



# CAMPTALK

The monthly Newsletter of the Capt. J.J. Dickson Camp 1387, Sons of Confederate Veterans, 10<sup>th</sup> Brigade, Florida Division, Army of Tennessee, Melbourne Florida

Vol. 30 No. 6 June 2012

Chartered 28 March 1981

Editor Don Young

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

## May 2012 MEETING

MEMAW's BBQ 600 East Eau Gallie Blvd. Indian Harbour Beach, FL

6:00 PM – 7:00 PM Order from menu 7:00 – 8:00 Program 8:00 – 8:45 Business Meeting.

Meetings are the fourth Thursday of each month.

Male descendants of men who served the Confederacy, their wives and others interested in the War For Southern Independence are invited to attend.

## CAMP OFFICERS

Chaplain Tim Cobb	321-259-8391
Treasurer Tom Watkins	321-254-0241
2 <sup>nd</sup> Lt.	Open
1 <sup>st</sup> Lt. Don Young	321-452-3207
Adjutant	Open
Commander Kevin Atchison	321-242-1126

## CAMP STAFF

Color Sgt Evan Phillips	321-961-9407
Q'termaster Larry Thornton	321-704-2834
Judge Advocate Don Lock	321-752-9276
Public Information Officer	Open
Editor Don Young	321-452-3207
Heritage Don Young	321-452-3207
Recording Sec. Miss June	321-984-9967
UDC/OCR Liaison Miss Lee	321-452-3207

## COMMANDERS CORNER

Over the Memorial Day weekend a number of our camp members participated in several events. 1<sup>st</sup> Lt. Commander Don Young and compatriot Rob Murray participated with the AVCG in the Rockledge Parade on Sunday and the Cocoa Memorial Day Event on Monday. In addition, I along with Compatriot Larry Thornton and 10<sup>th</sup> Brigade Commander Larry Rowe participated in Honor America's Massing of the Colors Event in Melbourne. Thanks for everyone's help during these events.

Camp 1387 will participate in the 4<sup>th</sup> of July parade in Melbourne, Florida. This parade will be similar to the Fourth of July and Veteran's Day parade that we participate in each year. More details on this event will be available at our June camp meeting.

Speaking of our June Camp meeting, this month's program will feature our Florida Division's 4<sup>th</sup> Lt. Commander Harry Hurst. He will be speaking about Facts and Myths we have heard and learned about the WBTS. Please support our Camp by attending this month's meeting. I would also like to congratulate Camp 1<sup>st</sup> Lt. Commander Don Young on being elected our Florida Division's 3<sup>rd</sup> Lt. Commander for another term (5<sup>th</sup>). Finally, it is about that time of the year when we will begin to collect dues for another year. I will be sending out dues statements during mid to late July. I would like to thank everyone during the past couple of years of getting your dues paid in a timely manner.

In Service to The South, Kevin Atchison Commander Camp 1387

\*\*\*\*\*

## EVENTS

03 Jun Happy Birthday President Davis  
14 Jun E-board meeting  
28 Jun Camp meeting  
04 July Melbourne Parade, Muster at 0900-30 on Melbourne Ave. by creek. Start 1000

\*\*\*\*\*

## PROGRAM

### Actual Historical Occurrences or Documented Facts vs. Personal Opinion

Florida Division 4<sup>th</sup> Lt. Commander Harry Hurst will visit us from Ocala to discuss Fact versus Opinion. It has happened to each of us, a speaker or someone in conversation tells us one myth after another and only offers "...everybody knows that" as proof of their statements. Commander Hurst is a veteran of many such encounters and will share some of them with us. He will also provide us with guidance and methods for sorting out the differences and refuting purveyors of myth.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Florida Division Reunion

Our Division Reunion was held in Ocala 01-3 June. The primary business this year was election and installation of Division Officers. This is the first changing of top Division leaders in 8 years. The Division website "contacts" page has been updated with all the current information.

James S. Davis from the St. Augustine Camp is our new Division Commander. Calvin Hart from the Jacksonville Camp is our new 1<sup>st</sup> Lt. Commander. Bob Hurst and Don Young were maintained in their 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Lt. positions. Harry Hurst from the Ocala Camp moved from 8<sup>th</sup> Brigade Commander to 4<sup>th</sup> Lt. and Robert Smith from the Tampa Camp is the new 5<sup>th</sup> Lt.

Larry Rowe from the Christmas Camp will serve a 2<sup>nd</sup> term as our 10<sup>th</sup> Brigade Commander.

Boundaries for Lt. Commander regions were reviewed and are unchanged. Brigade boundaries were also reviewed and remain unchanged. There were no amendments considered to the Division Constitution.

Let's all work together to support our new Division leadership in forwarding the Charge.

.....

.....  
**Editors Note:** This month we have two articles addressing approximately the same points. One is written quoting sources and using facts. The other proclaims to be dispelling myth and revisionist history. Read and decide which you believe is closer to fact and truth and which is opinion.

\*\*\*\*\*

## THE BIG LIE

Well, here we are once again firmly enmeshed in "silly season". "Silly season", to me, is the last six months before the presidential election in this country. Since these events occur every four years, and since I've been around for awhile, I've experienced many of these and what I find most irritating and exasperating is the constant pronouncements during this period of extreme hyperbole, prevarications, falsehoods, untruths and any other term that can be applied to an outright lie.

Yes, I get truly tired of the lies. There are lies to build up one candidate, lies to tear down another, lies to exaggerate the accomplishments of the incumbent, lies to... well, I think you get the picture. Sadly, this constant lying during political campaigns has become a part of the American pageant. It likely always has been although it seems more pervasive than ever before which, I suppose, can be attributed to the advancements in communications and the failure of the media to be non-partisan.

As much as I detest all the untruths associated with modern-day politicking, there is one lie that has been around for awhile which angers me even more than any of the constant untruths that I hear during political campaigns. To me, the biggest lie ever foisted on the American people is the myth that the Great War fought from 1861 to 1865 (and erroneously called the "Civil War") was instigated by the South and fought over the issue of slavery.

There had been vast differences between those of the North and those of the South even prior to the time of the American Revolution and the founding of this country. The question of secession had come up numerous times between the founding and the first actual secession of a state in 1860. Early threats of secession had come primarily from New England states with threats of secession being made four times between 1803 and 1846.

The first serious consideration of secession by a Southern State came about as a result of the Tariff of 1832 which followed closely on the heels of the Tariff of 1828 which, in the South, had been called the "Tariff of Abominations". The opposition was so strong in South Carolina that the state called for nullification of the tariff and President Andrew Jackson responded by sending federal naval and military forces into the state. A compromise was reached and the hostilities ended for the time being.

This certainly did not end the differences between the North and the South and by 1850 there were renewed calls by many Southerners for secession. The great John C. Calhoun had prepared what was to be his last public presentation for the South in the United States Senate. Calhoun was dying of tuberculosis and was too weak to present his speech so it was read for him by a younger colleague.

In this speech, Calhoun listed three main grievances of the South that could lead to secession. The first was the exclusion of the South from most of the new territories. The second was the growth in power of the federal government despite the limitations imposed by the United States Constitution. The third grievance was the most critical and involved the effect of federal taxation on the South. Calhoun's words reflected feelings throughout Southern State governments when he explained:

"The North had adopted a system of revenue and disbursements in which an undue proportion of the burden of taxation has been imposed upon the South, and an undue proportion of

proceeds appropriated to the North ... the South... has in reality paid vastly more than her due proportion of the revenue ".

Calhoun had precisely nailed the issue. The South was weary of supplying a large proportion of the federal revenue and receiving little in return.

Unfortunately, this situation did not change and on January 15, 1861, after the secession of four Southern states - South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida and Alabama - and the soon-to-be secession within days of three more - Georgia, Louisiana and Texas - Rep. John H. Reagan of Texas rose on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives and directed the following toward the Northern-dominated government:

"You are not content with the vast millions of tribute we pay you annually under the operation of our revenue laws, our navigation laws, your fishing bounties, and by making your people our manufacturers, our merchants, our shippers. You are not satisfied with the vast tributes we pay you to build up your great cities, your railroads, your canals. You are not satisfied with the millions of tribute we have been paying you on account of the balance of exchange which you hold against us. You are not satisfied that we of the South are almost reduced to the condition of overseers of northern capitalists. You are not satisfied with all this; but you wage a relentless crusade against our rights and institutions."

Even the English recognized the unfairness of the revenue situation in America. The *ATHENAEUM*, a British weekly, wrote: "As a rule, the great mass of the public expenditures were made from the North, not in the South, so that Southerners found themselves doubly taxed - taxed first for the benefit of the northern manufacturers, and then, in the disbursements of the public funds, denied an equal participation in the benefits accruing therefrom."

It should be noted that at this time the amount of revenue collected from the Southern States was approximately 75% of all revenue collected by the federal government. As both Calhoun and Reagan had mentioned, most of this was being spent on projects in the North with the South reaping few of the benefits. It's no wonder that the South had had enough.

It becomes obvious that the major disagreement between the North and the South was a financial one. There is a maxim that had been proven true for thousands of years that states that wars are fought for power and money. Power, of course, includes control of territory, resources and money. There is also an American truism that says when regarding any action of government, "follow the money". If you understand these two jewels of wisdom you will understand why the war of 1861 to 1865 was actually fought and, folks, it wasn't slavery for either side.

Charles Adams, the brilliant economist/historian, in his wonderful book *WHEN IN THE COURSE OF HUMAN EVENTS* makes the strong argument that it was during the month of March 1861 that the collision course of the North and South came inevitably to fruition and it was economic reasons alone that caused this happening. Adams calls this period the "war of the tariffs".

What happened was that in early March, Congress passed the highest tariff in American history. This was called the Morrill Tariff. On March 11 the Confederate Constitution was adopted and immediately created, for all practical purposes, a free trade zone in the South because of the exceedingly low tariff which was simultaneously implemented. Prior to this time, going back many months, northern newspapers had been advocating for peace between the two regions through conciliation. Within weeks of the creation of the Southern free trade zone, however, once the newspapers realized the implications of the extremely high tariff in the North and the exceedingly low tariff in the South, they changed their tunes drastically.

Charles Adams cites an example of this radical change by mentioning how the Philadelphia *PRESS* newspaper had opposed military action by the North in an editorial of January 18, 1861, stating that the secession crisis should best be handled peacefully and not by "conquest, subjugation, coercion or war". Yet, on March 18 this same newspaper was demanding war on the South and a blockade of all Southern ports. This turnaround was repeated by newspapers throughout the North.

For example, for months the New York Times had printed articles indicating that secession "would not injure Northern commerce and prosperity". By March 22 this same paper was calling for a shutdown of every Southern port and for "utter ruin" to be brought on the CSA.

The Boston TRANSCRIPT keenly perceived something that many other papers missed. The paper pointed out that although several Southern politicians had claimed that secession touched upon the slavery question, this was only a facade. The paper editorialized that "the mask has been thrown off and it is apparent that the people of the principal seceding states are now for commercial independence". For this reason the war was encouraged by many factions in the North. They saw war, a winning war, as the only way to protect commerce in the northern states. Likewise, a number of Southerners had claimed that secession was tied to slavery since they undoubtedly believed that most Northerners certainly would not fight a war, risking blood and treasure, for a cause so secondary to Northern prosperity. Remember, folks, always follow the money.

An interesting aside to all this was the threat issued by New York to withdraw from the Union (secede) and create its own free trade zone. Certainly doesn't sound like freeing the slaves was on the mind of New York businessmen and decision-makers.

It is a fact that a third party, not closely aligned with either of two warring entities, can have a better perspective on what is actually happening than a party close to one or the other of the war participants. For this reason it is interesting to read the perspectives of various periodicals that were covering the American conflict from afar.

The British press, represented by many magazines and periodicals, gave extensive coverage to the war in America. The Brits were especially confused by the Northern onslaught upon the South. For instance, the CORNHILL MAGAZINE of London asked a difficult question about Northern actions: "With what pretence of fairness, it is said, can you Americans object to the secession of the Southern States when your nation was founded on secession from the British Empire?" Good question!

Macmillan's MAGAZINE, a major British monthly, sent a correspondent to America to find an answer to a question that was extremely perplexing to many Brits: "What was the North fighting for?" The Brits, indeed all of Europe, knew that Lincoln had refused to speak to a peace delegation sent by Jefferson Davis a month before Lincoln's inauguration to discuss friendly relations and trade agreements between the two countries. To many Europeans this suggested a morality problem on Lincoln's part. There was an accepted doctrine that it was illegal and immoral for a Christian nation to go to war except to defend itself. It was obvious, in America, that it was the South that was on the defensive. Thus the question of what the North was really fighting for remained a mystery to most Brits and Europeans in general.

How did the British perceive the involvement of slavery as a causative factor of the conflict? Charles Dickens, who covered the war as a correspondent for several publications, wrote that "... the South instead of seceding for the sake of slavery seceded in spite of the fact that its separate maintenance will expose them ...to risks and losses which the Union would afford security." Dickens, as did many Brits, knew that slavery was protected in the U.S. Constitution and that the Fugitive Slave Act had been upheld and supported by the U.S. Supreme Court. [Question: Have you ever wondered why the "Underground Railroad" ended in Canada rather than the Northern states of the U.S.?)

The QUARTERLY REVIEW of London also recognized that slavery was not a major issue insofar as being a causative factor of the war with this analysis:

"For the contest on the part of the North is undisguisedly for empire. The question of Slavery is thrown to the winds. There is hardly any concession in its favor that the South could ask which the North would refuse, provided only that the seceding states would re-enter the Union... Away with the pretence on the North to dignify its cause with the name of freedom to the slave!"

The QR also was wise in its understanding of the South's reasoning as expressed in this opinion: "If slavery were alone, or principally, in issue, the conduct of the South would not only

be unreasonable but unintelligible." The QR well recognized that maintaining slavery was not the primary issue for the South nor was freeing the slaves a paramount concern for the North. Charles Adams summed up the attitude of the British reporters thusly: "It seems clear that British war correspondents and writers saw the War Between the States as caused by the forces that have caused wars throughout history - economic and imperialistic forces behind a rather flimsy facade of freeing the slaves." Smart folks, those Brits!

I cannot end without one more quote from the great Dickens: "The Northern onslaught upon slavery was no more than a piece of specious humbug designed to conceal its desire for economic control of the Southern states." Smart man, that Dickens!

In closing I would like to quote two outstanding writers of the current era. Several years ago in a rebuttal article that I wrote for the local (and very liberal) newspaper here in Tallahassee, I quoted the respected black journalist, W. Earl Douglas, on matters pertaining to that war from 1861 to 1865. During the South Carolina flag fight just over a decade ago, Douglas had defended the continued flying of the Confederate Battle Flag atop the Capitol dome. The following statement truly stood out to me:

"I am reminded that it was my grandparents who kept the home fires burning while the Confederacy waged war. Which is why I cannot view loyalty to the South or the desire for independence as being monopolized by either race. And the two greatest lies perpetrated by history (are) that the South instigated the war and that it was fought by the North for the purpose of freeing the slaves."

And finally, from the aforementioned Charles Adams who, by the way, is a Northerner and indeed a member of THAT Adams family:

" It seems to this historian that financial prosperity was the powerful force that moved the nation into war. ALL OTHER EVENTS AND MOTIVES WERE SECONDARY." (emphasis mine)

I feel that I am in good company.

Bob Hurst is a Son of the South who has special interests in the Confederacy and the antebellum architecture of the South. He is Commander of Col. David Lang Camp, Sons of Confederate Veterans, in Tallahassee and is also 2nd Lieutenant Commander of the Florida Division, SCV. He can be contacted at [confederatedad1@yahoo.com](mailto:confederatedad1@yahoo.com) or 850-878-7010.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Hate Article Dujour

### Five Biggest Misconceptions about the Confederacy by Blog Korsgaard's Commentary, name not given even on blogsite, April 18, 2012

It's a long running joke of mine that the American South is perhaps the only region of the planet that celebrates the fact it was on the losing end of a war, let alone one over the right to own other human beings. Of course, perhaps a large part of this might be due to the massive shift in tone led by historical revisionist [Lost Causer's](#) like [Jubal Early](#), and assisted by teary eyed accounts from folks like Margaret Mitchell who popularized and romanticized the image of an Antebellum Southern society that, in real life had never existed. The result is a mythological image of the South, and the Confederacy in particular, has been accepted by the general public without regards to the actual history.

#### 1) The war was over States Rights, not Slavery

Not surprising that this is the one point those who claim to revere the Confederate identify rush



to say that slavery was not a part of that identity – even the staunchest Dixiecrat would be hard pressed to defend the right to own another human being. As a result, many Confederate apologists wrap the Southern cause as one of States Rights, something Libertarian minded folk like myself should greet with great scorn and ridicule, and for good reason.



The picture above is of the Confederate 100 Dollar Bill, and the picture right in the middle of it is of slaves growing cotton. Not content to only enshrine slavery on their money, the Confederacy also wrote it into their Constitution, their respective state Constitutions, which among other things, made slavery one of the requirements of statehood, and had the abolition of slavery has quite literally outlawed in the Constitution. Much the same, many of the Founding Fathers of the CSA made speeches claiming slavery as the heart of the new nation, most famously in Vice President Alexander Stephen's "Cornerstone Speech", which included the following passage: "Our new Government is founded upon exactly the opposite ideas; its foundations are laid, its cornerstone rests, upon the great truth that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery, subordination to the superior race, is his natural and normal condition." In the words of their own leaders, their own laws, and even their constitution, the right to own slaves was the core of the national identity of the Confederacy – I guess life liberty and the pursuit of happiness was too radical for the plantation owners. Granted, the Union was hardly a poster child for racial harmony, as a number of incidents prove, but even lip service to 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness' makes a better national cause than 'right to own slaves'. The most ironic part is that it was the North that had the right to claim the mantle of states' rights more than the South had any claim to it – after all, the slave owners defended their peculiar institution by means of federalism any chance they got, because if it was left to popular opinion, slavery would have been left without a leg to stand on. One of the big reasons for the upswing in abolitionist support in the 1850s was the of the two latest efforts to prolong the lifespan of plantation slavery, the Kansas-Nebraska Act and the Dredd Scott Decision, one sparked a miniature Civil War in Kansas, and the other basically did away with the idea of Free States. So no, the slave owners that formed the Confederacy didn't give two damns about states' rights, and were more than happy to use federalism to defend their position, and the moment it no longer became possible to do so, they left the Union. It has all the political maturity of a toddler throwing a tantrum – if a toddler's temper tantrum could spark the bloodiest war in the history of the United States that is.

## 2) The Confederacy supported Limited Government

Ironically, this myth was not only pushed by folks who revered the Confederacy, but by many political opportunists who sought to slander those who support state's rights or limited government as bigoted neo-Confederates, and not surprisingly, by claiming the Confederacy to be a bastion of limited government, all either side does is showcase their ignorance. As if writing slavery and prohibiting its abolition into their Constitution wasn't a big enough hint, another notable part of the same document was to outlaw secession for any member of the Confederacy. So yes, not only did the group that claimed they has the right to leave the United States under the US Constitution forbid that same right in their own Constitution, but as a latter

point will prove, they killed those who tried it.

Another infamous law of the Confederacy was the Twenty Slave Law, which exempted anyone who owned more than twenty slaves from military service, which not only meant the ones who pushed for session wouldn't be the ones who fought for it, it also went the extra mile in restricting the civil liberties and voice in government of the vast majority of southerners who owned no slaves, while forcing them into conscription. To enforce this, you had the Confederate Home Guard, a band of proto-Gestapo thugs that was granted extra-constitutional rights to stifle dissent, enforce conscription and other edicts, and was authorized to use force, lethal or otherwise, to do so. I don't know about you, but when I think of limited government, roving death squads are one of the last things I associate with it.

If restricting the voice in government to a small rich minority, reducing poorer citizens to cannon fodder and having roving death squads to restrict their rights isn't big government enough for you, the Confederacy also had price and wage controls, internal passports restricting internal travel, government nationalized salt and alcohol production, required railroads to operate at a loss, and required shippers to transport government goods at no charge, all regulations that even in the current era of bloated big government, we have yet to see. There were more bureaucrats in Richmond then there were in DC, which is one reason while the Confederate Government couldn't even determine what qualified as a Confederate citizen, the folks up in DC worked hard to ensure that argument was a moot point.

So yes, between the restrictions on freedom and voice in government, intense regulation and nationalization of many sectors of the economy, and having a group of government affiliated paramilitary groups enforce the will of the small group of elites who ran the nation, the Confederacy boasted a limited government – at least in comparison to the myriad of dictatorships that all used the same policies a century later.

**Editor's Note:** Sections 3 and 4 were eliminated for space. Available from editor.

3) The Southern people almost universally supported the Confederacy.

4) The Confederate Military/Government leaders were brilliant/gentlemen/honorable.

## 5) The Confederacy could have won the Civil War (or long survived it)

To an extent, this particular myth has been debunked to all but the firmest of Confederate diehards – there was a reason why early Confederate apologists were called 'Lost Causers' after all. Nonetheless, I will say it here: there is no way the Confederacy could have won the Civil War on the field of battle.

As many Americans learned in grade school, one of the biggest advantages of the Union

	Union	CSA
Total population	22,100,000 (71%)	9,100,000 (29%)
Free population	21,700,000	5,600,000
Slave population, 1860	400,000	3,500,000
Soldiers	2,100,000 (67%)	1,064,000 (33%)
Railroad length	21,788 miles (35,064 km) (71%)	8,838 miles (14,223 km) (29%)
Manufactured items	90%	10%
Firearm production	97%	3%
Bales of cotton in 1860	Negligible	4,500,000
Bales of cotton in 1864	Negligible	300,000

in the War was that they made more guns, more railroads, more industry, more ships, more men to recruit into the army,



and even more crops than the regions South of the Mason-Dixon Line. Though the American Civil War would be the first showcase of it, industrial warfare determines its victors just as much by the supply lines as the battle lines, and the Union's ability to outgun, out supply and outman the Confederacy left the slavers cause with the deck already stood against them. The only prayer the Confederacy had, outside of foreign intervention, and what formed the core of their war strategy, was to fight on until the Union lost the will to fight, which though close at times, never happened. Somehow, the Southern cause, lost or otherwise, seems a lot less romantic when you realize the Confederate battle plan boiled down to keep sending waves of poor schmucks to die until the Union gets bored while the men in charge sipped on mint juleps. In the long run, defeat may have been the best fate for the CSA. Even if the Confederacy had won, its future was guaranteed to be grimmer than defeat. After all, nothing quite says national stability like a deeply indebted, neo-feudalist proto-banana republic built on chattel slavery. Odds are good, the best fate of an independent CSA, as its founders would have envisioned it, would be akin to your standard issue Latin American tin pot dictatorship. Far more likely, it would either be reabsorbed by the United States, splinter into separate nations, collapse due to anything from racial violence to economic crisis, and in any case, would likely not survive the century, and if it did, it would be as an economically broken, backward pariah state, masses of black slaves and poor disenfranchised whites itching to set aflame the powder keg, with a vengeful United States in the midst of jingoism staring hungrily across the border. Look away Dixie Land indeed!

So rather than salute the actions of a handful of traitorous slave-owning aristocrats that left hundreds of thousands of their countrymen dead, or mourn the loss of a nation that would have been fated no matter what to be an embarrassing footnote in the history of the continent, the folks sporting Confederate flags on their cars or shirts need to realize what I and many of our fellow southerners already know: That the best thing that ever happened to the South was that the attempt to swap the Stars and Stripes for the Stars and Bars failed miserably. To those who say otherwise, allow me to put a twist on slogan of yours. If this offends you:



Then you need a history lesson.

**Editor's Note:** We all need history lessons and this unnamed individual is certainly no exception. **FACTS** are usually hard to come by in such tirades, though there are several included in this one and even **some opinion** here that we would agree with. This self declared historian blogger blatantly presents his **opinion** as historical fact and selects which myth he wishes to quote as fact for support. Hate Speak by any other name is the same old thing regardless of whose opinion it represents.

\*\*\*\*\*

[Gen Jubal Anderson Early posted in Raising the "World's Largest" 3rd National Flag](#)

.....