

**The Reconciliation of North and South After the War Between the States
as Symbolized by the Confederate Memorial "New South" in
Arlington National Cemetery**

by Gene Kizer, Jr.

I am respectfully submitting this paper to the honorable commissioners on the Advisory Committee on Arlington National Cemetery, the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, members of the United States Congress, and all others who cherish Arlington National Cemetery.

The Naming Commission, whose mission is to erase a big piece of American history pertaining to the Confederate era in the South, in its Final Report to Congress, Part III, September 2022, in the section "Confederate Memorial, Arlington National Cemetery," states that the Confederate Memorial "is within its remit."

That is an ERROR. The Confederate Memorial is not within the Naming Commission's remit. It does not "commemorate" the Confederate States of America as is required by law for the Naming Commission to have any say about the Confederate Memorial in Arlington National Cemetery.

The Confederate Memorial commemorates the reconciliation of the North and South, which Arlington National Cemetery, itself, clearly establishes multiple times in its National Register of Historic Places Registration Form received by the National Park Service February 24, 2014 and approved for the property's entry onto the National Register of Historic Places April 11, 2014.¹ This is beyond question.

The Confederate Memorial, which was encouraged and celebrated by North and South as well as Congress, three presidents and veterans on both sides, stands for our great country coming back together after our nation's bloodiest war in which 750,000 died and over a million were maimed out of a national population of 31 million. Contrast those casualties with World War II in which we lost around 400,000 out of a national population of 132 million.

¹ The National Register of Historic Places Registration Form under heading "1. Name of Property" lists the "historic name" as Arlington National Cemetery Historic District, and also under "other names/site number" lists: Arlington National Cemetery; DHR #000-0042. Under "4. National Park Service Certification" it states "I hereby certify that this property is: 'entered in the National Register.'" It is signed by Patrick Andrews above "Signature of the Keeper" on April 11, 2014.

The Confederate Memorial was the idea of Union Army sergeant and later president of the United States, William McKinley, whose desire was to reconcile our nation, bind up our wounds and move forward as Americans. Southerners had served with Northerners in the 1898 Spanish-American War including former Confederate General Joseph Wheeler who then was a United States Army general. He also served in the Philippine-American War.

It was obviously time to encourage those good feelings and formally reconcile by the symbolic act of a monument in our nation's most sacred burial ground, Arlington National Cemetery.

The significance of the memorial is huge and an important history lesson. The aforementioned National Register of Historic Places Registration Form states in Section 7, Page 25:

The organization's petition [UDC's petition] was granted on March 4, 1906, by Secretary of War William Howard Taft, who, as president spoke at a reception for the organization upon the laying of the cornerstone of the monument on November 12, 1912. The completed monument was dedicated on June 4, 1914.

President Woodrow Wilson in his address "Accepting the Monument in Memory of the Confederate Dead at Arlington National Cemetery" on June 4, 1914, states that he is "profoundly aware of the solemn significance" of the memorial and he goes on:

It was proposed by a President of the United States who had himself been a distinguished officer in the Union Army. It was authorized by an act of Congress of the United States. The corner Stone of the monument was laid by a President of the United States elevated to his position by the votes of the party which had chiefly prided itself upon sustaining the war for the Union.

Others celebrating reconciliation at the monument's dedication were members of the GAR representing Union veterans, and members of the UCV representing Confederate veterans.

The National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Section 7, Page 26 clearly states that reconciliation of North and South began with the Confederate Memorial:

The significance of the Confederate Memorial extends beyond the monument itself to the social climate in which it was built. The turn of the twentieth century marked a beginning of changing sentiments between the North and South with the authorization by Congress of a Confederate section within ANC. The **reconciliation that began with this monument** would be further strengthened through the Arlington Memorial Bridge that would physically and symbolically bridge the divide between Lee's Arlington estate and Lincoln's Washington. (Bold emphasis added)

The National Register of Historic Places Registration Form under "8. Statement of Significance" under "Applicable National Register Criteria" includes these three criteria:

- A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of our history **[such as the reconciliation of North and South after our nation's bloodiest war]**.
- B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past **[such as internationally renowned Jewish sculptor Moses Ezekiel who is also listed separately in the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form under "8. Statement of Significance" under "Architect/Builder" along with three others]**.
- C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual

distinction. **[ALL of this criteria is met by Moses Ezekiel's "New South" Memorial, which is not named OLD South, in commemoration of the Confederacy, but NEW South, signifying the South after 1865 and after the Spanish-American War, now an integral part of the United States in every way including giving its blood willingly for our reconciled nation. A memorial named "New South" does not commemorate the Confederate States of America but celebrates the reunited, reconciled United States of America.]**

The National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet, Section 8, Pages 48 and 49 provide more conclusive proof in two sections, both with bold print titles, that the Confederate Memorial does not commemorate the Confederacy but does commemorate the reconciliation of our country:

Reconciliation, the Confederate Memorial (#33), and the Robert E. Lee Memorial (#3)

In 1906, Congress had approved the construction of a Confederate Memorial at ANC. **In an effort at national unity and reconciliation between the North and the South**, a one-acre area (Section 16) had been set aside in 1900 for the burial of Confederate dead. Although 241 Confederate burials at ANC had been disinterred and moved to Southern cemeteries during the 1870s, 136 Confederate burials remained. These burials were moved to the newly designated section and were joined by the 128 Confederates burials that were moved to ANC from the Soldiers' Home in Washington. The white marble markers in this section, which are set in concentric circles, exhibit the pointed top that was typical of Confederate burials in other national cemeteries. Each stone was 36 inches high, 10 inches wide, and 4 inches thick, and was engraved with the grave number, the name of the soldier (if known), his unit designation, and the letters C.S.A. (Krowl 2003:165). The site chosen for the Confederate section occupied a more prominent spot in the cemetery in 1900 than is apparent today.

Before the completion of the Arlington Memorial Bridge in 1932 as a direct route over the Potomac from Washington, many visitors would have entered the cemetery through the western gates near Fort Myer. From that vantage point, the Confederate section was easily accessible to sightseers. (Bold emphasis added in paragraph.)

The monument that was erected in the newly designated Confederate section was designed and executed by Richmond native and Confederate veteran Moses Ezekiel. The sculpture, which was unveiled in 1914, is 32 feet tall and was placed at the center of the Confederate circle. Ezekiel was buried at the base of his monument in 1917 (Figure 9).

In the early 1920s, a movement led by Frances Parkinson Keyes, the wife of a U.S. Senator requested that Arlington House be dedicated as a memorial to Robert E. Lee. In 1923, Congress passed a bill to restore Arlington House "as nearly as practicable to the condition in which it existed immediately prior to the Civil War" (Hanna 2001a:133). As part of the restoration, the ANC superintendent was required to move out of the mansion. In 1932, Lodge #1 was constructed as the superintendent's residence and was located west of the mansion beyond the administration building. This was the second lodge built at the cemetery, the first (today designated Lodge #2) had been constructed in 1895 near the original Ord & Weitzel Gate.

On June 10, 1933, Executive Order 6166 transferred Arlington House and two slave quarters from the War Department to the Department of the Interior, Office of National Parks, Buildings, and Reservations (later the National Park Service). No land was transferred at that time, but in 1947 a little over 2 acres surrounding the house was given to the NPS and additional land was transferred in 1959 (Hanna 2001a:153, 159). In 1955, Congress officially designated the house as the Custis-Lee Mansion and as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee. The NPS also occupies the former stable west of the house as

administrative offices and owns 12.8 acres of the ancient woods in Section 29 as a means to preserve some of the original setting of the mansion. Arlington House was individually listed in the NRHP in 1966 when the NRHP was created (although the nomination was not written until 1980).

Arlington Memorial Bridge (#19)

. . . [William Mitchell] Kendall presented plans for the bridge and its approaches to the Commission of Fine Arts in May 1923.

. . . the overall impact of the bridge and approach avenue into the cemetery accomplished what the Commission of Fine Arts intended; it **provided a monumental, though restrained, entrance into the cemetery while also providing the symbolic act of connecting North to South.** (Bold emphasis added to paragraph.)

The Confederate Memorial also marks the specific graves of four American soldiers from the South who are buried at its base including Moses Ezekiel. The monument is a grave marker and headstone for those four souls as well as for the 482 others who are buried in graves arranged in concentric circles around the memorial and are an integral part of the memorial itself.

It would be a desecration of graves in our nation's most sacred burial ground to destroy the monument as the Naming Commission suggests, leaving the four graves at its base and the 482 others that surround the memorial as if they are part of some half-finished construction project. It would be undignified and an insult to those whom Congress, three presidents, and soldiers North and South wanted to honor to symbolize the reunification of our country.

This political Naming Commission wants to do this cheaply, in the "most cost-effective method of removal and disposal."

Funny that a commission that wants to waste millions of dollars renaming a thousand assets that include Fort Bragg and Fort Benning from where we won two World Wars, is suddenly concerned about money. This Woke Naming Commission with its "presentist" history is a monumental waste of taxpayer money.

The Naming Commission came about because of the efforts of Sen. Elizabeth Warren of Massachusetts when she was on the 2021 Senate Armed Services Committee that approved the NDAA for that year. The bases named for Confederate generals were to be renamed but now that effort has morphed into renaming a thousand historically-inspired tributes around the country such as roads and patches, as well as the disgraceful desecration of graves and destruction of an extremely symbolic 108 year old monument in Arlington National Cemetery that stands for our reunited country.

The Naming Commission's report is not peer reviewed history that is argued by historians and scholars with diverse historical expertise and context as is the case in good historical scholarship. The Naming Commission is the epitome of "presentism," which is the judging of the past by the goofy Woke standards of today.

Serious historians know that to understand the past, you have to look at the past the way the people who lived in the past looked at it. It was the present to them. That's how you understand the past.

Sen. Elizabeth Warren, a highly partisan politician, has, herself, had problems with Native-American history.

An example of the Naming Commission's politicized history is its statement in its report on page 15:

The monument's pedestal features 14 shields, engraved with the coats of arms of the 11 Confederate states, plus Kentucky, Maryland and Missouri. Although distinct minorities in those three states chose to support the Confederacy, the substantial majority of their respective leadership and citizenry remained within – and in overwhelming support of – the United States. The memorial's inclusion of the heraldry from those states distorts history by inflating the Confederacy's size, support and significance.

The significance of the Confederacy was established by their quest for independence based on the sovereignty of their states - States' Rights - which they made clear in the Preamble to the Confederate Constitution:

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. (Bold emphasis added)

The Naming Commission is partially right when it says "distinct minorities in those three states chose to support the Confederacy" but Missouri, Kentucky and Maryland did remain in the Union. Missouri, Kentucky and Maryland were three of the **six Union slave states that fought for the Union the entire war**. All six were deliberately exempted by the Emancipation Proclamation because, like all Northern documents through the first years of the war when hundreds of thousands of men died, the North was OK with slavery. The war was not fought to end slavery.

The reason Missouri, Kentucky and Maryland are on the monument is because Missouri and Kentucky both had formal voting representation and full delegations in the Confederate Congress and each had a star in the Confederate flag, the same as every other Confederate state. Cultural ties between Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland and the rest of the South were strong. A rump legislature in Missouri had passed an ordinance of secession and voted to secede October 31, 1861. A secession convention in Kentucky had done the same on 20 November 1861.

Maryland would have seceded but due to its closeness to Washington, DC, the Northern capital, it was clamped down on by President Lincoln early when members of the Maryland legislature who would have voted to secede were arrested and thrown in jail. Nobody who has heard Maryland's former state song, *Maryland, My Maryland*, that was only recently retired, can doubt Maryland's feelings in the Nineteenth Century. Here are the first and last stanzas:

The despot's heel is on they shore,
Maryland!
His torch is at they temple door,
Maryland!
Avenge the patriotic gore
That flecked the streets of Baltimore,

And be the battle queen of yore,
Maryland! My Maryland!

...

I hear the distant thunder-hum,
Maryland!
The Old Line's bugle, fife, and drum,
Maryland!
She is not dead, nor deaf, nor dumb---
Huzza! she spurns the Northern scum!
She breathes! she burns! she'll come! she'll come!
Maryland! My Maryland!

If the Naming Commission was driven by legitimate historical truth instead of "presentism," it would have suggested contextualizing the reasons why Missouri and Kentucky were on the monument. It is understandable why two states as divided as they were, in which substantial numbers of citizens through their representatives voted to secede from the Union, would have complete voting representation in the Confederate Congress with full delegations, and have stars in the Confederate flag.

Lincoln did something similar with West Virginia. West Virginia was another of the six Union slave states. It came into the Union as a slave state just weeks *after* the Emancipation Proclamation was issued, and Abraham Lincoln was as glad to have questionably-formed West Virginia as the Confederates were Missouri and Kentucky.

The politicized Woke Naming Commission could learn something from the Confederate Memorial and pass that knowledge along to the public but it is lazy and would rather just destroy the monument. That's what happens when presentist Woke politicized commissions are in charge of history and symbolic 108 year old memorials.

The War Between the States is the central event in American history. Before the war, states were supreme over the federal government. After the war, the federal government was supreme over the states.

The descendants of the reconciled South all fought **ENTHUSIASTICALLY** for our reunited country in **EVERY** war contributing mightily, and they **CONTINUE** to do so. Alvin York, Audie Murphy, and other American soldiers from the South are legendary along with millions and millions of others over the years.

United States Army recruiting has always been better in the "Patriotic" South than anywhere in the country. Ask your Army recruiters which region of America is most enthusiastic for military service and they will tell you without question: **THE SOUTH.**

It is not very wise in the middle of a recruiting crisis to insult the region from where 44% of the United States military is recruited.²

Around a hundred million Americans, close to 1/3rd of the country, are descended from Confederate soldiers. Many of those Americans know the service records of their ancestors and are damn proud of them as they should be. It is not smart to tear at the fabric of our country by insulting and degrading the ancestors of millions of Americans on politicized Woke points of history. Confederates were right with everything they did. They followed the Constitution to the letter. They loved our country and were proud of it. They did not secede until Northern political hatred, not unlike the political hatred in our country today, forced them out of the Union.

Northerners financed and sent into the South murderers and terrorists like John Brown to kill Southern men, women and children, then celebrated him as a hero when brought to justice. There was also the Republican printing of hundreds of thousands of copies of Hinton Helper's *The Impending Crisis* as a campaign document in 1860 and distributing them coast to coast with their call for the throats of Southerners to be cut in the night. Of course, Southerners were not going to submit to that very real threat.

Let's talk about the truth of history and especially slavery.

Sen. Warren apparently does not realize that her Boston, as well as New York and Portland, Maine were the largest slave-trading ports on the planet in 1862, a year into the War Between the States. W. E. B. Du Bois in his famous book, *The*

² Sean Braswell, *Why Is the U.S. Military So Southern*, <https://www.ozy.com/news-and-politics/why-the-u-s-military-is-so-southern/72100/>, accessed Veterans Day, 11-11-22; Jeremy Bender, Andy Kiersz, Armin Rosen, Jul. 20, 2014, *Some States Have Much Higher Enlistment Rates Than Others*, <https://www.businessinsider.com/us-military-is-not-representative-of-country-2014-7>, accessed Veterans Day, 11-11-22.

Suppression of the African Slave-Trade to the United States of America 1638-1870, writes:

The number of persons engaged in the slave-trade, and the amount of capital embarked in it, exceed our powers of calculation. The city of New York has been until of late [1862] the principal port of the world for this infamous commerce; although the cities of Portland and Boston are only second to her in that distinction. Slave dealers added largely to the wealth of our commercial metropolis; they contributed liberally to the treasuries of political organizations, and their bank accounts were largely depleted to carry elections in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut.³

Nobody is suggesting that because New Yorkers and New Englanders were America's slave traders that we shouldn't honor any of them.

Peter Faneuil, who built Boston's Faneuil Hall, the Cradle of Liberty, was a major slave trader but we all still love Faneuil Hall. I wonder how Elizabeth Warren would like it if the Naming Commission suggested demolishing Faneuil Hall because Peter Faneuil bought and sold black people on his ships, forcing them through the horrendous Middle Passage so he could make money?

As a matter of record, the British bought and sold black people legally until 1807, and New Englanders and New Yorkers bought and sold black people legally until 1808.

New Englanders and New Yorkers then carried on an illegal slave trade until well after the War Between the States.

Here's how the 2005 book, *Complicity, How the North Promoted, Prolonged and Profited from Slavery*, written by three New England journalists then with the *Hartford Courant*, described New York's illegal slave trade:

New York City's bustling seaport became the hub of an enormously lucrative illegal slave trade. Manhattan shipyards built ships to carry

³ W.E.B. Du Bois, *The Suppression of the African Slave-Trade to the United States of America, 1638-1870* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1896), 179. Du Bois is quoting the *Continental Monthly*, January, 1862, p. 87, the article "The Slave-Trade in New York."

captive Africans, the vessels often outfitted with crates of shackles and with the huge water tanks needed for their human cargo. A conservative estimate is that during the illegal trade's peak years, 1859 and 1860, at least two slave ships---each built to hold between 600 and 1,000 slaves---left lower Manhattan every month.⁴

The North's addiction to slave trading should come as no surprise. Much of the infrastructure of New England and New York was built with the enormous profits from their slave trading.

Five out of six New England states were vigorous slave trading states. Little Rhode Island was a dynamo and America's transatlantic leader in the eighteenth century

launching nearly 1,000 voyages to Africa and carrying at least 100,000 captives back across the Atlantic. The captains and crews of these ships were often the veteran seamen of America: New Englanders.⁵

Rhode Island's Reverend Samuel Hopkins admits the slave trade was Newport, Rhode Island's "first wheel of commerce" but it was not just Newport's first wheel of commerce, it was all of New England and New York's first wheel of commerce:

'The inhabitants of Rhode Island, especially those of Newport, have had by far the greater share of this traffic, of all these United States. This trade in human species has been the first wheel of commerce in Newport, on which every other movement in business has chiefly depended.'⁶

Another famous Rhode Island slave trader, John Brown, whose family founded Brown University, said in a Providence newspaper in 1789:

⁴ Anne Farrow, Joel Lang, and Jenifer Frank, *Complicity, How the North Promoted, Prolonged, and Profited from Slavery* (New York: Ballantine Books, Copyright 2005 by The Hartford Courant Company), xxviii.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Farrow, Lang, Frank, *Complicity*, 99-100.

'there was no more crime in bringing off a cargo of slaves than in bringing off a cargo of jackasses.'⁷

I wonder how Rhode Islanders would like it if the Naming Commission stated that Brown University should be demolished because John Brown was a major New England slave trader.

Like the drug trade today, the slave trade was lucrative. When you can buy a slave in Africa — perhaps a warrior that had himself been on a mission to capture slaves but instead got captured — for \$50 and sell him for \$1,000, that is a huge profit even today, much less back then.⁸

Harvard professor, Bernard Bailyn, "dean of colonial historians," wrote:

[T]he main factor in New England's phenomenal economic success, 'the key dynamic force,' was slavery.⁹

Black tribal chieftains in Africa were the starting point of global slavery and the African diaspora. For centuries, slaves were Africa's chief export. They were the unfortunate captives of tribal warfare, gathered up and waiting in around 40 slave forts built by the British and other Europeans up and down the African coast because they needed labor in their colonies.

Harvard historian Henry Louis Gates, Jr. in a *New York Times* article, "Ending the Slavery Blame-Game," quotes Boston University historians John Thornton and Linda Heywood who estimated "that 90 percent of those shipped to the New World were enslaved by Africans and then sold to European traders."

Gates gets into specifics:

[T]he sad truth is that the conquest and capture of Africans and their sale to Europeans was one of the main sources of foreign exchange for several African kingdoms for a very long time. Slaves were the main export of the kingdom of Kongo; the Asanta Empire in Ghana exported slaves and used the profits to import gold. Queen Njinga, the brilliant

⁷ John Brown, in *United States Chronicle*, March 26, 1789, in Farrow, Lang, Frank, *Complicity*, 110.

⁸ Farrow, Lang, Frank, *Complicity*, 126.

⁹ Farrow, Lang, Frank, *Complicity*, 48.

17th-century monarch of the Mbundu, waged wars of resistance against the Portuguese but also conquered polities as far as 500 miles inland and sold her captives to the Portuguese. When Njinga converted to Christianity, she sold African traditional religious leaders into slavery, claiming that they had violated her new Christian precepts.¹⁰

Gates writes about the shocking but admirable display by some African leaders today who have begged African Americans to forgive them for selling their ancestors into slavery:

In 1999, for instance, President Mathieu Kerekou of Benin astonished an all-black congregation in Baltimore by falling to his knees and begging African-Americans' forgiveness for the "shameful" and "abominable" role Africans played in the trade. Other African leaders, including Jerry Rawlings of Ghana, followed Mr. Kerekou's bold example.¹¹

Captives in Africa were held sometimes for months, chained and shackled in pens inside slave forts on Africa's coast, waiting for European, New York and New England slave traders.

They would then be placed into the bowels of scorching hot slave ships that were filled to capacity with Africans on their backs, chained side by side to the decks below, where there was no ventilation, no fresh air.

Poor slaves had to endure the stench of vomit, urine, feces and death cooked together in ovenlike heat for months through the Middle Passage. No description of Hell could be worse than a New England or New York slave ship, or a British or Portuguese or Spanish slave ship before them.

The North, especially New England and New York, with Europeans, own the cruelty and brutality of the slave trade, which was more brutal than slavery itself because slave traders did not have to live with their slaves. All they had to do was deliver them and collect their money.

¹⁰ Henry Louis Gates, Jr., "Ending the Slavery Blame-Game," the *New York Times*, April 22, 2010, <https://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/23/opinion/23gates.html>, accessed 5-21-22.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

In the American slave trade, New England and New York own the stench and horror of slavery's Middle Passage, but nobody is suggesting that monuments in New York and New England be destroyed and New Yorkers and New Englanders who died in our wars have their graves desecrated by Woke politicians.

Most of the Naming Commission's report is not historical truth. It is quickly-written, politically motivated "presentist" history.

When Southerners seceded, they called conventions of the people, elected delegates as Unionists or Secessionists, debated the issues then voted. It was pure democracy at work.

The most widely quoted phrase in the secession debate in the South in the year before Southerners began seceding came from the Declaration of Independence:

Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

The country was not centralized in those days. Each state was sovereign and independent, like the countries of Europe. At the end of the Revolutionary War, King George III agreed to the Treaty of Paris, September 3, 1783 which listed each individual American state then proclaimed them all "to be free, sovereign and independent states . . .".

No state ever rescinded its sovereignty or gave up its independence.

No historian will say there was no right of secession before the War Between the States. There would never have been a United States of America if states thought they could not get out of the Union if it became oppressive in their minds. They had just fought a bloody war to secede from the British Empire. They were not about to lock themselves into another situation they could not get out of if they wanted to.

Horace Greeley believed in the right of secession and wrote a long, emotional editorial supporting it just as South Carolina's secession convention was starting.

He had famously said "let our erring sisters go" and he wrote in his editorial, "We do heartily accept this doctrine [secession], believing it intrinsically sound, beneficent, and one that, universally accepted, is calculated to prevent the shedding of seas of human blood" and

if it justified the secession from the British Empire of Three Millions of colonists in 1776, we do not see why it would not justify the secession of Five Millions of Southrons from the Federal Union in 1861.

Greeley changed his mind when he realized Southern secession was going to affect his money because the Northern economy was largely based on manufacturing for the South and shipping Southern cotton.

Three states insisted before they would join the new Union that they could secede from it if it became tyrannical in their eyes. Those states were New York, Rhode Island and Virginia.

Because all the states were admitted to the Union as equals, the acceptance of the right of secession demanded by New York, Rhode Island and Virginia, gave that right to all the other states as well.

When you destroy monuments, you make our country stupid.

Monuments are thought-provoking. You can study the reason for their being, the art work, and any assertion made on a monument and learn something. They are dramatic words from the people of the past to the present and future.

For example, Union monuments never say they were fighting to free the slaves because they weren't. They were fighting to preserve the Union because their wealth and power were tied to the Union.

Historian Michael R. Bradley in his recent book, *The Last Words, The Farewell Addresses of Union and Confederate Commanders to Their Men at the End of the War Between the States*, writes in the introduction:

Never mind that anyone touring a battlefield cannot find a single monument to Union soldiers which boasts that the men fought to end slavery. They all honor the bravery of those who fought and died, and speak of preserving the Union. Perhaps this emphasis on preserving the Union is why historians almost always call the United States forces the "Union Army" despite the fact

that this name displaces slavery as the central factor supposedly causing the war.¹²

So many of the politicized "historians" in academia and the idiot news media today proclaim that slavery was the cause of the war but one can prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that the North did not go to war to end slavery.

All Northern documents before and up to two years into the war — after hundreds of thousands of men had been killed — strongly supported slavery.

As stated, six slave states, or 25% of Union states, fought for the North the entire war.¹³ That, alone, proves the war was not fought over slavery.

If the North was fighting a war to end slavery, they would have first ended it in their own country by passing a constitutional amendment abolishing slavery.

Instead, they passed the Corwin Amendment, which would have left black people in slavery forever even beyond the reach of Congress in places where slavery already existed.

Lincoln strongly supported the Corwin Amendment and lobbied the governors to pass it in their states. He said in his first inaugural, "holding such a provision to now be implied constitutional law, I have no objection to its being made express and irrevocable." Five Union states ratified the Corwin Amendment before the war made it moot.¹⁴

The Northern War Aims Resolution passed in July, 1861, three months into the war stated:

. . . That this war is not waged upon our part in any spirit of oppression, nor for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, **nor for the purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or institutions [slavery] of the States, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of**

¹² Michael R. Bradley, *The Last Words, The Farewell Addresses of Union and Confederate Commanders to Their Men at the End of the War Between the States* (Charleston: Charleston Athenaeum Press, 2022), 75.

¹³ The Union slave states were Maryland, Delaware, Missouri, Kentucky, New Jersey, and West Virginia, which came into the Union as a slave state just weeks *after* the Emancipation Proclamation went into effect. The Emancipation Proclamation exempted all six Union slave states as well as Confederate territory already under Union control.

¹⁴ Union states ratifying the Corwin Amendment are "Kentucky, Ohio, Rhode Island, Maryland, and Illinois." See Samuel W. Mitcham, Jr. *It Wasn't About Slavery, Exposing the Great Lie of the Civil War* (Washington, DC: Regnery History, 2020), 127.

the Constitution [which allowed and protected slavery], and to **preserve the Union**. . . .¹⁵ (Bold emphasis added)

Even the Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation issued September 22, 1862, just weeks before the actual Emancipation Proclamation, states in the first paragraph:

I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America, and Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy thereof, do hereby proclaim and declare that **hereafter, as heretofore**, the war will be prosecuted for the object of practically restoring the constitutional relation between the United States, and each of the States, and the people thereof, in which States that relation is, or may be, suspended or disturbed. (Bold emphasis added)¹⁶

There are legion statements by Abraham Lincoln out there supporting slavery such as this one in his first inaugural made before he stated his support for the Corwin Amendment:

I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so.

Lincoln wrote Horace Greeley August 22, 1862, sixteen months into the war, and again made that clear. The italics are Lincoln's:

¹⁵ The War Aims Resolution is also known by the names of its sponsors, Representative John. J. Crittenden of Kentucky and Senator Andrew Johnson of Tennessee: The Crittenden-Johnson Resolution, or just the Crittenden Resolution. It passed the U.S. House of Representatives July 22, 1861 and the Senate July 25, 1861. There were only two dissenting votes in the House and five in the Senate. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crittenden-Johnson_Resolution, accessed April 19, 2022.

¹⁶ The next paragraph of the Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation expressed another of Lincoln's beliefs, that black people should be shipped back to Africa or into a place they could survive: ". . . the effort to colonize persons of African descent, with their consent, upon this continent, or elsewhere, with the previously obtained consent of the Governments existing there, will be continued." See "Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation, September 22, 1862" at https://www.archives.gov/exhibits/american_originals_iv/sections/transcript_preliminary_emancipation.html, accessed 4-12-22.

. . . My paramount object in this struggle *is* to save the Union, and is *not* either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing *any* slave I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing *all* the slaves I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that—What I do about slavery, and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do *not* believe it would help the Union.¹⁷

The proof is overwhelming and conclusive that the North did not go to war to free the slaves.

The North went to war because its economy was dependent on Southern cotton and without it they were headed for economic annihilation.

In 1860, the South was "producing 66 percent of the world's cotton, and raw cotton accounted for more than half [over 60% alone] of all U.S. exports."¹⁸

The American cotton industry before the war was awesome to behold. The *New York Tribune* agriculture editor, Solon Robinson, in 1848, wrote about "acres of cotton bales" on the docks in New Orleans:

Boats are constantly arriving, so piled up with cotton, that the lower tier of bales on deck are in the water; and as the boat is approaching, it looks like a huge raft of cotton bales, with the chimneys and steam pipe of an engine sticking up out of the centre.¹⁹

King Cotton was "the backbone of the American economy" and "the North ruled the kingdom."²⁰ Southerners grew the cotton and Northerners did everything else:

Northern merchants, shippers, and financial institutions, many based in New York City, were crucial players in every phase of the national

¹⁷ Letter, A. Lincoln to Horace Greeley, August 22, 1862, in Roy P. Basler, ed., *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1953) V:388.

¹⁸ Farrow, Lang, Frank, *Complicity*, 7.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*

and international cotton trade. Meanwhile, the rivers and streams of the North, particularly in New England, were crowded with hundreds of textile mills. Well before the Civil War, the economy of the entire North relied heavily on cotton grown by millions of slaves---in the South.²¹

Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote that "Cotton thread holds the union together; unites John C. Calhoun and Abbott Lawrence. Patriotism for holidays and summer evenings, with music and rockets, but cotton thread is the Union."²²

Without the South, the North was in serious economic trouble. Southerners had made protective tariffs unconstitutional. They had a 10% tariff for the operation of a small federal government in a States' Rights nation.

At the same time, economically ignorant Northerners passed the astronomical Morrill Tariff that was 37 to 50% higher. It threatened to reroute the Northern shipping industry into the South overnight because nobody was going to ship into the North and pay a 47 to 60% tariff when they could ship into the South and pay 10%.

The Morrill Tariff meant that Northern ship captains would have a hard time getting cargoes in the North but in the South they would be guaranteed all the cargoes they could handle of cotton and other valuable Southern commodities to transport around the world.

Those same ship captains would then be able to bring cargoes back from around the world and into warm water Southern ports where they would be put on boats in the Mississippi, and on railroads, and shipped to all parts of the Union.

Northerners could have passed a tariff competitive with the South but they didn't.

Because of Northern greed and economic stupidity, the Morrill Tariff threatened to give Southerners a gift of much of the commerce of the entire country.

The Northern manufacturing industry faced obliteration too because over half of its market was its captive market in the South. Independent Southerners would not be buying overpriced goods from people who sent murderers into their country to kill them.

²¹ Farrow, Lang, Frank, *Complicity*, xxvi.

²² Farrow, Lang, Frank, *Complicity*, 37.

Southerners had for decades wanted free trade with Europe so they could get out from under extortionate Northern prices for inferior goods jacked up by Yankee tariffs and monopolies.

South Carolina almost seceded thirty-three years earlier over the Tariff of Abominations, and should have.

Great Britain was the dominant economic and military power on earth in the 1860s. The cotton gin, short for "cotton engine," had revolutionized cotton production, which had led to an ironclad relationship between the South and Great Britain:

By the eve of the Civil War, Great Britain was largely clothing the Western world, using Southern-grown, slave-picked cotton.²³

All Southerners had to do was establish formal trade and military treaties with Great Britain, with whom they already had an "ironclad" relationship because of cotton, and the North would not be able to beat the South in a war.

Lincoln knew all this and was not going to allow the free-trade Confederate States of America to rise to power on his southern border.

He knew that the future of the American nation for at least the next century, maybe forever, was at stake right then.

That's why, with four times the white population of the South, enormous weapon manufacturing capability, a pipeline to the wretched refuse of the world with which to feed Union armies (25% of the Union army was foreign born), an army, navy and other advantages at that point in history, he sent five hostile military missions into Southern waters in March and April, 1861.²⁴

Several Northern newspapers such as the *Providence (R.I.) Daily Post* saw exactly what Lincoln was doing. In an editorial entitled "WHY?" published the day after the commencement of the bombardment of Fort Sumter, April 13, 1861, it

²³ Farrow, Lang, Frank, *Complicity*, 10. Eli Whitney patented his cotton gin in 1794.

²⁴ Mitcham, *It Wasn't About Slavery*, 142. Mitcham states that by the first of April, 1861, the following five military expeditions were "in, steaming toward, or about to sail for Southern territorial waters:

- 1) the Welles-Fox Expedition, heading for Charleston;
- 2) the Rowan Expedition, also heading for Charleston;
- 3) Captain Adams' ships, lurking off Santa Rosa Island;
- 4) Colonel Brown's Expedition, heading for Pensacola;
- 5) Porter's Expedition, also steaming for Pensacola."

wrote:

We are to have civil war, if at all, because Abraham Lincoln loves a party better than he loves his country. . . . Mr. Lincoln saw an opportunity to inaugurate civil war without appearing in the character of an aggressor.

The *New York Herald* eight days earlier wrote:

We have no doubt Mr. Lincoln wants [President Davis] to take the initiative in capturing . . . forts in its waters, for it would give him the opportunity of throwing [to the South] the responsibility of commencing hostilities.²⁵

We should study and learn from our history, not be at war with the past for the political advantages of some people in the present. As stated, interpreting the past using the goofy standards of today is known as "presentism," and the Naming Commission, whose start came from Elizabeth Warren, is the epitome of it.

Not a single suggestion in the Naming Commission's report to Congress can not be refuted or have additional points of history and historical context brought up.

For example, Ulysses S. Grant's wife, Julia Dent Grant, owned four slaves until Missouri abolished slavery late in the war. Mrs. Grant often traveled with her husband and was nearby for most of his battles. She almost always had one of her slaves, Black Julia, with her. What an odd scene that must have been, the Union general supposedly fighting to free the slaves, and his wife with her slave, Black Julia. Julia Dent Grant's father owned several slaves at their family home in Missouri.

I am proud of our magnificent country and I am SICK of seeing it torn apart by sleazy politicians who get away with it because so many historians are cowards who are afraid of being called a racist if they say anything good about the South.

Esteemed historian Eugene Genovese (*Roll Jordan Roll, The World the Slaves Made*, et al.) said 30 years ago that to speak positively about the Old South

²⁵ Editorial, *New York Herald*, April 5, 1861, in Mitcham, *It Wasn't About Slavery*, 147.

is to invite charges of being a racist and an apologist for slavery and segregation. **We are witnessing a cultural and political atrocity** — an increasingly successful campaign by the media and an academic elite to strip young white Southerners, and arguably black Southerners as well, of their heritage . . . ²⁶ (Bold emphasis added)

I do understand why so many so-called historians and journalists are cowards. If they say anything good about the Old South they will immediately be cast as racists who deserve to die as Dr. Genovese pointed out. Speaking well in any respect about the Old South opens one up to the Woke mob showing up at their office or some Woke corporation canceling them and destroying their careers.

Our history is now determined by mob rule and sleazy politicians.

Americans do not tear up grave markers because a tiny handful of the misguided think there is a political advantage to doing so. Things like this cause permanent damage to a country and hatred that can not be repaired. Once you break something precious you can't put Humpty Dumpty back together again.

Once it becomes widely known that a Woke political commission has gotten Arlington National Cemetery to destroy a 108 year old monument that is a grave marker inside the cemetery representing the reconciliation of our country, then the stature and honor of Arlington National Cemetery will go down in a lot of people's eyes, and it should.

Most people in our country support our historic monuments. I have met many Northerners who are outraged at the destruction of Confederate monuments.

The destruction of Confederate monuments has been the gateway to the destruction of other monuments including to Abraham Lincoln.

We should never ever destroy a historic monument. We build new monuments when we want to honor new things in our country and we all learn from them.

The Naming Commission can learn from Allied Supreme Commander of World War II, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, later president, who had a picture of Gen. Robert E. Lee on his wall in the White House the entire time he was president.

Like President John F. Kennedy, President Dwight D. Eisenhower had great respect for Gen. Lee and appreciated his efforts to bind up the nation's wounds after

²⁶ Eugene D. Genovese, *The Southern Tradition, The Achievement and Limitations of an American Conservatism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), xi-xii.

its bloodiest war.

On August 9, 1960, Eisenhower answered an angry letter from a New York dentist, Dr. Leon W. Scott, who had written eight days earlier and questioned why he kept a picture of Gen. Lee in his White House office.

Dr. Scott wrote:

I do not understand how any American can include Robert E. Lee as a person to be emulated, and why the President of the United States of America should do so is certainly beyond me.

The most outstanding thing that Robert E. Lee did, was to devote his best efforts to the destruction of the United States Government, and I am sure that you do not say that a person who tries to destroy our Government is worthy of being held as one of our heroes.²⁷

President Eisenhower wrote:

Dear Dr. Scott:

Respecting your August 1 inquiry calling attention to my often expressed admiration for General Robert E. Lee, I would say, first, that we need to understand that at the time of the War between the States the issue of secession had remained unresolved for more than 70 years. Men of probity, character, public standing and unquestioned loyalty, both North and South, had disagreed over this issue as a matter of principle from the day our Constitution was adopted.

General Robert E. Lee was, in my estimation, one of the supremely gifted men produced by our Nation. He believed unswervingly in the Constitutional validity of his cause which until 1865 was still an arguable question in America; he was a poised and inspiring leader,

²⁷ Dwight D. Eisenhower in Defense of Robert E. Lee, August 10, 2014, Mathew W. Lively, <https://www.civilwarprofiles.com/dwight-d-eisenhower-in-defense-of-robert-e-lee/>, accessed 5-3-20.

true to the high trust reposed in him by millions of his fellow citizens; he was thoughtful yet demanding of his officers and men, forbearing with captured enemies but ingenious, unrelenting and personally courageous in battle, and never disheartened by a reverse or obstacle. Through all his many trials, he remained selfless almost to a fault and unfailing in his faith in God. Taken altogether, he was noble as a leader and as a man, and unsullied as I read the pages of our history.

From deep conviction, I simply say this: a nation of men of Lee's caliber would be unconquerable in spirit and soul. Indeed, to the degree that present-day American youth will strive to emulate his rare qualities, including his devotion to this land as revealed in his painstaking efforts to help heal the Nation's wounds once the bitter struggle was over, will be strengthened and our love of freedom sustained.

Such are the reasons that I proudly display the picture of this great American on my office wall.

Sincerely,
Dwight D. Eisenhower²⁸

Union General Joshua Chamberlain, a hero of Gettysburg, was at Appomattox and assigned to oversee the transfer of Confederate arms on April 12, three days after Lee's surrender.

In his 1915 memoir, *The Passing of the Armies*, Chamberlain recalled this moment:

Before us in proud humiliation stood the embodiment of manhood: men whom neither toils and sufferings, nor the fact of death, nor disaster, nor hopelessness could bend from their resolve; standing before us

²⁸ Dwight D. Eisenhower letter, August 9, 1960, to Leon W. Scott, in "Dwight D. Eisenhower in Defense of Robert E. Lee," August 10, 2014, Mathew W. Lively, <https://www.civilwarprofiles.com/dwight-d-eisenhower-in-defense-of-robert-e-lee/>, accessed 5-3-20.

now, thin, worn, and famished, but erect, and with eyes looking level into ours, waking memories that bound us together as no other bond.

Arlington National Cemetery can not possibly dishonor the graves and descendants of men like this by destroying the Confederate Memorial. ANC can not allow the political Naming Commission to falsify history and attach no significance to the reunification and reconciliation of North and South and our country after a war in which 750,000 died and over a million were maimed.

The Naming Commission states that "In the case of this monument, the Commissioners assessed that contextualization was not an appropriate option."

The reason the Naming Commission doesn't want to contextualize the 108 year old monument is because it can't. It does not have the knowledge or historical sensitivity or context to do it. The Naming Commission is a political commission interested in virtue signaling and not truth.

The Naming Commission, which makes a big deal out of Missouri, Kentucky and Maryland being included on the monument, had no idea that two of those states, Missouri and Kentucky, had full, voting representation and delegations in the Confederate Congress and stars in the Confederate flag. Substantial factions in Missouri and Kentucky had formally voted to secede from the Union and they drafted and adopted ordinances of secession.

All you have to do is read the lyrics of the recently retired Maryland state song, *Maryland, My Maryland*, to know how they felt.

All of this could be explained beautifully and add to the historical value of the Confederate Memorial. It is certainly understandable why Missouri, Kentucky and Maryland are on the monument but the Naming Commission does not want to do that.

I don't know if they are just lazy, don't have the courage to say something that a Woke person could construe as defending the South, or what the problem is but rather than bring out some legitimate points of history, they would rather just destroy this magnificent memorial and in the process dishonor Arlington National Cemetery for all time.

As I state earlier, esteemed historian Eugene Genovese (*Roll Jordan Roll, The World the Slaves Made*, et al.) said 30 years ago that to speak positively about the Old South

is to invite charges of being a racist and an apologist for slavery and segregation. **We are witnessing a cultural and political atrocity** — an increasingly successful campaign by the media and an academic elite to strip young white Southerners, and arguably black Southerners as well, of their heritage . . . ²⁹ (Bold emphasis added)

If this monument that North and South both wanted, that was conceived by a Union soldier, later president, and strongly supported by two other presidents and also strongly supported by Union and Confederate soldiers because it represented the reconciliation of our great nation after a war in which 750,000 died and a million were maimed . . . if this memorial and the graves around it are desecrated in any way, it will be a black stain on Arlington National Cemetery for all time.

This Woke political presentist Naming Commission should stay OUT of Arlington National Cemetery. So what if the artwork and portrayals on the monument are typical of its time at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The memorial is 108 years old. This exposes the shallow non-historical approach of the Naming Commission, which uses presentism and political correctness as its standard.

Our nation's most sacred burial ground must remain above politics. It must be something we all as Americans can love and cherish with all our hearts.

The Confederate Memorial to the reconciliation of North and South after our nation's bloodiest war is one of the most important and symbolic in American history. It is a magnificent memorial created by a great, internationally renowned artist, Moses Ezekiel, who was Jewish and a Confederate soldier who is buried next to his beautiful monument that he named New South.

It must prevail in all its glory for all time along with all the other precious memorials and graves in Arlington National Cemetery.

Gene Kizer, Jr. is an historian, author and publisher at Charleston Athenaeum Press in Charleston, South Carolina. He graduated magna cum laude from the College of Charleston in 2000 at middle age with

²⁹ Eugene D. Genovese, *The Southern Tradition, The Achievement and Limitations of an American Conservatism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), xi-xii.

History Departmental Honors, the Rebecca Motte American History Award, and the highest award for the History Department, the Outstanding Student Award.

He is author of *The Elements of Academic Success, How to Graduate Magna Cum Laude from College (or how to just graduate, PERIOD!)*; *Slavery Was Not the Cause of the War Between the States, The Irrefutable Argument.*; and *Charleston, SC Short Stories, Book One.*

He is compiler and wrote the Introduction to *Charles W. Ramsdell, Dean of Southern Historians, Volume One: His Best Work.*

He recently wrote the Prologue to, and published, through Charleston Athenaeum Press, *The Last Words, The Farewell Addresses of Union and Confederate Commanders to Their Men at the End of the War Between the States*, by historian Michael R. Bradley.