

Arlington National Cemetery Confederate Memorial “New South” White Paper

“Culture is “web of meaning” shared by members of a particular society or group within a society...Culture is --- Shared by members of a society; there is no “culture of one.” Field Manual 3-24, Counterinsurgency, 2006

“We lag in science, but students' historical illiteracy hurts our politics and our businesses.”

Norm Augustine
Former Secretary of the Army
Retired Chairman and CEO,
Lockheed Martin

20 November 2022

Committee of Southern Historians
Save Southern Heritage
Tampa, Florida

About the Authors

Brigadier General John R. Scales, Army of the United States (retired). General Scales served over 32 years in the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Army Reserve, completing combat tours in Viet Nam and Afghanistan as an infantryman and as a special operations officer. He has a Ph.D. in engineering, holds six patents, and is the author of numerous technical papers and reports. In retirement he also wrote several books, including three on military history. One, *Sherman Invades Georgia*, was chosen as an AUSA book and published by the Naval Institute (garnering praise from two former Army Chiefs of Staff, Generals Sullivan and Schoomaker). Another, *The Battles and Campaigns of Confederate General Nathan Bedford Forrest*, was recently published by Savas Beatie, a major military history publisher. BrigGen Scales frequently speaks to groups on history topics and is the former president of the Tennessee Valley Civil War Round Table, an adjunct to a nationally established program that educates the public on aspects of the Civil War. He annually leads tours of Civil War campaign and battlefield sites.

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 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 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.

Dr. Michael R. Bradley earned a Ph.D. in history from Vanderbilt University in 1970. He taught at Motlow College, near Tullahoma, Tennessee, for 36 years prior to his retirement in 2006. He continues to write and speak to groups interested in history. He is the author of a number of books dealing with the Civil War. The latest of these is "The Last Words: The Farewell Addresses of Union and Confederate Commanders" (2022) and "They Rode With Forrest". "Murfreesboro in the Civil War" was released by The History Press in 2012. This book is a history of the experiences of the citizens, black and white, Unionist and Confederate, who lived in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, as the town changed hands several times between the opposing forces. Also published by The History Press is "Forrest's Fighting Preacher: David C. Kelley of Tennessee". Dr. Bradley is the author of a number of published articles regarding the Civil War in professional journals.

Dr. Samuel W. (Sandy) Mitcham, Jr. is a Professor of Geography and Military History with a Ph.D. in history from the University of Tennessee. He has authored over 40 books including: "It Wasn't About Slavery: Exposing the Great Lie of the Civil War"; "Bust Hell Wide Open: The Life of Nathan Bedford Forrest"; "The Greatest Lynching in American History: New York, 1863", "Vicksburg: The Bloody Siege that Turned the Tide of the Civil War"; "Richard Taylor and the Red River Campaign"; "The Death of Hitler's War Machine"; and many others. Has had several Main Selections of the Military Book Club and the British Military Book Club. Co-authored (with Theodor-Frederich von Stauffenberg) "The Battle of Sicily". His works have been translated into German, Russian, Polish, Hungarian, Chinese, Spanish and Japanese. Author of more than 100 articles. Dr. Mitcham is the 2022 awardee of the John Esten Cooke Literary Prize given "annually to encourage writers of fiction to portray characters and events dealing with the Civil War, Confederate heritage, or Southern history in a historically accurate fashion." Dr. Mitcham

is U.S. Army veteran helicopter pilot and company commander; graduate, U.S. Army's Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas; and advisor to General Norman Schwarzkopf on the CBS Special "D-Day."

Lieutenant Colonel Edwin L. Kennedy, Jr, US Army, Retired, is a former graduate history Assistant Professor at the US Army Command and General Staff College (USACGSC), Fort Leavenworth serving on faculty for 19 years. He is a certified Army professional historian and instructed the graduate Civil War core curriculum course and electives. As the former senior officer, Combat Studies Institute (U.S. Army) Staff Ride Team, he conducted extensive studies and staff rides to Chickamauga, Kennesaw Mountain, Vicksburg, and Gettysburg for senior military commanders, military units and military students. He continues to author articles on military topics for publication in professional journals. As a guest speaker, he frequently presents to groups on military history topics. He continues to volunteer his personal time to educate military leaders during Civil War battlefield visits.

Cover quotations:

#1 FM 3-24 / MCWP 3-33.5, Counterinsurgency, 15 December 2006, Chap 3, Intelligence in Counterinsurgency, "Culture". This is the primary field manual used by a generation of U.S. Military personnel fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan.

#2 "The Education Our Economy Needs", Wall Street Journal, 21 September 2011 by Norm Augustine. The article addresses the need for history knowledge by Americans.

FOREWORD

Over 150 years have passed since the Civil War. It is one of the most written about subjects in the United States. Despite over 60,000 published books on the war and associated topics with many more books published each year, it is still one of the least understood wars by members of the American public. Part of the problem is that so few Americans are literate in their own history. Numerous surveys, studies and anecdotal evidence shown in the media prove this. Another problem, especially in today's society, is that the undergraduate teachers are sometimes as ignorant of the subject as those they are teaching. High school is, in many cases, taught by those who were educated in a system pushing indoctrination rather than critical thinking. They seek "byte" size elements of knowledge on complex issues and then pass that information to their students. This has led to simplistic and often faulty analyses of important historical events. History ignorance leads to faulty understanding. Nationally renowned and distinguished professor, Dr. Bruce Cole, wrote the following that identifies this issue:

One study of students at 55 elite universities found that over a third were unable to identify the Constitution as establishing the division of powers in our government, only 29% could identify the term "Reconstruction" and 40% could not place the Civil War in the correct century.

The recent National Assessment of Educational Progress test found that over half of high school seniors couldn't say who we fought in World War II. And lest you think I'm picking on students---and hey, I'm a former professor--- a nationwide survey recently commissioned by Columbia law School found that almost two thirds of All Americans think Karl Marx's dogma, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," was or may have been written by the Founding Fathers and was included in the Constitution.

Such collective amnesia is dangerous. Citizens kept ignorant of their history are robbed of the riches of their heritage and handicapped in their ability to understand and appreciate other cultures.

-- Dr. Bruce Cole, Chairman, National Endowment of the Humanities

So what? This is important because this shows that even our "most educated" students are ignorant of our most basic history. They don't appreciate other *cultures* according to Cole. This does not improve much after graduation. What about those who did not attend "elite" universities? What does it say about those with no history education in college? This is unfortunately a serious problem facing us in many facets of our life today. *This is an indicator that the large majority of our American public are not knowledgeable about our history, yet base their opinions on their faulty knowledge.* This is the case with the Confederate monuments and memorials.

As former Secretary of the Army, Norm Augustine stated in his 2011 Wall Street Journal article, "The Education Our Economy Needs", a lack of history knowledge leads to a deficiency in critical thinking skills. In other words, without knowing the requisite history and having the ability to challenge faulty premises, everything that is posited, even with biases, is accepted as "truth". The fact is that every historian is subject to biases but

the real problem is that those biases can be easily projected onto others who do not know enough facts to challenge them ---- a function of “critical thinking”. They therefore uncritically accept everything that they read or hear without considering other, alternative views. Simplifying competing views and arbitrarily dismissing them because those views do not comport to today’s understandings is a major logic error. For example, judging the motives and actions of people in the distant past by using today’s standards is called “presentism”. It is wrong. It is happening in increasing frequency today. The massive 2020 move to erase any Confederate history is a classic symptom of “presentism”. Unfortunately, it is being propagated by some historians with biases and then accepted by those who do not have the critical thinking knowledge and skills to challenge this “presentism”.

Our history is complex and does not lend itself to simplistic “Woke” analyses. The current move to destroy what our American ancestors and their progeny on both sides of the War Between the States did to reconcile the country is a disservice to our future generations. Its near-term effect is to alienate many who are loyal American citizens by insulting their families and their ancestors after the move to reconcile by the very generation that fought in the war. The actions to now retroactively punish those from over a century and a half bygone is divisive and spiteful. It is only stirring animosities and costing taxpayers millions of mis-spent dollars for no meaningful and measurable effect.

If this is the beginning of a revisionist history by those with an agenda of hate for which there may be no return. All of our monuments and memorials are now endangered by new and unreasonable interpretations. Will our Vietnam soldiers’ memorials now be subject to anti-war protestors’ interpretations so that they also must be deemed “offensive” and removed? Clearly the My Lai massacre does not represent the total American war effort in Vietnam but to a small minority, it is. It, like slavery, will be used to rationalize the desecration, vandalism, removal or destruction of monuments and memorials. It already has happened with some WWII and Vietnam memorials. Sanctioning the destruction of the Arlington National Cemetery Confederate memorial is another step in re-writing our history and attack on Southern *culture*.

Even comedian Bill Maher, not known for being a conservative figure, recently stated the following about those who judge those in the past: “Being woke is like a magic moral time machine in which you judge everyone by what you think you would have done in 1066, and you always win.”

INTRODUCTION

For over a century, the North and South have been largely reconciled after a cataclysmic war lasting four years. The war was largely fought in the South leaving that region devastated physically and financially. Cities were destroyed, industries and businesses eliminated, people bankrupted, and their states occupied. Afterwards, a harsh policy was instituted to punish the South known as "Reconstruction". It wasn't just about issues of race and the citizenship of black Southerners. It was political, financial, and psychological program to change Southern culture and punish its citizens. Instead of "reconstructing", it was a program used as a cudgel against an already suffering people by the point of a bayonet. Instead of engendering good-will, the Reconstruction policies engendered resentment from a defeated populace. The leaders in the North finally divested themselves of this radical program which had naturally spawned radical responses from embittered Southerners.

We know now after years of experience in Iraq and Afghanistan that using force to implement social change is not the way to win "hearts and minds". Unfortunately, this was not the doctrine of the 1860s. The Reconstruction programs were not the way to try and change the South and it was finally abandoned, not because of success but because its tactics were counterproductive. It helped push much of the South into poverty. Reconstruction finally ended due to political pressures but the damage had been done. The Southern people, still Americans, tried to reintegrate the best they could. Unfortunately, the Union League and corrupt politicians, carpetbaggers and scalawags, to stay in power, often pitted whites and blacks against each other, which created hard feelings. It was an unfortunate and toxic result of U.S. government policies explicitly refuted in our current-day military doctrine. The Spanish American War provided the impetus for Northerners to reach-out and reestablish good relations with the South after the ending of Reconstruction. Many Northerners like President McKinley realized that Southerners offered patriotic service to the country and having them as friends was valuable to the United States as a whole.

Leading the effort to reconcile with their former enemies were former leaders of the Union Army. This was a way to thank the South for its patriotic support during the war with Spain. No less than the Union Army veteran president of the United States himself initiated this process at the national level. After this magnanimous act 122 years ago, it is being intentionally undone for reasons unrelated to the reasons for the reconciliation.

The soldiers who fought the war saw the issue as one having to do with hardships, privation and personal sacrifice. This was common on both sides. It is divorced from the political issues; e.g., tariffs, Federal overreach, "union", and slavery. Monuments and memorials were built on both sides to commemorate service and sacrifice in battle. They had nothing whatsoever to do with "intimidation" of black citizens. This is a totally new and synthetic explanation. Again, detractors of Confederate monuments and memorials illogically tie the soldiers' remembrances to issues of "Jim Crow" and race --- - a syllogistic fallacy due to a lack of historical knowledge about why the monuments and memorials were erected and when they were erected. Besides, Jim Crow started in

the North. C. Vann Woodward in his famous book, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow* (Oxford, Commemorative Edition, 2002, page 17) writes: "One of the strangest things about the career of Jim Crow was that the system was born in the North and reached an advanced age before moving South in force." Yet, in our Woke society of 2022, it is the Southerners always attributed with racism.

In 2020, Confederate memorials and monuments were illogically linked to race issues when George Floyd, high on fentanyl and methamphetamine, died when being arrested. The virulently anti-police and now discredited organization, Black Lives Matter, immediately tied Floyd's death to Confederate soldier monuments and memorials. This is despite the evidence that Confederate monuments and memorials have no direct ties whatsoever with racism. This is especially true in Minneapolis, a very Northern city with no Confederate monuments or memorials. This tie has been made by hateful people who have invented targets for their illogical wrath. They have lied about the police to target them and have lied about the soldiers' monuments and memorials to target them. It is a Marxist tactic by a self-professed Marxist organization and should be seen as such. Unfortunately, the emotional ties were not just accepted but propagated by those who should have known better. Rather than refuting this ignorance, it was used as a vehicle to do what is now called "virtue signaling" by those who have failed to use critical thinking.

The memorials and monuments were built to remember the military service of both black and white Southern military personnel. There is no evidence to support the specious claims they were intended to suppress or intimidate black people. That is a ridiculous claim that should be rejected by anyone with common sense and historical knowledge.

BACKGROUND

As a result of the 2020 riots and demonstrations initiated by the Marxist organization, Black Lives Matter, Confederate soldiers' symbology was illogically tied to "racism". The use of violence and destruction by domestic terrorists of B.L.M. intimidated many otherwise reasonable people to all of a sudden see "racism" behind every historical figure, not just Confederates. Confederate soldiers' symbology honoring the service of soldier ancestors and their military service became easy targets for those who subverted actual history and twisted it to fit their latent hate-filled narrative.

With a change in administrations in 2021, the Army was directed to root-out perceived "institutionalized " in a McCarthy-esque manner. The "Naming Commission" is a result of this effort to find racism where none has existed. As an example, the Confederate veterans memorial in Huntsville, Alabama (the largest city in the state) was targeted for removal due solely to B.L.M. threats of violence against the county commission. The Madison County Historical Society conducted and published a poll of black residents of the city at the time this happened. Not a single black person polled could cite the location, or even the existence of the Confederate monument, nor could they state the existence and location of the beautiful Buffalo Soldier monument in the same city (honoring the black troops of the 10th Cavalry stationed in Huntsville after the Spanish-American War). Yet, the B.L.M. agitators who came to Huntsville to organize a riot and violence, made the Confederate memorial a target in order to mobilize their followers. It is a common Marxist tactic and it works.

The Naming Commission has targeted the unoffending Confederate memorial in Arlington National Cemetery for the same reasons. It's all about "virtual signaling". The memorial was paid for and owned by a private organization. It has not been an issue for the 108 years it has existed. However, in an effort to "virtue signal" the Commission has decided that this monument must be destroyed and removed for totally illogical and very hypocritical reasons.

PROBLEM

The prevention of the removal / destruction of the Confederate memorial, "New South" in Arlington National Cemetery using tax dollars by the U.S. Army for illogical and biased reasons.

RISKS

There is a potential risk that this historical artwork embodied on the Confederate memorial ("New South") will be severely damaged and destroyed before due process can be implemented to save it.

This would engender deep resentment among Southerners which can affect military support and recruiting efforts. Southerners historically enlist in greater proportions than

other sections of the United States. The military is currently facing its largest failure in reaching recruiting goals in its volunteer force history, much attributed to the “Woke” culture perspectives.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF PART III A REFUTATION OF THE NAMING COMMISSION ARGUMENTS IN THE NAMING COMMISSION FINAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL

The “Naming Commission” has liberally applied its charter for eliminating Confederate names on military installations to anything and everything that can be illogically associated with anything remotely tied to the Confederacy. This is an outrageous extension of its original intent in an effort to purge American history by a markedly one-sided “Naming Commission” with a clear bias.

The Naming Commission immediately posits a faulty premise begging for a problem to be associated with it. While the memorial may offer a “nostalgic” representation of the war-time South that does not automatically mean that it is a *false* representation. Designed by a Jewish-Confederate veteran, it represents the South at that particular period of history (1860-1865). It is only a “mythologized vision” of the Confederacy to those who do not know the actual history and suffer from the logic fault of “presentism”.

The “vision of the Confederacy” (cited by the Commission) was recorded by someone who actually experienced it, a veteran named Moses Ezekiel. While the memorial does not conveniently fit today’s faulty understandings of that period of history’s Victorian culture, thereby possibly making some people “uncomfortable”, it is an accurate portrayal of the history of that period through the eyes of a person who experienced it. The accusation that it is “highly sanitized” is a gross generalization...a logic fault. The same claim can be made of U.S. WWI and WWII memorials. Using the same logic we can say that they memorialize a military that was officially segregated. The monuments and memorials almost exclusively feature only white personnel. This is probably because the military was still segregated during those wars. This is, of course, a nonsensical view of those monuments and memorials.

The Confederate memorial cannot possibly represent all things to all people. It was never meant to do so. The obvious intent is to honor soldiers’ service to their country, not portray every cultural norm of the period. It was never designed as a political statement. There is no evidence to the contrary. To impute it with political characteristics is unintellectual. It is a soldiers’ monument to honor military service. It was never intended to address slavery in any of its contexts.

Black people were part and parcel of the South, many supporting the South in its war efforts. We cannot, today, possibly understand the reasons of all black people to support the Confederacy as no exit poll was taken after the war. However, during the Great Depression, the U.S. government commissioned the “Slave Narratives”. These were the

unbiased accounts of living black people who experienced life in the time of the war and during Reconstruction. Like any other peoples, their reasons for doing what they did were products of their particular circumstances and varied by situation and location. They do not neatly fit into stereotypes and so to force them into those stereotypical molds is again, unintellectual and dishonest. The fact is that many blacks (both free and enslaved) supported the South for a variety of reasons. The Commission does great historical disservice by assuming everyone should accept their biased premise that the monument “sanitizes” history on a Southern memorial just because it does not reflect their views, a by product of “presentism”.

The Commission’s report makes the interesting but invalid assertion that border states’ inclusion on the memorial is wrong. The Commission’s rationale is wrong. The commission report correctly asserts that a number of border states were split in their allegiances. We see this same thing today where state populations are not homogenous in their political views. So, alluding to the fact that some border states had larger percentages of those who were loyal to the Union does not diminish the fact that part of their populations were not in support of the Union. In fact, large numbers supported the Confederacy.

The Commission report states that the border states had a “distinct minority” supporting the Confederacy, thus eliminating consideration of their inclusion on the monument. This is an interesting over-generalization to rationalize their decision to denigrate the memorial. What is a “distinct minority” cited in the Commission report? Is it 5%? 10%? 20%? The Missouri state monument at Vicksburg National Military Park commemorates both Union and Confederate units. Of approximately 109,000 Missourians who served in the war, more than 27.5% were Confederates. Of the 109,000 Union soldiers, many were forced into uniform against their wishes to serve in the Enrolled Missouri Militia. Do they really count as Union soldiers? Union commanders frequently complained that the Enrolled Missouri Militia (EMM) was unreliable as it forced pro-Confederates into it. Yet, they are counted on the U.S. rolls as “Union”.
<https://www.sos.mo.gov/archives/soldiers/abstract.asp>

The Confederates recruited volunteers, not draftees in Missouri so the numbers are skewed in favor of the Union Army that forced enrollment of citizens into blue uniforms. Clearly, more than a quarter of the population that was voluntarily Confederate is *not* a “distinct” minority. This wording by the Commission reflects a clear bias to fit a preconceived notion. “Overwhelming” support means different things to different people but many do not consider 75% to be “overwhelming”. What it also discounts are the numbers of Missourians who sided with neither the South nor the North, automatically assuming that those who were not of the 27.5% Confederates were, therefore, Union supporters. Many people did not wish to be involved with either side, lowering the percentage of those supporting the Union who were forced into service under duress.

The Naming Commission intentionally distorts the support of pro-Confederates in Border States by claiming that the pro-Confederates in those states don’t count as people now. This is purely revisionist history. Future president, Harry S. Truman clearly thought his pro-Confederate family members counted. He joined the Sons of Confederate Veterans

based on his beliefs and the fact his ancestors served in the Confederate forces. Just because a higher percentage of the Missouri state populace sided with the North does not erase the existence of pro-Southern citizens in Missouri. Coincidentally, Truman was responsible for integrating the U.S. military with Executive Order 9981 in 1948.

The soldiers who came from the Border States were organized into official Confederate units just like other Confederate states. As an example, over 17 regiments and 7 separate battalions of infantry were mustered into Confederate Army service from the border state of Missouri. At least 26 regiments of cavalry and mounted infantry and 5 separate companies of cavalry served. Seventeen batteries of artillery were listed on the Confederate rolls. Additionally, irregular forces included a number of regiments of Partisan Rangers and separate companies serving behind Union lines. Missouri is just one border state example demonstrating that the state's loyalties were significantly divided ---- enough to be considered both Confederate and Union. Both countries kept stars on their flags for Missouri. It was a complex, not simple situation.

Missourians fought in all the major campaigns and battles in every ground theater. The Missourians gained a tremendous military reputation and did not lay down their arms at places like Mobile until after the surrender of the Army of Northern Virginia. They are just as much honored Southern soldiers as those from the deep South states. To dismiss the service out-of-hand, and their symbology on the Arlington Confederate memorial when at least a quarter of the state's military personnel were Confederates is a clear attempt to hide the facts, change the history, and denigrate their service in the war.

The Commission Final Report suffers revisionist and biased history when dealing with the black people shown on the memorial frieze. The Commission's bias in the paragraph about an "enslaved woman" and "enslaved man" is overwhelming. There is no evidence that the blacks on the memorial were enslaved. This is purely stereotypical conjecture. The number of freed slaves in the South was roughly 7% of all Southern blacks in 1860. Therefore, there is a 7% chance the blacks on the frieze were free. No one really knows and to assume they are enslaved is stereotyping.

According to the 1860 census, 261,918 free blacks lived in the South, outnumbering Northern free blacks to the tune of 35,766. According to extensive research by black historian Professor Edward C. Smith of American University, the number of free blacks was growing fairly rapidly in the South at the time of the war. So, to automatically assume that all blacks portrayed as enslaved is academically dishonest and done in order to intentionally bias the view of those who accept the premise that the black people on the memorial frieze are, in fact enslaved with no evidence to the contrary.

Feigned outrage over a black "Mammy" totally discounts the population numbers and *culture* of the South. Black domestic help was common in upper-class families. The reason is fairly obvious and completely overlooked (demonstrating "presentism"). The very high proportion of blacks in the South meant that unlike the North, they were more common in Southern society and hence, more involved in daily life. It was not so in the

North. To have them on the memorial makes logical and common sense. Hiding them would be projecting a false narrative. They were, and are, very much a part of the South.

The higher ratio of blacks to whites in the South meant that they were much more integrated into the Southern society culture than in the North. "Mammys" were, in many cases, treated as members of the family. They had close personal relationships from living in proximity with whites. And even though they were domestic workers, even if they were slaves, they were treated and considered as family members in many documented cases. This is evidenced by numerous interviews of former slaves and cited in the "Slave Narratives" commissioned by the US government during the Depression. It is in no way a defense of slavery. It is just an accurate depiction of life as it was then.

Another particular point of contention seems to be the black soldier wearing a uniform on the memorial frieze. Again, a stereotypical assessment is offered by the Commission Report when it states: "an enslaved man following his owner to war." What evidence is the black soldier "enslaved"? While many certainly were, there are a number of instances of black slaves and some free black men following their owners, or former owners, on their own volition into military service.

As one example of a foreign observer's observations, British Colonel Arthur Freemantle of the Coldstream Guards wrote about his experience at Gettysburg watching black Confederates in his book, "Three Months In The Confederate States":

"This little episode of a Southern slave leading a white Yankee soldier through a Northern village, alone and of his own accord, would not have been gratifying to an abolitionist; nor would the sympathizers both in England and in the North feel encouraged if they could hear the language of the detestation and contempt with which the numerous Negroes with Southern armies speak of their liberators."

British Colonel Freemantle wrote about exactly what he saw. Confederate infantry veteran, Moses Ezekiel sculpted what he saw. When the memorial was erected during an age of Jim Crow laws and blatant racism in the United States, what reason would Ezekiel have to honor black Confederate soldiers *if they were not so*? Trying to denigrate them and rationalize their existence on the memorial now is another wrong. A new term has been invented for this treatment of Confederate blacks that don't fit the traditional stereotypes: "*Eracism*". Erasing their memory.

It is very important to consider that those who argue against black Confederates commonly use the argument that they were not "real" soldiers, "only cooks or teamsters". So, using that criteria we would have to discount a number of current-day Army cooks and truck drivers. Additionally, there was no common definition of "soldier" that stated that they must have been formally enlisted into the Army 150 years ago. The definition just states that the person(s) must be doing "military duties" (as part of a

military organization). Finally, why would the Southern states grant soldier pensions to these men if they had not served in the capacity of soldiers? Why are there numerous photos of the black veterans at Confederate reunions? They weren't "forced to fight" and they were not forced to attend the reunions years after the war ended. The fact is that a number did receive military pensions. They attended reunions voluntarily as honored veterans. Ezekiel's black soldier belongs on the memorial and his memory should be honored as much as that of his white comrades'. In the book, "Orderly For Lee: A Modern Black Man's Confederate Journey" by black author Al Arnold, is an excellent start to counter old stereotypes about black Confederates. A number of books now chronicle black Confederates and none of them contend that blacks were fighting to support slavery! They served like soldiers today, for a variety of reasons.

The Commission intentionally uses the exaggerated, biased language and false premises to explain the "Lost Cause" and thus attempts to discredit it completely. White "backlash" against Reconstruction had much to do with the gross injustices, mistreatment, and abuses of Southerners by the Federal government ---- part of radical Republican revenge against the South. Yes, very unfortunately there was a racial component but that was only part of the overall resentment engendered in Southerners.

The Commission's reasons for Southern secession (a political issue) are being illogically tied to the Confederate memorial which honors the soldiers' *military service*, not the political issues of secession or slavery. These are all different issues. Using emotion-laden descriptors such as "horrors" of slavery and then tying it to "Reconstruction" is a strawman argument. The "Lost Cause"---- that is, a free and separate country unburdened by excessive Federal control and taxes is still a cause that many, not just in the South believe even today. As Pulitzer Prize winning Dr. James McPherson aptly determined in his ground-breaking study of why soldiers on each side fought, the soldiers' reasons are largely divorced from political reasons. In fact, McPherson states that only a very small percentage of Confederate soldiers, about 5%, ever mention "slavery" for a reason for fighting. Dr. Michael Bradley's new book: "The Last Words: The Farewell Addresses of Union and Confederate Commanders To Their Men At The End of the War Between The States" examines the written, extant addresses given to the soldiers of both sides by their commanders at the end of the war. Only one Union Army commander cited even mentions "slavery". *None of the others*, either Union or Confederate, mention slavery as a reason for fighting. It just was not a major reason. This is according to commanders on both sides in their own words.

McPherson, a nationally renowned historian and Northerner with a Union Army ancestor, is predisposed to determine otherwise when sharing his findings on why soldiers fought. Yet, his analysis is honestly based on extensive study of thousands of first-hand period documents. His findings are recorded in his book, "For Cause and Comrades: Why Soldiers Fought In The Civil War". What he found is that the Union Army soldiers largely did not fight to end slavery but to maintain the "Union" (hence the name of their army). Confederate soldiers fought to stop an invasion and for "liberty".

The Commission's focus on "Reconstruction" as an issue is not addressed by the Confederate memorial. It is an attempt to make an emotional argument to back the reasoning for eliminating the memorial. "Reconstruction" means different things to different people. While the term itself seems to have a manifestly positive connotation, it was not the Marshall Plan our county implemented for Europe. "Reconstruction" in many respects was a financially and socially crippling program that allowed for massive corruption and abuses by "carpetbaggers" and "Scalawags" intent on taking advantage of a prostrate country crippled by invasion and massive wanton destruction. It attempted to enforce civil equality for black people but it also severely punished those whose political views, not actions, were not pro-Northern. Churches and schools were punished for speaking-out and disagreeing with Northern political dictates, a phenomena occurring even today in other venues.

"The image of the faithful slave, embodied in the two figures on the memorial, appeared widely in American popular culture during the 1910s through 1930s, perhaps most famously in the 1939 film "Gone with the Wind." --- from the Commission Final Report.

Facts sometimes hurt. The fact that the South continued a war for four years required the enormous resources provided by black Southerners, both enslaved and freed. The Southern blacks were a major reason outmanned and out-resourced Confederates lasted for years in the field. The fact is that there are substantial documented cases of freed blacks providing financial, material, economic, and other support to the South. There were many who were enslaved forced to support Confederate efforts. That is not denied. However, treating all blacks, enslaved and freed, as a monolithic entity as the Commission has demonstrated in its written study is another case of intellectual dishonesty. *They were not all the same!* The "faithful" slaves actually did exist. There is plenty of written documentary evidence to support this assertion. Not every black person in the South was a guerilla freedom fighter as the Commission implies. As noted black historian, Dr. Roland Young stated: "...some, if not most, black southerners would support their country (the South) ...[and that by doing so they were] *demonstrating it's possible to hate the system of slavery and love one's country.*" It was a cultural phenomena of the period that is difficult for some people, hobbled by "presentism" to comprehend today.

Removing the Confederate memorial is tantamount to saying that the Southern, American soldiers are now unworthy of being remembered by their descendants. This issue only gained attention in 2020 in the illogical connection of racism and the Confederacy. Why is the same attention not given to the U.S. side when it was hardly the paragon of racial harmony? New York City's draft riots in the summer of 1863 resulted in the lynching of over 20 black residents. Major General Sherman compared black soldiers to sandbags and called them "Sambos". The U.S. military's segregation and decades-long substandard treatment of black members are conveniently overlooked by those who are looking for "low hanging fruit". This resulting effort to insult Southerners and Confederates but ignore Northern transgressions is nothing less than shameless pandering and hypocrisy. Confederate soldiers are being unfairly

criminalized despite the fact the president who started the reconciliation of the country was, in fact, the last president to serve in the Union Army. He specifically called Confederates "Americans" for a purpose... "Reconciliation".

Attacking the Arlington Cemetery Confederate memorial to *American soldiers* establishes a dangerous precedent of attacking memorials in cemeteries. The memorial is more than a soldiers' memorial. It is a significant piece of American art by an American veteran and distinguished Southern Jew. The attack on the memorial is especially insulting to many Southern Confederate descendants whose families have honorably served the U.S. military both before and after the war and who believe President McKinley's characterization of their ancestors as honorable American soldiers.

Shortly after the war, former Union Army soldier and famous journalist, Ambrose Bierce, responded to radical Republican politicians who had never fired a shot in anger, never marched a mile with a musket, never sweated under the load of a pack, and never faced a Confederate in battle when these same politicians attempted to prevent the decoration of Confederate graves, a situation we find now encounter. He wrote the following words, addressing them to those "courageous" politicians:

"The brave respect the brave. The brave respect the dead;
but you --- you draw that ancient blade, the ass's jaw, and shake
it o'er a hero's grave."

The disposition of the Confederate memorial has been directly and indirectly tied to its future potential destruction. The memorial was paid for by American citizens with private funds. It was accepted for display in trust by a serving president and other U.S. government officials. The current move for the destruction of the Confederate memorial "New South" by disassembling or destroying it is reminiscent of the actions by the Bolsheviks during the Russian Revolution, or even more recently, the Taliban in Afghanistan. The major difference is that we are now destroying memorials to fellow American soldiers who were deemed honorable opponents by men such as President U.S. Grant and President McKinley, both of whom fought in combat against them.

The Commission's mention of "Contextualization" is simply "New Speak" for revisionist history to turn Confederate military memorials and monuments into political targets solely based on the issues of race. Again, that was never the memorials' purposes when they were erected. No evidence exists to prove Confederate memorials and monuments were erected for any other reason than to honor the military service of Confederates. That evidence doesn't exist and cannot be produced otherwise. Any ties to "racism" are strictly speculative, ---- *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* ---- hardly substantive, scientific evidence they were erected as "racist" or "white supremacy" threats to black people.

SUMMARY AND SOLUTION

In the event that the Confederate memorial is to be removed as has been proposed, the recommendation to also remove all U.S. military monuments erected prior to 1948 should be made as well. The US military was officially and illegally segregated as part of the continuing Union Army policy from 1863 onward of separating soldiers by race. If race is the key and dominant issue to be considered for the rationale to keep memorials and monuments, then the same standard of treatment needs to be applied equally to both sides throughout relevant time.

When the United States began its wars in Afghanistan and Iraq in 2001 and 2003 respectively, the military reverted to conducting counter-insurgency warfare. Two key manuals were written to fight this type of conflict. The first is FM 3-24, Counter-insurgency and the second is FM 3-07, Stability Operations. “*Culture*” is specifically addressed in these manuals as an adjunct to military operations with the admonitions to consider others’ *cultures* and norms. The 2006 version of FM 3-24 was the primary manual used in Iraq and Afghanistan. Chapter 3 gives great emphasis to the importance of “*culture*”. This doctrine guides military decision making and most importantly, ethical values in combat theaters. However, this doctrine is conveniently over-looked and ignored in the case of dealing with our own Southern-American *culture*.

Extract From FM 3-07, Stability, Shrines and Art, para. 2-88
(U.S. Army doctrine):

Military forces protect shrines and art. Except in cases where military operations or military necessity prevents it, the force protects and preserves all historical and cultural monuments and works, religious shrines and objects of art, and any other national collections of artifacts or art.

The entire point of respecting the *culture* of others, even enemies’, is to engender a feeling of mutual respect and make the return to peace much easier. *It assists in reconciliation*. It is not just for foreign opponents. Southern-American *culture* is just as important as any foreign enemies’ culture. The Naming Commission needs to treat it as such. Reconciliation once undone, will be very difficult to reestablish because it hits at the very core of Southern *culture* for very bad reasons.

CONCLUSION

The knee-jerk reaction of “cancel culture” purging and erasure of any symbols of the Confederacy is a Marxist political tool never envisioned by the majority of the victors of the war in 1865. It is the result of a lack of historical knowledge and acceptance of false premises by those who have falsely accused everyone with whom they disagree as “racists”. Even President Lincoln was a voice of reason on this issue. “With malice toward none, with charity for all.” His second inaugural speech exemplifies the attitude of reconciliation now being undone by those who little understand the *culture* of the

1860s and who are inimical to reconciliation. It has not always been this way. Recounting the surrender at Appomattox, Union hero Major General Joshua Chamberlain wrote:

*Instructions had been given; and when the head of each division column [Confederate] comes opposite our group, our bugle sounds the signal and instantly our whole line from right to left, regiment by regiment in succession, gives the soldier's salutation, from the "order arms" to the old "carry"— the marching salute. Gordon [Confederate general] at the head of the column, riding with heavy spirit and downcast face, catches the sound of shifting arms, looks up, and, taking the meaning, wheels superbly...with profound salutation as he drops the point of his sword to the boot toe [saluting]; then facing to his own command, gives word for his successive brigades to pass us with the same position of the manual, **honor answering honor**.*

---- Brevet Major General Joshua Chamberlain
Union Army hero of Gettysburg

Where are the Joshua Chamberlains of the Naming Commission?