, but it did not seat the three representatives presenting credentials from the truncated Union occupied Virginia for the 38th Congress. The entire Virginia state delegation went vacant at the end of the war.

Throughout the conflict, Confederate Representatives supporting the Jefferson Davis administration retained their seats in the Confederate Congress throughout Virginia, regardless of Union disruption or occupation. Richmond did not recognize the new state of West Virginia, even though Confederates did not vote there. West Virginia contributed about 32,000 soldiers to the Union Army and about 10,000 to the Confederate cause. But as in Kentucky and Missouri, the ultimate decision would be made on the battlefield, and early on Richmond sent in Robert E. Lee to secure Virginia’s northwest frontier. Lee found little local
support and his Confederates were defeated by Union forces from Ohio. Union victories in 1861 drove the Confederate forces out of the Monongahela and Kanawha valleys, and throughout the remainder of the war the Union held the region west of the Alleghenies and controlled the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad in the north.[55]

Virginians in the Civil War[edit]

See also: List of Virginia Civil War units

Virginia's Confederate government fielded about 150,000 troops in the American Civil War. They came from all economic and social levels, including some Unionists and former Unionists. However, at least 30,000 of these men were actually from other states. Most of these non-Virginians were from Maryland, whose government was controlled by Unionists during the war. Another 20,000 of these troops were from what would become the State of West Virginia in August 1863. Important Confederates from Virginia included General Robert E. Lee, commander of the Army of Northern Virginia, General Stonewall Jackson (born in what became West Virginia), General J.E.B. Stuart, General A.P. Hill, and General Jubal Early.

Roughly 50,000 Virginians served in the Union military, including West Virginians and roughly 6,000 Virginians of African ancestry.

Some of these men served in Maryland units. Some African Americans, both freedmen and runaway slaves, enlisted in states as far away as Massachusetts. Areas of Virginia that supplied Union soldiers and sent few or no men to fight for the Confederacy had few slaves, a high percentage of poor families, and a history of opposition to secession. These areas were located near northern states and were often under Union control.[56] 40% of Virginia's officers in the United States military when the war started stayed and fought for the Union.[57] These men included Winfield Scott, General-in-Chief of the Union Army, David G. Farragut, First Admiral of the Union Navy, and General George Henry Thomas.

At least one Virginian actually served in both the Confederate and Union armies. At the beginning of the war, a Confederate soldier from Fairfax County approached the Union soldiers guarding Chain Bridge in his Confederate uniform. Asked what he was doing trying to cross the bridge, he responded that he was travelling to Washington, D.C. to see his uncle. The perplexed Union soldiers asked who his uncle was and the soldier replied his name is Uncle Sam. He was quickly enlisted as a Union scout due to his knowledge of the local terrain.[58]

Legacy[edit]

Numerous battlefields and sites have been partially or fully preserved in Virginia. Those managed by the Federal government include Manassas National Battlefield Park, Richmond National Battlefield Park, Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park, Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historical Park, Petersburg National Battlefield, Appomattox Court House National Historical Park.
Notable Civil War leaders (Confederate) from Virginia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Gen.</td>
<td>A. P. Hill</td>
<td>Col.</td>
<td>John S. Mosby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Gen.</td>
<td>Richard S. Ewell</td>
<td>Captain, CSN</td>
<td>French Forrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj. Gen.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spy</td>
<td>Belle Boyd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gov.</td>
<td>Francis Harrison Pierpont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Gen.</td>
<td>Winfield Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>David G. Farragut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Adm.</td>
<td>Samuel Phillips Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj. Gen.</td>
<td>George Henry Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj. Gen.</td>
<td>Jesse Lee Reno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brig. Gen.</td>
<td>Philip St. George Cooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brig. Gen.</td>
<td>William R. Terrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brig. Gen.</td>
<td>Alexander Brydie Dyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brig. Gen.</td>
<td>William Hays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal of Honor Sgt.</td>
<td>William Harvey Carney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Sen.</td>
<td>Waitman T. Willey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Sen.</td>
<td>John S. Carlile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Sen.</td>
<td>Lemuel J. Bowden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abolitionist and Spy
Elizabeth Van Lew
Appendix Analysis of the Declaration of Causes of Seceding States

Analysis of The Declaration of Causes of Seceding States
Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia

As Evidence of the Seceding States’ Argument:

Preserve Slavery
For Religious, Natural, Political, Social, Moral, and Economic Reasons

Georgia

The declaration is the longest of them all, six pages. The argument is largely based in economics and states’ rights and firmly connected with a state’s right to slavery. The word slave is mentioned 35 times in the six-page document, and slaves are described as property seven times.

Non-slaveholding states’ complaints against the “subject of African slavery” is listed as Georgia’s first reason for secession.

They [non-slaveholding states] have endeavored to weaken our security, to disturb our domestic peace and tranquility, and persistently refused to comply with their express constitutional obligations to us in reference to that property [slaves], and by the use of their power in the Federal Government have striven to deprive us of an equal enjoyment of the common Territories of the Republic.

The declaration states that the federal government’s hostility to slavery, despite a SCOTUS ruling supporting slavery as a state’s right, is the basis of the secession. It explains that the internal debate for and against slavery has been going on since the country was established and that Lincoln’s anti-slavery position and the states’ support of slavery is a continuation of this longstanding and difficult conversation. It states that slavery is disappearing from non-slave holding states “while the subordination and the political and social inequality of the African race was fully conceded by all.”

It cites a very long and complicated history of the federal and state economies and the relationships of state money flowing into the federal government for the benefit of the other states and support of industries that were struggling. The explanation is one of power and control, a push-pull between the state and federal government, with some suspicion of motivations, ultimately, with the slaveholding states having had enough of other states benefiting from their prosperity. The us-them argument is described in terms of slaveholding and non-slaveholding; descriptions of each side’s laws, points of view, and arguments are in two campus, either slaveholding or non-slaveholding.

The Constitution declares that persons charged with crimes in one State and fleeing to another shall be delivered up on the demand of the executive authority of the State from which they may flee, to be tried in the jurisdiction where the crime was committed. It would appear difficult to employ language freer from ambiguity, yet for above twenty years the non-slave-holding States generally have wholly refused
to deliver up to us persons charged with crimes affecting slave property. Our confederates, with punic faith, shield and give sanctuary to all criminals who seek to deprive us of this property [slaves] or who use it to destroy us.

Mississippi

The declaration is rather short, less than two pages and focuses on slaves and slavery. It mentions slaves and slavery seven times, referring to slaves as property three times and describing blacks as fundamentally different from whites. It states that:

Our position is thoroughly identified with the institution of slavery— the greatest material interest of the world.

Like Texas, it points to black people being different because of a law of nature and further explains that slavery supports the existence of commerce and civilization itself.

These products are peculiar to the climate verging on the tropical regions, and by an imperious law of nature, none but the black race can bear exposure to the tropical sun. These products have become necessities of the world, and a blow at slavery is a blow at commerce and civilization.

It includes a list of 16 events, laws, and statements about the anti-slavery movement to support its decision to secede, including the following two that address the social and economic position of slaves:

It [the anti-slavery movement] advocates negro equality, socially and politically, and promotes insurrection and incendiaryism in our midst.

It [the anti-slavery movement] seeks not to elevate or to support the slave, but to destroy his present condition without providing a better.

It concludes with an argument of economics:

We must either submit to degradation, and to the loss of property [slaves] worth four billions of money, or we must secede from the Union framed by our fathers, to secure this as well as every other species of property.
South Carolina

The declaration is just over four pages long, and it only mentions slavery once in the first two and a half pages, but then in the last two pages it mentions slaves and slavery 16 times, focusing on the us-them dichotomy between slaveholding and non-slaveholding states.

It asserts that its secession is in “in deference to the opinions and wishes of the other slaveholding States” and draws a parallel with the founding fathers’ separation from England to assert independence in economy and self-governance. It goes on to explain that the destruction of the slave-based economy is the basis of their secession, to institute a new government that will allow for the slave based economy. Like Georgia, it cites laws of colonial America and revolutionary war, and that each state is its own independent government.

“Thus were established the two great principles asserted by the Colonies, namely: the right of a State to govern itself; and the right of a people to abolish a Government when it becomes destructive of the ends for which it was instituted.”

It explains that disagreement on the legality of slavery is the foundation of the dissolution of the legal relationship between the state and the federal government and cites the laws and practices of slave and non-slaveholding states as examples of the disagreements and varying positions of the states, some at odds with and some in agreement with the federal government.

“The General Government, as the common agent, passed laws to carry into effect these stipulations of the States. For many years these laws were executed. But an increasing hostility on the part of the non-slaveholding States to the institution of slavery, has led to a disregard of their obligations, and the laws of the General Government have ceased to effect the objects of the Constitution.”

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

It points to the moral argument of abolitionists who actively and purposefully “denounce as sinful the institution of slavery” “whose avowed object is to disturb the peace and to elion the property of the citizens of other states.” The property this quote refers to is slaves. And it concludes the argument by citing the government granting citizenship to former slaves as against the law because slaves are “incapable of becoming citizens” “by supreme law of the land.”

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

The declaration is just over four pages long and mentions slaves and slavery 21 times, focusing on the fundamental differences between white and black as in agreement with a religious belief system and connected with the success of the political system, like Mississippi. It uses very strong and colorful language in comparison with the other declarations.

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

It cites the history of Texas when it first joined the union, describing the relationship between whites and blacks as one of the superiority of whites and never-ending “servitude” of blacks:

She was received as a commonwealth holding, maintaining and protecting the institution known as negro slavery-- the servitude of the African to the white race within her limits-- a relation that had existed from the first settlement of her wilderness by the white race, and which her people intended should exist in all future time.

It associates Texas with other slaveholding states as like-minded and the non-slaveholding states as wanting to destroy “the institutions of Texas and her sister slaveholding states.” It calls the federal government “imbecile” and cites many instances of the federal government’s lack of support and outright hostility to Texas as well as lack of military and financial support to protect Texas “against the Indian savages on our border, and more recently against the murderous forays of banditti from the neighboring territory of Mexico.”

It explains that its connections with slaveholding states is stronger than its connection with the federal government, so legal secession is almost a formality.

It describes the history of other states and laws and relationships among them, diving them into two campus, slaveholding and non-slaveholding. The differences between the two are characterized as hostile, for or against slavery, and it points to slavery as a law of nature and a “divine” law, a “beneficent” and “patriarchal” system and states that a doctrine of equality among the races is “debasing”:

In all the non-slave-holding States, in violation of that good faith and comity which should exist between entirely distinct nations, the people have formed themselves into a great sectional party, now strong enough in numbers to control the affairs of each of those States, based upon an unnatural feeling of hostility to these Southern States and their beneficent and patriarchal system of African slavery, proclaiming the debasing doctrine of equality of all men, irrespective of race or color-- a doctrine at war with nature, in opposition to the experience of mankind, and in violation of the plainest revelations of Divine Law.
It asserts that because the slaveholding states are a minority in Congress, their rights are being threatened. It explains that abolitionists “have for years past encouraged and sustained lawless organizations to steal our slaves and prevent their recapture, and have repeatedly murdered Southern citizens while lawfully seeking their rendition.”

Before concluding that its only recourse is secession, it goes on to say that:

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

Virginia

The declaration is less than one page long and mentions slavery just once; the entire declaration is four paragraphs long and each paragraph is itself only one (very long) sentence.

It does not give reasons and explanations like the other declarations and essentially includes the dispassionate legal language of secession to refer to the dissolution of the state’s relationship with the federal government. It states that the federal government’s “perversion” of power injures the people of Virginia and “oppresses” the southern slaveholding states.

This is the first sentence:

The people of Virginia, in their ratification of the Constitution of the United States of America, adopted by them in Convention on the twenty-fifth day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty-eight, having declared that the powers granted under the said Constitution were derived from the people of the United States, and might be resumed whенsoever the same should be perverted to their injury and oppression; and the Federal Government, having perverted said powers, not only to the injury of the people of Virginia, but to the oppression of the Southern Slaveholding States.
Georgia

The people of Georgia having dissolved their political connection with the Government of the United States of America, present to their confederates and the world the causes which have led to the separation. For the last ten years we have had numerous and serious causes of complaint against our non-slave-holding confederate States with reference to the subject of African slavery. They have endeavored to weaken our security, to disturb our domestic peace and tranquility, and persistently refused to comply with their express constitutional obligations to us in reference to that property, and by the use of their power in the Federal Government have striven to deprive us of an equal enjoyment of the common Territories of the Republic. This hostile policy of our confederates has been pursued with every circumstance of aggravation which could arouse the passions and excite the hatred of our people, and has placed the two sections of the Union for many years past in the condition of virtual civil war. Our people, still attached to the Union from habit and national traditions, and averse to change, hoped that time, reason, and argument would bring, if not redress, at least exemption from further insults, injuries, and dangers. Recent events have fully dissipated all such hopes and demonstrated the necessity of separation.

Our Northern confederates, after a full and calm hearing of all the facts, after a fair warning of our purpose not to submit to the rule of the authors of all these wrongs and injuries, have by a large majority committed the Government of the United States into their hands. The people of Georgia, after an equally full and fair and deliberate hearing of the case, have declared with equal firmness that they shall not rule over them. A brief history of the rise, progress, and policy of anti-slavery and the political organization into whose hands the administration of the Federal Government has been committed will fully justify the pronounced verdict of the people of Georgia. The party of Lincoln, called the Republican party, under its present name and organization, is of recent origin. It is admitted to be an anti-slavery party. While it attracts to itself by its creed the scattered advocates of exploded political heresies, of condemned theories in political economy, the advocates of commercial restrictions, of protection, of special privileges, of waste and corruption in the administration of Government, anti-slavery is its mission and its purpose. By anti-slavery it is made a power in the state. The question of slavery was the great difficulty in the way of the formation of the Constitution.

While the subordination and the political and social inequality of the African race was fully conceded by all, it was plainly apparent that slavery would soon disappear from what are now the non-slave-holding States of the original thirteen. The opposition to slavery was then, as now, general in those States and the Constitution was made with direct reference to that fact. But a distinct abolition party was not formed in the United States for more than half a century after the Government went into operation. The main reason was that the North, even if united, could not control both branches of the Legislature during any portion of that time. Therefore such an organization must have resulted either in utter failure or in the total overthrow of the Government. The material prosperity of the North was greatly
dependent on the Federal Government; that of the South not at all. In the first years of the Republic the navigating, commercial, and manufacturing interests of the North began to seek profit and aggrandizement at the expense of the agricultural interests. Even the owners of fishing smacks sought and obtained bounties for pursuing their own business (which yet continue), and $500,000 is now paid them annually out of the Treasury. The navigating interests begged for protection against foreign shipbuilders and against competition in the coasting trade.

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

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

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

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

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

Under this equally just and beneficent policy law and order, stability and progress, peace and prosperity marked every step of the progress of these new communities until they entered as great and prosperous commonwealths into the sisterhood of American States. In 1820 the North endeavored to overturn this wise and successful policy and demanded that the State of Missouri should not be admitted into the Union unless she first prohibited slavery within her limits by her constitution. After a bitter and protracted struggle the North was defeated in her special object, but her policy and position led to the adoption of a section in the law for the admission of Missouri, prohibiting slavery in all that portion of the territory acquired from France lying North of 36 [degrees] 30 [minutes] north latitude and outside of Missouri. The venerable Madison at the time of its adoption declared it unconstitutional. Mr. Jefferson condemned the restriction and foresaw its consequences and predicted that it would result in the dissolution of the Union. His prediction is now history. The North demanded the application of the principle of prohibition of slavery to all of the territory acquired from Mexico and all other parts of the public domain then and in all future time. It was the announcement of her purpose to appropriate to herself all the public domain then owned and thereafter to be acquired by the United States. The claim itself was less arrogant and insulting than the reason with which she supported it. That reason was her fixed purpose to limit, restrain, and finally abolish slavery in the States where it exists. The South with great unanimity declared her purpose to resist the principle of prohibition to the last extremity. This particular question, in connection with a series of questions affecting the same subject, was finally disposed of by the defeat of prohibitory legislation.
The Presidential election of 1852 resulted in the total overthrow of the advocates of restriction and their party friends. Immediately after this result the anti-slavery portion of the defeated party resolved to unite all the elements in the North opposed to slavery and to stake their future political fortunes upon their hostility to slavery everywhere. This is the party to whom the people of the North have committed the Government. They raised their standard in 1856 and were barely defeated. They entered the Presidential contest again in 1860 and succeeded.

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

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

The prohibition of slavery in the Territories is the cardinal principle of this organization.

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

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

A similar provision of the Constitution requires them to surrender fugitives from labor. This provision and the one last referred to were our main inducements for confederating with the Northern States. Without them it is historically true that we would have rejected the Constitution. In the fourth year of the Republic Congress passed a law to give full vigor and efficiency to this important provision. This act depended to a considerable degree upon the local magistrates in the several States for its efficiency. The non-slave-holding States generally repealed all laws intended to aid the execution of that act, and imposed penalties upon those citizens whose loyalty to the Constitution and their oaths might induce
them to discharge their duty. Congress then passed the act of 1850, providing for the complete execution of this duty by Federal officers. This law, which their own bad faith rendered absolutely indispensable for the protection of constitutional rights, was instantly met with ferocious revilings and all conceivable modes of hostility.

The Supreme Court unanimously, and their own local courts with equal unanimity (with the single and temporary exception of the supreme court of Wisconsin), sustained its constitutionality in all of its provisions. Yet it stands to-day a dead letter for all practicable purposes in every non-slave-holding State in the Union. We have their covenants, we have their oaths to keep and observe it, but the unfortunate claimant, even accompanied by a Federal officer with the mandate of the highest judicial authority in his hands, is everywhere met with fraud, with force, and with legislative enactments to elude, to resist, and defeat him. Claimants are murdered with impunity; officers of the law are beaten by frantic mobs instigated by inflammatory appeals from persons holding the highest public employment in these States, and supported by legislation in conflict with the clearest provisions of the Constitution, and even the ordinary principles of humanity. In several of our confederate States a citizen cannot travel the highway with his servant who may voluntarily accompany him, without being declared by law a felon and being subjected to infamous punishments. It is difficult to perceive how we could suffer more by the hostility than by the fraternity of such brethren.

The public law of civilized nations requires every State to restrain its citizens or subjects from committing acts injurious to the peace and security of any other State and from attempting to excite insurrection, or to lessen the security, or to disturb the tranquillity of their neighbors, and our Constitution wisely gives Congress the power to punish all offenses against the laws of nations.

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

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

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

Approved, Tuesday, January 29, 1861

---

Mississippi

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

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

Our position is thoroughly identified with the institution of slavery—the greatest material interest of the
world. Its labor supplies the product which constitutes by far the largest and most important portions of
commerce of the earth. These products are peculiar to the climate verging on the tropical regions, and
by an imperious law of nature, none but the black race can bear exposure to the tropical sun. These
products have become necessities of the world, and a blow at slavery is a blow at commerce and
civilization. That blow has been long aimed at the institution, and was at the point of reaching its
consummation. There was no choice left us but submission to the mandates of abolition, or a dissolution
of the Union, whose principles had been subverted to work out our ruin. That we do not overstate the
dangers to our institution, a reference to a few facts will sufficiently prove.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Utter subjugation awaits us in the Union, if we should consent longer to remain in it. It is not a matter of choice, but of necessity. **We must either submit to degradation, and to the loss of property worth four billions of money, or we must secede from the Union framed by our fathers, to secure this as well as every other species of property.** For far less cause than this, our fathers separated from the Crown of England.

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

---

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

The people of the State of South Carolina, in Convention assembled, on the 26th day of April, A.D., 1852, declared that the frequent violations of the Constitution of the United States, by the Federal Government, and its encroachments upon the reserved rights of the States, fully justified this State in then withdrawing from the Federal Union; but in deference to the opinions and wishes of the other slaveholding States, she forbore at that time to exercise this right. Since that time, these encroachments have continued to increase, and further forbearance ceases to be a virtue.

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

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

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

In pursuance of this Declaration of Independence, each of the thirteen States proceeded to exercise its separate sovereignty; adopted for itself a Constitution, and appointed officers for the administration of government in all its departments-- Legislative, Executive and Judicial. For purposes of defense, they united their arms and their counsels; and, in 1778, they entered into a League known as the Articles of Confederation, whereby they agreed to entrust the administration of their external relations to a common agent, known as the Congress of the United States, expressly declaring, in the first Article "that each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right which is not, by this Confederation, expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled."

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

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

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

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

If only nine of the thirteen States had concurred, the other four would have remained as they then were-- separate, sovereign States, independent of any of the provisions of the Constitution. In fact, two of the States did not accede to the Constitution until long after it had gone into operation among the other eleven; and during that interval, they each exercised the functions of an independent nation.

By this Constitution, certain duties were imposed upon the several States, and the exercise of certain of their powers was restrained, which necessarily implied their continued existence as sovereign States. But to remove all doubt, an amendment was added, which declared that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people. On the 23d May, 1788, South Carolina, by a Convention of her People, passed an Ordinance assenting to this Constitution, and afterwards altered her own Constitution, to conform herself to the obligations she had undertaken.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Adopted December 24, 1860

---

Texas

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

The government of the United States, by certain joint resolutions, bearing date the 1st day of March, in the year A.D. 1845, proposed to the Republic of Texas, then *a free, sovereign and independent nation* [emphasis in the original], the annexation of the latter to the former, as one of the co-equal states thereof,
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The people of Texas, by deputies in convention assembled, on the fourth day of July of the same year, assented to and accepted said proposals and formed a constitution for the proposed State, upon which on the 29th day of December in the same year, said State was formally admitted into the Confederated Union.

Texas abandoned her separate national existence and consented to become one of the Confederated Union to promote her welfare, insure domestic tranquility and secure more substantially the blessings of peace and liberty to her people. She was received into the confederacy with her own constitution, under the guarantee of the federal constitution and the compact of annexation, that she should enjoy these blessings. She was received as a commonwealth holding, maintaining and protecting the institution known as negro slavery-- the servitude of the African to the white race within her limits-- a relation that had existed from the first settlement of her wilderness by the white race, and which her people intended should exist in all future time. Her institutions and geographical position established the strongest ties between her and other slave-holding States of the confederacy. Those ties have been strengthened by association. But what has been the course of the government of the United States, and of the people and authorities of the non-slave-holding States, since our connection with them?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By consolidating their strength, they have placed the slave-holding States in a hopeless minority in the federal congress, and rendered representation of no avail in protecting Southern rights against their exactions and encroachments. They have proclaimed, and at the ballot box sustained, the revolutionary doctrine that there is a 'higher law' than the constitution and laws of our Federal Union, and virtually that they will disregard their oaths and trample upon our rights.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

For these and other reasons, solemnly asserting that the federal constitution has been violated and
virtually abrogated by the several States named, seeing that the federal government is now passing
under the control of our enemies to be diverted from the exalted objects of its creation to those of
oppression and wrong, and realizing that our own State can no longer look for protection, but to God
and her own sons-- We the delegates of the people of Texas, in Convention assembled, have passed an
ordinance dissolving all political connection with the government of the United States of America and
the people thereof and confidently appeal to the intelligence and patriotism of the freemen of Texas to
ratify the same at the ballot box, on the 23rd day of the present month.

Adopted in Convention on the 2nd day of Feby, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and
sixty-one and of the independence of Texas the twenty-fifth.

Virginia

THE SECESSION ORDINANCE.

AN ORDINANCE TO REPEAL THE RATIFICATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA BY THE STATE OF VIRGINIA, AND TO RESUME ALL THE RIGHTS AND POWERS GRANTED UNDER
SAID CONSTITUTION.

The people of Virginia, in their ratification of the Constitution of the United States of America, adopted
by them in Convention on the twenty-fifth day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven
hundred and eighty-eight, having declared that the powers granted under the said Constitution were
derived from the people of the United States, and might be resumed whensoever the same should be perverted to their injury and oppression; and the Federal Government, having perverted said powers, not only to the injury of the people of Virginia, but to the oppression of the Southern Slaveholding States.

Now, therefore, we, the people of Virginia, do declare and ordain that the ordinance adopted by the people of this State in Convention, on the twenty-fifth day of June, eighty-eight, whereby the Constitution of the United States of America was ratified, and all acts of the General Assembly of this State, ratifying or adopting amendments to said Constitution, are hereby repealed and abrogated; that the Union between the State of Virginia and the other States under the Constitution aforesaid, is hereby dissolved, and that the State of Virginia is in the full possession and exercise of all the rights of sovereignty which belong and appertain to a free and independent State. And they do further declare that the said Constitution of the United States of America is no longer binding on any of the citizens of this State.

This ordinance shall take effect and be an act of this day when ratified by a majority of the votes of the people of this State, cast at a poll to be taken thereon on the fourth Thursday in May next, in pursuance of a schedule to be hereafter enacted.

Done in Convention, in the city of Richmond, on the 17th day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and in the eighty-fifth year of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

JNO. L. EUBANK, Secretary of Convention
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Constitution of the Confederate States; March 11, 1861

Preamble

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

Article I

Section I. All legislative powers herein delegated shall be vested in a Congress of the Confederate States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. (1) The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States; and the electors in each State shall be citizens of the Confederate States, and have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature; but no person of foreign birth, not a citizen of the Confederate States, shall be allowed to vote for any officer, civil or political, State or Federal.

(2) No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained the age of twenty-five years, and be a citizen of the Confederate States, and who shall not when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

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

(4) When vacancies happen in the representation from any State the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.
(5) The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers; and shall have the sole power of impeachment; except that any judicial or other Federal officer, resident and acting solely within the limits of any State, may be impeached by a vote of two-thirds of both branches of the Legislature thereof.

Sec. 3. (1) The Senate of the Confederate States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen for six years by the Legislature thereof, at the regular session next immediately preceding the commencement of the term of service; and each Senator shall have one vote.

(2) Immediately after they shall be assembled, in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes. The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year; of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year; and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year; so that one-third may be chosen every second year; and if vacancies happen by resignation, or other wise, during the recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such vacancies.

(3) No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of thirty years, and be a citizen of the Confederate States; and who shall not, then elected, be an inhabitant of the State for which he shall be chosen.

(4) The Vice President of the Confederate States shall be president of the Senate, but shall have no vote unless they be equally divided.

(5) The Senate shall choose their other officers; and also a president pro tempore in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the Confederate states.

(6) The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the Confederate States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside; and no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present.

(7) Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under the Confederate States; but the party convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment according to law.

Sec. 4. (1) The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof, subject to the provisions of this Constitution; but the Congress may, at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the times and places of choosing Senators.

(2) The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year; and such meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall, by law, appoint a different day.

Sec. 5. (1) Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number
may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent members, in such manner and under such penalties as each House may provide.

(2) Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds of the whole number, expel a member.

(3) Each House shall keep a journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the members of either House, on any question, shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the journal.

(4) Neither House, during the session of Congress, shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

Sec. 6. (I) The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the Treasury of the Confederate States. They shall, in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place. ’o Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the Confederate States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the Confederate States shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office. But Congress may, by law, grant to the principal officer in each of the Executive Departments a seat upon the floor of either House, with the privilege of discussing any measures appertaining to his department.

Sec. 7. (I) All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments, as on other bills.

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

(3) Every order, resolution, or vote, to which the concurrence of both Houses may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the Confederate States;
and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him; or, being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two-thirds of both Houses, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in case of a bill.

Sec. 8. The Congress shall have power-

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

(2) To borrow money on the credit of the Confederate States.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(9) To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.

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

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

(12) To raise and support armies; but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years.
(13) To provide and maintain a navy.

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

(15) To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Confederate States, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.

(16) To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the Confederate States; reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

(17) To exercise exclusive legislation, in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of one or more States and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the Confederate States; and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the Legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the . erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings; and

(18) To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the Confederate States, or in any department or officer thereof.

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

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

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

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

(5) No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken.

(6) No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State, except by a vote of two-thirds of both Houses.

(7) No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another.

(8) No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.
(9) Congress shall appropriate no money from the Treasury except by a vote of two-thirds of both Houses, taken by yeas and nays, unless it be asked and estimated for by some one of the heads of departments and submitted to Congress by the President; or for the purpose of paying its own expenses and contingencies; or for the payment of claims against the Confederate States, the justice of which shall have been judicially declared by a tribunal for the investigation of claims against the Government, which it is hereby made the duty of Congress to establish.

(10) All bills appropriating money shall specify in Federal currency the exact amount of each appropriation and the purposes for which it is made; and Congress shall grant no extra compensation to any public contractor, officer, agent, or servant, after such contract shall have been made or such service rendered.

(11) No title of nobility shall be granted by the Confederate States; and no person holding any office of profit or trust under them shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state.

(12) Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

(13) A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

(14) No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner; nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

(15) The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated; and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

(16) No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor be compelled, in any criminal case, to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

(17) In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor; and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

(18) In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved; and no fact so tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the Confederacy, than according to the rules of common law.
(19) Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

(20) Every law, or resolution having the force of law, shall relate to but one subject, and that shall be expressed in the title.

Sec. 10. (1) No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, or ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts; or grant any title of nobility.

(2) No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws; and the net produce of all duties and imposts, laid by any State on imports, or exports, shall be for the use of the Treasury of the Confederate States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and control of Congress.

(3) No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty on tonnage, except on seagoing vessels, for the improvement of its rivers and harbors navigated by the said vessels; but such duties shall not conflict with any treaties of the Confederate States with foreign nations; and any surplus revenue thus derived shall, after making such improvement, be paid into the common treasury. Nor shall any State keep troops or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay. But when any river divides or flows through two or more States they may enter into compacts with each other to improve the navigation thereof.

ARTICLE II

Section I. (1) The executive power shall be vested in a President of the Confederate States of America. He and the Vice President shall hold their offices for the term of six years; but the President shall not be reeligible. The President and Vice President shall be elected as follows:

(2) Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the Confederate States shall be appointed an elector.

(3) The electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for President and Vice President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice President, and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit, sealed, to the seat of the Government of the Confederate States, directed to the President of the Senate; the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted; the person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers, not exceeding three, on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in
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choosing the President the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President, whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the 4th day of March next following, then the Vice President shall act as President, as in case of the death, or other constitutional disability of the President.

(4) The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice President shall be the Vice President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have a majority, then, from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice.

(5) But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the Confederate States.

(6) The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the Confederate States.

(7) No person except a natural-born citizen of the Confederate States, or a citizen thereof at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, or a citizen thereof born in the United States prior to the 20th of December, 1860, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained the age of thirty-five years, and been fourteen years a resident within the limits of the Confederate States, as they may exist at the time of his election.

(8) In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President; and the Congress may, by law, provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President; and such officer shall act accordingly until the disability be removed or a President shall be elected.

(9) The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services a compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected; and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the Confederate States, or any of them.

(10) Before he enters on the execution of his office he shall take the following oath or affirmation:

Sec. 2. (I) The President shall be Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the Confederate States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the Confederate States; he may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the Executive Departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices; and he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the Confederate States, except in cases of impeachment.

(2) He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties; provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint, ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the Confederate States whose appointments...
(3) The principal officer in each of the Executive Departments, and all persons connected with the diplomatic service, may be removed from office at the pleasure of the President. All other civil officers of the Executive Departments may be removed at any time by the President, or other appointing power, when their services are unnecessary, or for dishonesty, incapacity, inefficiency, misconduct, or neglect of duty; and when so removed, the removal shall be reported to the Senate, together with the reasons therefor.

(4) The President shall have power to fill all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session; but no person rejected by the Senate shall be reappointed to the same office during their ensuing recess.

Sec. 3. (I) The President shall, from time to time, give to the Congress information of the state of the Confederacy, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them; and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the Confederate States.

Sec. 4. (I) The President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the Confederate States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

ARTICLE III

Section I. (I) The judicial power of the Confederate States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may, from time to time, ordain and establish. The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

Sec. 2. (I) The judicial power shall extend to all cases arising under this Constitution, the laws of the Confederate States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority; to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; to controversies to which the Confederate States shall be a party; to controversies between two or more States; between a State and citizens of another State, where the State is plaintiff; between citizens claiming lands under grants of different States; and between a State or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens, or subjects; but no State shall be sued by a citizen or subject of any foreign state.

(2) In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.
(3) The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury, and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.

Sec. 3. (1) Treason against the Confederate States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.

(2) The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason; but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture, except during the life of the person attainted.

ARTICLE IV

Section 1. (1) Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State; and the Congress may, by general laws, prescribe the manner in which such acts, records, and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.

Sec. 2. (1) The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States; and shall have the right of transit and sojourn in any State of this Confederacy, with their slaves and other property; and the right of property in said slaves shall not be thereby impaired.

(2) A person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime against the laws of such State, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another State, shall, on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime.

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

Sec. 3. (1) Other States may be admitted into this Confederacy by a vote of two-thirds of the whole House of Representatives and two-thirds of the Senate, the Senate voting by States; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State, nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned, as well as of the Congress.

(2) The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations concerning the property of the Confederate States, including the lands thereof.

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

(4) The Confederate States shall guarantee to every State that now is, or hereafter may become, a member of this Confederacy, a republican form of government; and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the Legislature or of the Executive when the Legislature is not in session) against domestic violence.

ARTICLE V

Section I. (I) Upon the demand of any three States, legally assembled in their several conventions, the Congress shall summon a convention of all the States, to take into consideration such amendments to the Constitution as the said States shall concur in suggesting at the time when the said demand is made; and should any of the proposed amendments to the Constitution be agreed on by the said convention, voting by States, and the same be ratified by the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, or by conventions in two-thirds thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the general convention, they shall thenceforward form a part of this Constitution. But no State shall, without its consent, be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate.

ARTICLE VI

1. The Government established by this Constitution is the successor of the Provisional Government of the Confederate States of America, and all the laws passed by the latter shall continue in force until the same shall be repealed or modified; and all the officers appointed by the same shall remain in office until their successors are appointed and qualified, or the offices abolished.

2. All debts contracted and engagements entered into before the adoption of this Constitution shall be as valid against the Confederate States under this Constitution, as under the Provisional Government.

3. This Constitution, and the laws of the Confederate States made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the Confederate States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

4. The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the Confederate States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the Confederate States.

5. The enumeration, in the Constitution, of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people of the several States.

6. The powers not delegated to the Confederate States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people thereof.
ARTICLE VII

I. The ratification of the conventions of five States shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same.

2. When five States shall have ratified this Constitution, in the manner before specified, the Congress under the Provisional Constitution shall prescribe the time for holding the election of President and Vice President; and for the meeting of the Electoral College; and for counting the votes, and inaugurating the President. They shall, also, prescribe the time for holding the first election of members of Congress under this Constitution, and the time for assembling the same. Until the assembling of such Congress, the Congress under the Provisional Constitution shall continue to exercise the legislative powers granted them; not extending beyond the time limited by the Constitution of the Provisional Government.

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

HOWELL COBB, President of the Congress.
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MONTGOMERY, April 29, 1861

Gentlemen of the Congress: It is my pleasing duty to announce to you that the Constitution framed for the establishment of a permanent Government for the Confederate States has been ratified by conventions in each of those States to which it was referred. To inaugurate the Government in its full proportions and upon its own substantial basis of the popular will, it only remains that elections should be held for the designation of the officers to administer it. There is every reason to believe that at no distant day other States, identified in political principles and community of interests with those which you represent, will join this Confederacy, giving to its typical constellation increased splendor, to its Government of free, equal, and sovereign States a wider sphere of usefulness, and to the friends of constitutional liberty a greater security for its harmonious and perpetual existence. It was not, however, for the purpose of making this announcement that I have deemed it my duty to convene you at an earlier day than that fixed by yourselves for your meeting. The declaration of war made against this Confederacy by Abraham Lincoln, the President of the United States, in his proclamation issued on the 15th day of the present month, rendered it necessary, in my judgment, that you should convene at the earliest practicable moment to devise the measures necessary for the defense of the country. The occasion is indeed an extraordinary one. It justifies me in a brief review of the relations heretofore existing between us and the States which now unite in warfare against us and in a succinct statement of the events which have resulted in this warfare, to the end that mankind may pass intelligent and impartial judgment on its motives and objects. During the war waged against Great Britain by her colonies on this continent a common danger impelled them to a close alliance and to the formation of a Confederation, by the terms of which the colonies, styling themselves States, entered "severally into a firm league of friendship with each other for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other against all force offered to or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretense whatever." In order to guard against any misconstruction of their compact, the several States made explicit declaration in a distinct article - that "each State retains its Sovereignty, freedom, and - independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled."

Under this contract of alliance, the war of the Revolution was successfully waged, and resulted in the treaty of peace with Great Britain in 1783, by the terms of which the several States were each by name recognized to be independent. The Articles of Confederation contained a clause whereby all alterations were prohibited unless confirmed by the Legislatures of every State after being agreed to by the Congress; and in obedience to this provision, under the resolution of Congress of the 21st of February, 1787, the several States appointed delegates who attended a convention "for the sole and
express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation and reporting to Congress and the several Legislatures such alterations and provisions therein as shall, when agreed to in Congress and confirmed by the States, render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of Government and the preservation of the Union." It was by the delegates chosen by the several States under the resolution just quoted that - the Constitution of the United States was framed in 1787 and submitted to the several States for ratification, as shown by the seventh article, which is in these words: "The ratification of the conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same." I have italicized certain words in the quotations just made for the purpose of attracting attention to the singular and marked caution with which the States endeavored in every possible form to exclude the idea that the separate and independent sovereignty of each State was merged into one common government and nation, and the earnest desire they evinced to impress in the Constitution its true character - that of a compact between independent States. The Constitution of 1787, having, however, omitted the clause already recited from the Articles of Confederation, which provided in explicit terms that each State retained its sovereignty and independence, some alarm was felt in the States, when invited to ratify the Constitution, lest this omission should be construed into an abandonment of their cherished principle, and they refused to be satisfied until amendments were added to the Constitution placing beyond any pretense of doubt the reservation by the States of all their sovereign rights and powers not expressly delegated to the United States by the Constitution. Strange, indeed, must it appear to the impartial observer, but it is none the less true that all these carefully worded clauses proved unavailing to prevent the rise and growth in the Northern States of a political school which has persistently claimed that the government thus formed was not a compact between States, but was in effect a national government, set up above and over the States. An organization created by the States to secure the blessings of liberty and independence against foreign aggression, has been gradually perverted into a machine for their control in their domestic affairs. The creature has been exalted above its creators; the principals have been made subordinate to the agent appointed by themselves. The people of the Southern States, whose almost exclusive occupation was agriculture, early perceived a tendency in the Northern States to render the common government subservient to their own purposes by imposing burdens on commerce as a protection to their manufacturing and shipping interests. Long and angry controversies grew out of these attempts, often successful, to benefit one section of the country at the expense of the other. And the danger of disruption arising from this cause was enhanced by the fact that the Northern population was increasing, by immigration and other causes, in a greater ratio than the population of the South. By degrees, as the Northern States gained preponderance in the National Congress, self-interest taught their people to yield ready assent to any plausible advocacy of their right as a majority to govern the minority without control. They learned to listen with impatience to the suggestion of any constitutional impediment to the exercise of their will, and so utterly have the principles of the Constitution been corrupted in the Northern mind that, in the inaugural address delivered by President Lincoln in March last, he asserts as an axiom, which he plainly deems to be undeniable, of constitutional authority, that the theory of the Constitution requires that in all cases the majority shall govern; and in another memorable instance the same Chief Magistrate did not hesitate to liken the relations between a State and the United States to those which exist between a county and the State in which it is situated and by which it was created. This is the lamentable and fundamental error on which rests the policy that has culminated in his declaration of war against these Confederate States. In addition to the long-continued and deep-seated resentment felt by the Southern States at the persistent abuse of the powers they had delegated to the Congress,
for the purpose of enriching the manufacturing and shipping classes of the North at the expense of the South, there has existed for nearly half a century another subject of discord, involving interests of such transcendent magnitude as at all times to create the apprehension in the minds of many devoted lovers of the Union that its permanence was impossible. When the several States delegated certain powers to the United States Congress, a large portion of the laboring population consisted of African slaves imported into the colonies by the mother country. In twelve out of the thirteen States negro slavery existed, and the right of property in slaves was protected by law. This property was recognized in the Constitution, and provision was made against its loss by the escape of the slave. The increase in the number of slaves by further importation from Africa was also secured by a clause forbidding Congress to prohibit the slave trade anterior to a certain date, and in no clause can there be found any delegation of power to the Congress authorizing it in any manner to legislate to the prejudice, detriment, or discouragement owners of that species of property, or excluding it from the protection of the Government.

The climate and soil of the Northern States soon proved unpropitious to the continuance of slave labor, whilst the converse was the case at the South. Under the unrestricted free intercourse between the two sections, the Northern States consulted their own interests by selling their slaves to the South and prohibiting slavery within their limits. The South were willing purchasers of a property suitable to their wants, and paid the price of the acquisition without harboring a suspicion that their quiet possession was to be disturbed by those who were inhibited not only by want of constitutional authority, but by good faith as vendors, from disquieting a title emanating from themselves. As soon, how ever, as the Northern States that prohibited African slavery within their limits had reached a number sufficient to give their representation a controlling voice in the Congress, a persistent and organized system of hostile measures against the rights of the owners of slaves in the Southern States was inaugurated and gradually extended. A continuous series of measures was devised and prosecuted for the purpose of rendering insecure the tenure of property in slaves. Fanatical organizations, supplied with money by voluntary subscriptions, were assiduously engaged in exciting amongst the slaves a spirit of discontent and revolt; means were furnished for their escape from their owners, and agents secretly employed to entice them to abscond; the constitutional provision for their rendition to their owners was first evaded, then openly denounced as a violation of conscientious obligation and religious duty; men were taught that it was a merit to elude, disobey, and violently oppose the execution of the laws enacted to secure the performance of the promise contained in the constitutional compact; owners of slaves were mobbed and even murdered in open day solely for applying to a magistrate for the arrest of a fugitive slave; the dogmas of these voluntary organizations soon obtained control of the Legislatures of many of the Northern States, and laws were passed providing for the punishment, by ruinous fines and long-continued imprisonment in jails and penitentiaries, of citizens of the Southern States who should dare to ask aid of the officers of the law for the recovery of their property. Emboldened by success, the theater of agitation and aggression against the clearly expressed constitutional rights of the Southern States was transferred to the Congress; Senators and Representatives were sent to the common councils of the nation, whose chief title to this distinction consisted in the display of a spirit of ultra fanaticism, and whose business was not "to promote the general welfare or insure domestic tranquillity," but to awaken the bitterest hatred against the citizens of sister States by violent denunciation of their institutions; the transaction of public affairs was impeded by repeated efforts to usurp powers not delegated by the Constitution, for the purpose of impairing the security of property in slaves, and reducing those States which held slaves to a condition of inferiority. Finally a great party was organized for the purpose
of obtaining the administration of the Government, with the avowed object of using its power for the total exclusion of the slave States from all participation in the benefits of the public domain acquired by all the States in common, whether by conquest or purchase; of surrounding them entirely by States in which slavery should be prohibited; of thus rendering the property in slaves so insecure as to be comparatively worthless, and thereby annihilating in effect property worth thousands of millions of dollars. This party, thus organized, succeeded in the month of November last in the election of its candidate for the Presidency of the United States.

In the meantime, under the mild and genial climate of the Southern States and the increasing care and attention for the wellbeing and comfort of the laboring class, dictated alike by interest and humanity, the African slaves had augmented in number from about 600,000, at the date of the adoption of the constitutional compact, to upward of 4,000,000. In moral and social condition they had been elevated from brutal savages into docile, intelligent, and civilized agricultural laborers, and supplied not only with bodily comforts but with careful religious instruction. Under the supervision of a superior race their labor had been so directed as not only to allow a gradual and marked amelioration of their own condition, but to convert hundreds of thousands of square miles of the wilderness into cultivated lands covered with a prosperous people; towns and cities had sprung into existence, and had rapidly increased in wealth and population under the social system of the South; the white population of the Southern slaveholding States had augmented from about 1,250,000 at the date of the adoption of the Constitution to more than 8,500,000 in 1860; and the productions of the South in cotton, rice, sugar, and tobacco, for the full development and continuance of which the labor of African slaves was and is indispensable, had swollen to an amount which formed nearly three-fourths of the exports of the whole United States and had become absolutely necessary to the wants of civilized man. With interests of such overwhelming magnitude imperiled, the people of the Southern States were driven by the conduct of the North to the adoption of some course of action to avert the danger with which they were openly menaced. With this view the legislatures of the several States invited the people to select delegates to conventions to be held for the purpose of determining for themselves what measures were best adapted to meet so alarming a crisis in their history. Here it may be proper to observe that from a period as early as 1798 there had existed in all of the States of the Union a party almost uninterruptedly in the majority based upon the creed that each State was, in the last resort, the sole judge as well of its wrongs as of the mode and measure of redress. Indeed, it is obvious that under the law of nations this principle is an axiom as applied to the relations of independent sovereign States, such as those which had united themselves under the constitutional compact. The Democratic party of the United States repeated, in its successful canvass in 1856, the declaration made in numerous previous political contests, that it would "faithfully abide by and uphold the principles laid down in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798, and in the report of Mr. Madison to the Virginia Legislature in 1799; and that it adopts those principles as constituting one of the main foundations of its political creed." The principles thus emphatically announced embrace that to which I have already adverted - the right of each State to judge of and redress the wrongs of which it complains. These principles were maintained by overwhelming majorities of the people of all the States of the Union at different elections, especially in the elections of Mr. Jefferson in 1805, Mr. Madison in 1809, and Mr. Pierce in 1852. In the exercise of a right so ancient, so well established, and so necessary for self-preservation, the people of the Confederate States, in their conventions, determined that the wrongs which they had suffered and the evils with which they were menaced required that they should revoke the delegation of powers to the Federal Government which they had ratified in their several conventions. They consequently passed
ordinances resuming all their rights as sovereign and Independent States and dissolved their connection with the other States of the Union.

Having done this, they proceeded to form a new compact amongst themselves by new articles of confederation, which have been also ratified by the conventions of the several States with an approach to unanimity far exceeding that of the conventions which adopted the Constitution of 1787. They have organized their new Government in all its departments; the functions of the executive legislative, and judicial magistrates are performed in accordance with the will of the people, as displayed not merely in a cheerful acquiescence, but in the enthusiastic support of the Government thus established by themselves; and but for the interference of the Government of the United States in this legitimate exercise of the right of a people to self-government, peace, happiness, and prosperity would now smile on our land. That peace is ardently desired by this Government and people has been manifested in every possible form. Scarce had you assembled in February last when, prior even to the inauguration of the Chief Magistrate you had elected, you passed a resolution expressive of your desire for the appointment of commissioners to be sent to the Government of the United States "for the purpose of negotiating friendly relations between that Government and the Confederate States of America, and for the settlement of all questions of disagreement between the two Governments upon principles of right, justice, equity, and good faith." It was my pleasure as well as my duty to cooperate with you in this work of peace. Indeed, in my address to you on taking the oath of office, and before receiving from you the communication of this resolution, I had said "as a necessity, not a choice, we have resorted to the remedy of separation, and henceforth our energies must be directed to the conduct of our own affairs and the perpetuity of the Confederacy which we have formed. If a just perception of mutual interests shall permit us peaceably to pursue our separate political career, my most earnest desire will have been fulfilled." It was in furtherance of these accordant views of the Congress and the Executive that I made choice of three discreet, able, and distinguished citizens, who repaired to Washington. Aided by their cordial cooperation and that of the Secretary of State, every effort compatible with self-respect and the dignity of the Confederacy was exhausted before I allowed myself to yield to the conviction that the Government of the United States was determined to attempt the conquest of this people and that our cherished hopes of peace were unattainable.

On the arrival of our commissioners in Washington on the 5th of March they postponed, at the suggestion of a friendly intermediary, doing more than giving informal notice of their arrival. This was done with a view to afford time to the President, who had just been inaugurated, for the discharge of other pressing official duties in the organization of his Administration before engaging his attention in the object of their mission. It was not until the 12th of the month that they officially addressed the Secretary of State, informing him of the purpose of their arrival, and stating, in the language of their instructions, their wish "to make to the Government of the United States overtures for the opening of negotiations, assuring the Government of the United States that the President, Congress, and people of the Confederate States earnestly desire a peaceful solution of these great questions; that it is neither their interest nor their wish to make any demand which is not founded on strictest justice, nor do any act to injure their late confederates."

To this communication no formal reply was received until the 8th of April. During the interval the commissioners had consented to waive all questions of form. With the firm resolve to avoid war if possible, they went so far even as to hold during that long period unofficial intercourse through an intermediary, whose high position and character inspired the hope of success, and through whom
constant assurances were received from the Government of the United States of peaceful intentions; of the determination to evacuate Fort Sumter; and further, that no measure changing the existing status prejudicially to the Confederate States, especially at Fort Pickens, was in contemplation, but that in the event of any change of intention on the subject, notice would be given to the commissioners. The crooked paths of diplomacy can scarcely furnish an example so wanting in courtesy, in candor, and directness as was the course of the United States Government toward our commissioners in Washington. For proof of this I refer to the annexed documents marked ,(1) taken in connection with further facts, which I now proceed to relate.

Early in April the attention of the whole country, as well as that of our commissioners, was attracted to extraordinary preparations for an extensive military and naval expedition in New York and other Northern ports. These preparations commenced in secrecy, for an expedition whose destination was concealed, only became known when nearly completed, and on the 5th, 6th, and 7th of April transports and vessels of war with troops, munitions, and military supplies sailed from-Northern ports bound southward. Alarmed by so extraordinary a demonstration, the commissioners requested the delivery of an answer to their official communication of the 12th of March; and thereupon received on the 8th of April a reply, dated on the 15th of the previous month, from which it appears that during the whole interval, whilst the commissioners were receiving assurances calculated to inspire hope of the success of their mission, the Secretary of State and the President of the United States had already determined to hold no intercourse with them whatever; to refuse even to listen to any proposals they had to make, and had profited by the delay created by their own assurances in order to prepare secretly the means for effective hostile operations. That these assurances were given has been virtually confessed by the Government of the United States by its sending a messenger to Charleston to give notice of its purpose to use force if opposed in its intention of supplying Fort Sumter. No more striking proof of the absence of good faith in the conduct of the Government of the United States toward this Confederacy can be required than is contained in the circumstances which accompanied this notice. According to the usual course of navigation the vessels composing the expedition designed for the relief of Fort Sumter might be expected to reach Charleston Harbor on the 8th of April. Yet, with our commissioners actually in Washington, detained under assurances that notice should be given of any military movement, the notice was not addressed to them, but a messenger was sent to Charleston to give the notice to the Governor of South Carolina, and the notice was so given at a late hour on the 8th of April, the eve of the very day on which the fleet might be expected to arrive.

That this maneuver failed in its purpose was not the fault of those who contrived it. A heavy tempest delayed the arrival of the expedition and gave time to the commander of our forces at Charleston to ask and receive the instructions of this Government. Even then, under all the provocation incident to the contemptuous refusal to listen to our commissioners, and the tortuous course of the Government of the United States, I was sincerely anxious to avoid the effusion of blood, and directed a proposal to be made to the commander of Fort Sumter, who had avowed himself to be nearly out of provisions, that we would abstain from directing our fire on Fort Sumter if he would promise not to open fire on our forces unless first attacked. This proposal was refused and the conclusion was reached that the design of the United States was to place the besieging force at Charleston between the simultaneous fire of the fleet and the fort. There remained, therefore, no alternative but to direct that the fort should at once be reduced. This order was executed by General Beauregard with the skill and success which were naturally to be expected from the well-known character of that gallant officer; and , although the bombardment
lasted but thirty-three hours our flag did not wave over its battered walls until after the appearance of the hostile fleet off Charleston. Fortunately, not a life was lost on our side, and we were gratified in being spared the necessity of a useless effusion of blood, by the prudent caution of the officers who commanded the fleet in abstaining from the evidently futile effort to enter the harbor for the relief of Major Anderson. I refer to the report of the Secretary of War, and the papers which accompany it, for further details of this brilliant affair. In this connection I cannot refrain from a well-deserved tribute to the noble State, the eminent soldierly qualities of whose people were so conspicuously displayed in the port of Charleston. For months they had been irritated by the spectacle of a fortress held within their principal harbor as a standing menace against their peace and independence. Built in part with their own money, its custody confided with their own consent to an agent who held no power over them other than such as they had themselves delegated for their own benefit, intended to be used by that agent for their own protection against foreign attack, they saw it held with persistent tenacity as a means of offense against them by the very Government which they had established for their protection. They had beleaguered it for months, felt entire confidence in their power to capture it, yet yielded to the requirements of discipline, curbed their impatience, submitted without complaint to the unaccustomed hardships, labors, and privations of a protracted siege; and when at length their patience was rewarded by the signal for attack, and success had crowned their steady and gallant conduct, even in the very moment of triumph they evinced a chivalrous regard for the feelings of the brave but unfortunate officer who had been compelled to lower his flag. All manifestations of exultation were checked in his presence. Their commanding general, with their cordial approval and the consent of his Government, refrained from imposing any terms that could wound the sensibilities of the commander of the fort. He was permitted to retire with the honors of war, to salute his flag, to depart freely with all his command, and was escorted to the vessel in which he embarked with the highest marks of respect from those against whom his guns had been so recently directed.

Not only does every event connected with the siege reflect the highest honor on South Carolina, but the forbearance of her people and of this Government from making any harsh use of a victory obtained under circumstances of such peculiar provocation attest to the fullest extent the absence of any purpose beyond securing their own tranquillity and the sincere desire to avoid the calamities of war. Scarcely had the President of the United States received intelligence of the failure of the scheme which he had devised for the reinforcement of Fort Sumter, when he issued the declaration of war against this Confederacy which has prompted me to convoke you. In this extraordinary production that high functionary affects total ignorance of the existence of an independent Government, which, possessing the entire and enthusiastic devotion of its people, is exercising its functions without question over seven sovereign States, over more than 5,000,000 of people, and over a territory whose area exceeds half a million of square miles. He terms sovereign States "combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings or by the powers vested in the marshals by law." He calls for an army of 75,000 men to act as a posse comitatus in aid of the process of the courts of justice in States where no courts exist whose mandates and decrees are not cheerfully obeyed and respected by a willing people. He avows that "the first service to be assigned to the forces called out" will be not to execute the process of courts, but to capture forts and strongholds situated within the admitted limits of this Confederacy and garrisoned by its troops; and declares that "this effort" is intended to maintain the perpetuity of popular government." He concludes by commanding "the persons composing the combinations aforesaid "-to wit, the 5,000,000 of inhabitants of these States- "to retire peaceably to their respective abodes within twenty days." Apparently contradictory as are the terms of this singular
document, one point is unmistakably evident. The President of the United States called for an army of 75,000 men, whose first service was to be to capture our forts. It was a plain declaration of war which I was not at liberty to disregard because of my knowledge that under the Constitution of the United States the President was usurping a power granted exclusively to the Congress. He is the sole organ of communication between that country and foreign powers. The law of nations did not permit me to question the authority of the Executive of a foreign nation to declare war against this Confederacy. Although I might have refrained from taking active measures for our defense, if the States of the Union had all imitated the action of Virginia, North Carolina, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, by denouncing the call for troops as an unconstitutional usurpation of power to which they refused to respond, I was not at liberty to disregard the fact that many of the States seemed quite content to submit to the exercise of the power assumed by the President of the United States, and were actively engaged in levying troops to be used for the purpose indicated in the proclamation. Deprived of the aid of Congress at the moment, I was under the necessity of confining my action to a call on the States for volunteers for the common defense, in accordance with the authority you had confided to me before your adjournment. I deemed it proper, further, to issue proclamation inviting application from persons disposed to aid our defense in private armed vessels on the high seas, to the end that preparations might be made for the immediate issue of letters of marque and reprisal which you alone, under the Constitution, have power to grant. I entertain no doubt you will concur with me in the opinion that in the absence of a fleet of public vessels it will be eminently expedient to supply their place by private armed vessels, so happily styled by the publicists of the United States "the militia of the sea," and so often and justly relied on by them as an efficient and admirable instrument of defensive warfare. I earnestly recommend the immediate passage of a law authorizing me to accept the numerous proposals already received.

I cannot close this review of the acts of the Government of the United States without referring to a proclamation issued by their President, under date of the 19th instant, in which, after declaring that an insurrection has broken out in this Confederacy against the Government of the United States, he announces a blockade of all the ports of these States, and threatens to punish as pirates all persons who shall molest any vessel of the United States under letters of marque issued by this Government. Notwithstanding the authenticity of this proclamation you will concur with me that it is hard to believe it could have emanated from a President of the United States. Its announcement of a mere paper blockade is so manifestly a violation of the law of nations that it would seem incredible that it could have been issued by authority; but conceding this to be the case so far as the Executive is concerned, it will be difficult to satisfy the people of these States that their late confederates will sanction its declarations - will determine to ignore the usages of civilized nations, and will inaugurate a war of extermination on both sides by treating as pirates open enemies acting under the authority of commissions issued by an organized government. If such proclamation was issued, it could only have been published under the sudden influence of passion, and we may rest assured mankind will be spared the horrors of the conflict it seems to invite.

For the details of the administration of the different Departments I refer to the reports of the Secretaries, which accompany this message.

The State Department has furnished the necessary instructions for three commissioners who have been sent to England, France, Russia, and Belgium since your adjournment to ask our recognition as a member of the family of nations, and to make with each of those powers treaties of amity and
commerce. Further steps will be taken to enter into like negotiations with the other European powers, in pursuance of your resolutions passed at the last session. Sufficient time has not yet elapsed since the departure of these commissioners for the receipt of any intelligence from them. As I deem it desirable that commissioners or other diplomatic agents should also be sent at an early period to the independent American powers south of our Confederacy, with all of whom it is our interest and earnest wish to maintain the most cordial and friendly relations, I suggest the expediency of making the necessary appropriations for that purpose. Having been officially notified by the public authorities of the State of Virginia that she had withdrawn from the Union and desired to maintain the closest political relations with us which it was possible at this time to establish, I commissioned the Hon. Alexander H. Stephens, Vice President of the Confederate States, to represent this Government at Richmond. I am happy to inform you that he has concluded a convention with the State of Virginia by which that honored Commonwealth, so long and justly distinguished among her sister States, and so dear to the hearts of thousands of her children in the Confederate States, has united her power and her fortunes with ours and become one of us. This convention, together with the ordinance of Virginia adopting the Provisional Constitution of the Confederacy, will be laid before you for your constitutional action. I have satisfactory assurances from other of our late confederates that they are on the point of adopting similar measures, and I cannot doubt that ere you shall have been many weeks in session the whole of the slaveholding States of the late Union will respond to the call of honor and affection, and by uniting their fortunes with ours promote our common interests and secure our common safety.

In the Treasury Department regulations have been devised and put into execution for carrying out the policy indicated in your legislation on the subject of the navigation of the Mississippi River, as well as for the collection of revenue on the frontier. Free transit has been secured for vessels and merchandise passing through the Confederate States; and delay and inconvenience have been avoided as far as possible, in organizing the revenue service for the various railways entering our territory. As fast as experience shall indicate the possibility of improvement in these regulations no effort will be spared to free commerce from all unnecessary embarrassments and obstructions. Under your act authorizing a loan, proposals were issued inviting subscriptions for $5,000,000, and the call was answered by the prompt subscription of more than $8,000,000 by our own citizens, and not a single bid was made under par. The rapid development of the purpose of the President of the United States to invade our soil, capture our forts, blockade our ports, and wage war against us induced me to direct that the entire subscription should be accepted. It will now become necessary to raise means to a much larger amount to defray the expenses of maintaining our independence and repelling invasion. I invite your special attention to this subject, and the financial condition of the Government, with the suggestion of ways and means for the supply of the Treasury, will be presented to you in a separate communication.

To the Department of Justice you have confided not only the organization and supervision of all matters connected with the courts of justice, but also those connected with patents and with the bureau of public printing. Since your adjournment all the courts, with the exception of those of Mississippi and Texas, have been organized by the appointment of marshals and district attorneys and are now prepared for the exercise of their functions. In the two States just named the gentlemen confirmed as judges declined to accept the appointment, and no nominations have yet been made to fill the vacancies. I refer you to the report of the Attorney-General and concur in his recommendation for immediate legislation, especially on the subject of patent rights. Early provision should be made to secure to the subjects of foreign nations the full enjoyment of their property in valuable inventions and
to extend to our own citizens protection, not only for their own inventions, but for such as may have been assigned to them or may hereafter be assigned by persons not alien enemies. The Patent Office business is much more extensive and important than had been anticipated. The applications for patents, although confined under the law exclusively to citizens of our Confederacy, already average seventy per month, showing the necessity for the prompt organization of a bureau of patents.

The Secretary of War in his report and accompanying documents conveys full information concerning the forces - regular volunteer, and provisional - raised and called for under the several acts of Congress - their organization and distribution; also an account of the expenditures already made, and the further estimates for the fiscal year ending the 18th of February, 1862, rendered necessary by recent events. I refer to his report also for a full history of the occurrences in Charleston Harbor prior to and including the bombardment and reduction of Fort Sumter, and of the measures subsequently taken for the common defense on receiving the intelligence of the declaration of war against us made by the President of the United States. There are now in the field at Charleston, Pensacola, Forts Morgan, Jackson, Saint Philip, and Pulaski 19,000 men, and 16,000 are now en route for Virginia. It is proposed to organize and hold in readiness for instant action, in view of the present exigencies of the country, an army of 100,000 men. If further force should be needed, the wisdom and patriotism of Congress will be confidently appealed to for authority to call into the field additional numbers of our noble spirited volunteers who are constantly tendering service far in excess of our wants.

The operations of the Navy Department have been necessarily restricted by the fact that sufficient time has not yet elapsed for the purchase or construction of more than a limited number of vessels adapted to the public service. Two vessels purchased have been named the Sumter and McRae, and are now being prepared for sea at New Orleans with all possible dispatch. Contracts have also been made at that city with two different establishments for the casting of ordnance - cannon shot and shell - with the view to encourage the manufacture of these articles, so indispensable for our defense, at as many points within our territory as possible. I call your attention to the recommendation of the Secretary for the establishment of a magazine and laboratory for preparation of ordnance stores and the necessary appropriation for that purpose. Hitherto such stores have usually been prepared at the navy arcs, and no appropriation was made at your last session for this object. The Secretary also calls attention to the fact that no provision has been made for the payment of invalid pensions to our own citizens. Many of these persons are advanced in life; they have no means of support, and by the secession of these States have been deprived of their claim against the Government of the United States. I recommend the appropriation of the sum necessary to pay these pensioners, as well as those of the Army, whose claims can scarcely exceed $70,000 per annum.

The Postmaster General has already succeeded in organizing his Department to such an extent as to be in readiness to assume the; direction of our postal affairs on the occurrence of the contingency contemplated by the act of March 15, 1861, or even sooner if desired by Congress. The various books and circulars have been prepared and measures taken to secure supplies of blanks, postage stamps, stamped envelopes, mail bags, locks, keys, etc. He presents a detailed classification and arrangement of his clerical force, and asks for its increase. An auditor of the Treasury for this Department is necessary, and a plan is submitted for the organization of his bureau. The great number and magnitude of the accounts of this Department require an increase of the clerical force in the accounting branch in the Treasury. The revenues of this Department are collected and disbursed in modes peculiar to itself, and require a special bureau to secure a proper accountability in the administration of its finances. I call your
attention to the additional legislation required for this Department; to the recommendation for changes in the law fixing the rates of postage on newspapers, periodicals, and sealed packages of certain kinds, and specially to the recommendation of the Secretary, in which I concur, that you provide at once for the assumption by him of the control of our entire postal service.

In the military organization of the States provision is made for brigadier and major generals, but in the Army of the Confederate States the highest grade is that of brigadier general. Hence it will no doubt sometimes occur that where troops of the Confederacy do duty with the militia, the general selected for the command and possessed of the views and purposes of this Government will be superseded by an officer of the militia not having the same advantages. To avoid this contingency in the least objectionable manner I recommend that additional rank be given to the general of the Confederate Army, and concurring in the policy of having but one grade of generals in the Army of the Confederacy, I recommend that the law of its organization be amended so that the grade be that of general. To secure a thorough military education it is deemed essential that officers should enter upon the study of their profession at an early period of life and have elementary instruction in a military school. Until such school shall be established it is recommended that cadets be appointed and attached to companies until they shall have attained the age and have acquired the knowledge to fit them for the duties of lieutenants. I also call your attention to an omission in the law organizing the Army, in relation to military chaplains, and recommend that provision be made for their appointment.

In conclusion, I congratulate you on the fact that in every portion of our country there has been exhibited the most patriotic devotion to our common cause. Transportation companies have freely tendered the use of their lines for troops and supplies. The presidents of the railroads of the Confederacy, in company with others who control lines of communication with States that we hope soon to greet as sisters, assembled in convention in this city, and not only reduced largely the rates heretofore demanded for mail service and conveyance of troops and munitions, but voluntarily proffered to receive their compensation, at these reduced rates, in the bonds of the Confederacy, for the purpose of leaving all the resources of the Government at its disposal for the common defense. Requisitions for troops have been met with such alacrity that the numbers tendering their services have in every instance greatly exceeded the demand. Men of the highest official and social position are serving as volunteers in the ranks. The gravity of age and the zeal of youth rival each other in the desire to be foremost for the-public defense; and though at no other point than the one heretofore noticed have they been stimulated by the excitement incident to actual engagement and the hope of distinction for individual achievement, they have borne what for new troops is the most severe ordeal - patient toil and constant vigil, and all the exposure and discomfort of active service, with a resolution and fortitude such as to command approbation and justify the highest expectation of their conduct when active valor shall be required in place of steady endurance. A people thus united and resolved cannot shrink from any sacrifice which they may be called on to make, nor can there be a reasonable doubt of their final success, however long and severe may be the test of their determination to maintain their birthright of freedom and equality as a trust which it is their first duty to transmit undiminished to their posterity. A bounteous Providence cheers us with the promise of abundant crops. The fields of grain which will within a few weeks be ready for the sickle give assurance of the amplest supply of food for man; whilst the corn, cotton, and other staple productions of our soil afford abundant proof that up to this period the season has been propitious. We feel that our cause is just and holy; we protest solemnly in the face of mankind that we desire peace at any sacrifice save that of honor and independence; we seek no
conquest, no aggrandizement, no concession of any kind from the States with which we were lately confederated; all we ask is to be let alone; that those who never held power over us shall not now attempt our subjugation by arms. This we will, this we must, resist to the direst extremity. The moment that this pretension is abandoned the sword will drop from our grasp, and we shall be ready to enter into treaties of amity and commerce that cannot but be mutually beneficial. So long as this pretension is maintained, with a firm reliance on that Divine Power which covers with its protection the just cause, we will continue to struggle for our inherent right to freedom, independence, and self-government.

JEFFERSON DAVIS.
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Capital Cities of the Confederacy

First Capital: Montgomery, Alabama

The Capitol Building in Richmond, Virginia (Library of Congress)

Founded in 1819, on the high bluffs above the Alabama River and 330 miles from the Gulf of Mexico, Montgomery, Alabama quickly became the heart of the state's plantation economy. By 1846 Montgomery was named Alabama's capital. In 1861, 9,000 people lived in the city, considered the richest for its size in the nation. Montgomery was a transportation center, with steamboats traveling to Mobile, stagecoaches traveling east, and a railroad running northeast and southwest.

On January 11, 1861, the State of Alabama seceded from the Union. Less than one month later, in early February, the Alabama secession convention invited delegates of the other seceded states to meet in Montgomery to form the new Confederate nation. Delegates from six of the seven seceded states (the Texans arrived late) wrote a constitution for the Confederate States of America in only four days; the next day they elected Jefferson Davis the Confederacy's president. In late February, Davis took the oath of office while standing on the portico of the state capitol in Montgomery.

Montgomery's three hotels and numerous boarding houses were crowded with government officials, politicians, soldiers, and newspapermen. It became more of a metropolis than a quiet village, with its streets crowded with carriages and horses, and people on the prowl for gossip, argument, and discussion. Everyone admired the town's beauty.

But by May the summer's humid heat and the mosquitoes changed many people's minds about Montgomery. So when the newly seceded Virginians offered their own state and their own capital as the seat of the Confederacy, many were eager to accept the offer. Mary Boykin Chesnut noted in her diary that her husband, a former U.S. Senator, was against the move. However, she remarked, "I think these uncomfortable hotels will move the Congress. Our statesmen love their ease."

Jefferson Davis was at first opposed, believing the capital should reside in the Deep South, where the feelings for secession were most fervent. However, the Confederate Congress approved the move and adjourned May 21, and scheduled to meet in Richmond two months later. As Dr. James McPherson writes in *Battle Cry of Freedom*,

"Virginia brought crucial resources to the Confederacy. Her population was the South's largest. Her industrial capacity was nearly as great as that of the seven original Confederate states combined. The Tredegar Iron Works in
Richmond was the only plant in the South capable of manufacturing heavy ordnance. Virginia's heritage from the generation of Washington, Jefferson, and Madison gave her immense prestige..."

The Confederacy's Most Permanent Capital: Richmond, Virginia

Davis left Montgomery May 26 at the climax of the fervor following the fall of Fort Sumter and Lincoln's call for 75,000 troops. Arriving in Richmond, the capital of Virginia, on May 29, he was met by crowds at the railroad station and throngs along the streets to the Spotswood Hotel.

Richmond was a much larger metropolis than Montgomery. The heart of the South’s industry, Richmond was also a market town specializing in flour and slaves. It was a beautiful town located at the foot of the Great Falls of the James River and on seven hills. Its citizens compared it to Rome. Between 1861 and 1865, its population swelled to 100,000 and more. Much to its citizens’ dismay, many of the new residents were rowdy, noisy, and troublesome. In addition, because the city was the Confederate capital, it became the focus of Union attention. The threat of capture by Federal forces was constant.

Richmond at first thrived as the capital of the Confederacy. Then starved. Then burned when, at last, Robert E. Lee’s forces were forced to retreat, leaving the city defenseless.

The Last Capital: Danville, Virginia

Located in south central Virginia, not far from the North Carolina border, Danville was the western terminus of the Richmond and Danville Railroad and a major Confederate supply base. Jefferson Davis and his government traveled to Danville as Richmond fell to the Federal army. The city was the seat of the Confederate government for only eight days, April 3-10, 1865.

Danville’s quartermaster, Major William T. Sutherlin, offered his home to Davis and the Confederate government. Davis occupied an upstairs bedroom, and the Confederate cabinet met in the Sutherlin dining room. Davis delivered his final proclamation to the Confederate nation from the home on April 4.

Davis believed that Danville was only a temporary location for the government. He believed that the Confederacy had "entered upon a new phase of the struggle" in which the fight would not be tied to the defense of cities, but taken to the mountains in guerrilla warfare.

But Lee's decimated army could not hold out. The cabinet was sitting at dinner when word of Lee’s surrender at Appomattox reached Danville. The Confederate government would have to move immediately. They had originally intended to move to Lynchburg, but with no army operating in Virginia, the government would have to move south, toward Joseph Johnston’s army. Davis still had hope the Confederacy could survive the recent series of disasters. He left Danville, Virginia for Greensboro, North Carolina, in the rain.
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The Lost Cause

The Lost Cause is the name commonly given to a literary and intellectual movement that sought to reconcile the traditional Southern white society to the defeat of the Confederate States of America in the Civil War. White Southerners sought consolation in attributing their loss to factors beyond their control and to betrayals of their heroes and cause. Those who contributed to the movement tended to portray the Confederacy's cause as noble and most of the Confederacy's leaders as exemplars of old-fashioned chivalry, defeated by the Union armies not through superior military skill, but by overwhelming force. They also tended to condemn Reconstruction.

The term Lost Cause first appeared in the title of an 1866 book by the historian Edward A. Pollard, The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates. However, it was the articles written for the Southern Historical Society by Lt. Gen. Jubal A. Early in the 1870s that established the Lost Cause as a long-lasting literary and cultural phenomenon.

Early's original inspiration for his views may have come from General Robert E. Lee. In his farewell order to the Army of Northern Virginia, Lee spoke of the "overwhelming resources and numbers" that the Confederate army fought against.

The Lost Cause theme was taken up by memorial associations such as the United Confederate Veterans and the United Daughters of the Confederacy. The Lost Cause helped Southerners to cope with the social, political, and economic changes after the Civil War especially in the oppressive Reconstruction era.

Some of the main tenets of the Lost Cause movement were that:

Confederate generals such as Lee and Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson represented the virtues of Southern nobility. This nobility was contrast most significantly in comparisons between U.S. Grant and Lee. The Northern generals, were characterized as men with low moral standards who engaged in vicious campaigns against Southern civilians such as Sherman's March to the Sea and Philip Sheridan's burning of the Shenandoah Valley in the Valley Campaigns of 1864.

Losses on the battlefield were inevitable and were blaming Northern superiority in resources and manpower.

Losses were also the result of betrayal and incompetence on the part of certain subordinates of General Lee, such as General James Longstreet. Longstreet was the object of blame because of his association with Grant, conversion to the Republican Party, and other actions during Reconstruction.

While states' rights was not emphasized in the declarations of secession, the Lost Cause focused on the defense of states' rights, rather than preservation of slavery as the primary cause that led eleven Southern states to secede.

Secession was seen as a justifiable constitutional response to Northern cultural and economic aggressions against the Southern way of life.

Slavery was fictionally presented as a benign institution, and the slaves were treated well and cared for and loyal and faithful to their benevolent masters.

The most powerful images and symbols of the Lost Cause were Robert E. Lee and Pickett's Charge. Following the war Lee acquired a god-like persona. He was deified as a leader whose soldiers would loyally follow him into every fight no matter how desperate. Thus he became the figure head of the Lost Cause. He was cast as the ideal of the antebellum Southern gentleman, an honorable and pious man who selflessly served Virginia and the Confederacy.
Lee's military brilliance at Second Bull Run and Chancellorsville took on legendary status. In a position of such honor, Lee was not subject to criticism by veterans and historians.

Although Lee accepted responsibility for the defeat at Gettysburg, Southerners refused to blame him. Seeking a scapegoat for the pivotal defeat, Jubal Early blamed Lt. Gen. James Longstreet. Early's accused Longstreet of failing to attack early in the morning of July 2, 1863, as instructed by Lee. Lee never expressed dissatisfaction with the second-day actions of his "Old War Horse."

Grant rejected the Lost Cause argument that the South had simply been overwhelmed by numbers. Grant argued, “This is the way public opinion was made during the war and this is the way history is made now. We never overwhelmed the South ... What we won from the South we won by hard fighting.”

In the annotated bibliography of Douglas Southall Freeman's definitive four-volume biography of Lee, published in 1934, Freeman acknowledged his debt to the Southern Historical Society Papers and Early by stating that they contain "more valuable, unused data than any other unofficial repository of source material on the War Between the States." Lee's subordinates were primarily to blame for errors that lost battles. While Longstreet was the most common target of such attacks, others were criticized as well. Richard Ewell, Jubal Early, J.E.B. Stuart, A.P. Hill, George Pickett, and many others were frequently attacked and blamed by Southerners in an attempt to deflect criticism from Lee. While others refused to blame, Lee, in keeping with his nobility, accepted total responsibility for his defeats and never blamed any of his subordinates.

The Lost Cause view of the Civil War also influenced the 1936 novel Gone with the Wind by Margaret Mitchell and the 1939 film of the same name. There Southerners were portrayed as noble, heroic figures, living in a romantic and conservative society, who tragically succumbed to an unstoppable, destructive force. Another prominent use of the Lost Cause perspective was in Thomas F. Dixon, Jr.'s 1905 book The Clansman, later adapted to the screen by D.W. Griffith in his controversial movie Birth of a Nation in 1915. In both the book and the movie, the Ku Klux Klan is portrayed as continuing the noble traditions of the South and the CSA soldier by defending Southern culture in general and Southern womanhood in particular against alleged depredations and exploitation at the hands of the Freedmen and Yankee carpetbaggers during Reconstruction.

Today, historians are reviewing and reinterpreting both Lee and other aspects of the Lost Cause.

http://civil-war-journeys.org/the_lost_cause.htm

Civil War Journeys is an educational website dedicated to research and analysis of the American Civil War.
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While slavery was not the only cause for which the South fought during the Civil War, the testimony of Confederate leaders and their supporters makes it clear that slavery was central to the motivation for secession and war.

"The Lash," a lithograph by Henry Louis Stephens (1863)

Library of Congress

One of the most sensitive and controversial issues that any Civil War site interpreter will confront is the role of slavery in the South's decision to secede from and take up arms against the United States. Although an argument that slavery played an important role in the coming of the Civil War would raise few eyebrows among academic scholars, for public historians faced with a popular audience unfamiliar with the latest scholarship on the subject such an assertion can be very controversial. Whenever I speak to groups about the Civil War, I am reminded that slavery and the war are often separated in the public mind.

As historian James McPherson explained in a recent article, it is especially difficult for southern whites "to admit - that the noble Cause for which their ancestors fought might have included the defense of slavery." Yet, the best historical scholars over the last generation or more have argued convincingly for the centrality of slavery among the causes of the Civil War. The evidence for such arguments provided in the letters, speeches, and articles written by those who established and supported the Confederacy is overwhelming and difficult to deny. While slavery was not the only cause for which the South fought during the Civil War, the testimony of Confederate leaders and their supporters makes it clear that slavery was central to the motivation for secession and war.

When southern whites in the 19th century spoke of the "southern way of life," they referred to a way of life founded on white supremacy and supported by the institution of slavery.

South Carolina led the way when its Charleston convention, held just before Christmas in 1860, declared that the "Union heretofore existing between the State of South Carolina and the other States of North America is dissolved ... " The reason for the drastic action, South Carolina delegates explained in their "Declaration of the Causes which Induced the Secession of South Carolina," was what they termed a broken compact between the federal government and "the slaveholding states." It was the actions of what delegates referred to as "the non-slaveholding states" who refused to enforce the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 that was the specific example used as evidence for this argument. "In many of these States the fugitive [slave] is discharged from the service of labor claimed,..... [and] in the State of New York even the right of transit for a slave has been denied .... " The delegation made clear that the election of Abraham Lincoln in the fall of 1860 as "President of the United States whose opinions and purposes are hostile to Slavery" was the final straw. In the South Carolinian mind the coming of Republican political power signaled, in the words of the convention, "that a war [would] be waged against slavery until it shall cease throughout the United
The editors at the Charleston Mercury agreed. They had anticipated the threat that a Republican victory would pose when in early November they warned South Carolinians and the entire South that "[t]he issue before the country is the extinction of slavery." "No man of common sense, who has observed the progress of events, and is not prepared to surrender the institution," they charged, "can doubt that the time for action has come-now or never." The newspaper editors, like most southerners, saw Lincoln's election as lifting abolitionists to power, and like most southerners they understood, as they plainly stated, that "[t]he existence of slavery is at stake." They called for a convention to consider secession because they saw such action as the only way to protect slavery. When the South Carolina convention did meet little more than a month later, it dealt almost entirely with issues related directly to slavery. It did not complain about tariff rates, competing economic systems or mistreatment at the hands of northern industrialists. The South was not leaving the United States because of the power of northern economic elites who in reality, as historian Bruce Levine observed, "feared alienating the slave owners more than they disliked slavery." The secession of South Carolina, approved by the convention 169 votes to none, was about the preservation of slavery.

Alexander Hamilton Stephens of Georgia also understood what the South was fighting for. A decade before secession, in reaction to the debate over the Compromise of 1850, he wrote to his brother Linton citing "the great question of the permanence of slavery in the Southern States" as crucial for maintaining the union. "[T]he crisis of that question," he predicted, "is not far ahead." After the war he would become more equivocal, but in the heat of the secession debate in the spring of 1861 Stephens spoke as directly as he had in 1850. On March 21, 1861 in Savannah, Stephens, the then Vice President of the Confederacy, drew applause when he proclaimed that "our new government" was founded on slavery, "its foundations are laid, its corner-stone rests upon the great truth, that the [N]egro is not equal to the white man; that slavery - submission to the superior race - is his natural and normal condition. This, our new government, is the first in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth."

Mississippi's Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederacy, was more cautious about declaring slavery as the pivotal issue. When he did address the issue, he generally did so within the context of constitutional guarantees of property rights. Yet, there was no doubt that the property rights he sought most to guarantee in 1861 protected slavery. He was sure that under Republican rule "property in slaves [would become] so insecure as to be comparatively worthless...." As a large slaveholder, Davis was concerned about the economics of abolition as well, but as an experienced politician he also worried that an overtly pro-slavery stand might alienate potential European allies and split the southern population. After all, by 1861 only about one-third of southern families in the 11 seceding states held slaves and the non-slaveholders always posed a potential problem for Confederate unity.

A special edition of the Louisville Daily Courier was detailed and direct in its message to non-slaveholders. The abolition of slavery would raise African Americans to "the level of the white race," and the poorest whites would be closest to the former slaves in both social and physical distance. Thus, "do they wish to send their children to schools in which the [N]egro children of the vicinity are taught? Do they wish to give the [N]egro the right to appear in the witness box to testify against them?" Then the article moved to the final and most emotionally-charged question of all. Would the non-slaveholders of the South be content to "AMALGAMATE TOGETHER THE TWO RACES IN VIOLATION OF GOD'S WILL." The conclusion was inevitable the article argued; non-slaveholders
had much at stake in the maintenance of slavery and everything to lose by its abolition. African-American slavery was the only thing that stood between poor whites and the bottom of southern society where they would be forced to compete with and live among black people.

These arguments were extremely effective as even the poorest white southerners got the message. Their interest in slavery was far more important than simple economics. As one southern prisoner explained to his Wisconsin-born guard "you Yanks want us to marry our daughters to niggers." This fear of a loss of racial status was common. A poor white farmer from North Carolina explained that he would never stop fighting because what he considered to be an abolitionist federal government was "trying to force us to live as the colored race." Although he had grown tired of the war, a Confederate artilleryman from Louisiana agreed that he must continue to fight. An end to slavery would bring what he considered horrific consequences, for he would "never want to see the day when a [N]egro is put on an equality with a white person." Even northern soldiers understood the passion with which the Confederates fought to protect the institution of slavery. Most Confederates would have agreed with the assessment of a Union soldier in 1863, shortly after the passage of the Emancipation Proclamation. "I know enough about the southern spirit," he said, "that I think they will fight for the institution of slavery even to extermination." Fears of the consequences of abolition fostered white solidarity, forming the load-bearing pillar in the foundation of Confederate nationhood.

Although the defense of slavery was central to the Confederacy, the abolition of slavery was not initially the official goal of the United States or the primary concern of most of the American people. As the most respected historians of our generation have shown, Lincoln and the vast majority of Republicans sought only to limit the expansion of slavery. Most who supported this "free soil" program that would maintain the western territories for free labor, did so out of self-interest. To urban or farm workers or to northern small farmer owners, Republicans offered the possibility of cheap land devoid of competition from slave labor or even from free blacks, who faced restriction in western settlement. "Vote yourself a Farm," was the not-so-subtle Republican message to white laboring men with the understanding that the western territories, having undergone Indian removal in the 1830s and 1840s, would be racially homogeneous.

Abolitionists, black and white, sincerely sought the end to slavery and accepted its geographical limitation as a step toward its inevitable demise. But although most whites in the North wanted to restrict slavery's spread, they would not have gone to war in 1861 to end it. President Lincoln understood his constituency very well and his statements on slavery were calculated to reassure white northerners as well as southern slaveholders that the U.S. government had, in his words, "no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists." Indeed, Lincoln even reluctantly agreed to accept an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would have protected slavery in those states where it existed. Ohio, Maryland, and Illinois actually ratified this measure that, ironically, would have been the 13th Amendment. Although this may have played well among northerners who were willing to concede protection to slavery so long as it remained in the South, slaveholders understood only too well it was not that simple.

Since most Americans saw the West as the place that would provide the vitality of national progress, to deny slaveholders access to that territory was to deny them access to America's future. Southerners took such restrictions as a direct affront to their regional honor and a threat to their social and economic survival. Georgia secessionist Robert Toombs put it succinctly: "we must expand or perish." Lincoln did not have to explain that slavery had no place in the nation's future, the South was well aware that in order to save their institution of bondage they must leave the United
States and that is precisely what their secession movement was calculated to do.

Thus, while northerners claimed that they meant only to restrict slavery's expansion, southerners were convinced that to restrict slavery was to constrict its life blood. This war was not about tariffs or differences in economic systems or even about state's rights, except for the right of southern states to protect slavery. It was not willing to stand for state's rights except to preserve its institution of slavery where it existed and where it must expand. Some southerners had argued in the 1850s for the annexation of Cuba, one of only two other remaining slave societies in the western hemisphere, as one plan for slavery's expansion. Others looked to Mexico and Latin America, but always it was about saving and expanding slavery. And while the U.S. government may not have gone to war to abolish slavery in the South, it did go to war to save the union from what it increasingly came to believe was a "slave power conspiracy" to restrict citizen liberties and finally to destroy the United States. The northern determination to contain slavery in the South and to prevent its spread into the western territories was a part of the effort to preserve civil rights and free labor in the nation's future. The South was willing to destroy the union to protect slavery.

Lincoln's issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863 transformed the war into a holy crusade, but there was always disagreement among U.S. troops about outright abolition. Yet, increasingly after 1863, "pro-emancipation conviction did predominate among the leaders and fighting soldiers of the Union Army." Regardless of whether U.S. troops fought to limit or to abolish it, however, slavery was the issue that focused their fight, just as it did for the Confederacy. A half-century after serving the Confederate cause, John Singleton Mosby, legendary leader of Mosby's Rangers, offered no apologies for his southern loyalties. He was quite candid about his reason for fighting. "The South went to war on account of slavery," he said. "South Carolina went to war - as she said in her secession proclamation - because slavery w[oul]d not be secure under Lincoln." Then he added as if to dispel all doubt, "South Carolina ought to know what was the cause of her seceding."

Of course, Mosby was right. South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, and the other states that seceded from the United States did know the reason for their action and they stated it clearly, time and time again. They named the preservation of slavery as foremost among their motivations. When such a wide variety of southerners - from private citizens, to top governmental officials, from low ranking enlisted men to Confederate military leaders at the highest levels, from local politicians to regional newspaper editors - all agree, what more evidence do we need?

This essay is taken from The Civil War Remembered, published by the National Park Service and Eastern National. This richly illustrated handbook is available in many national park bookstores or may be purchased online from Eastern at www.eparks.com/store.

https://www.nps.gov/resources/story.htm%3Fid%3D217

By James Oliver Horton, Professor Emeritus, George Washington University
Appendix Kidnapping Escaped and Freed Slaves
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Winner of the Bancroft Prize: Through a gripping narrative based on massive new research, a leading historian reshapes our understanding of the Civil War.

Our standard Civil War histories tell a reassuring story of the triumph, in an inevitable conflict, of the dynamic, free-labor North over the traditional, slave-based South, vindicating the freedom principles built into the nation's foundations.

But at the time, on the borderlands of Pennsylvania and Virginia, no one expected war, and no one knew how it would turn out. The one certainty was that any war between the states would be fought in their fields and streets.

Edward L. Ayers gives us a different Civil War, built on an intimate scale. He charts the descent into war in the Great Valley spanning Pennsylvania and Virginia. Connected by strong ties of every kind, including the tendrils of slavery, the people of this borderland sought alternatives to secession and war. When none remained, they took up war with startling intensity. As this book relays with a vivid immediacy, it came to their doorsteps in hunger, disease, and measureless death. Ayers's Civil War emerges from the lives of everyday people as well as those who helped shape history—John Brown and Frederick Douglass, Lincoln, Jackson, and Lee. His story ends with the valley ravaged, Lincoln’s support fragmenting, and Confederate forces massing for a battle at Gettysburg.
One great exception to the “rules of war” marked the Confederate behavior: “the carrying away of free negroes.” The Confederates’ actions toward black people proved to be even worse than the white residents of Franklin had anticipated. “One of the revolting features of this day was the scouring of the fields about the town and searching of houses in portions of the place for negroes,” Hoke lamented. “These poor creatures—those of them who had not fled upon the approach of the foe—sought concealment in the growing wheat fields around town. Into these the cavalrymen rode in search of their prey, and many were caught—some after a desperate chase and being fired at.” Philip Schaff, down in Mercersburg, saw the capture of black people he knew “to have been born and raised on free soil.” 350

Rachel Cormany anguished over the raids. The Confederates, on the second day of their occupation of Chambersburg, “were hunting up the contrabands & driving them off by droves. O! How it grated on our hearts to have to
sit quietly & look at such brutal deeds—I saw no men among the contrabands—all women & children.” Like Hoke and Schaff, Rachel Cormany could see that “some of the colored people who were raised here were taken along.” She could do nothing, only watch “on the front step as they were driven by just like we would drive cattle. Some laughed & seemed not to care—but nearly all hung their heads. One woman was pleading wonderfully with her driver for her children—but all the sympathy she received from him was a rough ‘March along’—at which she would quicken her pace again.” Rachel could not imagine what the Rebel soldiers “want with those little babies—whole families were taken.” She assumed that the black men “left thinking the women & children would not be disturbed. I cannot describe all the scenes.” 357

The white people of Franklin did not always stand by and watch the kidnapping by the Confederates. Hoke interceded for two of his kidnapped neighbors, and down in Greencastle “a few determined men, armed with revolvers, captured a squad which had in charge a number of these poor frightened creatures, and released them from the unhappy fate which threatened them.”358 A prominent Reformed Church theologian, Benjamin S. Schneck, went directly to Confederate headquarters to testify on behalf of Esque Hall, a
“well and favorably known colored man,” as well as for two
repairmen on the Cumberland Valley Railroad. 359

Jemima Cree took things in hand as well. She heard that
the Rebels had been “scouting around, gathering up our
Darkies, and that they had Mag down on the court house
pavement. I got my ‘fixens’ on, and started down,” she wrote
her husband. “There were about 25 women and children,
with Mag and Fannie. I interceded for Mag, told them she
was free born, etc. The man said he could do nothing, he was
acting according to orders.” Fannie was indeed “contraband,”
so Cree could have done nothing for her. In any case, the
Confederates left before the Franklin woman could take her
complaint higher up.

“They took up all they could find,” Cree wrote with terror
and disgust, “even little children, whom they had to carry on
horseback before them. All who could get there fled to the
woods, and many who were wise are hid in the houses of
their employers.” Despite such efforts by white patrons, the
numbers and guns lay with the Confederates, who captured
“about 250 people . . . into bondage,” Chambersburg
merchant William Heyser estimated. Amos Stouffer sadly
observed that Confederates “are scouring the country in
every direction about Waynesboro, Greencastle, Mercersburg

[and] Finkstown for horses and cattle and Negroes.” 360
Citations:

356 Franklin Repository and Transcript, July 8, 1863, p 1 column 1.

357 Diary of Rachel Cormany, entry dated June 16, 1863

358 Hoke, Great Invasion, pp 107-08


360 Diary of Amos Stouffer, June 19, 1863, private collection on the Valley of the Shadow Website.
Reverse Underground Railroad

KIDNAPPING FREED SLAVES AND SELLING THEM INTO SLAVERY

Reverse Underground Railroad

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

The Reverse Underground Railroad is the term used for the practice of kidnapping free blacks from free states and transporting them into the slave states for sale as slaves. The Reverse Underground Railroad operated for eighty-five years, from 1780-1865. The name is a reference to the Underground Railroad, the informal network of abolitionists and sympathizers who helped to smuggle escaped slaves to freedom, generally in Canada.

Notable illegal slave trader kidnappers[edit]

From 1811-1829, Martha "Patty" Cannon was the leader of a gang that kidnapped slaves and free blacks, from the Delmarva Peninsula of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and Chesapeake Bay and transported and sold them to plantation owners located further south. She was indicted for four murders in 1829 and died in prison, while awaiting trial, purportedly a suicide via arsenic poisoning.

In the 1820s-1830s, John A. Murrell led an outlaw gang in western Tennessee. He was once caught with a freed slave living on his property. His tactics were to kidnap slaves from their plantations, promise them their freedom, and instead sell them back to other slave owners. If Murrell was in danger of being caught with kidnapped slaves, he would kill the slaves to escape being arrested with stolen property. In 1834, Murrell was sentenced to ten years in the Tennessee State Penitentiary for slave-stealing.

John Hart Crenshaw was a large landowner, salt maker, and slave trader, from the 1820s to the 1850s, based out of Gallatin County, Illinois and a business associate of lawman and outlaw, James Ford. Although Illinois was a free state, Crenshaw leased the salt works in nearby Equality.
Illinois from the U.S. Government, which permitted the use of slaves for the arduous labor of hauling and boiling brackish water from local salt springs to produce salt. Due to Crenshaw's keeping and "breeding" of slaves and kidnapping of free blacks, who were then pressed into slavery, his house became popularly known as The Old Slave House and is alleged to be haunted.

Prevalence[edit]

Free blacks in New York City and Philadelphia were particularly vulnerable to kidnapping. In New York, a gang known as 'the black-birders' regularly waylaid men, women and children, sometimes with the support and participation of policemen and city officials.[1] In Philadelphia, black newspapers frequently ran missing children notices, including one for the 14-year-old daughter of the newspaper's editor.[2] Children were particularly susceptible to kidnapping; in a two-year period, at least a hundred children were abducted in Philadelphia alone.[3]

Prevention and rescue[edit]

An organization called The Protecting Society of Philadelphia, an auxiliary of the Abolition Society of Philadelphia, was established in 1827 for "the prevention of kidnapping and man-stealing."[4] In January, 1837, The New York Vigilance Committee, established because any free black person was at risk for being kidnapped, reported that it had protected 335 persons from slavery. David A Ruggles, a black newspaper editor and treasurer of the organization, writes in his paper of his futile attempts to convince two New York judges to prevent illegal kidnapping, as well as a daring successful physical rescue of a young girl named Charity Walker from the New York home of her captors.[5]

From Philadelphia, high constable Samuel Parker Garrigues took several trips to Southern states at the behest of mayor Joseph Watson to rescue children and adults who had been kidnapped from the city's streets. He also successfully went after their abductors. One such case was Charles Bailey, kidnapped at fourteen in 1825 and finally rescued by Garrigues after a three-year search. Unfortunately, the beaten and emaciated youth died a few days after being brought back to Philadelphia. Garrigues was able to find and arrest Bailey's abductor, Captain John Smith, alias Thomas Collins, head of "The Johnson Gang".[6] He also tracked down and arrested John Purnell of the Patty Cannon gang.[7]
On the first day of July 1863, Confederate Lieutenant General James Longstreet (left), writing through his adjutant, ordered General George Pickett to bring up his corps from the rear to reinforce the main body of the Army of Northern Virginia. The lead elements of the armies of Robert E. Lee and George Meade had come together outside a small Pennsylvania market town called Gettysburg. The clash there would become the most famous battle of the American Civil War, and would be popularly regarded as a critical turning point not just of that conflict, but in American history. More about Longstreet's order shortly.

I was thinking about the central role of the Battle of Gettysburg in our memory of the war when I recently read an essay by David G. Smith, "Race and Retaliation: The Capture of African Americans During the Gettysburg Campaign," part of Virginia's Civil War, edited by Peter Wallenstein and Bertram Wyatt-Brown (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press). All but the last page and a few citations is available online through Google Books.

It's not a pleasant read.

During the Gettysburg Campaign, soldiers in the Army of Northern Virginia systematically rounded up free blacks and escaped slaves as they marched north into Maryland and Pennsylvania. Men, women and children were all swept up and brought along with the army as it moved north, and carried back into Virginia during the army's retreat after the battle. While specific numbers cannot be known, Smith argues that the total may have been over a thousand African Americans. Once back in Confederate-held territory, they were returned to their former owners, sold at auction or imprisoned.
That part of the story is well-known. What makes Smith's essay important is the way he provides additional, critical background to this horrible event, and reveals both its extent across the corps and divisions of Lee's army, as well as the acquiescence to it, up and down the chain of command. The seizures were not, as is sometimes suggested, the result of individual soldiers or rouge troops acting on their own initiative, in defiance of their orders. The perpetrators were not, to use a more recent cliché, "a few bad apples." The seizure of free blacks and escaped slaves by the Army of Northern Virginia was widespread, systematic, and countenanced by officers up to the highest levels of command. This event, and others on a much smaller scale, were so much part of the army's operation that Smith argues they can legimately be considered a part of the army's operational objective. Smith is blunt in his terminology for these activities; he calls them "slave raids."

These ugly episodes did not spring up spontaneously; it was a violent and entirely predictable result of multiple factors that had been building for months or years. For a long time, there was growing resentment in Virginia over escaped slaves seeking refuge in Pennsylvania, where there was considerable sympathy for the abolitionist cause, and stops on the Underground Railroad. These tensions increased substantially after the outbreak of the war, as Virginia slaves learned that they could expect to be safe as soon as they reached Union territory, where they would be considered contraband. White Southerners' resentment of this situation redoubled again in the fall of 1862, with the news that the Lincoln administration would issue the Emancipation Proclamation. This further encouraged slaves to flee to the North, and made it clear to slaveholders—had it not been clear before—that defeat would put an end to the "peculiar institution," and upend the economy and culture that went with it.
A November 1862 Harper's Weekly (New York) illustration showing Confederates driving slaves further south, to put them out of reach of the Federal armies in advance of the Emancipation Proclamation. The accompanying article told of two white men who escaped to Union lines and:

upon being questioned closely, they admitted that they had just come from the James River; and finally owned up that they had been running off "niggers" having just taken a large gang, belonging to themselves and neighbors, southward in chains, to avoid losing them under the emancipation proclamation. I understand, from various sources, that the owners of this species of property, throughout this section of the State, are moving it off toward Richmond as fast as it can be spared from the plantation; and the slaveholders boast that there will not be a negro left in all this part of the State by the 1st of January next.

Against this backdrop, the organization of Federal units of black soldiers, comprised of both escaped slaves and free men, was taken as an outrage. It struck a raw nerve, never far off in the Southern psyche: fear of a slave insurrection. The prospect of African American men in blue uniforms was taken as an extreme provocation, so much so that it was proposed in the
Confederate congress—and endorsed by General Beauregard, the hero of Fort Sumter—that all Federals captured, black or white, should be summarily executed. This proposal was never adopted, but the Confederate congress did eventually pass, in May 1863, a proclamation instructing President Jefferson Davis to exercise "full and ample retaliation" against the North for arming black soldiers.

Finally, there was simple revenge. The Union army's shelling of Fredericksburg several months before had been a particular sore point, that festered for months as the Confederate army went into winter quarters nearby. One officer, determined to fix the destruction there in his mind's eye, made a special visit to that town one last time before setting out on the road north into Maryland and Pennsylvania.

So when Lee's army finally marched north in June 1863, it was fully infused with the intent to exact "full and ample retaliation" on Union territory as it passed. Lee issued orders against the indiscriminate destruction of civilian property, but made no mention of seizing African Americans, whether free or former slaves. In his essay, Smith points out that diaries, letters and even official reports from every division in Lee's army mention Confederates rounding up African Americans and holding them with the army. The practice was tolerated—when not actively encouraged—by officers at all levels of the army. Some, in fact, saw it as not only justified, but a legitimate tactic to meet the Confederacy's military objectives. Smith quotes a private letter to his wife from Major General Lafayette McLaws, whose division would bear the brunt of the action on the assault on the Peach Orchard on the second day at Gettysburg. Marching north into Maryland and Pennsylvania with his division, McLaws wrote:

> It is reported that our army will will not be allowed to plunder and rob in Pennsylvania, which is all very well, but it would be better not to publish it as we have received provocation enough to burn and take and destroy, property of all kids and even the men, women & children along out whole border.

> In every instance where we have even threatened retaliation, the enemy have given [way]—I am strongly in favor of trying it the very first chance we get.

In McLaws' view, the seizure of "even the men, women & children" was both justified as moral retribution and as an intentional escalation of tactics.
McLaws' corps commander was Longstreet, the most senior of Lee's officers and effectively the second-in-command of the Army of Northern Virginia. Longstreet acknowledged the practice of seizing civilians and accommodated it. In sending orders to George Pickett, whose corps was bringing up the rear of the army, Longstreet, writing through his adjutant, G. Moxley Sorrel, sent word on July 1—the day the two armies first engaged each other—to move his troops toward Gettysburg. In closing he added, "the captured contrabands had better be brought along with you for further disposition."

"Further disposition" here refers to imprisonment, auction, enslavement, and (often) severe punishment at the hands of a former-and-once-again master.

McLaws' letter and the thirteen words closing Longstreet's order are damning, in that they show full well that the seizure and abduction of African Americans was, if not written policy, widely tolerated and made allowance for, even at the highest levels of the Confederate command structure. McLaws was a division commander, and Longstreet was second-in-command; while their words do not prove Lee knew and approved of this practice, it's hard to imagine he was unaware of it, and there's no evidence that he publicly objected to it, or made any effort to curtail it. My intent here is not to single out either McLaws or Longstreet alone for condemnation—the de facto policy did not originate with either—but to demonstrate that the forcible abduction of free African Americans and escaped slaves was known and tolerated throughout the Confederate army, from the lowest private to the most senior generals.

There are many questions, many aspects, of the Civil War that are legitimate sources of controversy and dispute. There are questions that serious historians will argue about as long as anyone remembers this conflict, saying that this politician's actions were justified by that event, or that general made the right decision because he didn't know those troops were on the other side of the river. The abduction of free blacks and escaped slaves from Maryland and Pennsylvania during the Gettysburg campaign is not one of those events. It cannot be justified, or rationalized, or denied. It can only be ignored.

But it shouldn't be.

https://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2010/08/we-have-received-provocation-enough/61276/
Appendix Timeline of Integration/Segregation

Timeline
Segregation, Massive Resistance & Naming J.E.B Stuart High School

May 17, 1954 - The U.S. Supreme Court rules in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, that segregation in schools is unconstitutional, but fails to explain how quickly and in what manner desegregation is to be achieved. The decision leads to the Massive Resistance movement in Virginia.

Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote in the unanimous opinion: "Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law, for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system. ... We conclude that, in the field of public education, the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." [Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas 347 U.S. 483 (1954) 349 U.S. 294 (1955)]


September 1954. The first FCPS secondary school for black students, Luther Jackson High School, opens. “Prior to this time, black students attended high school in Washington, DC or were transported to the Industrial School Of Manassas.” [Luther Jackson Middle School website, “History, 1954-Present”, http://www2.fcps.edu/LutherJacksonMS/history.html]

May 21, 1955 - The Winchester Evening Star reported on the results of a recently completed survey conducted by The Richmond News-Leader. The newspaper polled 1,368 “men and women, from all sections of the city.” The survey revealed that 92% of all white adults in Richmond favored segregation of public schools, 6% were opposed to segregation, and 2% were undecided. By contrast, 3% of “Negro” adults surveyed favored segregation in the public schools, 91% opposed segregation, and 6% were undecided.
May 31, 1955 - The U.S. Supreme Court issues a vague ruling outlining the implementation of desegregation required by their 1954 in *Brown v. the Board*. They noted that “Full implementation of these constitutional principles [in *Brown*] may require solution of varied local school problems” and that the responsibility for developing plans to solve those problems lie with the local school districts. The Supreme Court remanded to the local courts oversight of these plans and provide some direction to the localities. The Court further required a “prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance” with *Brown*, but did not impose an absolute deadline. [349 U.S. 294 (1955)]

July 18, 1955 – One of the cases remanded by the U.S. Supreme Court in its Brown II decision, was *Davis et al. v. County School Board of Prince Edward County et al.*. On July 18, 1955, a three-judge panel of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, entered its order requiring “admission of children ... on a nondiscriminatory basis with all deliberate speed as required by the decision of the Supreme Court in this cause." The court found that it would not be practicable to require that this provision be made effective before the commencement of the school term in September 1955; but the finality and binding force of the order was not otherwise affected. [149 F.Supp. 431 (1957) on http://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/FSupp/142/616/2263528/]


November 11, 1955 - Virginia state senator Garland Gray issues the report of a commission he chaired at the request of Governor Thomas B. Stanley. In the introduction, Gray wrote:

“Our modern public school system has been developed on a racially segregated basis and advancement of the Negro race has been a direct result of such a system. Without segregation, the white children would still be largely taught in private academies as they were in the early days of Virginia. Public schools would have made no progress and Negro children would have received little or no public education. Future judicial pronouncement and the attitudes of the Negroes themselves will largely determine whether in many parts of Virginia the clock will be turned back a century.

“It is now judicially asserted that Negro children lose something by being compelled to attend separate schools. The Supreme Court of the United States, however, gave no consideration to the adverse effect of integration on white children, although this was expressly called to the attention of the Court. This Commission believes that separate facilities in our public schools are in the best interest of both races, educationally and otherwise, and that compulsory integration should be resisted by all proper means in our power.” [Public Education Report of the Commission to the Governor of Virginia. Senate Document No. 1 (1955). Virginia Center for Digital

March 12, 1956 - In response to the Supreme Court’s decisions in Brown v. Board of Education, 101 U.S. Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from the eleven states of the old Confederacy—including the entire Louisiana congressional delegation—signed what became known as the “Southern Manifesto.” The manifesto characterized the “unwarranted” Brown decision as a “clear abuse of judicial power.” “We pledge ourselves to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision which is contrary to the Constitution and to prevent the use of force in its implementation.” U.S. Senator Harry F. Byrd helped to author the "Southern Manifesto." [Federal Judicial Center. History of the Judiciary page. http://www.fjc.gov/history/home.nsf/page/tu_bush_doc_6.html Document Source: U.S. Congress, Congressional Record, 84th Cong., 2d sess., 1956, 102, pt. 4: 4515–16.]


The Pupil Placement Board was charged with assigning, enrolling, or placing students to and in public schools. Pupil placement was a task formerly under the control of school boards and division superintendents. The board’s authorizing legislation required members to take several factors into consideration when placing a pupil in a school. Factors included but were not limited to the health of the pupil, his or her aptitudes, the availability of transportation, and, "such other relevant matters as may be pertinent to the efficient operation of the schools or indicate a clear and present danger to the public peace and tranquility affecting the safety or welfare of the citizens of such school district." [Library of Virginia. “Historical Information,” Records of the Virginia Pupil Placement Board, 1957-1966. http://ead.lib.virginia.edu/vivaxtf/view?docId=lva/vi02003.xml]

**November 11, 1957** - The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals orders integration of the Prince Edward County Schools "without further delay." But the Prince Edward County School Board wins a stay of this order pending appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, which turns down the appeal and returns the case to District Judge Sterling Hutcheson to set a precise timetable. [Allen, et al., v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia, et al., 249 F.2d 462 (4th Cir. 1957). http://openjurist.org/249/f2d/462/allen-v-county-school-board-of-prince-edward-county-virginia]

**March 18, 1958** – Fairfax County School Board meeting minutes refer to construction of Munson Hill High School (MHHS) and a “deed of dedication” for an access road to MHHS. [https://insys.fcps.edu/schoolboardapps/ArchivedSBMinutes/1950-1959/19580318s.pdf]

**April 15, 1958** – FCPS Superintendent W.T. Woodson presented a memorandum to members of the school board suggesting the renaming of Franconia High School to Lee High School to “promote better community spirit and cooperation...” The suggestion “elicited exchanges of critical comments about the resurrection of a matter which had been covered at several other meetings and had been conceded to have been settled.”

School Board member Mr. Lory proposed that MHHS be renamed Stonewall Jackson High School (among several other name changes proposed). That motion failed.

Subsequently, School Board member Mr. Solomon moved that the board take up at its next meeting that future high schools be named after prominent Americans. [Fairfax County Public Schools Board. Meeting Minutes for “special meeting” held April 15, 1958. https://insys.fcps.edu/schoolboardapps/ArchivedSBMinutes/1950-1959/19580415s.pdf]

**May 6, 1958** – The issue of renaming Franconia High School sparked a contentious discussion involving members of the public as well as the school board and superintendent. Hilliard Higgins, president of the Springfield Forest Civic Association, complained that the School Board’s re-consideration of the school had created “dissension and controversy” in the
community and noted that “the Superintendent’s recommendation that the name change was out of order. ... Mr. Woodson said his recommendation concerning the change of the school name was made in all good faith and for the interests of school unity and harmony, and not because of any pressure on him by anyone.” Later in the School Board minutes of this meeting: “Mr. Fred Moran, of the Springfield Forest Civic Association, read to the Board a letter received by the Association from the Superintendent, dated January 10, 1958, which explains that the Springfield Estates School was named for the community, as is common practice, especially where land is donated by the developer of a particular subdivision, rather than the name suggested by his Association, to bring home his point that the same should apply to naming of the high school for its location in Franconia.”

The motion of School Board Member Mr. Solomon, offered at the April 15, 1958, meeting – that all future new high schools, under construction and proposed, shall be named for some prominent American, now deceased,” carried on a 4-3 vote. [Fairfax County Public Schools Board. Meeting Minutes for “regular meeting” held May 6, 1958. https://insys.fcps.edu/schoolboardapps/ArchivedSBMinutes/1950-1959/19580506r.pdf ]

September 4, 1958 - Governor J. Lindsay Almond Jr. divests superintendents of Virginia schools of their authority to integrate their schools; he also advises that if they go against his order they will be found in violation of Virginia laws. [Encyclopedia Virginia, entry for J. Lindsay Almond Jr. [http://www.encyclopediavirginia.org/Almond_James_Lindsay_Jr_1898-1986#start_entry]


September 27, 1958 – In a letter to the Norfolk School Board, Governor J. Lindsay Almond Jr. declares that schools in that city “closed and are removed from the public school system.” The letter is in defiance of an order by the federal district court mandating integration. [Letter to Dr. J.J. Brewbaker, Norfolk Superintendent of Norfolk City Schools and members of the School Board. http://dc.lib.odu.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/sdinv/id/3328/rec/37]
October 7, 1958 – School Board Member Mr. Solomon moved the revocation of the Board’s policy, adopted at its May 6, 1958, meeting, for naming future high schools and reverting to earlier policy of naming schools for the “community location.” Ultimately, the motion was withdrawn. School Board Member Mr. Davis, who had moved to table Solomon’s motion, then moved to name “the high school under construction in the Munson Hill area” as JEB Stuart High School. The motion passed. [Minutes of the Fairfax County School Board, October 7, 1958. https://insys.fcps.edu/schoolboardapps/ArchivedSBMinutes/1950-1959/19581007r.pdf ]


January 19, 1959 - The Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, on a 5-2 vote, determines that the General Assembly’s legislation closing integrated schools and cutting off state funds violated the state constitution. [Harrison v. Day, 200 Va. 439. https://www.courtlistener.com/opinion/1328174/harrison-v-day/]

February 2, 1959 - Seventeen black students in Norfolk – who became known as the ‘Norfolk 17’ – peacefully enroll in white schools. [http://dc.lib.odu.edu/cdm/norfolk17/collection/sdinv/]

February 2, 1959 – Arlington’s Stratford Junior High School (now H-B Woodlawn High School) integrated with the admission of four black students with over 100 Arlington County police officers in riot gear standing guard. [http://blogs.weta.org/boundarystones/2013/02/02/it-happened-here-first-arlington-students-integrate-virginia-schools]

May 5, 1959 – After years of stalling, the U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals overturns U.S. District Judge Sterling Hutcheson’s ruling in the case of segregated schools in Prince Edward County and orders Prince Edward to integrate its schools by September 1, 1959. “Other communities in the state have taken steps to meet the question and solve it, whereas in Prince Edward County the school authorities have taken no effective action whatsoever during the four years since the second decision in Brown v. Board of Education was rendered, and even today contemplate no action in the future. Under these circumstances, it is incumbent upon this Court to take steps to give effect to the mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States.” NAACP and Prince Edward County lawyers will continue to fight in court over desegregation of the schools for the next five years. [Allen v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia. 266 F. 2d 507. http://openjurist.org/266/f2d/507/Allen-v-County-School-Board-of-Prince-Edward-County-Va]

August 1959 – Twenty-six black students in FCPS petition for transfers to all-white schools. Three are rejected by the county on technicalities. The remaining 23 were forwarded without recommendation to Richmond to the Virginia State Pupil Placement Board. All 23 requests were denied, “along with every petition from other jurisdictions.” On September 20, 1960, a federal judge ordered Fairfax County to admit some of the previously denied black students to all-white schools. [Duke, Daniel L. Education Empire: The Evolution of an Excellent Suburban School System. 2005, Albany: State University of New York Press. P. 19. https://www.sunypress.edu/pdf/61145.pdf]


September 1959 – JEB Stuart High School opens.


September 1961 – JEB Stuart High School admits first black students

April 11, 1964 – Fairfax County Makes the Decision to close one of its six segregated schools.

April 11, 1964 Washington Post, “Fairfax County Decides to Close One of its Six All-Negroe [sic] Schools”

Fairfax County Decides to Close One of Its Six All-Negroe Schools

Fairfax County’s School Board Thursday decided to close one of its six all-Negro elementary schools and eliminate the seventh and eighth grades from the County’s only all-Negro secondary school.

All students involved in the changes will be reassigned to desegregated schools for the 1964-65 school year.

The unanimous board decision is a major step in the direction of total integration of the County’s schools.

Board members suggested that more such moves will follow by endorsing a statement affirming “the goal of establishing school attendance areas strictly on a geographical basis.”

The school to be closed is Oak Grove Elementary on the Loudoun County boundary. Its 59 students will be reassigned to three neighboring schools. It is the first all-Negro school to be closed by the School Board.

The Board also announced the closing next year of the seventh grade at Luther Jackson Intermediate and High School. The School’s eighth grade thus will be eliminated in 1965-66. The students will be moved to intermediate schools in the areas where they live.

Reassignement of these students represents a step beyond the Board’s established principle of school integration by acceptance of transfer applications. Under the transfer system, students have had to apply for permission to enter other schools.

But students affected by last night’s decision will be transferred automatically by the Board without need for application.

After Luther Jackson’s intermediate grades are closed, the school will be converted in “due time” to a regular secondary school “enrolling students without regard to race,” the Board said.

The Board also indicated that Oak Grove might some day be reopened on an integrated basis “as the surrounding area becomes more populous.”
To Integrate School System

By Lon Tucker
Staff Reporter

The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals issued a mandate that Fairfax County is operating "system" and ordered a prompt on the decision finding that the County runs a dual school system.

The decision overturned a March 4 ruling by Federal District Judge Oren R. Lewis that the school system is not discriminatory in its assignments.

The three-judge panel left unclear exactly when the ruling is to be implemented but suggested that some of the issues can be resolved "with finality" in time for the reopening of school in September.

More Expected

With further appeals considered unlikely, the School Board is expected to move promptly toward its stated long-range goal of total integration. Fairfax has been moving gradually toward desegregation, but still operates seven all-Negro schools for 2100 pupils.

The ruling came only one day after the judges heard oral arguments in the dispute from lawyers for the School Board and the NAACP.

Sitting in Asheville, N.C., the judges issued a mandate to Judge Lewis to order "forthwith" that:
- Boundaries of County school attendance areas be re-districted on a strictly geographic basis, which probably will lead to desegregation of all-Negro schools.
- Teachers be hired and assigned without regard to race, a policy which conforms with a decision made by the School Board in December.

Motion Requested

Headed by Chief Judge Simon E. Sobeloff of Baltimore, the tribunal also told the NAACP to file "at once" a motion contesting the School Board's refusal in April to reassign 48 Negroes to previously all-white schools. Another 22 such requests had been granted by the Board.

In the one-page opinion, the judges said they "are satisfied" that Judge Lewis will "cooperate" by allowing a hearing within 15 days of the motion.

After learning of the decision, School Board Attorney James Keith said it "probably will not be appealed to the United States Supreme Court."

Keith commented, "the School Board only operates schools, it is not engaged in massive resistance."

School Board Chairman William Hooifagle declined to comment on the ruling before receiving an interpretation from Keith.

Yesterday's decision will legally impose on the Fairfax schools the total abolition of racial barriers that they had been moving toward gradually, first under court order and then on their own initiative.

Desegregation began in 1960, and this year 428 of the County's 2529 Negro pupils were in desegregated schools. The School Board agreed recently to close one of six all-Negro elementary schools and to phase out the 7th and 8th grades of the County's all-Negro Luther Jackson High School over a two-year period.

In addition to the integration question, some Board members and citizens have criticized the expense of maintaining small, under-capacity Negro schools, which an NAACP attorney has said cost an extra million.

Judge Sobeloff was joined in the opinion by Judge Clement F. Hainesworth of Greenville, S.C., and Judge J. Spencer Bell of Greensboro, N.C.
Fairfax Unit Pushes Plan On Schools

By Muriel Quinn
Staff Reporter

Fairfax County officials, who have maintained a wait-and-see policy on school desegregation, are under increasing pressure to take some sort of action.

The newest pressure is coming from the powerful and influential Federation of Citizens Associations, which is circulating a draft resolution among its member bodies calling on the county to adopt a program of gradual school desegregation.

Earlier the Council of Parent-Teacher Associations asked the school board to guarantee teachers' salaries for a full year in the event some county schools are closed down under the state's anti-integration laws.

Drafted by a School Committee headed by Boris N. Mandrovsy, the Citizens Association Federation desegregation resolution will probably come before the membership for a vote during a special meeting next month.

Until now, the Committee report stated, the waiting game has been reasonable. But the county should act to escape the fate of its neighbors and the "far-reaching economic consequences" of closed schools.

The resolution urges all eligible residents to register in order to vote on any referendum on the school issue.

It urges opposition to the adoption of any measure which would weaken the General Assembly's obligation to maintain public schools.

The committee said that under Supreme Court rulings, there appears no way of maintaining segregated public schools. Consequently it is far better to have a planned program of desegregation over a period of years than to have spot desegregation determined by court action.

The resolution calls for desegregation to begin at a set date in the first grade, and to progress at the rate of one grade a year.

The statement of policy has two more points. The School Board should seek an injunction against the enforcement of massive resistance laws which would close the county schools should they be desegregated. If court action is instituted against the School Board, the Board should move to have the Governor and any other State officials responsible, made party to the litigation.
Athletic Race
Bar Charged
In Fairfax

By Lon Tuck
Staff Reporter

Boys from Fairfax County's predominantly Negro community, Gum Springs, have been turned away from neighboring baseball leagues, the Fairfax County Council on Human Relations said yesterday.

In a letter to officials of the County and the leagues, Council President J. Sidney Holland called for "constructive and neighborly" negotiations on the problem.

"Within the past few weeks," Holland said, "six or eight Gum Springs boys have sought unsuccessfully to play with the Fort Hunt Athletic Association and the Woodley Hills Junior Baseball Clubs.

In each case, Holland wrote, the applications were rejected because the boys "purportedly lived beyond the geographic boundaries of the leagues. Holland maintained that the boundaries come "virtually to the edge of Gum Springs but are "gerrymandered" around it.

The Woodley Hills teams play at the Whitman Intermediate School, which is attended by Gum Springs youths, he said.
Virginia Study Unit Head Challenges Congressmen on Segregation Plan

By Robert E. Baker
Staff Writer

The chairman of the Perrow Commission put two Southside Virginia Congressmen on the spot yesterday and they retorted with sharp criticism of the Commission's secrecy.

The controversy started when State Sen. Mosby C. Perrow of Lynchburg invited Virginia's congressional delegation to appear at a public hearing Friday to present ideas on how to restore complete school segregation.

Although Perrow maintained the invitations were simply a matter of courtesy, it was obvious they were aimed primarily at Rep. Watkins M. Abbit and Rep. William M. Tuck of the Fourth and Fifth Congressional Districts, respectively.

Tuck and Abbit have been particularly outspoken against any desegregation, and petitions calling for restoration of the State's "inviable position of no integration" have been widely circulated in their Southside districts.

Perrow's invitation appeared to be a challenge to Tuck and Abbit to present a valid "no integration" plan, or keep quiet.

The petitions, specifically referred to in the invitation, also have been widely circulated in the Seventh District of Rep. Burr P. Harrison.

Most of the congressional delegation declined the invitation and pointed out it would be inappropriate for Congressmen to interfere in State matters.

But Tuck accused Perrow of conducting a "sub rosa" government by "holding secret meetings for weeks under the protection of armed guards."

He also accused Perrow of supporting desegregation by "his so-called program of 'con-

tainment' which the people of Virginia recognize for what it is—a subterfuge and another name for integration."

Neither Tuck nor Abbit said whether or not they would attend. Harrison said he would not, and added this note to Perrow about the petitions among his constituents:

"I had always understood, however, that they (constituents) do have the right to petition the General Assembly for redress of their grievances, as they see them, without having their petitions referred to Congress for solution."

The Perrow Commission was appointed by Gov. J. Lindsay Almond to recommend a long-range program for dealing with desegregation after the state's "massive resistance" laws were invalidated and Negroes entered white schools in Norfolk, Arlington and Alexandria.

In other developments:
- Directors of the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce called for the continued operation of a public school system in Virginia as essential to the economic welfare of the county.
- Three more attorneys lodged assaults on the State Supreme Court's ruling that the General Assembly is required to operate a public school system under the State Constitution.
April 1959

Fairfax Negroes Seek School Entry

By Robert E. Baker
Staff Writer

Two Negro children have applied to enter white elementary schools in Fairfax County at the beginning of the September term.

School officials announced that the applications would be sent along with all others to the State Pupil Placement Board in Richmond.

Neither Fairfax elected officials nor School Board members expressed surprise at the applications filed by the Negro boys who are applying for the first grade.

One seeks to enter 450-pupil Belvedere School on Columbia Pike near Lake Barcroft; the other has applied to the 400-pupil Flint Hill School near Vienna.

Their parents made the applications during preschool registration a few days ago and the School Board met in executive session Monday night to discuss them.

The Board has frequently discussed policy in executive sessions and has taken no action publicly. But it has adopted assignment criteria similar to those used by the Arlington School Board and has decided to consider each case on its merits.

Chairman Merion S. Parsons said he would not call a special Board meeting but assumed the applications will be discussed at the regular meeting Tuesday night.

He said the applications would be forwarded to others to the State Pupil Placement Board.

That Board was created by the anti-integration session of the 1956 General Assembly at part of Virginia’s “massive resistance” program. It took assignment powers away from local boards and, to date, has not assigned any Negroes to white schools.

The State Board has been ignored by Federal courts in desegregation cases while other “massive resistance” laws existed.

Its supporters claim that it cannot now be ignored since other “massive resistance” have been invalidated. The recent Assembly action enacted a local assignment plan, as a local option to the State Pupil Placement Act, but it will not become effective until next March.

The State Board, meanwhile, is being used as a defense by Newport News and Richmond in pending desegregation cases and rulings on its validity are expected soon.

Fairfax has a total school enrollment of 48,407—of 1973, about four percent are Negro.

Last February, the powerful Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations adopted unanimously a resolution asking the School Board to institute a gradual desegregation program before any court action is brought.

The Board has recommended a 12-year program beginning with the first year.

In another development, the Arlington School Board asked the County Board to establish a $150,000 fund for scholarships for Negroes for the next school year under Virginia’s new “Freedom of Choice” program dealing with school desegregation.

Arlington School Supt. Ray E. Rudel said the fund would be used to pay the county’s share of $150,000—already attending established private schools and an estimated 600 others who would choose private schooling rather than attend desegregated schools.

A survey of Alexandria, Falls Church and Fairfax school officials showed they were still studying the law which requires localities to set up scholarship funds for private schooling entirely divorced from public school appropriations.

The new $150,000 appropriation would equal a 4-cent increase in Arlington’s tax rate. But Edgar D. Smith, Director of Finance, said he was virtually certain the amount could be absorbed in the budget without increasing taxes.
Virginia’s Road Back

As the work of the recent special session of the Virginia General Assembly takes on perspective, the really significant thing is not the details of the legislation passed but the change of attitude. There is plenty of room for doubts about mischievous results of particular aspects of the Perrow program, much of which as enacted by the Assembly will not take effect until March, 1960. The program is in no sense one of broad school integration (nor is that required by the courts), and it is questionable whether there will be any wholesale readjustment in the public schools which proceed with desegregation.

The public policy of Virginia, however, has evolved from defiance to compliance, from massive resistance to acknowledgment of the supremacy of Federal law. In the last analysis legislators looked at the values of public education as a state responsibility and decided that they could not be sacrificed even under pressure of strong emotion. This is a truly historic change, the long-range meaning of which will not be diminished by transient delays and frustrations such as may attend the new desegregation appeal in Fairfax County because of the still cumbersome state machinery.

In all of this the Senators and Delegates who voted to enact the Perrow program deserve great credit for putting into legislation what many privately had long recognized was necessary. Governor Almond, though he may not welcome praise from this source, deserves even more credit. At considerable risk to his own political future he broke with the Bryd organization stalwarts and Southside Virginia to lead the state along the course of reality. What he did is far more important than anything he said as concession to the extremists.

In providing a way for communities to remove the stigma of a racial bar to public school admission, the Governor and the Assembly have achieved something that will have influence well outside the Old Dominion. Virginia has recognized, even if under protest, that to spile the courts would be to spile itself and would therefore be a lost cause. This recognition cannot but produce eventual profound repercussions throughout the South and gratification throughout the Nation.
State Asks Court To Deny Review In DeFebio Case

RICHMOND — The U. S. Supreme Court has been asked by the state of Virginia to deny Mrs. Theo DeFebio of Fairfax a review of her case testing the constitutionality of the state’s Pupil Placement Act.

Atty. Gen. A. S. Harrison Jr., said in a brief filed with the high court yesterday that changes made in the act by the 1958 General Assembly have rendered the question raised by Mrs. DeFebio out of date.

In addition, Harrison contended Mrs. DeFebio has nothing to complain about because she is white and her children were assigned to a white school.

Mrs. DeFebio brought suit last year against the Fairfax County School board and various state agencies to test whether she was required to sign placement forms for her two sons. When she refused to sign the forms, the children were expelled from school.

The Virginia Supreme Court turned down her suit on grounds that, as a white parent of white children, she had no reason to complain that the Placement Act was for the purpose of racial segregation. She appealed to the U. S. Supreme Court.

Mrs. DeFebio’s attorney, based much of their argument on the wording of the act which called for pupil placement to maintain “efficient operation” of the state’s public schools. The lawyers contend the word “efficient” was defined elsewhere in the law to mean “segregated.”

The references to “efficient” operation of the schools was eliminated from the law by the 1958 Legislature which also made other changes in the Placement Act.
Senate Hits Marines Cut

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Senate voted yesterday in tie-up to increase funds to reduce marines to strength in 200,000.

The unanimous vote was followed a similar move Wednesday to reverse a reversal of marines cut.

"With actual and potential cutting being worked by the Koweit, the Middle East and the Far East," Senator Mansfield (D-Mont.) told the Senate, "this is not time for our nation to weaken its defense."

The issue is headed now for a Senate-House conference.

Virginia County Desegregation Target

ARLINGTON, Va. (UPI) — A Virginia suburban area across the Potomac River from Washington was made the target yesterday of a new drive for school desegregation.

Attorney Otto L. Tucker of Alexandria, Va., said as many as 30 Negro students would seek to enrol in white schools in Fairfax County next September for the first time.

It posed the possibility of new court action toward desegregation in Virginia where the legislature last week complied a new local-option type of "freedom of choice" program to deal with school integration.

Arlington and Alexandria, Neth Virginia cities near Washington, admitted Negroes to previously white schools last February, along with Norfolk, Va.

Thirty-one Negroes have quietly attended former all-white public schools in the three localities since then.

Five other Negro students also asked to enter still-segregated schools in Arlington and Alexandria next fall.

Fairfax County School Board Chairman Morten S. Petersen said the Negroes' requests for transfer to white schools would be forwarded to the Virginia Pupil Placement Board in Richmond, a three-member state agency which heretofore has assigned students on a segregated basis.

Tucker said he would ask Federal District Judge Albert Bryan to require Alexandria school board to admit the new applicants to Alexandria schools.
New Integration Drive Hits Virginia Schools

ARLINGTON, Va. — UPI — Another Virginia suburb across the Potomac River from Washington was made the target yesterday of a new drive for school desegregation.

Attorney Otto L. Tucker of Alexandria, Va., said as many as 50 Negro students would seek to enroll in white schools in Fairfax County next September for the first time.

It posed the possibility of new court action toward desegregation in Virginia where the legislature last week completed a new lingerie type "freedom of choice" program to deal with school integration.

Arlington and Alexandria, both Washington areas and neighbors of Fairfax County, admitted Negroes to previously white schools last February, along with Norfolk, Va.

Thirty-one Negroes have quietly attended formerly all-white public schools in the three localities since then.

Five other Negro students also asked to enter still-segregated schools in Arlington and Alexandria next fall.

Fairfax County School Board Chairman Merton S. Persons said the Negroes' requests for transfer to white schools would be forwarded to the Virginia Pupil Placement Board in Richmond, a three-member state agency which heretofore has assigned students on a segregated basis.

Tucker, who was successful in getting 10 Negroes admitted to three Alexandria schools in February, said he would ask Federal District Judge Albert Bryan to require the Alexandria school board to admit the four new applicants to Alexandria schools.
Fairfax County Is Newest Va. Integration Site

RICHMOND, Va. (UPI) — Virginia’s newest battleground over school integration is Fairfax County, a teeming suburban area just across the Potomac River from Washington.

Negro attorney Otto L. Tucker of Alexandria disclosed Thursday that as many as 30 Negro children will seek to enter previously white schools in Fairfax County next September for the first time.

Tucker said the applications will be made for two high schools and five elementary schools in Fairfax, a neighbor of Arlington and Alexandria which bowed last February to court-ordered integration.

Norfolk also admitted 17 Negroes to six white schools in February and desegregation suits are pending against Richmond, Newport News and Prince Edward County.

NAACP attorneys have indicated an integration attempt also will be made next fall in southwest Virginia in an unnamed county.

Fairfax School Board Chairman Merion S. Persons said the Negroes’ request for assignment to white classes would be sent to the State Pupil Placement Board in Richmond, a three-member agency which has made all of its assignments in the past on a segregated basis.

The placement board is under attack in the Richmond and Newport News suits and likely will be challenged if Tucker goes to the courts to force the admission of the Negro children in Fairfax.

Four new applications by Negroes to Alexandria white schools have been rejected by the city school board and Tucker, who also represents the plaintiffs in this case, said he would seek a federal court injunction to force the board to reverse its ruling.
Board Adopts
School Plan
In Fairfax

FAIRFAX, Va. (AP) — The
Fairfax County School Board to-
day adopted a school desegrega-
tion plan which it said will be put
into effect when the county re-
eceives authority to handle pupil
assignments.

The board, meeting in closed
session, declined to disclose any
details. Board Chairman Sidney
S. Solomon said the plan will not
be disclosed at this time because
"it will be in the best interest
of the county not to do so."

Today's action apparently will
have no effect on the application
of 26 Negro students to enter
white schools here in September.
Solomon said the board intends
to follow state law, which places
the power to assign students in
the hands of the State Placement
Board.

The state board has rejected the
applications of the 26 Negroes.

Under the recently adopted Pe-
row "freedom of choice" legisla-
tion, Negro students are scheduled to
get back the power to assign
their own pupils next March.

Attorneys for the Negro appli-
cants have threatened court action
in an attempt to have the Negroes
admitted to schools if the school
board will not admit them.

Solomon said he hopes "any-
thing we do will reduce court suits
or any other type of action" but
that details of the plan will not
be disclosed unless the board is
ordered to do so by the courts.

Solomon declined to say why
board members feel it would be
in the best interest of the county to
keep the plan secret for the time
being.

The board has met several
times in recent weeks on the seg-
geration problem, and it is known
they have discussed several plans.
Among these were assignment
plans used in other Virginia areas
which set up criteria for judging
Negro transfer applications, such
as geographic location, achieve-
ment, overcrowding of schools,
psychological factors and others.
Another plan discussed was one
recommended by the Civic Federa-
tion which would provide for de-
segregation one grade each year,
beginning with the first grade.
Fairfax Adopts Integrated School Plan

FAIRFAX, Va. (AP) — The Fairfax County School Board today adopted a school desegregation plan which it said will be put into effect when the county receives authority to handle pupil assignments.

The board, meeting in closed session, declined to disclose any details. Board Chairman Sidney S. Solomon said the plan will not be disclosed at this time because “it will be in the best interest of the county not to do so.”

Today’s action apparently will have no effect on the applications of 26 Negro students to enter white schools here in September. Solomon said the board intends to follow state law, which places the power to assign students in the hands of the State Placement Board.

The state board has rejected the applications of the 26 Negroes.

Under the recently adopted Prewar “freedom of choice” legislation, facilities are scheduled to get back the power to assign their own pupils next March.

Attorneys for the Negro applicants have threatened court action in an attempt to have the Negroes admitted to schools if the school board will not admit them.

Solomon said he hopes “anything we do will reduce court suits or any other type of action” but that details of the plan will not be disclosed unless the board is ordered to do so by the courts.

Solomon declined to say why board members feel it would be in the best interest of the county to keep the plan secret for the time being.

The board has met several times in recent weeks on the segregation problem, and it is known they have discussed several plans. Among these were assignment plans used in other Virginia areas which set up criteria for judging Negro transfer applications, such as geographic location, achievement, overcrowding of schools, psychological factors and others.

Another plan discussed was one recommended by the Civic Federation which would provide for desegregation one grade each year, beginning with the first grade.

NEW TUBES ARE RUGGED

NEW YORK (AP) — The need for more compact and rugged electronic equipment has produced tiny electron tubes that can operate in a furnace at 800 degrees Fahrenheit as well as in liquid nitrogen at 320 degrees below zero Fahrenheit.

The thimble-size tubes called “Nuvistor” were developed by RCA to withstand shock and heat changes in space flight. They are expected to have extensive use in missiles, jets and military communications equipment.
Negroes Apply For Enrollment

FAIRFAX, Va. (UPI)—Twenty-six Negro students today filed suit in federal district court asking admission to eight white schools in Fairfax County, just across the Potomac River from Washington. NAACP attorney Frank D. Reeves of Washington, who represents the students, asked Federal District Judge Albert V. Bryan of Alexandria to order immediate enrollment of 20 of the Negro students in elementary schools and 6 others in high school.

It marked the first court suit against Fairfax County which has drawn up a voluntary desegregation but has steadfastly refused to reveal its contents.

The 26 students had applied earlier for admission to Fairfax white schools but were turned down by the controversial state pupil placement board in Richmond.

Reeves, in his suit, asked Bryan to order the Fairfax County School Board, should it request a delay in the case, to submit within 10 days a "complete and comprehensive plan for a prompt and reasonable start" toward desegregation.
26 Negroes Ask Admission To Fairfax School

FAIRFAX, Va. (UPI)—Twenty-six Negro students Thursday filed suit in federal district court asking admission to eight white schools in Fairfax County, just across the Potomac River from Washington. NAACP attorney Frank D. Reeves of Washington, who represents the students, asked Federal District Judge Albert V. Bryan of Alexandria to order immediate enrollment of 20 of the Negro students in elementary schools and 6 others in high school.

It marked the first court suit against Fairfax County which has drawn up a voluntary desegregation plan but has steadfastly refused to reveal its contents.

The 26 students had applied earlier for admission to Fairfax white schools but were turned down by the controversial state pupil placement board in Richmond.

Reeves, in his suit, asked Bryan in order the Fairfax County School Board, should it request a delay in the case, to submit within 10 days a "complete and comprehensive plan for a prompt and reasonable start" toward desegregation.

Reeves said the only grounds for delaying September enrollment of the 26 Negro students would be "evidence relating to problems of administration."

Judge Tells School Boards They Must Justify Refusing 42 Negroes
Arlington And Fairfax Cited

ALEXANDRIA, Va. — U. S. District Judge Albert V. Bryan Wednesday told the Arlington and Fairfax County School Boards they must justify their refusal to admit 42 Negroes to white schools in the two counties.

In the Arlington case, where 18 Negroes applying to white and desegregated schools were rejected by the State Pupil Placement Board, Bryan told the school board to report its own action on the applications.

In the Fairfax case, where 26 Negroes also were denied admission to white schools by the state board, the judge ordered the local board to file an answer to the Negroes' request for immediate entry pending outcome of the suit.

Will File Monday

James H. Simmonds, attorney for the Fairfax School Board, and Frank D. Reeves, attorney for the Negroes, said the report and answer will be filed Monday.

Reeves asked Bryan for a prompt hearing on the two suits, but the judge said his docket "is already built up with cases of similar urgency." He said he couldn't be "too rosy" about an early hearing.

Reeves told the court: "Meanwhile, these children are not in school. We have the immediate problem of where they shall go."

Bryan replied that it is "optional with them whether they shall not go to any school or whether they shall accept their present assignment.

He indicated, as he has in similar cases, that their entry into Negro schools would not prejudice their case.

The delay apparently means that the Negroes will not enter any white school in Fairfax County this fall.

Reeves' argument in both cases was that under Bryan's rulings the local school boards are responsible for assigning pupils.
Grade-A-Year Desegregation Plan Outlined

ALEXANDRIA, Va. — A grade-a-year desegregation plan has been outlined by the Fairfax County School Board that would admit first and second grade Negroes in the 1960-61 school year and add another grade each succeeding year.

In papers filed yesterday with Federal District Judge Albert V. Bryan, the board said it would not oppose admission of three Negro children to previously all-white schools. But it said it would oppose admission of 27 other Negroes who also applied for entrance to white schools.

Each application, the board said, will be considered on grounds such as educational needs, availability of school facilities and effect on orderly administration of school involved. Race would not be a factor except in the gradual desegregation plan, the board said.

The board said it ruled against most of the 27 Negro children on the grounds they were not first or second-graders.

Unopposed were the admission of Gerald R. Belz and Raynard Wheeler, both of Annandale, who would be admitted to Belvedere Elementary School, and Gwendolyn Brooks of Vienna, who would go to Cedar Lane School.
Judge Bryan Voids Fairfax County 12-Year Plan

Local conditions ruled key factor

ALEXANDRIA, Va. — Federal Judge Albert V. Bryan Thursday threw out the grade-a-year plan okayed by Fairfax County School Board, ruling that "local conditions" determine the rate of speed at which a school system can be integrated.

Following the ruling, the school board announced it would admit 19 more colored pupils, previously rejected because they were not in the first or second grades, as soon as possible.

The ruling affects six formerly white schools. Groveton High will admit one; Bryant...

Bomb shelter will form half of new Arkansas school

MORRILTON, Ark. — When the Menifee School, destroyed by a tornado last May, is rebuilt it will have a shelter area capable of withstanding not only tornadoes, but A-bombs as well.

The school board, state board of education and civic defense have agreed to share the cost of a $330,000 model structure, half of which - 11,500 square feet - will be underground, encased in concrete which will be blast-resistant and capable of withstanding nuclear fallout.

It will have an independent air-conditioning and heating system, an emergency power plant and a special air-filtering system. Civil defense will display the school as a model for other districts.

Intermediate, two; Lanier Intermediate, one; Parklawn, one; Hollin Hall, two; and D...
Appendix The confederate Flag

Confederate flag debate: A state-by-state roundup

By Eric Bradner, CNN
Updated 2:35 PM ET, Tue June 30, 2015

Story highlights

Debate over the Confederate flag has led several Southern states to re-think their use

South Carolina's legislature will vote on removing the flag from capitol grounds next week

Washington (CNN) South Carolina's legislature has enough votes to remove the Confederate flag from its Capitol grounds, a survey of lawmakers by The Charleston Post and Courier shows.

It's a strong indication that the state's House and Senate will vote next week to remove the flag -- ending a decades-long fight that was renewed after the racially motivated shootings of nine African-Americans in a Charleston church.

RELATED: Reining in symbols of the Confederacy: How far would you go?

But the debate over the Confederate flag's public display will continue: The Ku Klux Klan is holding a rally at South Carolina's capitol on July 18 to protest the flag's removal.

The Confederate flag's appearance at statehouses, within state flags and in other government imagery has led to a flurry of action in several southern states. Here's a look at where things stand in each:

Alabama

Gov. Robert Bentley ordered that four Confederate flags be removed from a monument on the state's capitol grounds last week -- a move that came after a Democratic lawmaker filed a bill that would have done just that.

But 1,000 flag supporters rallied at the Statehouse on Saturday, flying hundreds of Confederate flags and claiming its removal is an affront to their southern heritage.
Georgia

Gov. Nathan Deal's administration late last week halted the use of specialty license plates created by the state for the Sons of Confederate Veterans that featured the Confederate flag.

Mississippi

State House Speaker Philip Gunn said last week that the state's current flag -- which features the Confederate stars and stripes in its upper left corner -- should be changed. But Mississippi voted in a 2001 referendum to keep the Confederate flag in place as part of its state flag. Lawmakers are unlikely to change it until a new legislative session begins in January.

South Carolina

The state legislature will begin debate over bills to remove the flag from capitol grounds in a special session that begins on July 6 -- and in addition to the Post and Courier's survey, there's political momentum behind the flag's removal: Gov. Nikki Haley and a cadre of other top GOP officials have also called for it to be taken down.

Fifteen years ago, South Carolina moved the Confederate flag from atop its statehouse to a monument in front of the building. As part of that move, the state put in place a requirement that two-thirds of its lawmakers approve before it's moved again.

Tennessee

Gov. Bill Haslam has said the Confederate flag should be removed from Tennessee's Sons of Confederate Veterans specialty license plates. But proposals to end the specialty plates, at least, won't be discussed until the state legislature meets again early next year.

Haslam has also called for the state to remove a bust of Confederate General Nathan Bedford Forrest, a Ku Klux Klan founder and slave trader, from the Capitol.

Virginia

Gov. Terry McAuliffe ordered an end to Sons of Confederate Veterans specialty license plates that, like Georgia's and Tennessee's, featured the Confederate emblem.
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About The Stuart-Mosby Historical Society

The Stuart-Mosby Historical Society is a non-profit organization established to research and preserve accurate history and to perpetuate the memory and deeds of General J. E. B. Stuart and Colonel John S. Mosby. Perhaps the best description of the goals of the Society is given in the mission statement:

- To promote the study of the lives and military accomplishments of General J. E. B. Stuart and Colonel John S. Mosby.
- To share our knowledge of these officers with others through publications, talks, and appropriate ceremonies whenever and wherever possible.
- To honor General Stuart and Colonel Mosby annually on the anniversaries of their births.
- To preserve, promote and provide an accurate understanding of the history of Confederate arms, particularly the mounted arm.
- To secure, when possible, important artifacts that can be directly associated with General Stuart and Colonel Mosby.
- To ensure that the collected artifacts of the Society are preserved and held in a safe place that is accessible to members of the Society and reputable scholars.
- To work through all possible avenues to ensure that monuments, markers, artifacts, and public presentations on all aspects of Confederate history and arms are maintained and held in honor.
- To promote communication between members of the Society.
- To maintain a viable and active membership in the Society that is in full agreement with the above objectives.

The Society currently sponsors a Lee-Jackson-Maury Day Ceremony in the State Capitol in Richmond, Virginia on the Saturday closest to January 19. Ceremonies are held each February and December to mark the Birthdays of General Stuart and Colonel Mosby, respectively. The Society also holds an annual meeting each June. On numerous occasions, the Society offers a tour of sites of importance to the history of these Confederate officers. The Society maintains a collection of important artifacts and papers. A bimonthly newsletter, entitled "The Southern Cavalry Review" is published by the Society and is sent free of charge to members in good standing. Numerous members of the Society are authors of articles, books and papers relative to General Stuart and Colonel Mosby and the Society has also taken a direct hand in the publication of letters and notes from these men and republication of their books. When possible, publications are made available to members at attractive prices.

Members of the Society are encouraged to be active participants and to share in the fellowship and responsibilities of the Society. There are many opportunities to engage in historical work, Society business and meetings as well as represent the Society where needed. We want our members to feel welcome and to be part of the organization!

http://www.stuart-mosby.com/about-smhs
Reasons to Change the Name of the High School that Serves the Mason District

“J.E.B. Stuart” is not an appropriate name for a school for the following reasons:

Public buildings, especially schools, should and can inspire. Few young people in our community can identify with, or be inspired by, General Stuart.

- The initiative to rename our high school was begun by Stuart student leaders and their parents.
- The name does not reflect the values of our community. General Stuart fought and died defending the values of the Confederacy, including slavery, white supremacy and racism.
- A school named in honor of General Stuart sends the wrong messages to our students, our community and to the rest of our country.
- Stuart was named after an officer of the United States Army who, in defense of human slavery, took up arms against the United States, which Article III of the Constitution of the United States defines as “treason.” That war cost over 500,000 American lives.
- School Board regulations required that schools be named after American citizens; General Stuart renounced his citizenship in 1861 and was not a U.S. citizen when he died.
- The Fairfax County School Board, without polling the community, named this high school after a Confederate general as gesture of support for the Confederacy.
- While the name “Stuart” may have reflected the racial attitudes of the appointed School Board of the 1950s, it does not reflect the values of most of the elected School Board members of today.
- Many students at Stuart, and many members of our community and of Fairfax county are offended, embarrassed and dismayed by the School Boards’ decision to name and maintain a school named after General Stuart and would like to see the name changed.
- J.E.B. Stuart High School was intended for European Americans only, not for Asian Americans, Black Americans or brown-skinned Hispanic Americans.

A decision to change the name of our high school would present the School Board with opportunities to:

- Disavow and repudiate our county’s segregationist past.
- Honor a woman and/or person of color who made positive and enduring contributions to our community, state and country, a person whom all Virginians would honor. Moreover, such a decision would affirm that our community values and promotes gender and racial equality.
- Boost student morale and pride and inspire our students to achieve and to serve.
- Encourage a deeper and more comprehensive study and understanding of Virginia history.
- Encourage greater private financial support for our high school.
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