

**UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS IN BRATISLAVA  
FACULTY OF APPLIED LANGUAGES**

106007/Dp/2016/3781325709

**American Civil War**

The Deadliest War in American History and Its Legacy

**Master Thesis**

**Bratislava 2016**

**Róberta Bakulyová**

**UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS IN BRATISLAVA  
FACULTY OF APPLIED LANGUAGES**

**American Civil War**

The Deadliest War in American History and Its Legacy

**Master Thesis**

**Study Program:** Foreign Languages and Intercultural Communication

**Field of Study:** 2.1.32 Foreign Languages and Cultures

**Consultation Centre:** Department of Intercultural Communication

**Tutor:** PhDr. Mária Bláhová, PhD.

**Bratislava 2016**

**Róberta Bakulyová**



## **Affirmation**

I hereby affirm that I have elaborated the final thesis independently and that I have listed all the used literature.

Bratislava, April 1<sup>st</sup> 2016

.....

(student's signature)

## **Acknowledgements**

First and foremost I offer my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor, PhDr. Mária Bláhová, PhD., who has supported me throughout my thesis with her knowledge whilst allowing me the room to work in my own way.

## **Abstract**

BAKULYOVÁ, Róberta: *American Civil War: The Deadliest War in American history and its Legacy* – University of Economics in Bratislava. Faculty of Applied Languages; Department of Intercultural Communication. – Tutor: PhDr. Mária Bláhová, PhD. – Bratislava: FAJ EU, 2016, 76 pp.

The present work focuses on the vast topic of the American Civil War and its legacy. The scope of the work ranges from the antebellum period, through four years of fighting, to post-war period known as Reconstruction. Each of these features form an individual chapter within this work. The method of synthesis is used in order to summarize all the wartime-connected information needed for the understanding of the war's legacy and its remembering. The final, fourth chapter evaluates the place of the Civil War in the consciousness of the Americans since its end till today. The comparison of the ways of commemorating the war on the occasion of its semi-centennial, centennial, and sesquicentennial is set as the main aim. The collective memory of the nation composes of partial memories of individuals and various groups. In the case of the Civil War, remembering within the groups of African Americans, veterans, and Southerners is examined in detail. By comparing the commemorations of the war on the chosen occasions the work comes to a conclusion that remembering the Civil War has undergone significant shifts mainly because of the changes in the modern society, racial relations, and new approaches towards the study of the history.

**Key words:** Civil War, North, South, slavery, African Americans, secession, government, Constitution, Reconstruction, legacy, memory, commemoration, veterans, semi-centennial, centennial, sesquicentennial

## Abstrakt

BAKULYOVÁ, Róberta: *Americká občianska vojna - najstrašnejšia vojna v amerických dejinách a jej odkaz* – Ekonomická univerzita v Bratislave. Fakulta aplikovaných jazykov; Katedra interkultúrnej komunikácie. – Vedúci záverečnej práce: PhDr. Mária Bláhová, PhD – Bratislava: FAJ EU, 2016, 76 s.

Predložená záverečná práca sa venuje téme Americkej občianskej vojny a odkazu, ktorý zanechala. Jej súčasťou je popis obdobia pred občianskou vojnou, samotný priebeh ozbrojeného konfliktu, ako aj povojnové obdobie, ktoré zahŕňalo obnovu vojnou zničenej spoločnosti. Každý z týchto časových úsekov tvorí samostatnú kapitolu. V práci je použitá metóda syntézy, pomocou ktorej sa spájajú historické údaje do jedného celku, ktorý nám následne umožňuje pochopiť jej samotný odkaz. Záverečná štvrtá kapitola skúma, aké miesto má občianska vojna v povedomí Američanov v súčasnosti. Hlavným cieľom práce je porovnanie vnímania vojny pri príležitostiach jej päťdesiateho, stého, a stopäťdesiateho výročia. Kolektívne spomienky určitého národa sa skladajú z čiastkových spomienok či už jednotlivcov, alebo skupín. V prípade Americkej občianskej vojny sú v popredí skúmania Afroameričania, vojnoví veteráni a obyvatelia južných štátov. Porovnaním spomienok na vojnu počas zvolených príležitostí prichádza záverečná práca k záveru, že spôsob, akým Američania vnímajú občiansku vojnu, prešiel určitými zmenami. Tento posun vo vnímaní ich histórie nastal najmä v dôsledku zmien v modernej spoločnosti, zmenou postavenia Afroameričanov, ako aj novými prístupmi v štúdiu histórie.

**Kľúčové slová:** občianska vojna, sever, juh, otroctvo, Afroameričania, odlúčenie (sa), vláda, ústava, obnova, odkaz, spomienka, oslava pamiatky, veteráni, päťdesiate výročie, sté výročie, stopäťdesiate výročie

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	8
<b>1 The Roots of the Civil War</b>	12
1.1 Institution of Slavery and Abolition Movement	12
1.2 Industrial versus Agricultural Economy	17
1.3 Changes in the Social and Religious Life	19
1.4 Antebellum Politics and Secession	23
<b>2 The Armed Conflict and its End</b>	27
2.1 Attack at Fort Sumter and the First Year of the War	27
2.2 The Second Year of the Civil War	31
2.3 The Third Year of the Civil War	34
2.4 The Fourth Year of the Civil War	36
2.5 The South Surrenders	37
<b>3 Reconstruction Era</b>	41
3.1 The Black Reconstruction	43
3.2 The Presidential Reconstruction	46
3.3 The Radical Reconstruction	48
3.4 Towards the End of the Era	53
<b>4 The Legacy of the Civil War in American Memory</b>	56
4.1 The Black Civil War Memory	57
4.2 South and its War Memory, Reconstruction, and the Lost Cause	61
4.3 Reunion and the Role of Veterans in the Collective Memory	65
4.4 Remembering the War in the Modern Times	69
<b>Conclusion</b>	74
<b>Résumé</b>	78
<b>Bibliographical References</b>	84



## **Introduction**

The American Civil War is generally considered the deadliest war in American history. The North against the South was a conflict that arose from incompatible ways of life and interpretations of the Constitution between the upper and lower states of the USA. Industrial economy versus agricultural, federal versus state power, anti-slavery versus pro-slavery approach.

Accumulating contradictory forces very often end up in a conflict. In the worst case opposite convictions may lead to an armed clash with incalculable damages and losses in lives. This is what happened between April 1861 and April 1865 on the North American soil. Four years of fighting affected millions of soldiers, untold civilians, and changed the future of the African slaves. It altered the internal structure of American history more profoundly than had the Revolution (Levine, 1993, p. 3).

In 2015, Americans commemorated the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the end of the Civil War. In this connection the main objective of the present work is set: to compare the memorialisation of the wartime period during three significant occasions: the war's semi-centennial, centennial, and sesquicentennial. Is the Civil War memory still present in the lives of ordinary Americans? To cope with the past is a challenging task and requires time. A war is not forgotten with a new generation. When we take a closer look at the controversies the Confederate battle flag evokes till today, we might suppose that the mental as well as physical heritage of the past are part of the collective memory even in the new millennium. The legacy of the war, whether positive or negative, has shaped the nation's identity.

Exploring the war's impact on the modern U.S. society and the way the nation store its memories is conditioned by the understanding of the whole history connected to the war itself. Because of this the present work synthesized not only the Civil War and its legacy, but focuses on the antebellum era and post-war era as well. It should be mentioned that the amount of publications, new literature, and the scope of the field complicate the task of synthesis considerably.

Some scholars fear that the method of synthesis leads to a broad generalization and narrow focus. However, the aim of the present work is to view the period as a whole, to integrate the social, political, and economic aspects of the antebellum era, Civil War and Reconstruction into a coherent unit.

The scope of this work is divided into two main areas while the first area is chronologically split into three periods: pre-war era and description of causes that led to the outbreak of the war; the armed conflict itself and struggle for its ending; and the war's aftermath era known as Reconstruction. The second part of the work is engaged with the legacy of the war in the form of memorialisation. Rather than monuments building and singing of war songs, the final part of the work focuses on the way how the nation commemorates this crucial event of their history.

The first chapter explaining the developments that gradually led to secession covers four main aspects including the institution of slavery, social changes, religious changes, and the course of the federal politics. Insight into history of slavery, formation of abolitionist movements, shaping of family relations, as well as westward expansion and presidential election built the structure of the introductory chapter. Knowledge of the war's causes makes the understanding of the Civil War easier and at the same time helps us to put single events into a comprehensive picture.

The second chapter of the work is devoted exclusively to the course of the American Civil War. Summing up the whole history of the armed conflict into several pages is a demanding task. Historians writing publications on this topic usually issue several volumes to cover all the years, battles, and relations. Within this chapter, each of the wartime years forms an individual part; these parts are chronologically arranged and thus give a very brief overview of the bloody years of the 1860s.

The era known as Reconstruction is introduced in the third chapter of the work. One might argue that the Reconstruction does not relate to the war itself and thus should not be included in this work dealing with the war and its legacy. However, the political, social, and economic changes that were implemented during this period have had an enormous impact on the life and public memory mainly in the South. Based on this argument Reconstruction composes a component of this work and will be mentioned in the final chapter as part of the collective memory as well.

The final part is built on the evaluation of the states of Civil War memory in the course of time. Memorializing the war after fifty years, hundred years, and in the new millennium is influenced by the current attitudes toward the history, race, gender, and society. Collective memory of the nation composes of partial memories: the community of African Americans view the war and its consequences in a completely different way than the white Northerners and Southerners especially. The chapter examines the effort of the war generation as well as post-war generations to protect memories of the

nation's greatest conflict and the central event of their lives. The memory varies not only based on the target group; it has varied throughout the history as well. Thus a comparison of the way of commemorating the war on its semi-centennial, centennial, and sesquicentennial is given.

Causes of the conflict, its course, and output of the Civil War are one of the most discussed topics in the U.S. literature. Some authors wrote on the wartime topics right after the end of the war. One of them was Colonel of the Confederate Army, Robert Tansill, who identified several causes of the armed conflict already in 1865. R. G. Hill Kean, former head of Confederate Bureau of War tried to reveal the reasons for the collapse of the Confederacy right after its end.

Later historians continued to discuss the key war facts and reasons for Confederate defeat and its weaknesses. One of the first authors, who dealt with the war from the Northerners' point of view, was A. Nevin. He summed up the comparative resources of both sides already in 1860. The personality of Abraham Lincoln is a frequent topic in history works. Generation of Lincoln's biographers, J. F. Rhodes among them, concluded that the preponderating asset of the North proved to be Lincoln (Burlingame, 2011, p. 3). Military historians, on the other side, stressed the excellence of Northern military leadership. Even several opinions arose, that the Europe's failure to intervene was of decisive importance in securing Union victory.

There are many theories explaining the Northern victory and Southern collapse. Many of them were re-examined on the event of centennial and sesquicentennial. In doing so, new approaches were contrasted with the older ones and thus contributed to the rich theoretical basis on the American Civil War.

In the Slovak republic, the authors do not dedicate much space nor time to this crucial part of the American history. The Civil War is to be found in the schoolbooks and in the translated works of foreign authors respectively. However, works of Slovak origin on this topic are rather rare. The situation is slightly different in the Czech Republic, where few historians devote their energy to this event.

The era of Reconstruction, similarly as the Civil War, has attracted historians, writers, and journalists. Throughout the history this topic has been re-interpreted and explained in contradictory ways. In the very beginning of the twentieth century, supported by the teaching of W. A. Dunning and his students, Reconstruction was widely seen as the biggest mistake in the U.S. history. Du Bois contradicts this teaching in *Black Reconstruction in America* (1935). In the modern times, Eric Foner is

considered to be one of the most renowned authors employing himself with the Reconstruction era within the U.S. history.

Dealing with the collective memory of the nation is rather a young discipline in the academic field. Robert Penn Warren's *The Legacy of the Civil War* (1961) is seen as a pioneer study regarding the memorializing of the nation's history. This work draws, among others, also from David W. Blight's *Race and Reunion* (2001). On the occasions on the war's centennial and sesquicentennial many studies have been conducted that contributed to the understanding of the collective memory of the American nation considering the Civil War.

In the second half of the twentieth century, the study of American history witnessed an expansion and redefinition of historical study as such: the older understanding with institutions, politics, and ideas was replaced by a new one related to the new social concerns – the role of the African Americans, women, and labour in the society. These concerns enrich the understanding of the nation's history. At the same time, the new studies attempt to synthesize the social, political, and economic aspects of the particular period. In this sense, this work aims to combine the findings and concerns of recent scholarship to provide a comprehensive modern account of the Civil War, its wide background, and its legacy.

When studying the varying forms of the memorializing the history of the Civil War it can be presumed that the influence of the present ideology, way of life, and the degree of education affects the way people understand and commemorate the past events. Thus a comparison of different time slots regarding the commemoration of the Civil War across the United States might reveal particular distinctions. At the same time it is presumed that although the battles were fought 150 years ago, some of the war's legacies are to be found in the consciousness of the modern U.S. society of the twenty first century as well.

Right as part of the introduction it should be mentioned that the community of the African Americans is sometimes referred to as "the blacks, the coloured people, the Negro" in this work, what might be seen as politically incorrect identification. However, these denominations were frequent and seen as natural in the nineteenth as well as twentieth century and are present in the historical literature that deals with the Civil War era and connected topics. When following the aim to interpret the history in an authentic way, these denominations are used in this work as well – without any racist connotations.

# **1 The Roots of the Civil War**

The Civil War broke out when the Confederates bombarded Union soldiers at Fort Sumter, South Carolina on 12<sup>th</sup> April 1861. There are many accounts describing Civil War's origins. Some of them concentrate upon fundamental ones including slavery issue and federal powers. But when considering the involvement of such a mass population in the war, a wider perspective is needed for understanding the reasons that made the war possible. Nearly three million men joined the Union blue or the Confederate gray armies. Massive popular mobilization like that must be determined by all-society dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs. What brought the nation as a whole to that point is a question the following chapter tries to answer.

This chapter examines the vast topic of the war's causes from under four aspects: the institution of slavery is described from its very beginning through cotton production boom up to the gradual antislavery movement. The significant changes that had been occurring in the U.S. since the first half of the nineteenth century are divided into three areas – economy, social life and public sphere, and politics. Each of them is addressed in a way that contributed to the outbreak of the American Civil War.

## **1.1 Institution of Slavery and Abolition Movement**

When studying the roots of the conflict, an analysis tracing several decades back into the past is needed. The American Revolution that brought independence from the British Empire gave birth to a paradox. On the one hand, the new nation was in many respects the freest in the world. During the next two centuries, millions of immigrants would come to its shores with a hope for a better life. Thomas Jefferson, the third president of the United States, best captured the nation's devotion to personal freedom by declaring that "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal (cited in Levine, 1992, p. 5)." He added that all men possess inalienable rights; among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But the real life showed the other side of the above mentioned paradox. The new land of liberty was the greatest slaveholding country in the nineteenth-century world.

Generally speaking, slavery is among the oldest social systems. It existed in ancient China, Persia, Greece, and Rome. Portuguese colonists were the first who brought African slaves to sugarcane plantation on off-shore islands in the Caribbean. Their

success inspired the Spanish, followed later by the French, the Dutch and the English. The records indicate that from the fifteenth through eighteenth century six out of every seven people, who arrived to the North America coast, were African slaves.

Slave-based commercial agriculture focused besides sugarcane on tobacco and rice. What made the slave labour even more inevitable was the production of a new commercial crop – cotton. Problems of separating the seeds from the cotton ball were solved by the end of the eighteenth century by Eli Whitney, who invented the cotton gin. This machine revolutionized the process of purification, making it dramatically faster and less expensive to turn picked cotton into usable cotton for textiles. By 1850 the tool had changed the face of Southern agriculture.

The cotton production was concentrated almost exclusively in the South, because of the weather conditions needed for the plant to grow. Faster processing led to bigger plantations. Between 1800 and 1860, slave-holding states grew in number from eight to fifteen. Moreover, the South's population multiplied more than five times (Levine, 1993). Slaves comprised about a third of the total Southern population. As a result of steadily growing demand for cotton in England the labour of about four million slaves was needed. Southern wealth had become dependent on the crop and thus was completely dependent on slave-labour.

Meanwhile, however, as Levine points out, the economy of the upper South (or lower North) was moving in the opposite direction. The natural conditions in Maryland and Virginia had never been suitable for growing crops like cotton; thus the slave labour became impractical. By 1860, about half of Maryland's black residents were out of slavery (Levine, 1993). Producers in the North tried to save costs by purchasing various labour-saving implements, which, in turn, stimulated the production of coal and iron.

The economic and social developments that were happening mainly in the North have strongly affected the ways in which residents of the free states related to each other. At the same time, these changes deeply influenced the ways the Northerners perceived the nature of life in the slave-holding slaves. In the course of time the different perception of Southerners' way of life, which included the bound-labour, was one of the strongest incentives for the antislavery movement.

None of this changed the basic characteristics of the Southern economy. It neither altered its relationship with the rest of the country. Slavery as such lessened incentives to raise the productivity of human labour technologically, which is basically the driving force of real economic development and social progress. As authors dealing with the

Civil War from the economic point of view stress, e.g. Richard N. Current, the South of 1860 remained backward in both urban and industrial development (in Donald, 1962).

Taking a closer look at the antislavery sentiment it can be assumed that its roots trace back to the pre-revolutionary era. Persons educated in the spirit of Enlightenment gradually expressed their desire to abolish the institution. From the religious point of view, some people saw slavery to be inconsistent with the Bible. Protestant clergy of those times even formed societies dedicated to its abolition. As Levine states in *Half Slave and Half Free* the first president of the United States George Washington contended short after the end of the War for Independence that he wished the gradual abolition of the slavery. It is known that Thomas Jefferson unsuccessfully tried to include in the Declaration of Independence a clause banning the further importation of African slaves. Jefferson hoped that a combination of Enlightenment and moral awakening would move slaveholders towards gradual emancipation. At the same time he believed in the young generation brought up under the light of liberty that would acknowledge these great reformations. Jefferson was convinced the value of the slave was lessening every day; his burthen on his master increasing. It is obvious that his optimism was rather wrong. Naturally, antislavery beliefs were present exclusively in the North, where slavery was never crucial to the region's economy and continued to decline in significance. In the South, economic development both at home and abroad was strengthening the position of the slavery.

An unexpected event happened off the American coast. In 1791, slaves in the French colony Saint Domingue rose in revolt which culminated in the elimination of slavery there, fighting off the foreign armies, and founding of the Haitian republic (Hunt, 2006). An independent black republic was created and the echo of the Haitian drama spread quickly and encouraged slaves and the free blacks with confidence. Few revolts occurred on the American soils as well and some planters began to doubt the security of the institution of slavery. Known is the case of Frederick Douglass, a former slave and eminent human rights leader in the abolition movement, who fled to North and helped free several more slaves. Another revolt was planned by a literate, enslaved blacksmith Gabriel Prosser. Even though it failed, Prosser's uprising was notable because of its potential to cause mass chaos and widespread violence among the slaves and their owners.

As the Civil war approached, slave owners saw such dangerous attitudes spreading. The Gabriel Prosser's Rebellion of 1800 caused a growing fear in the eyes of slave

holders. It had severe effects on the treatment of blacks in the American South, including stricter emancipation laws, limited travel between plantations for slaves, and legislation designed to limit the growing free black population. Few more major revolt attempts came in the 1820s and 1830s. One was led by a free black carpenter named Denmark Vesey, who encouraged fellow slaves and free blacks through his speeches in African Methodist Church. Vesey sought aid in Haitian president Boyer and planned to sail for Haiti. In contrary to Vesey's revolt, Nat Turner led a violent rising that killed approximately sixty white residents in Virginia before being suppressed (Levine, 1992). David Walker fought against the black slavery principles with pamphlets and other publications that were primarily directed not to masters but rather to his suffering brothers. His *Appeal* created a sensation in both the North and South. Southern states' governments immediately took steps to prevent the work from circulation.

Repression, however, failed to bury antislavery opinion. On the contrary, escalating attacks against free expression of antislavery opinion convinced ever more Northerners that this institution was not simply immoral in the abstract but "a tangible and immediate threat to their own liberties (Sewell, 1970, p. 23)."

An important milestone in the slavery history occurred when the U.S. Congress outlawed the Atlantic slave trade in 1807-8. However, it became clear during the following decades of the nineteenth century that the American South planters were not about to follow the gradual emancipation sentiment of the North. Some of the educated Northerners hoped that a ban on the Atlantic slave trade would stimulate movements towards slavery abolition in the whole country, not only in the North. A reverse was truth. With expanding the U.S. territory westwards, a struggle irrupted over the future of slavery in the new areas. By the end of the eighteenth century the Congress refused to ban slavery in the Mississippi Territory. The question of slavery in the new territory of Louisiana was passionately discussed. The Congress's representatives were split on the issue whether the new territory should be a free state or a slave-holding one. However, the expansion of the United States and its background are rather a political question and will be dealt with in the third part of this chapter.

The Enlightenment-inspired Northern merchants and professionals continued in their fight against slavery through Antislavery societies that were (some of them) founded already by the end of the eighteenth century. These bodies later sponsored an educational campaign in support of gradual emancipation throughout the United States.



A different proposal was submitted by “The American Colonization Society” which promoted the transportation of emancipated slaves to the African colonies. T. Jefferson once expressed his sympathies to this idea but later never mentioned it again.

From the religious point of view, church leaders played an important role in spreading antislavery movement. One wing of such movement arose from evangelical ranks and criticised the bound labour in religious terms. George Bourne, a representative of Northern Evangelical clergy, pointed out that “both master and slave were thus trapped in a relationship that inevitably led both down the path of sin and depravity (cited in Levine, 1992, p. 93).”

Publication activities and foundation of relevant bodies were inevitable in spreading the emancipation visions. *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Liberator* were among the first ones. The Liberator’s editor W. L. Garrison was a former Baptist advocate and later a co-founder of the Anti-slavery Society in Boston (AAS). Garrison drafted its declaration of principles that rejected the colonization and demanded that everybody, regardless of race, is free and can use their own labour to the common advantages of society. His words perfectly summarized the essence of the free-labour ideology that had been shaping the society of the North. The debates over the nature and merits of the free labour system took place simultaneously with a deepening national dispute about chattel slavery.

Few years after founding of the AAS, its leaders demanded immediate abolition. The organization distributed antislavery literature and in time the body had been apparently gaining its power. Abolitionists used their power for petitions submitted to Congress. They hoped this campaign would force Congress to address the same subject and lead to abolition by state authority.

The gradual antislavery sentiment from the North revealed that there was disparity not only between the emancipated Northerners and Southern planters. Some hopes for the ban on slavery existed among a section of the Upper South’s white population as well. However, most planters even of that region and Deep South especially remained strongly opposed to any practical steps towards emancipation. This is what definitely destroyed hopes for voluntary abolition in the South.

## 1.2 Industrial versus Agricultural Economy

The historians agree upon that incompatibility between Northern and Southern economies was one of the causes of the Civil War. The gradual industrial revolution in the North during the first few decades of the nineteenth century brought about a machine age economy that relied on wage labourers, not slaves. At the same time, the warmer Southern states continued to rely on slaves for their farming economy and cotton production.

Closely related to this change, cities rose in the North while creating an urban society; whereas the South remained primarily agrarian. This statement, however, does not mean that there were no farms in the North or no cities in the South. As Gavin Wright (Wright, 1960) reveals from the census data on farms and cities, in 1860 there were more farms in the North than in the South, although Southern states, especially in the so called Cotton Belt (south-eastern states where cotton was the predominant crop), had the majority of large farms. Similar applies to the location of the cities. The U.S. had eight cities with more than 150,000 residents in 1860 and three of them – St. Louis, Baltimore and New Orleans – were in the slave states.

The industrial revolution created a huge number of occupations in this sector. Between 1800 and 1860, the percentage of labourers working in agriculture dropped drastically from about 70% to only 40% (Mountjoy, 2009). In the cities and their factories the slavery was replaced by immigrant labourers from Europe.

However, the Northern farmers were able to increase production by adopting new cultivating techniques. They began to use new types of seeds and imported breeds of domesticated animals from Europe. New machines sped up the harvesting of wheat. The growth of production helped form a strong economic alliance between the two Northern sections, the factory-centred North-east and the agricultural North-west. This, in turn, increased the isolation of the South within the Union.

Furthermore, the Northern merchants saw potential in the domestic commerce. The first necessary step, how to take advantage within the domestic market, was to improve the means of transportation. The federal and especially state governments supported the construction of bridges, roads, canals and, above all, railroads. Parallel improvements transformed communications; innovations in printing combined with the new telegraph system brought information from distant places and attract mass audience in record time. In aftermath it reduced human isolation of rural areas. The farmers from distant

communities slowly became involved in the commerce and later dependent on the market and its fluctuations.

The expansion of interregional commerce and competition at the same time initiated some dramatic changes in Northern economic life. With a hope for a more fertile soil and thus better life and much profit, migration westwards grew. At the same time, population multiplied few times since the beginning of the nineteenth century. As Levine sums up, the transportation revolution together with agriculture commerce and the growth of the West created a tremendous domestic market for manufactured goods.

Production of textile goods moved from home to factory. In the shoemaking industry, tailoring and furniture production, both employment and output increased with the changing nature of the work process. These and other sectors then developed their own needs, which were satisfied by firms producing machines, tools, and engines. Coal and iron mines, as a link of the chain, expanded to meet the demand for their products.

All of these – the development of Northern industry, commerce and labour productivity – reflected into an immense increase in total wealth; chiefly in Northeast. The two biggest cities, New York and Philadelphia, boasted and these became dominant manufacturing cities in the nation. Many new occupations emerged, including teamsters, carters, porters, dockworkers, sailors, etc. These were taken either by incoming unskilled immigrants from Europe or free Northern ex-slaves.

Proceeding to the Southern part of the United States, historians would say that “you cannot generalize about the South (Wright, 1961, p. 54),” because the plantation areas of the deep South are so different in so many ways from the small farm and backwoods sections. The same could be said about the North, since the Northeast was the leading industrial region of the whole country, whereas in Northwest, the agriculture was inseparable part of the region’s economy.

Generally saying, for most of its history, the South has been a farming region. However, in the first half of the nineteenth century, the same could be applied to the whole country. Taking a closer look at the farming conditions in the South, it is obvious that the farming there was always different. As Wright points out, for over three hundred years, the prosperity of the South was tied to the performance of various export staples – tobacco, rice, indigo, sugar, and pre-eminently, cotton. Each of these crops has geographical prerequisites, depending on the temperature, soil characteristics, rainfall etc. Thus, the South has had a distinctive agricultural geography. What unified these distinctive agricultural areas were large scale farms and the use of bound-labourers.

A common misconception is that all white farmers were rich planters that owned a large slave force. The reality was that of about 1.6 million families only about 384,000 families owned slaves, and only about 10,000 owned more than 20 slaves (Russel, Haun, Raubenstein, 2012). The majority of people instead had small, family based farms that required extensive labour from the family in order to survive.

Wright describes as the distinctive unifying feature of Southern agriculture the simple historical fact that the Southern people intermingled less with the outsiders than did the people of any other major American region. Economically speaking, before the Civil War, the unity came from slavery.

However, not all the historians and authors agree that the difference between the industrial North and agricultural South was so enormous it led to the armed conflict. A. W. Dean in *The Agricultural Republic* challenges the common historical misconception that the pre-Civil-War North comprised mainly of industrialized and urban populations, while the South was primarily an agricultural society. According to him, roughly 60 % of Northerners worked on farms (Dean, 2015). Most farms were small, with the average of 150 acres (0.6 km<sup>2</sup>) in the states that stayed loyal to the Union. Dean stresses the fact that if the public continues to understand the war as a conflict between an industrial North and an agricultural South, they cannot possibly understand the world that nineteenth-century Americans inhabited. Since most Northerners were farmers, they carried the values and norms cultivated by this lifestyle into politics.

For the purposes of this work, the difference between the economies of the Northern and Southern part of the United States will be perceived as one of the causes that gradually led to the outbreak of the Civil War.

### **1.3 Changes in the Social and Religious Life**

It has already been mentioned in the previous section that the Northern economy had been influenced by new manufacturing processes and technological developments, which, in turn, affected the social life and the direction of the Northern nation as such.

The economic development of the free states had tremendous cultural consequences. The transition from manpower to water and steam power caused a complete revolution in the social life and domestic manners at the same time. Almost all aspects of human life have been affected; including family life, definition of gender roles, standards of public behaviour, forms of entertainment, and last but not least the form of religion.

According to an 1850 census, the U.S. population was about 23 million – up from 13 million in 1830. Based on the 1860 census, the U.S. population was more than 31 million – an enormous increase (Levine, 1992). The immigrants kept on arriving to the United States and took the jobs the industrial revolutions had created. The 1830s were marked by labourer shortage – immigrants were needed as labour forces and made economic growth possible. Levine confirms that nine of ten new immigrants settled in the free states – some entering agriculture but most finding employment in commerce and manufacturing. Majority of these people settled in major Northern cities, what boosted the urbanization of the North.

The expansion of domestic commerce and manufacturing reshaped society in the free states. The Northern rich grew far wealthier. In the meantime, a new expression "millionaire" came into existence, when around 65 Northern merchants claimed their personal property worth million dollars in 1845. However, Southern planters still dominated the ranks of the U.S. economic elite, basically until the outbreak of the war.

More radical were the changes in the lives of other Northerners. The number of people listed by the 1860 census in mining and manufacturing occupations tripled. They all became economically dependent population. As economists dealing with antebellum economy of the U.S. point out, the widespread independent proprietorship led to a creation of a new social structure. New working class of people dependent on wages has emerged. The housing conditions of urban labourers were wretched. They settled down mainly in declining neighbourhoods – the nation's first slums. Slums were inhabited predominantly by free blacks; the situation of the Irish people was slightly better.

Another transformation of the antebellum era is that one of family life. Through most of the colonial era, the life of the free population was devoted to the household and family as such. Farm males worked the fields, while females cooked, cleaned, and did other domestic works. Significant changes reshaped the nature of households mainly of merchants, manufacturing employers, and professionals. More and more goods were bought in the shops rather than manufactured at home. Meanwhile, some innovations (piped-in gas and water, iron cook stoves, iceboxes) eased housework for those women who could afford them.

Another important shift in the family life was a decreasing size of an average family. According to N. Hewitt, who examined not only the role of a woman in New York of the nineteenth century, the average number of family members reduced from about seven in 1800 to about five in 1860 (Hewitt, 1988). Meanwhile, fathers

increasingly did their work outside the home – in offices, stores, workshops, and factories. This change diverted men’s attention from household matters. For middle- and upper-class women, the family and home life became a special sphere strictly separated from the public sphere of business and politics. As a result of this development, mothers became responsible for rearing the children. At the same time, the nature of middle-class child rearing evolved as well. Earlier automatic obedience to authority has been slowly replaced with self-regulation and self-discipline approach.

The developments in the Northern economy – foremost those connected to the textile industry – have changed the family life mostly in a negative way. Because of the poor economic situation, an active assistance of all family members was needed. Children and women were suitable for occupations in the textile production. Expensive skilled work was converted into simpler and cheaper tasks, thus allowing companies to employ either children and whole families, or single Yankee young women from countryside (Levine, 1992).

Changes in the North’s economy and social structure also left their mark on leisure activities of different social classes. As F. R. Dulles explains in *A History of Recreation*, hard work, self-discipline, personal reserve, and social life organized around church, family, and home, were the limitations of a boisterous public entertainment. However, prosperous Northerners engaged in diverse activities, such as museum and library foundation, theatre, opera, social clubs, or summer spas visits. Dinner parties, banquets and dances were quite common; men went hunting and racing. Other segments of the population amused themselves with card playing, billiard, cock-, bull-, dogfights. All of these activities were accompanied with wagers and spirits.

A destruction of the moral principles goes usually hand in hand with growing religious awakening. As a result, more Americans than ever before affiliated to church institutions. Between 1800 and 1860, the combined membership of the three biggest Protestant denominations – Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians – multiplied more than thirteen times (Ahlstrom, 2004). Evangelicalism grew popular among various classes in the North; ranging from successful entrepreneurs, shopkeepers, and farmers up to skilled workers. Its doctrine, saying that with self-discipline and effort, individuals could influence their afterlives, stressed their values – initiative, hard work, individualism, personal liberty and advancement – in this world. Catholicism was represented mainly by the Irish immigrants – their numbers swollen from some 30,000 in 1790 to some 1.6 million in the 1850s. As a contrary to the Catholics and other

religious people stood freethinkers, rationalists, or sometimes called religious liberals. They all demanded radical changes in economic, social, or political life.

Proceeding to the changes of social life in the South, the existence of the slavery must be stressed as the element at the core of antebellum Southern culture. The obvious tension that existed between the whites and the blacks shaped all the aspects of social life. In the Southern highlands – where slave labour and market forces mattered least – the social life and gender role changed only very slightly. Patriarchal family and family ties remained at the centre of both cultural and economic lives. Fathers governed the moneymaking activities and mothers supervised the domestic sphere. On the large plantation, female responsibilities included maintenance of own family and the slave families as well.

In contradiction to the social developments in the North, where men worked outside the house and thus lost the primary contact to the household and upbringing, the situation in the South was different. Men remained in greater physical proximity to family life and household, which gave them a greater power over these. As G. Wright concludes in *Old South, New South* plantation families experienced the realities of rural isolation which was one of the aspects that led to comparative underdevelopment of commercial exchange in the South.

From the point of view of leisure time activities, wealthy Southerners regarded themselves as the cultural heirs of Europe's feudal aristocracy (Levine, 1992). Planters loved horse racing and yachting; they organized parties and balls, deer and fox hunts.

Religion played an important role in the family life of the Southerners as well. According to Ahlstrom, by the Civil War, nine out of ten Southern Protestants were either Methodists or Baptists (Ahlstrom, 2014). Although Southern evangelicalism did not label slave owning as sinful, individual ministers – especially in the upper South – helped found societies dedicated to gradual ending of slavery (Levine, 1992). Not only some evangelicals, but some Methodist ministers as well spoke openly and sympathetically of the poor Africans; some evangelical preachers invited African Americans into the church.

The new doctrine spread from plantation to plantation and by the 1830s, most Methodist congregations in the Southern cities were overwhelmingly black. The Baptist belief in the autonomy of each congregation allowed them to shape their religious lives. These were the first and only formal institutions that united the black community.

Besides these, Christianity was spread among slaves as well. Although generally unable to read, they evolved their own understanding of the Bible. Through this, slaves formulated a vocabulary in which they could express their own pain and suffering.

Generally speaking, society in the free states had undergone momentous transformation between the American Revolution and the Civil War. Immigrants used to compare the industrial cities of the North to gigantic workshop. But the sword had two edges and cut both ways; a negative aspect of this impressive economic progress was a growing dependent population, which was free of slavery, but, on the other hand, free of any property as well. Observers realized that big cities – New York as the first – were overburdened with population, and two extremes of social life met there – luxury and waste with misery and hopelessness.

#### **1.4 Antebellum Politics and Secession**

The pre-Civil War years (sometimes referred to as antebellum years) were among the most chaotic in American history. During these years (from about 1820 to about 1860), the nation – mainly in the North – faced transformation from farmers and frontiersmen into an urbanized economic powerhouse. The era was characterized by the rise of abolition and the gradual polarization between abolitionists and supporters of slavery and the westward expansion. In this part of the work, trends are discussed that are related to the political life and influenced the future of the States the most.

One of the most crucial disputes among the people and in Congress was the definition of liberty. From the very existence of the United States, the freedom of her people was a pillar of nation's identity. The problem was, as A. Lincoln delivered in his speech in the spring of 1864, that the world has never had a good definition of the word liberty: "We all declare for liberty, but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing (quoted in Basler, 1953, online)." With these words, Lincoln identified the issue of much public discussion and conflict in the new nation during its first seventy years of life. B. Levine concludes from the Lincoln's words that the deepening differences in the economic and social lives of the North and the South led spokesmen to conceptualize liberty and democracy in increasingly different ways.

Another ongoing dispute that was discussed in the Congress was a problematic struggle over political power between the federal government and individual states. Nullification crisis was a confrontation between the state of South Carolina and the federal government in 1832. The federal government passed a law that would raise



tariffs significantly on manufactured items such as wool and textiles. South Carolina leaders protested against this law with the so called nullification doctrine – the constitutional theory that upheld the right of states to nullify federal acts within their boundaries. President Jackson asserted the supremacy of the federal government; at the same time Congress passed Force Bill – authorizing Jackson to use the military if necessary to collect tariff duties. On one side, the resolution of the nullification crisis in favour of the federal government helped to undermine the nullification doctrine; on the other side, Southerners were made more conscious of their minority position and of their vulnerability to a Northern majority as long as they remained in the Union.

Debates over the nature of the political power were directly connected to the dispute over the institution of slavery. By the end of eighteenth century, the population of both the North and the South were about equal, as was their representation in Congress (Levine, 1992). On the turn of the centuries, the United States comprised of sixteen states. That situation, however, soon began to change – with western expansion, mainly during the 1840s. The balance of powers in Congress between the free and slave-holding states was in 1820 ensured by the so called Missouri Compromise. Missouri applied for statehood as a slave state, what would mean that Union comprises of twelve free states and thirteen slave states. To maintain the balance, a new free state of Maine from land owned by Massachusetts was created. Congress also recognized a theoretical line at 36°30' north latitude and stated that slavery would be permitted only in the remaining Louisiana Purchase lands south of that line; from the remaining Louisiana Purchase lands north of that line slavery would be banned.

The acquisition of huge parcels of the new land after the Mexican War reopened the issue of slavery in the territories and forced Congress to face the issue once again. In 1848, as a result of the Mexican War, the United States acquired most of what is now the south-western portion of the country. Texas entered the Union directly as a slave state; California, where slavery had been illegal under Mexico, as a free state. But the status of slavery in the other former Mexican states became the subject of dispute in Congress. Finally, a deal known as Compromise of 1850 was accepted. It included the doctrine of popular sovereignty, which allowed settlers in the territories themselves to decide whether to make slavery legal or illegal. The old 36°30' line did not apply to these lands, since they had not been under U.S. possession at the time of the Missouri Compromise.

Besides the dispute over the west-coast territory with Mexico, the United States confronted similar issue with the United Kingdom over the Oregon Country. The tension between the British and the Americans grew and this dispute almost brought about another war. Based on the expansionist sentiment of the U.S., the Democratic Party of 1844 asserted they had a valid claim to the entire Oregon Country (Farnham, online). Eventually, moderation had won out over calls for war and the Oregon Treaty, ratified in 1846, set the new border at the 49<sup>th</sup> parallel (which holds till today). The Mexican War and settling the Oregon question meant that the United States now stretched from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

One of the last drops that led to the outbreak of the Civil War was The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 (Etcheson, 2004). Under this act, each territory was allowed to decide the issue of slavery on the basis of popular sovereignty. Since both territories lied north of the 36°30' line, slavery would violate the Missouri Compromise, which had kept the Union from falling apart for the last thirty years. Opposition was intense, but ultimately the bill passed in May 1854.

The Northerners were outraged and the bill caused a split in the Whig Party – together with the Democratic Party they dominated the political landscape in the antebellum era. Every Northern Whig had opposed the bill; almost every Southern Whig voted for it. Most of the Southern Whigs soon switched over to the Democratic Party. Northern Whigs reorganized themselves to become the Republican Party. The political scene was complemented by the abolitionist Liberty Party in 1840; and the anti-slavery Free Soil Party few years later. The demise of the Whig Party and the split in the Democratic Party in the years leading up to the 1860 elections gave the Republicans an opportunity to advance. The new party had very little support in the South before the war and virtually none after war broke out (Markey, online). Republican candidate Abraham Lincoln won the U.S. Presidential election in 1860; however, “Democrats still controlled both Congress and the Supreme Court (Douglas in Levine, 1992, p. 228).” In the aftermath, more and more Southerners pressed the course of secession. One Southerner concluded that no compromise on earth could ever unite the cotton states with the old Union (Lederer, 1973).

In 1861, before the secession, the Union comprised of 34 states – 19 free states and 15 slaveholding. However, the anti-Union sentiment was growing in the South and in December 1860, just little more than a month following Lincoln’s election, South Carolina withdrew from the Union, followed by six other lower South states –

Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas. These states formed a new federation – Confederate States of America – and elected Jefferson Davis of Mississippi a President. Other eight slave states held back, but later after discords with the Congress, four out of these – Virginia, North Carolina, Arkansas, and Tennessee – joined the Confederacy.

Several opinions arose that tried to explain the secession – all of them differently. One, supported by D. G. Faust who wrote on Confederate Nationalism says that the Southern leaders were afraid of the Northerners, assisted by a Republican federal government, who would subvert the peculiar institution and thus their whole civilization. They gambled the withdrawal from the Union and hoped it would secure their way of life once and for all. They hoped they could gain victory – at least –on the battlefield.

Others attributed secession and war to a clash of regional cultures and ambitions. Twenty years after the war, J. Davis asserted that the actual cause was to be found in sectional rivalry and political ambition. Other observers traced the war to the clash between two schools of constitutional interpretation. As Alexander Stephens, Vice-President of the Confederate States of America expressed, the Civil War was a strife between the principles of Federation, on one side, and Centralism, on the other.

The Southerners were afraid of the rise of Republican Party that attracted the attention of Southern blacks. The loyalty of the non-slaveholding whites of the South was uncertain. From the planters' standpoint, secession seemed the only alternative. Northerners greeted secession as a deadly assault upon their own rights, welfare, and security. That could not be tolerated. President Lincoln called to arms after the Confederates bombarded Union soldiers at Fort Sumter, South Carolina on 12<sup>th</sup> April, 1861. He acknowledged that neither side had eagerly sought military conflict. On the contrary; both parties deprecated war. But when the interests of the two parties proved irreconcilable within a united country, “one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive; and the other would accept war rather than let it perish. And the war came (quoted in Basler, 1953, online).”

## **2 The Armed Conflict and its End**

The first chapter was aimed at describing the most crucial events and changes that had been cumulating in the American society for decades and eventually led to the outbreak of the war. As James M. McPherson, a Pulitzer Prize winning author of *Battle Cry of Freedom* explains, "the republic at midcentury" was a divided society, certainly, and a violent one, but not one in which so appalling a phenomenon as civil war is likely. Slowly, slowly the remote possibility became horrible actuality (McPherson, 1988).

Americans of the Civil War generation understood the importance of the era they lived in. Many contemporaries wrote diaries, articles, and letters and thus left valuable comments on the wartime era. The proportions of the American Civil War are hard to imagine in the modern times of the twenty first century. However, this part of the work tries to give a brief, and at the same time, a sufficient account of the most crucial events that happened after the attack at Fort Sumter on 12<sup>th</sup> April, 1861. Generally speaking, the war comprised of several hundreds of smaller battles including nearly fifty major battles. Alongside the biggest battles at Antietam and Gettysburg, non-military events such as Emancipation Proclamation, Presidential election and Lincoln's assassination are present in this chapter as well.

The last part of the wartime description is devoted to its gradual end achieved by seizure of South's ports, railroads, inland areas, and towns. The Yankees burnt many of the buildings on the rebels' territory to ashes, which, in turn, combined with several defeats in a row resulted in loss of their will to fight.

### **2.1 Attack at Fort Sumter and the First Year of the War**

After secession of the lower south states stood Unionist Fort Sumter, a man-made island at the entrance to the bay of Charleston, on the Confederacy territory. Even before seceding South Carolina sent commissioners to Washington to negotiate for the fort and the arsenal. For the Northerners, Fort Sumter was seen as a symbol of sovereignty (McPherson, 1988). It was assumed, that if war had come, it had likely started at Fort Sumter.

Major R. Anderson, the commander of the fort, was well aware of this. Both he and former President Buchanan wanted to prevent the attack. There was a harsh discussion in the Cabinet, whether to risk and supply the fort with food and all the needed material and forces, or to give up the Sumter and evacuate the garrison; which, in turn, might

divide the Northerners. Some members of the cabinet suggested reinforcement of Fort Pickens, Florida, and giving up the Fort Sumter. This might be seen as a gesture of peace and good will.

As contemporaries accounted, wrath between the North and the South rose almost to the bursting point. But it did not burst; mainly because neither side wanted war. Secessionists from other southern states warned South Carolina to cool down the conflict before the new Confederacy was organized and ready. Fort Sumter should be left alone so long as the Union government did not try to reinforce it. However, something had to be done, since the newly appointed President Lincoln learned that the garrison was running out of supplies. Lincoln faced hard choices – he, under no conditions, wanted to start the war. After calling his cabinet into emergency session he decided to send a message to Charleston informing that an attempt will be made to supply Fort Sumter (McPherson, 1988). Historians agree that a challenge was put in front of Jefferson Davis – shall it be peace or war? The Confederates knew that help was about to arrive, so they opened fire on 12<sup>th</sup> April, at 4:30 a.m. Almost starved and exhausted men under the commandship of Anderson surrendered on 14<sup>th</sup> April and the Confederate stars and bars rose over Sumter.

This news galvanized the North. Lincoln issued a proclamation calling 75,000 militiamen into national service; the response from the "free" states (non-slavery) was overwhelming. The message of Sumter's fall was welcomed and widely celebrated in the South. Everyone seemed to be perfectly delighted and in favour of secession.

The outbreak of war at Fort Sumter confronted the upper South with a crisis of decision – its choice could decide the fate of the Confederacy. These eight border states contained most of the South's resources for waging war. During the following two months after the attack and after a short period of neutrality, four out of these states seceded from the Union and joined the Confederacy – namely Virginia (West Virginia broke away from Virginia and became a new state in the Union in 1863), Arkansas, North Carolina and Tennessee. Four slave states never declared secession: Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, and Missouri. However, men from these states fought either on the side of the Union or Confederacy. Missouri and Maryland mainly for the North; Kentucky, as a birthplace of both Lincoln and Davis, was more evenly divided between the two. Precisely because Kentucky was so evenly divided in sentiment and geography, she adopted legislature stating that “this state and the citizens thereof shall take no part in the Civil War now being waged [but will] occupy a position of strict neutrality”

(Harrison, 1975, p. 9). The geographical position of Kentucky made her a crucial point in transportation and trade among the armies' stations.

Considering the advantages of the upper south secession, perhaps the greatest asset that Virginia brought to the Confederacy was Robert E. Lee. Despite the fact that he made clear his dislike for slavery and secession, he became the General of the Confederate army. The example of Virginia – and of Robert Lee – exerted a powerful influence on the rest of the upper South and other states copied her decision.

The sentiments in Virginia were not clearly secession-motivated. A strong anti-slavery and anti-secession movement in the north-western part ended up in breaking away from the rest of the state. West Virginia became a state following the Wheeling Conventions of 1861, and was admitted to the Union in June 1863.

War fever during the first months after Sumter caused that sober reflections on the purpose of the fighting were suppressed. Most people on both sides took for granted the purpose and justice of their cause. McPherson summed up the most common reasons people believed they fought for; the most eloquent is perhaps the one declared in a Yankee Republican newspaper: “We must fight now, not because we want to subjugate the South...but because we must! (1988, p. 308).”

Both sides fought symbols of abstraction – the flag, the Union, the Constitution. Southerners mainly for state sovereignty, the right of secession, the Constitution as they interpreted it. The institution of slavery was generally omitted or mentioned very scarcely. Rather they portrayed the South as fighting for liberty and self-government. Jefferson Davis said repeatedly that the South was fighting for the same sacred right of self-government that the Revolutionary Fathers had fought for.

Despite the fact that the conflict between the North and the South had been escalating for quite a long time, the Civil War caught both sides military unprepared. The Yankee army owned no general staff, no strategic plans, no program for mobilization, only few accurate maps of the South. In early 1869, the U.S. army consisted of 16,000 men. Nearly a third of its officers were resigning to go with the South (McPherson, 1988).

In contrary to the army, the navy was little better prepared for the war. Although many officers and seamen left to the South, the large marine was overwhelmingly Northern. A large part of the Union's navy was engaged in the blockade of southern ports; a naval strategy by the United States to prevent the Confederacy from trading

(mainly with Britain). Under the leadership of Gideon Welles and Assistant Secretary G.V. Fox, the navy played an irreplaceable role in the wartime period.

On the other hand, the Confederacy began with no navy and few facilities for building one. Eventually, they concentrated on damaging Union's warships by mines placed at the mouths of harbours and rivers.

Expecting short and glorious war, both northern and southern boys rushed to join the armies. Many eager volunteers signed 90-day papers, evidence of the widespread belief that the war would be brief and nearly bloodless. Even though the Confederacy had to organize a War Department and an army from the ground up, the South got an earlier start on mobilization than the North. But these soldiers began to experience two biggest problems of the Confederacy army – logistics and supply. Overwhelming majority of the industrial capacity laid in the North; including production of firearms, clothes, boots, and shoes. The Union had more than twice the density of railroads; several times the mileage of canals and roads (McPherson, 1988).

A common problem in both armies was a confusing colourful variety of uniforms: a journalist described gathering Union forces like a circus on parade. The variety and similarity of uniforms on opposite sides caused tragic mixups in early battles when regiments mistook friends for enemies or enemies for friends. The northern government, as fast as possible, resolved this issue by clothing its soldiers in the standard light blue trousers and dark blue blouse of the regular army; a grey colour became the colour of the Confederacy army.

Different colours of uniforms caused confusion during the first earnest battle of Bull Run (called Manassas by Southerners) on 21<sup>st</sup> July, 1861. The Union army in Northern Virginia attacked the Confederate forces. The goal was to defeat the Confederate army, open the way to Richmond, the Confederate capital, and end the war. However, the reverse was truth. After the whole day of fighting, Confederate army won and remains of the Union troops retreated to Washington. Although victorious, Confederate forces were too disorganized to pursue (Gottfried, 2011, online).

Confederate Colonel Jackson and his Virginia brigade joined the battle at a key moment. The defence of the Bull Run earned him the nickname "Stonewall"; and his men who stood fast at Manassas became the Stonewall brigade (Freeman, 1943-44).

The Battle of Bull Run had two important outputs; first, it convinced the Lincoln administration that the Civil War would be a long and costly affair. Second, General

McClellan was appointed commander of the Union army; he reorganized troops defending Washington, thereafter known as the Army of the Potomac.

President Lincoln, as stated in McPherson's *Battle Cry of Freedom*, did not panic after the news of the defeat at Bull Run; the day after he signed enlistment of 500,000 three-year men.

The end of the first year of the war was characterized by an international diplomatic crisis for President Lincoln, as two Confederate officials sailing toward England were seized by the Union's Navy. England demanded their release, threatening war. Lincoln eventually gave in and ordered their release in December. "One war at a time," Lincoln remarked; there was wisdom in his words (Mahin 1999, p. IX).

## **2.2 The Second Year of the Civil War**

The beginning of the second year can be described by a striking promotion in the career of Ulysses S. Grant. After Fort Sumter, without any formal rank in the army, Grant helped recruit a company of Northern volunteers. Despite his bad reputation as a drinker, he was promoted through the ranks of Colonel and Brigadier General to Major-General of volunteers. Victory in Tennessee, capturing Fort Henry, and ten days later Fort Donelson earned him the nickname "Unconditional Surrender" Grant.

One of the biggest battles of 1862 took place at Shiloh on the Tennessee River. Also called Battle of Pittsburgh Landing the fight ended up with 20,000 killed and wounded. The battle started on 6<sup>th</sup> April with a surprise Confederate attack under Generals Johnston and Beauregard on Grant's army. Beauregard sent a victory telegram to Richmond; he did not know yet that Union reinforcements crossed the Tennessee River. As McPherson narrates, the second day at Shiloh began with a surprise attack – but now the Yankees were attacking. By afternoon the Union troops pressed the rebels back to the point of their original attack and the Confederate army retreated eventually. The Battle of Shiloh was the bloodiest battle in American history up to that time. Gone was the romantic innocence of Rebels and Yankees who had marched off to war in 1861.

As part of Lincoln's war effort, several places were attacked simultaneously. In April, Union naval powers captured New Orleans, a vital southern city. As Confederacy troops were concentrated much northerly, the city of New Orleans was left with a rather weak defence. Rests of the rebels surrendered on 29<sup>th</sup> April. The Confederacy lost a major city, and the lower Mississippi soon became an irreplaceable means of transport.



In the crisis atmosphere created by these setbacks during the spring of 1862, the southern Congress enacted first conscription law in American history. It called “all able-bodied while male citizens between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five liable to service for three years” (McPherson, 1988, p. 430). Furthermore, one-year enlistment soldiers had to remain in the army for two more years. However, the South had still more soldiers than it had weapons to arm them. There was an internal disaffection in the country; the Confederate dollar fell, inflation was increasing, problems of financing the war were getting more and more serious. As long as the South seemed to be winning the war, Jefferson Davis was an esteemed leader; however, several setbacks in a row caused his loss of the confidence of the country.

During the same period of time, the Union government and economy was doing better than the Confederate. Generally said – domestic developments reflected the rhythm of events on the battlefield. The thirty seventh Congress brought many innovations into the economy and social life; revolution in tax and monetary structures, future of higher education, transcontinental railroads, and disposition of public land – which later became an important part of the westward expansion after the war; as well as several steps toward abolition of slavery (Montgomery, 1981, p. 97). As McPherson concludes from scholars’ works, the Congress session drafted “the blueprint for modern America (1988, p. 452).”

However, before changing the future of America, the war had to be over. In summer 1862, Union’s prospects of peace were destroyed by the Confederacy Generals Stonewall Jackson and Robert E. Lee.

In March, the Northerners started with the first large-scale offensive called Peninsula Campaign. The operation was commanded by Gen. McClellan and was aimed at capturing the Confederate capital of Richmond. Initially successful plan collapsed after major defeats in the Shenandoah Valley, Virginia in May 1862 and after Seven Days Battle (25<sup>th</sup> June – 1<sup>st</sup> July). These battles resulted in very heavy losses for both armies and the administration decided to withdraw the rests of McClellans’s troops back toward Washington.

The summer was marked by widespread illness on both sides caused by heavy rains and humid heat. One of the reasons why McClellan’s army was withdrawn from the Peninsula was the sickliest season of the year (August/September) coming on and the administration did not want to risk even higher losses on lives caused by malaria, dysentery, and typhoid. Meanwhile Congress was passing a bill to confiscate the

property of Confederates – including slaves – and Lincoln was making up his mind to issue an emancipation proclamation.

As stated in the *Battle Cry of Freedom*, after Seven Days' Battle, the Union policy took a decisive turn toward total war; from now on, the North would fight not to preserve the old Union but to destroy it and build a new one on the ashes.

The second half of 1862 experienced three more major battles. By the end of August, Second Bull Run Battle (Second Manassas) was fought on the same ground like First Bull Run in July 1861. Approximately 70,000 Federals (the figure varies from 65,000 to 75,000) under Gen. John Pope were defeated by 55,000 Confederates under Gen. Lee and Gen. Longstreet. Lee's achievements in his strategic offensive caused a rapid shift towards Washington. Less than a month earlier the main Union army had been only twenty miles (32.2 km) from Richmond. Lee, although having only half as many troops as his opponents, shifted the scene to twenty miles from Washington. The news spread through the North during the first half of the September; army's moral plunged.

Only few days after victory at Bull Run, the Confederacy army continued their Maryland campaign (also called Antietam campaign) with another victory at Harpers Ferry in today West Virginia. Stonewall Jackson defeated the Yankees at relatively minor cost. The Union commander raised the white flag of surrender and the Rebels took hundreds prisoners in blue uniforms.

After this victory, Stonewall's troops rushed to Sharpsburg, Maryland to take part in the first major battle fought on the Union soil, which is, at the same time, considered to be the bloodiest single day battle in the American history, causing more than 22,000 casualties (McPherson, 2002). The battle of Antietam (by Southerners called Battle of Sharpsburg) took place on 17<sup>th</sup> September. Despite McClellan failed to destroy Lee's army, the battle ended up with a withdrawal of Lee's troops to Virginia and thus making the Union the victorious side.

Lincoln's growing discontent with McClellan's inefficiency resulted in his replacement with Gen. Burnside as the new Commander of the Army of the Potomac. In the middle of December, the Yankees, under new commandship, suffered a costly defeat at Fredericksburg in Virginia with a loss of thousands of men. After the victory of Lee's army the whole South celebrated and newspapers sang Lee's praises. Burnside was relieved of command a month later and Battle at Fredericksburg belongs to one of the costliest battles of the American Civil War.

### 2.3 The Third Year of the Civil War

Since the outbreak of the war there was a growing Republican conviction that the fate of the nation could not be separated from the fate of slavery (McPherson, 1988). More precisely, radical leader G. W. Julian of Indiana concluded that the four million slaves cannot be neutral; as labourers, if not soldiers, they will be the allies of the rebels, or of the Union.

Given this mood, antislavery bills were discussed in the Congress quite often. Meanwhile, many of the slaves escaped their owners and sought refuge – and freedom – in Union camps. In the summer of 1862, a law was passed that enabled President to enrol "persons of African descent for any war service for which they may be found competent".

Lincoln appeared to be a mediator between abolitionists (and radicals) who fought for immediate abolition of slavery and Democrats who opposed the emancipation. The preservation of the Union remained the purpose of the war. However, hints indicated that “partial or even total emancipation might become necessary to accomplish that purpose (McPherson, 1988, p. 510).”

A month after the Battle of Antietam, Lincoln issued a preliminary proclamation warning that in all states still in rebellion in the beginning of the following year, their slaves would be declared “then, thenceforward, and forever free (Wilson, 2011, p. 140)”. The final proclamation was issued on 1<sup>st</sup> January 1863 and applied only to the Southern states in rebellion.

As E. Foner sums up in *The Fiery Trial: Abraham Lincoln and American Slavery*, the Proclamation did not compensate the owners, did not outlaw slavery, and did not grant citizenship to the ex-slaves. It applied to more than three million of the four million slaves at the time. The Proclamation also authorized the recruitment of freed slaves and free blacks as Union soldiers who made a vital contribution to Union victory in the war (Foner, 2011).

But in the spring of 1863, there was no vision of the war’s end. In May, the Union troops under the commandship of newly appointed Gen. Joseph "Fighting Joe" Hooker suffered a defeat by Lee's much smaller forces at the Battle of Chancellorsville, in Virginia. The battle was victorious for the Confederacy mainly thanks to Lee's brilliant tactics. On the other side, this battle was the last for Confederate Gen. Stonewall Jackson who was mortally wounded by his own soldiers.

In the very beginning of June, Gen. Lee launched his second invasion of the North, heading into Pennsylvania in a campaign that soon led to Gettysburg. The Battle of Gettysburg that was fought from 1<sup>st</sup> July to 3<sup>rd</sup> July 1863 around the small market town of Gettysburg is considered by many the most famous and most important Civil War battle; it is often even described as turning point of the war itself. After victorious Chancellorsville, the morale in the Confederacy army was good; Lee persuaded his men they could do anything and go anywhere (McPherson, 1988). This attitude and advance of the rebels into Pennsylvania set off panic in the North and, in turn, heightened southern euphoria.

The euphoria was soon replaced with failure and horror. The Union Army of the Potomac under its very new commander General Meade clashed with Lee's Army of Northern Virginia. Dissents between Confederate Gen. J. Longstreet and Lee regarding the positions and attacks resulted in heavy losses. In 90°F (32.2 °C) heat, July humidity, clouds of blinding smoke and dust, the Rebels gave up after three days of fierce battles. The next day, 4<sup>th</sup> July, Lee began a long slow withdrawal of his army back to Virginia. As McPherson figures out, human cost after Gettysburg was unimaginable – 23,000 Union casualties (equalling to one-quarter of the army); the cost to the South was even greater – 28,000 men killed, wounded or missing (more than a third of her army) (McPherson, 1988).

The summer witnessed even more bloody fights. From May to July, the siege of Vicksburg waged, that helped shape the future development of the war itself. The Vicksburg campaign was won by Union Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant. His Army of the Tennessee yielded command of the Mississippi River and thus cut off the states of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas from the rest of the Confederacy. Vicksburg capitulation came on 4<sup>th</sup> July –a great humiliation for the Southerners. In contrary, this important victory meant for the Yankees “the most Glorious Fourth they ever spent” (McPherson, 1988, p. 636).

After Gettysburg and Vicksburg, Lee offered his resignation to Jefferson Davis. Davis refused; General went on to win further battles. However, Lee and his men never again possessed the power and reputation they carried into Pennsylvania when launching the North's invasion in the spring of 1863.

The autumn of the same year was marked by two major battles – both of them with a different winning side. In September, a decisive Confederate victory by Gen. B. Bragg's Army of Tennessee resulted in Confederacy siege over Tennessee. The Union's

Army of the Cumberland retired to Chattanooga that witnessed a two-month campaign ending up with a Yankees' victory. Union troops, with Gen. Sherman involved, avenged their previous defeat at Chickamauga, gained control of Tennessee and opened the door to an invasion of the Deep South that came the following year.

## **2.4 The Fourth Year of the Civil War**

1864 seemed to be the most decisive wartime year. As Lincoln said "upon the progress of our arms, all else chiefly depends (McPherson, 1988, p. 718)." The word "all" included Lincoln's own re-election as well as the fate of Emancipation and of the Union. The Southerners hoped that the ongoing war would pursue people to vote for a peace Democrat candidate in the Presidential election of 1864. The peace Democrat would negotiate Confederate independence – something Lincoln would never do.

From the military point of view, spring of 1864 was marked by Grant's appointment as the commander-in-chief of all Union armies; Gen. William T. Sherman succeeded Grant as commander in the West. In May, they launched together a coordinated campaign involving all the Union Armies to defeat Confederate Lee's army. Grant began an advancing toward Richmond that included major battles at the Wilderness and Spotsylvania in May and Cold Harbour in June. Both armies suffered heavy casualties – Battle at the Wilderness as well as Battle of Spotsylvania ended inconclusive; at Cold Harbour the Union army suffered a bloody defeat as a result of Grant's mistake. Later in June, a nine-month siege of Petersburg by Union forces began as Union's inability to cut off the Confederate rail lines.

Meanwhile in the west, Sherman advanced toward Atlanta. In the very beginning of September, Sherman telegraphed Lincoln that Atlanta was captured. Doubtless, this is one of the factors that helped shape the sentiment of the Northerners toward Lincoln's re-election. Eventually, in two months time, Lincoln defeated Democrat candidate George B. McClellan, the former General of the Army of Potomac. Lincoln won all the states but Kentucky, Delaware and New Jersey; his party also captured a majority in the Congress of three-fourths (McPherson, 1988).

Few days after election, Sherman started a March to the Sea (also known as Savannah Campaign) through Georgia that lasted until pre-Christmas time, included Battle of Nashville and ended with the capture of the port of Savannah. Sherman's men

destroyed military targets as well as industry, infrastructure, and civilian property and disrupted the Confederacy's economy and its transportation networks.

Since 1863, when the 54<sup>th</sup> Massachusetts Infantry Regiment, the first black regiment in the North, was formed, the soldiers of African descent served in artillery and infantry and performed all noncombat support functions that sustain an army, e.g. cooks, labourers, spies, carpenters. However, the Battle at Fort Wagner, which guarded the Port of Charleston in South Carolina, was the first time in the Civil War that black troops led an infantry attack. Despite the fact that the ex-slaves were needed as fighting force in the Federal army, the administration was reluctant to use African-American troops in combat. This was partly due to racism, since many Union officers believed black soldiers were not as skilled or as brave as white soldiers. Moreover, not only were the ex-slaves assigned to inferior jobs, they were paid only three quarters of the regular white man's wage (Freeman et al, 1992, online). Eventually, this was adjusted in 1864 with a bill authorizing equal pay for black and white soldiers.

In the spring of 1865, a proposal to enlist slaves appeared even in the South Government. Already in September 1864 the governor of Louisiana declared that "The time has come for us to put into the army every able-bodied Negro man as a soldier (McPherson, 1988, p. 833)." The lack of men suitable for fighting forced Davis and his administration to discuss such a notion of "arming blacks." After Lee expressed his opinion of this as a necessary act, the House passed the bill. Though, Davis could not commit his Congress on this matter; and he never did. Virginia herself enacted the law for the enlistment of black soldiers – however the two companies of "slave" soldiers never saw actions.

## **2.5 The South Surrenders**

Despite Confederate disasters in the last months of 1864, the war was not yet over – at least Jefferson Davis and his colleagues refused to admit that it was over.

However, 3<sup>rd</sup> February witnessed the first attempt of peace negotiations between the North and the South. The two sides, represented by W. H. Seward – the United States Secretary of State and a three-men commission appointed by Confederacy, met on the Union steamer River Queen. Besides peace conditions, including unconditional surrender demanded by Lincoln, Seward informed the commissioners that the House of Representatives had just passed the Thirteenth Amendment abolishing slavery and had

been submitted to the states for ratification. Confederacy President refused the unconditional surrender and declared: “The South must fight on (McPherson, 1988, p. 824).” In fact only Lee’s Army at Petersburg and Johnston’s forces in North Carolina remained to fight for the South against Northern forces.

At the beginning of 1865 the only bigger portions of the Confederate land still untouched by invading Yankees were the interior of the Carolinas and most of Alabama. Grant had already been planning to seize the latter. By March, her two important towns, Selma and Montgomery, were seized and ruined by young James H. Wilson and his men.

In February, Sherman’s blue army started their march from Savannah through the heart of enemy territory up to South Carolina. This was part of Sherman’s plan – to destroy all war resources and to crush Lee’s army of Northern Virginia (Lewis, 1993). Union soldiers had their own purpose in mind: to punish the state that started the unholy rebellion. One Ohio soldier vowed: “We will let her know that it isn’t so sweet so secede as she thought it would be (McPherson, 1988, p. 826).” Towns as well as villages of South Carolina were pillaged; the capital Columbia was burnt into ashes on 17<sup>th</sup> February. However, when the army entered North Carolina the destruction of civilian property stopped. It must be said that this march was a spectacular act – administration engineers reported that it was absolutely impossible to cross the lower portions of the State in winter. Despite this advice, Sherman’s men cut trees on their way, built bridges, waded through water, and fought alligators, snakes and rebels. Eventually their campaign brought success.

On 4<sup>th</sup> March inauguration ceremonies for President Lincoln were held in Washington. He started his second term with famous words “[...] let us strive on to finish the work we are in (Levin, 2015, online).” Regarding the question on abolition of slavery, Lincoln had moved during his political career steadily from no emancipation to limited emancipation with colonization and then to universal emancipation with limited suffrage. This trajectory might well end in universal suffrage secured by the gradual "education" of the nation.

Lincoln’s target had been achieved not only on the political scene. Sherman advanced on the enemy’s territory and thus supported hopes for a soon end of the war. In mid-March it became clear that final destination of Sherman’s march is Goldsboro in North Carolina. Sherman had an opportunity to encounter Lee’s men earlier, but he didn’t want to lose men in a direct attack when it can be avoided (cited in McPherson,

1988, p. 830). He would rather win by strategy and manoeuvre than by battle. Besides that Sherman believed that the war was nearly over and that his destruction of enemy resources had done much to win it.

By the end of March Lee conducted the last attack on the centre of Grant's forces at Petersburg, Virginia. The Confederates seemed to have achieved a breakthrough but a Federal counterattack recaptured all lost ground and resulted in rebels' surrender. The town of Petersburg as well as the Confederate Capital Richmond were evacuated. The next day, Union troops entered and raised the Stars and Stripes. On 4<sup>th</sup> April Abraham Lincoln, the President of the United States of America, sat in the study of the President of the Confederate States, forty hours after Davis and the Army of Northern Virginia had left it (McPherson, 1988).

Confederate army was reduced to 35,000 men, cut off a railroad, and deprived of their dream. With a heavy heart Lee decided that "there is nothing left for me to do but go and see General Grant, and I would rather die a thousand deaths (Freeman, 1934, p. 120)." Gen. Robert E. Lee's final surrender to Gen. Ulysses S. Grant came on 9<sup>th</sup> April at the village of Appomattox Court House in Virginia. After Grant had said his men that the war is over the news of the surrender spread through Union camps and the joyfulness erupted (McPherson, 1988). After symbolic gestures it could be concluded that these two enemies in many bloody battles ended the war with a soldier's "mutual salutation and farewell (Davis, 2002, p. 362)."

Despite the fact that many historians consider 9<sup>th</sup> April to be the official end of the Civil War, the Confederate army existed some more weeks. Gen. Johnston surrendered to Sherman near Durham in North Carolina on 18<sup>th</sup> April; remaining Confederate forces surrendered in May as Jefferson Davis fled southward.

Only five days after Confederate General Robert E. Lee surrendered and thus ended the war, the sixteenth President of the United States Abraham Lincoln was assassinated during the play performance "Our American Cousin" at Ford's Theatre in Washington by John Wilkes Booth. Lincoln died the next morning. The American nation that had recently rejoiced at the end of the Civil War now mourned at Lincoln's shocking assassination.

Arguments about the causes and consequences of the Civil War, as well as the reasons for the Northern victory are frequently discussed among historians. But certain large consequences of the war seem clear – secession and slavery were ruined, which in turn resulted in a broader transformation of American society. The new federal system



led to a more centralized polity; this change shifted much of the political power from South to North. After the war, the Southerners lost their majority in the House, Senate, and Supreme Court as well. Few decades were needed to re-acknowledge the Southerners in the politics.

Taking a closer look at the original differences between the North and the South that led to the outbreak of the war, through most of the American history, the South usually seemed to be different from the rest of the United States with “a separate and unique identity...which appeared to be out of the mainstream of American experience (Monroe, 1976, p. 1).” But as McPherson compares the South with some of the societies in the world, he came to a conclusion that the North might have been exceptional and unique before the Civil War (1988, p. 860). It was the North that hurtled toward industrial capitalism; the South, like the majority of countries worldwide, remained predominantly rural, agricultural, and labour-intensive.

A Louisiana planter, cited in McPherson, who returned home sadly after the war wrote that the society has been completely changed by the war. Through most of the world history, demand for a change is the reason any war is fought.

### 3 The Reconstruction Era

The first chapter of the present work explained the war's root causes. The chapter that followed gave an account of the most crucial events of the Civil war itself. Yet the chronology brings us to the era generally known as Reconstruction. In the very beginning it must be said that probably no other chapter of American history has been interpreted in such conflicting ways as the period that followed after the war.

Unlike the war, it cannot be easily stated when the era began. Reconstruction did not start with a gunshot nor did it start with an official proclamation. Historians are not united regarding the timeline of the Reconstruction. Did the Reconstruction start simultaneously with the war? Or in 1863 when the Emancipation Proclamation was issued? When the war was over? One of America's most distinguished historians on Reconstruction, Eric Foner, starts his *Forever Free* with the Emancipation of 1863.

The study of Reconstruction began in the early twentieth century with the work of William Dunning, John W. Burgess, and their students. However, their explanation of the era differs greatly from that one of the twenty first century. It is predominantly caused by the transformation of understanding of race relations, which, combined with the changing definition of history itself and changes in politics and economy, resulted in a new portrait of the era (Foner, 1988).

General accounts of Reconstruction in the tradition of the Dunning School are usually summed up as follows: the white South accepts her military defeat, stands ready to do justice to the ex-slaves, and desires a quick reintegration back into the national life. Andrew Johnson continues in Lincoln's politics. Radical Republicans stress black suffrage – black people's right to vote – over the defeated South and a period known as Radical Reconstruction (1867-77) follows. Later the white Southerners overthrow the governments and restore the so-called home rule. Basically, it refers to white supremacy. According to the Dunning School interpretation, the "negro incapacity" causes their unpreparedness for freedom and political rights. Thus the role of the former slaves is fully ignored in that era. Dunning School advocates consider the Reconstruction to be the darkest page in the saga of American history (Dunning, 1907). Those still influenced by the traditional view often think of the expansion of the rights of African Americans as a punishment to whites rather than as an expansion of democracy; of the Ku Klux Klan as a guardian of the order; and of the federal government's social reforms as enforced doctrine.

Some 30 years after Dunning's work, the Reconstruction was explained from the point of view of a black activist and scholar. W. E. B. Du Bois published *Black Reconstruction in America*, in which he depicts the creation of order from the ashes of slavery and struggle between capital and labour. He offers the first comprehensive scholarly critique of the prevailing view of Reconstruction. Furthermore he lists scholars who ignored in their works the role of the emancipated slaves in the era. Foner concludes that *Black Reconstruction* in many ways anticipates the findings of modern scholarship; however, at that time, it was largely ignored (Foner, 1988).

The so called revisionist wave broke out in the 1960s and required not only the evolution in scholarship, but a profound change in the nation's politics and racial attitudes. It took an entire decade to prove that the real goal of the Reconstruction was the establishment of the public school system, the granting of equal citizenship to the blacks, and the effort to revitalize the devastated Southern economy. However, a new generation of scholars from the 1970s and 1980s viewed almost every aspect of the period sceptically. They draw attention to ongoing racism; secret collaboration between the federal government and former slaveholders, and their studies of Southern social history emphasizes the survival of the old planter class and thus "Old South" as well.

Foner defines Reconstruction as "a crucial moment when conflicts over racial justice, political democracy, and the meaning of American freedom reached their greatest intensity (2005, p. xix)." America witnessed the creation of religious, educational, and political institutions by the newly freed slaves, and their entrance into American politics as voters and officeholders.

Today we can claim that the Reconstruction was tragically misunderstood by both historians and the broader popular culture for nearly a century. Hence this chapter tries to give a neutral account of the period of Reconstruction built on the recent findings and concerns. It is divided into four parts based on the aspect they focus on. The first part includes emancipation of the freed slaves and the formation of the definition of American citizenship. The second part is devoted to the period known as Presidential Reconstruction; while the third section focuses on the Radical Reconstruction that replaced the previous one. The ratification of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, and the first confrontation of the United States with terrorism in the form of the Ku Klux Klan are present as well. The last part of this chapter offers a link between the civil rights movement of 1860 and 1960 and shows the effect of Reconstruction on the U.S. history.

Racism, federalism, and belief in limited government and local autonomy – Reconstruction challenged these deeply rooted elements of the nineteenth-century political culture. The underlying principles – that the federal government possesses the power to define and protect citizens' rights, and that blacks were equal members of the society – represented a profound change in the American law (Foner, 2005). Although the era of Reconstruction lasted approximately a bit more than a decade, the rewriting of laws and the Constitution during those years continues to affect American life to this day.

### **3.1 The Black Reconstruction**

Emancipation Proclamation, issued in 1863, has been discussed in the previous chapter. Since this act has had a profound impact on the course of U.S. history including the Era of Reconstruction, a more detailed account of its effect is offered in this part.

Despite the fact, that the Emancipation Proclamation did not free the slaves with a stroke of Lincoln's pen, the Proclamation provoked jubilation among free blacks and abolitionists in the North and contrabands (escaping slaves with whole families but not legally free) and slaves in the South. The constitutional legality of the document was derived from the president's authority as military commander in chief and thus applied almost exclusively to areas under Confederate control.

Doubtless it altered the nature of the war. E. Foner concludes that the Union's war for self-preservation and the slaves' war for freedom had at last merged. Frederick Douglass, an advocate of the racial justice, proclaimed in the similar sense that the cause of the slaves and the cause of the country had become one.

Abraham Lincoln remarked in his second inaugural speech in March 1865 that slavery was "somehow" the cause of the war. However, his administration for nearly two years after the breakout of the war insisted that the preservation of the Union, not the abolition of the slavery, was the war's goal (Foner, 2005). Long before Lincoln made emancipation a war aim, African Americans in both the North and the South called the conflict the "freedom war."

Even in the areas of the Confederacy far from the battlefields, the conflict undermined the institution of slavery. Many of the owners left their plantations and fought in the war, thus leaving their property, including slaves, watched only by their

wives and elderly. This often resulted in slaves' refusal to work. Furthermore with the arrival of Union forces, slave discipline collapsed altogether.

Thousands of them escaped their master and joined the Yankee army. Frederick Douglass was the one who persistently called for the Union army to begin enrolling black soldiers; not only to add to the army's manpower, but to enable the blacks to deserve equal rights in the reunited nation. Initially, the army was not equipped to deal with all of the fugitives, often including whole families with women and children. In the early days of the war, as researchers found out, Union military commanders even returned fugitive slaves to their owners.

Union navy, in contrary, offered sailor occupations for blacks even before the war. The position of the black sailors was rather equal with their white counterparts. Conditions of ships made racial segregation impossible. Black and white sailors lived together, dined together and received equal pay (Foner, 2005). The Union army, in contrary, organized black soldiers into segregated units, paid them less and assigned them to labour rather than to combat.

Nonetheless, black soldiers played a crucial role not only in winning the Civil War, but, as modern historians declare, also in defining the war's consequences. Frederick Douglass stated that more than any other single event in the history, the military service of black men in the Union army placed the question of black citizenship on the national agenda. At the same time, the military service proved to be a liberating experience for the black soldiers themselves.

The service of the black soldiers was only one of many developments during the Civil War that helped shape the political and social aspects of the post-war Reconstruction. In the Confederacy areas that later came again under the control of Union, crucial issues were debated – access to land, control of labour, the new structure of political power. Different attitudes clashed in the discussion – those of emancipated slaves, southern whites, northern businessmen, and government officials. Each of these groups had distinctive views on how the transition to freedom should be organized. Furthermore, each side had its own understanding of the meaning of freedom. In the whole United States, no consensus existed clarifying what social and political system should replace slavery.

In January 1865, the Equal Rights League gathered – "the first political move ever made by the coloured people" as written in the New Orleans Tribune, first daily black-run newspaper. At approximately the same time, General Sherman issued Field Order

15, distributing the land along the South Carolina and Georgia coast for the settlement of black families. In the Order lay the origins of the phrase "forty acres and a mule."

Meanwhile in Washington, the Congress established the Freedmen's Bureau to help both former black slaves and poor whites in the South after war's end. The Bureau existed for seven years; it was closed as a response to pressure from white Southerners.

Neither Lincoln approached the post-war world with a fixed plan for the South. Indeed, in his final speech in April 1865 he proposed that "some blacks ought to have the right to vote (Foner, 2005, p. 66)." Under "some" he meant not only the educated ones but those who "serve our cause as soldiers as well". Although this statement does not declare equality, it was the first time an American president publicly endorsed any kind of political rights for the black Americans. Four days later, he was assassinated.

The events of 1865 influenced the social and political history of Reconstruction and, indeed, of the decades that followed. This era was shaped by the question on the rights of American citizens and fair access to economic resources. Eric Foner in his *Forever Free* defines the central question of Reconstruction as follows: What was the meaning of freedom? What rights and status would African Americans enjoy in post-war American society? On these questions, consensus would not be found for decades.

For the blacks, freedom grew out of slavery. The collective values and institutions they had preserved in bondage now became fully visible in freedom. Many separated themselves from the former owners and made usage of the newly acquired freedom to physical movement. They moved mainly to southern towns and cities, where they founded schools, churches and fraternal societies. Moreover, former slaves tried to reunite their relatives separated by slavery. In overall, the blacks expressed their desire for independence from white control through their everyday behaviour.

Regarding the definition of the freedom, in debates over the Thirteenth Amendment one phrase was used more than any other to underline the distinction between slavery and freedom: "the right to the fruits of his labour." However, many doubted how this attribute of freedom could be guaranteed. In the months immediately after the war, it was the task of the Freedmen's Bureau to help create a free society in the South. In some areas, the bureau achieved significant goals. But the central effort – to establish a working system of free labour – proved to be far more problematic. Understanding the difficulty of the situation, Frederick Douglass remarked, when the Thirteenth Amendment abolishing slavery was ratified in December 1865, that the work does not end with the abolition of slavery, but only begins (Foner, 2005). The effects of the

Reconstruction were for the blacks indeed profound – within a few years of Emancipation, the former slaves were granted the citizenship rights equal to those of the whites. Although the freedpeople failed to achieve full freedom, their ongoing struggle to define the meaning of freedom did much to shape the nation’s political and social agenda during and beyond the Reconstruction Era.

### **3.2 The Presidential Reconstruction**

Abraham Lincoln died suddenly without having established a complex plan for Reconstruction. In his last speech, as already has been mentioned, he publicly supported limited black suffrage in the South. However, Lincoln’s successor Andrew Johnson did not share his view mainly because of his attitudes on both race and government. Although being a Unionist, Johnson was also a defender of states’ rights and he denied that the federal government should be entitled to dictate voting requirements. According to him, from the legal point of view, the southern states had never left the Union nor did they give up the right to govern their own affairs. Johnson insisted that the biggest problem of Reconstruction was to put the southern states under the control of loyal whites and bring the states back to the Union as quickly as possible (Foner, 2005). Moreover, Johnson held deeply racist views regarding the blacks and wanted the South to be managed by white men. He developed his policies without consulting anyone and did not accept any criticism. Unlike Lincoln, he had no real standing in the Republican Party. Generally speaking, Johnson lacked both the personal qualities and political experience to provide the nation with leadership when it was most needed.

This era is known to historians as Presidential Reconstruction (1865-67). The major steps that Johnson conducted include appointment of provisional governors for the ex-Confederate states, an outline for the new state governments, restoration of property rights for the whites except Confederate leaders and wealthy planters; however, eventually almost all of these subsequently received individual pardons. New governments were required to abolish slavery and declare off the secession. Besides these, they were granted a free hand in managing their affairs. Johnson had a free hand as well – mainly because of the interim period between the Thirty-eighth Congress of March 1865 and the Thirty-ninth that did not assemble until December.

As part of his plan of Reconstruction, Johnson ordered nearly all the plantation lands – previously granted to the freedpeople by Field Order 15 – to restore to their

former owners. The freedpeople were asked to either sign labour contracts to work for planters, otherwise they would be evicted. In the end, only a small number of former slaves managed to retain their lands. As a result, the vast majority of rural ex-slaves remained poor during Reconstruction, and for many years after. Despite the disappointments that followed the end of the war, the generation of black Americans would always “regard the moment when slavery ended as the turning in their lives (Foner, 2005, p. 78).”

When the former slaves understood that no significant change in land ownership would come, they fought at least for an improvement of the working conditions. A long period of conflict over the organization and control of labour followed on plantations throughout the South. The pace of work, the level of pay, the supervision, and control over the labour of children were strongly discussed between ex-slaves and plantation owners. Planters complained that agricultural workers were not as hard-working as under slavery. Unable to change this situation, planters turned for assistance to the new state governments established under President Johnson’s plan for Reconstruction. As a result, "Black Codes" were issued consisting special laws that applied only to black persons. These Black Codes violating the free-labour principles were adopted by eleven former Confederacy states, Mississippi as the first one, and restricted the freedom of the blacks. Codes limited the type of property African Americans could own, type of business they could conduct. Vagrant blacks could be arrested. Former slaves were forbidden to carry firearms or to testify in court (except in cases involving other blacks). Legal marriage between African Americans was allowed, but interracial marriage was prohibited. In general, contemporaries concluded that the whites seemed unable to comprehend that their old control over the blacks was gone and that freedom for the blacks meant the same thing as freedom for them.

Meanwhile in the North, most Northerners believed Johnson's plan deserved a chance to succeed. This opinion changed when the states’ governments issued the biased political and legal measures – Black Codes – and thus undermined support for Johnson’s Reconstruction program in the North. The enactment of the Black Codes together with an aggression towards the freedpeople throughout the South caused many northern Republicans to doubt whether the white South, indeed, was prepared to accept the reality of emancipation.

Nevertheless, as Foner concludes with regard to the Presidential Reconstruction, the period right after the war was both a time of profound social conflict and a unique



moment of promise in American history. Former slaves, in general, were very modest in their demands toward the society: “All we ask is justice, and to be treated like human beings,” declared a black convention in Mississippi (Foner, 2005, p. 100). Failure of Johnson’s Reconstruction program and his attempts to restore as much of the older order as possible shifted the discussions over the transition from slavery to freedom to Washington. Thus, period known as Congressional Reconstruction began to shape the post-war U.S. history.

### **3.3 The Radical Reconstruction**

Historians agree that between 1865 and 1868, the United States faced one of the greatest political crises in its history. The battle between the President Andrew Johnson and Congress over Reconstruction resulted in far-reaching changes in the structure of constitutional authority and the nature of American citizenship. With the ratification of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution, the principle of equality before the law for all Americans, regardless of race, was written into the Constitution for the first time. At the same time, the authority of the federal government allowed to interfere with state actions that violated the new principle of equal civil rights.

Johnson’s policies were openly criticized by the Radical Republicans – representatives of the antislavery ideology that had grown in the wartime North. Although having own internal issues within the party, Radicals shared the conviction that “slavery and the rights of black Americans were the preeminent questions facing nineteenth-century America (Foner, 2005, p. 111).”

Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner were among the most outspoken Radical leaders. They both were advocates of black suffrage even before the war, of the arming of black soldiers during it, and of the confiscation and redistribution of planters’ land after the war. Besides these, the Radicals supported the expanded powers of the federal government. They insisted that the traditions of federalism and states’ rights must not obstruct the national effort to protect the equal rights of all citizens.

The moderate majority of the Republican Party stood between the Radicals and President Johnson. They viewed the black suffrage as political possibility in the North and an experiment whose outcome cannot be predicted in the South. A paradox existed regarding the right to vote for the African Americans. When the Civil War ended, only five northern states allowed the blacks to vote on the same terms as the whites.

Moderates asked how the North could require of the South what it was not prepared to do itself (Foner, 2005). Unlike Radicals, moderate Republicans perceived Reconstruction as a set of practical problems, not as a social revolution. At first, they were willing to cooperate with President Johnson, but later his policies and actions of the state governments cause their turn to the side of Radicals.

When Congress assembled in December 1865, Johnson announced that Reconstruction was over. In response, Radicals with Moderates refused to accept the representatives and senators elected from Southern states, many of whom had been leading officials in the Confederacy. Thus, the already mentioned battle between the Congress and President of the United States continued. It reached its peak with the impeachment of Johnson in early 1868.

Among others, two important bills were discussed during the Congressional session. The first bill extended the life of the Freedmen's Bureau; the second, the Civil Rights Bill, was an important measure that for the first time offered a legislative definition of American citizenship. It declared equality before the law regardless the race. Furthermore, the Bill declared all persons born in the United States (except Indians) national citizens. The Civil Rights Bill represented the first attempt to give a particular meaning to the Thirteenth Amendment, which ended slavery.

Both bills were vetoed by Johnson. He insisted that the Congress had neither the need nor the authority to protect the freedpeople's rights. However, Senate successfully passed the Civil Rights Act and it became law over the president's veto.

As part of Republicans' plan of Reconstruction, the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution was proposed. It was approved by Congress in 1866 and ratified two years later. The amendment codifies the idea of birthright citizenship and equal rights for all Americans. Regarding the black men's right to vote, the Fourteenth Amendment leaves this issue to be determined by the states. Unlike the Civil Rights Act, which lists specific rights all citizens are to enjoy, the Fourteenth Amendment uses more general language. This broad language allowed the Congress and federal courts to specify the legal equality guaranteed by the Amendment, a process that occupied courts for much of the twentieth century.

The amendment was rather a product of the Moderates; however, the Radicals as well admitted that the Civil Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment embodied a profound change in the federal system and the nature of American citizenship (Foner, 2005). With the passage of the Amendment, the Republican majority in Congress

confirmed their position against President Johnson. Johnson insisted that he was defending the Constitution "as it is," preserving the original vision of the Founding Fathers (Stewart, 2010, p. 4). His position was further weakened by incidents of violence in the South – the riots in Memphis from May 1866 as well as riots in New Orleans that took place by the end of July 1866.

In December 1866, the Congress reassembled and Republicans proposed a new Reconstruction Act, passed over Johnson's veto in March, the following year. Also known as the Military Reconstruction Act, the bill divided the secessionist states into five military districts, each governed by a Union general. Furthermore, Congress declared martial law in the territories to keep the peace and to protect former slaves. The Act offered an outline for new state governments and the southern states were obliged to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment and adopt new constitutions. Thus the interracial democracy – the dream of Radicals, abolitionists, and the former slaves, had finally come to the South. This event marked the beginning of the period known as Radical or Congressional Reconstruction that lasted until the fall of the last southern Republican governments in 1877.

The popular passion for liberty and equality woke up the interests of women as well. Advocates of women's rights joined the era's struggle for equal rights. They saw Reconstruction as a golden opportunity to claim their own emancipation. However, the Radical Republicans insisted that Reconstruction was the "Negro's hour" (Foner, 2005). The Fourteenth Amendment introduced the word "male" into the Constitution; the Fifteenth outlawed discrimination in voting based on race but not gender.

The decade after the war witnessed a remarkable experiment in political democracy – biracial democratic government. During Reconstruction, several hundreds of African Americans held public office, from governor to U.S. senator. Thousands more led the Union Leagues and local branches of Republican Party. Many former slaves established themselves as community leaders – as ministers, teachers, workers, or soldiers.

White Southerners launched a violent campaign to bring Reconstruction to an end. The increasing power of Republican governments stimulated a rapid expansion of the violence. The Ku Klux Klan and similar groups, e.g. the White Brotherhood and the Knights of the White Camellia, were more organized. Their aim was to intimidate the African Americans, influence elections, affect power relations between the races in the South and to overturn Reconstruction governments. Foner describes the Klan during Reconstruction as “the most extensive example of home-grown terrorism in American

history (2005, p. 171).” The investigation of the problem revealed the campaign of criminal violence by the whites to punish black leaders, defeat the Republican Party, re-establish control over the black labour force, and restore white supremacy. The cruelty of the Klan forced Congress to enact three Enforcement Acts, including Ku Klux Klan Act of 1871, aimed at suppressing violence in the South. For the first time in American history, certain crimes were declared offenses punishable under the federal law. Administration under President Grant acted decisively against violence; hundreds of men were arrested, leaders of the organization went on trial. The election of 1872 was thanks to that the most peaceful in the entire Reconstruction era.

KKK assaults took place when biracial governments were assuming power in every state of the old Confederacy. The first biracial elections in the South took place in the fall of 1867, as part of the constitutional conventions. Under the terms of the Reconstruction Act, the southern states were obliged to draft new state constitutions. In general, convictions announced the principle of equality, established free public education, and in some states made the school attendance compulsory. Furthermore, in some cases, a provision of relief for the poor was included.

By 1867, the Republican Party became as central to the black community as the church and school. An Alabama observer wrote that “You never saw people more excited on the subject of politics than are Negroes of the South (Foner, 2005, p. 132).” A significant change in the class and racial composition of American government occurred – white politics of the South was represented mainly by planters, lawyers, and farm owners; in the North, by lawyers, professionals, farmers and urban businessmen dominated. The black political leaders of the Reconstruction South occupied positions such as farmer, minister, teacher, and labourer. On the other hand, black office holders faced the constant threat of violence – a feature of the post-war southern society.

The description of Reconstruction as a time of "Negro rule" expressed the shock of the white Southerners who were against the social and political revolution. However, the power remained largely in white hands. Although the face of Reconstruction varied from state to state, there were three issues that dominated the southern politics in general: education, race relation, and economic policy. The creation of public school systems in every state of the South is generally viewed as the biggest accomplishment of the era. For many years, schools remained strictly segregated. Black leaders simultaneously demanded equal treatment in other spheres of public life, especially in transportation and public accommodation. It was a reflection of the African Americans

of a colour-blind society in which all citizens “would enjoy the same treatment before the law and in the public life (Foner 2005, p. 163).”

Regarding the economic policy of the ex-Confederacy states, their governments tried to support, for the first time in the history, the labourers rather than planters. One of the economic factors shared in every southern state was the railroad construction. The railroad plan was aimed at boosting the factories, towns, and offering the blacks and whites opportunity for economic advancement. The dark side of this economic promotion was represented by corruption. *The Facts of Reconstruction* (1913) by a former slave John R. Lynch was one of the first works to challenge the then-dominant picture of Reconstruction as a time of corruption and misgovernment. As he sums up, the new school system and rapid growth of state budgets led to a desire for influence that produced bribery.

Meanwhile in Washington, the House of Representatives voted to impeach Andrew Johnson, who became the first president to go on trial before the Senate. He was charged with violating the Tenure of Office Act – barring the President from removing major officials without the Senate’s consent. Johnson dismissed from office Secretary of War E. B. Stanton who was an ally of the Radicals. However, the Radicals did not manage to receive support of the two-thirds of the Congress required to remove Johnson from office. Despite this fact, Johnson’s power had been destroyed. As the author of the *Impeached: The Trial of President Andrew Johnson* reveals, the Senate trial was surrounded by corruption and bribery. There remains substantial evidence, as David O. Stewart states, that various means, money including, had been used in order to keep Johnson in office, or to drive him out (Stewart, 2010).

Johnson was succeeded by Republican candidate Ulysses S. Grant; Republicans carried almost the entire South except Georgia and Louisiana, where the party’s campaign had been violently restricted.

Supported by the victory in the elections, the Republicans introduced the last of the era’s amendments to the Constitution during the Congress of 1869 – the Fifteenth Amendment extending the principle of the black suffrage to the entire nation. The Amendment as ratified banned states from racial discrimination in voting rights, but, on the other hand, allowed other qualifications – property, literacy, gender, the payment of a poll tax – which later disabled the right to vote for many black voters in the South and still did not allow women to vote.

After ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment, most Republicans shared the same sentiment that the nation did as much as could reasonably be expected for the former slaves. On this occasion an Illinois Republican newspaper wrote: “The negro is now a voter and citizen. Let him take his chances in the battle of life (Foner, 2005, p. 149).”

### **3.4 Towards the End of Era**

While the image of the South has been shaped by equal citizenship, black suffrage, and dominance of the federal government, the North was experiencing its own transformation after the Civil War – expanding manufactory, railroad construction, expansion of agriculture, mining – a shift to a mature industrial society. New political questions were introduced: the industrial workers demanded an eight-hour workday, farmers asked for the same state intervention as been granted to railroad constructors. On this example, the Northerners sought to extend the Reconstruction principle of equality into economic relations as well. At the same time, the Republican Party went through its own transformation – from the identity based on preserving the Union and emancipating the slaves, the party developed closer ties to business and started to promote business interests and economic development.

However, during the early 1870s, the movement of the Radical Republicans began to loose on significance. No longer was the division of the Republicans based on the radicalism and moderation. More important was the relationship to Grant’s administration and the role of the government itself.

In 1873, Ulysses S. Grant was re-elected as the President of the United States. In the same year, the U.S., as well as some European countries, experienced a great depression in economy, sometimes referred to as the Panic of 1873. The downturn was caused by the failure of the country’s leading banking houses that eventually led to factory closings, business bankruptcies, falling prices for agricultural products, and widespread unemployment. Given this conditions, economic recovery replaced Reconstruction as the main issue in the politics. Historians conclude that the depression destroyed existing hope that Reconstruction would create a modernized New South.

However, in 1875, the last of the major Reconstruction measures was enacted – the Civil Rights Act of 1875, which prohibited racial discrimination in transportation and public accommodation. No further Reconstruction legislation would be adopted,

because the economic depression revitalized the Democratic Party that won control of the House of Representatives.

In 1877, the Republican Rutherford B. Hayes became the eighteenth President of the United States. After negotiations between the two major political parties and conclusion of the Compromise of 1877, Hayes became president and, in turn, he would recognize Democratic control of the entire South. However, not all of the conditions stated in Compromise were fulfilled – the southern Democrats would never truly recognize blacks as equal citizens.

The new political leaders of the South – entitling themselves as Redeemers – took control of the region's politics and undid as much as possible of Reconstruction effort. The racism affected all spheres of public life in the region. There was a growing tendency to eliminate the black voting in the South; separate facilities for the blacks and whites were required based on the state laws. The responsibilities of the government were diminished and taxes and state expenditures likewise. The new public school system, one of the greatest achievements of the Reconstruction, was affected the most. The expenditure on education declined rapidly, while widening the gap between black and white schools.

At the same time, the black middle class grew considerably, mainly thanks to the institutions established during the Reconstruction era – churches, businesses, women's clubs – that made a basis for black urban communities. However, in both the cities and country, the majority of blacks were dependent on inferior jobs and unskilled occupations. Overall, the rural South sank even further into poverty under the Redeemers. This trend continued into the twentieth century, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt would declare the South's poverty the nation's main economic problem.

With the beginning of Hayes's presidency and his removal of federal troops from the South, the Era of Reconstruction, according to some of the historians, came to an end. Some declare that the era continued after 1877 as well. Eric Foner in his *Forever Free* claims that the "proper" Reconstruction – when Republicans controlled the South, the blacks had political power, and federal government protected the rights of all American citizens – ended in the spring of 1877.

Generally speaking, Reconstruction was a mix of achievement and failure. It can be marked as an experiment in the nineteenth-century world. It did not only influence the American history in a broader sense; Reconstruction affected daily life in local

communities. The black men serving as policemen, sheriffs, school and tax officials – they symbolized the political revolution that was taking place on the American soil.

Du Bois summed up the post-Reconstruction period in his *Black Reconstruction in America* when saying that the slave went free; stood a brief moment in the sun; and then moved back again toward slavery (Du Bois, Lewis, 1995). It took nearly a century for the nation to begin again with the Reconstruction agenda granting genuine freedom for all members of the society. It takes a long time and effort as well to overcome the traditional image of Reconstruction as a "Negro rule". As historians agree, the process continues to this day.

The fight for the genuine freedom continued in the twentieth century and reached its peak in the 1950s and 1960s with the modern civil rights revolution, sometimes entitled as the Second Reconstruction. The personality of Martin Luther King Jr. stood in the middle of the struggle. The leaders of the movement often referred to the laws and constitutional amendments enacted during the Reconstruction; King himself linked the struggle for racial justice to the unfulfilled promises of the Civil War era (Foner, 2005).

However, the effects of the second Reconstruction are more far-reaching. With the adoption of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the discrimination based on race, colour, religion, sex, or national origin has been outlawed, as well as the racial segregation in the public sphere. In the beginning of the twenty first century it is obvious how much America's racial situation has changed. The African Americans now play roles in the society that would have been unthinkable a few decades ago – from sports and entertainment to universities, businesses, and military.

It is of a crucial importance to remember the history accurately. At the same time, studying Reconstruction can help us understand the world in which we live today. The glorious failure, as Reconstruction is sometimes termed, was a politically turbulent, corrupted, and often a violent period in U.S. history. As Philip Dray describes in his *Capitol Men*, Reconstruction was certainly in many ways a shameful time in American nation's history (Dray, 2010). On the other hand, it is a story of idealism and moral conflict. At its core there was the courage of black and white Americans who together strived to right the country's greatest wrong. Although the grand experiment of Reconstruction failed it cannot diminish the effort's nobility and ambition.



## 4 The Legacy of the Civil War in American Memory

Pulitzer Prize winning novelist Robert Penn Warren wrote in his *Legacy of the Civil War* that “The Civil War is our "felt" history – history lived in the national imagination (1961, p.4).” Furthermore he declares that most Americans, somewhere in their bones, have a storehouse of lessons drawn from the Civil War. How these lessons look like and what they contain remains an open dispute among historians.

Thus, the main aim of this chapter is to give an insight into how Americans remembered and commemorated their deadliest and most traumatic experience during three important occasions – the war’s semi-centennial, its centennial, and sesquicentennial. The relationships between race, government, fraternity, and reunion are interwoven and this vast topic is synthesized based on the works from the twentieth as well as twenty first century. The points of view of both sides of the conflict, the North and the South, as well as of the blacks and the whites are put together and form a single entity. This chapter, because of the large scope of the topic, focuses mostly on immaterial memory partially excluding some important forms of recollections such as monuments building, music, and literature.

The work attempts to reveal the evolution of the public memories from the time right after the war up to today. Regarding the memory during first five decades after the war, this work draws predominantly from David W. Blight’s *Race and Reunion* (2001). The author distinguishes three overall visions of the Civil War memory that were combined over time – the reconciliationist vision, that has its roots in the dealing with the cruelty from the battlefields and is based on reunion; the white supremacist vision – including terror and violence in the terms of segregated society; and emancipationist vision, that includes the complex of African Americans’ freedom, the politics of radical Reconstruction, and equal citizenship in the terms of Constitution.

Commemorating the Civil War on its centennial is based, among others, on the work of Robert Penn Warren *The Legacy of the Civil War* (1961) – a pioneer study regarding the memorializing the nation’s history. The emancipationist memory of the war together with the transformation of American society – as a result of the civil rights movement allowed a new understanding of the era in the last third of the twentieth century. Warren declares that the Civil War is the nation’s only "felt" history. However, fifty years later, Thomas J. Brown shows in *Remixing the Civil War* (2011) that the tights to the history of the brotherhood war have faded among Americans. Caroline E.

Janney examines the understanding of the legacy and remembrance in *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation* (2013). Moreover, she explores the subtle difference between reunion and reconciliation and indicates the slavery as the main obstacle in the reunion of the two sections.

#### **4.1 The Black Civil War Memory**

White supremacy combined with reconciliation dominated the memory how most Americans viewed the war. This fact emerged from the process of history itself, shaped by the public as well as private recollections. The very question of the slavery had been excluded. A popular narrative of the Civil War was that one with two foes both struggling equally for liberty, with romantic plantation of the South, and brave soldiers devoted to fight for noble causes. That mythology was a product of fifty years of cultural evolution, social tension, and political changes.

The most challenging task for the freedpeople and their remembering was how to deal with the slavery. Some of them believed they had lived useful, creative lives; others face their past experience as impoverishment of their minds and ravage of their bodies. For many, looking back into past meant an encounter with the shame of slavery. The greatest wound by slavery and the African heritage has been, according to Benjamin Tanner, a curse of disrespect. Nevertheless, slavery was a collective racial experience “in which it was difficult to take pride when the larger society looked on with so much amusement and contempt (Blight, 2001, p. 311).” Together with the emotional legacy they compose an internal part of the broader black Civil War memory.

A black Baptist minister, Silas X. Floyd, reflected in his addresses many dilemmas that Southern blacks faced. He raised central questions confronting the dealing with the meaning of more than two centuries of slavery, and the meaning of Emancipation in the Civil War. Understanding the past shapes the present and future, thus is the confrontation with the past an inevitable but demanding task.

In black memory over time, the violence of slavery, the terror of the Reconstruction years, and the long history of lynching dominated in black folk stories. Black veterans also had their own wartime experiences to process in memory. Black troops encountered discrimination in pay, promotion, and medical care. The mistreatment of coloured men in army would always remain part of black Civil War memory.

However, the blacks all over the land continued to commemorate Emancipation and Union victory in the decades that followed. They tried to keep their story at the centre of

national attention. Despite their effort commemorating black freedom was highly unsuccessful in the daily life. Frederick Douglass was the biggest advocate of the black Civil War memory and presented its emancipationist vision, which, despite of his struggle and the struggle of the whole black community was suppressed by both reconciliationist and white supremacist visions.

It must be mentioned that the blacks sought no official apologies for slavery. What they demanded was a simple justice – a fair chance to exercise their basic rights, education, and human recognition. On the other side, for many whites, especially veterans and their families, healing from the war was a different matter, often not taking into consideration the need for racial justice. The gap between the war perception of white Southerners and the blacks was immense. Therefore Blight argues that varying perceptions of wartime era made the nation's collective memory shattered more than never before (Blight, 2001).

Albion Tourgée, a former Union soldier, Radical Republican, and pioneer civil rights activist, was in the early 1880s one of the first white men who attempted to deal with the pain in the black memory as a result of discrimination and violence. Blight points out that Tourgée dared to say that the war and its aftermath were all about race, thus identifying some of the most enduring dilemmas in Civil War remembrance (Blight, 2001).

No Northerner contributed more to the war's ideological meaning and memory than Frederick Douglass in the first decades of the twentieth century (Blight, 2001). An abolitionist orator followed Lincoln's words of human equality in a nation. They both stressed the transformation in the history of freedom and an American second founding, while attempting to explain the conversion of the war's first purpose – preservation of the Union, into the second – emancipation of the slaves. Furthermore, Douglass pointed out that the new republic could not be reborn if blacks simply forgive and forgot. A full acknowledgment of the past is required. He admitted that "The South has suffered to be sure, but she has been the author of her own suffering (cited in Blight, 2001, p.92)."

In the war's aftermath, in the late 1860s, black Southerners acted actively in the political life what meant a step forward remembrance and forgetting for them. However, with the racial attitudes and segregation sharpening in the very beginning of the twentieth century, the black community faced decisions of how to compete for their place in America's collective memory.

Blight presents several issues, among others, if African Americans should embrace or reject the nation they helped to preserve; or whether they should celebrate or forget their past; should they fight the Lost Cause and segregation or focused on their own self-development (Blight, 2001). Based on this, several approaches, or as Blight suggests – attitudes toward the past – are to be distinguish in the black Civil War memory. First, the slave past as a dark void; second, celebratory mode of memory based on the progress of the race; and a third, a patriotic memory with the black soldiers, Emancipation, and Amendments at its core. Even a growing argument existed that slavery protected and civilized blacks, while freedom gradually “sent them falling into a state of barbarism (cited in Blight, 2001, p. 317).”

On the contrary, some black leaders, foremost Booker T. Washington viewed Emancipation as a new creation, as the zero point of black racial development (Harlan, Smock, 1982). Similar to Washington’s opinion, some religious leaders considered Emancipation and the black Civil War memory as such to be a crucial turning point in the long chronicle of international race development.

The war was generally seen as a white man’s war, a war between men of equally strong character and devotion on both sides, but largely ignoring race and black freedom (Blight, 2001). Most black Civil War veterans had their own cause to preserve. By liberating slaves and themselves, they insisted that they helped remake America. Black veterans no doubt had their own memories that they tried to pass on to the next generation. However, they could not win the struggle over the public culture, which became racist and segregated.

As part of the Lost Cause philosophy, some of influential Southern orators, including Virginian politician Roger A. Pryor, stated that the war had nothing directly to do with slavery. According to him, slavery had been only the occasion, not the cause of secession (Cobbs-Hoffman, Blum, 2011).

In the decade leading to the fiftieth anniversary of the war and Emancipation, the reconciliationist and white supremacist memory still prevailed over the emancipationist memory that had been oppressed since Reconstruction. Despite this fact, segregation and racism had not stopped African Americans from commemorating Emancipation as the most defining event of their history.

At the turn of the century, many Americans spoke of the "Negro Problem" or "Race Problem" as of the obstacle to national progress, as a social crisis demanding a solution. Many blacks preferred endless debates over the Negro Problem in favour of discussing

its root problems – racial prejudice and legal discrimination. Lawyer D. A. Straker wrote that there is no Negro Problem; but a race prejudice among whites (cited in Blight, 2001, p. 364). Through the racial public discussion American society forced the blacks to confront their past in the endless circle of remembering and forgetting.

In the literature before the civil rights movement of the 1960s, the blacks were perceived as passive victims of the era (Foner, 1988). Works by Foner, and many others, portrayed African Americans as active agents in the making of Civil War and Reconstruction especially. Their actions helped establish Reconstruction's political and economic agenda. They used the opportunity created by the end of slavery and their participation in the Southern public life can be seen as an experiment in the interracial democracy – something unprecedented in any other country that abolished slavery in the nineteenth century. The transformation of slaves (better said an attempt to transformation) into equal citizens was the most dramatic example of the social and political changes resulting from Civil War and Emancipation.

The centennial commemoration of the Civil War represented a great opportunity for individuals, public, as well as politicians to reconsider and redefine the meaning of the Civil War in American memory. As John Wiener declares in *Civil War, Cold War, Civil Rights* the dominant memory of the Civil War had changed little since the fiftieth anniversary observances in 1913 (in Fahs, Waugh, 2004, p. 238). White supremacy and white reconciliation dominated the commemoration after five decades of the war's end. Additional fifty years later, similar sentiments were present in the history books, school curriculum as well as in the public and political life. Wiener underlines the fact that by the time of the centennial commemoration the emancipationist vision rooted in African Americans' memories was lost within the collective memory; it was suppressed by white supremacist ideology that had dominated the national memory ever since.

Similarly, the centennial of Emancipation provided the civil rights movement a date for action and public commitment. Commemorative events were held across the land. The civil rights movement of the 1960s strived for challenging once again the meaning of the war, to enforce the emancipationist vision. The centennial celebrations were accompanied by strict segregation rules, protests of African Americans, attacks on them, and subsequent boycotts by some of the states' governments. In this situation, some of the contemporaries, Rabbi Bernard J. Bamberger among them, expressed the opinion that "the war was in vain if a century later the Negro's right to full equality may still be limited by prejudice enacted into law (Wiener in Fahs and Waugh, 2004, p.

242).” Many of the problems the Civil War left unsolved have only been papered over; however, in the 1960s the everyday’s situations reminded the nation that the African Americans are not yet free. Unfortunately, the scope of this work does not allow us to deal with the civil rights movement in depth although being in a close connection to the issue on African American emancipation.

In the twenty first century, there are issues with their roots in the Civil War era that still evokes controversy – the display of Confederate flags in the Southern states among the most critical ones. In the 1980s and 1990s, flying Confederate battle flag over statehouses in Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina demonstrated how deeply meaningful Civil War symbols are, especially regarding the racial politics. The topic of the controversy of the Confederate battle flag will be addressed in the following part of this chapter as a component of the South’s war memory.

Unlike historians from the first half of the twentieth century, the modern scholars tend to view Emancipation itself as one of the most revolutionary aspects of the period. In the present day it is widely known and accepted that it is impossible to separate the question of the Civil War memory from the question on the racial relations. However, debates over race remain a very sensitive topic even in the new millennium.

#### **4.2 South and its War Memory, Reconstruction, and the Lost Cause**

With very few exceptions white America remembered the sectional crisis of 1861 as a national catastrophe. White Southern memory of the war was forever shaped by the profound sense of loss – loss of slaves and own property as well. Immediately after the war, all Southerners were fearfully depressed (Blight, 2001). Submission to the Union, confiscation, and Negro equality were words that characterized, according to their own words, Southerners’ fate. Blight describes these elements as the beginnings of white Southern Civil War memory. A significant part of that memory was represented by nostalgia – nostalgia for "good old days."

Hand in hand with nostalgia, Civil War monuments and cemeteries were built, while local memorial associations were formed in the South, largely by women. In this case, memorialisation functioned as a ritual, a way of coping with loss.

In the 1880s the sentimental fiction about the South and the war began to shape the nation’s war memory. "New South" as well as the motion of the "Lost Cause" emerged and flourished mainly thanks to the literature and associations devoted to the past.

The Lost Cause has its roots in the physical destruction of the Southern culture, in the psychological trauma of defeat, in the opposition to Reconstruction, and in racial violence. This understanding dominated popular, as well as scholarly teaching. The myth of the Lost Cause was born – a glorious civilization destroyed by an industrial society of its cultural foes (Confederate Memorial Literary Society, 2009). In this way the Lost Cause represented – on the broadest level – an attitude toward the past and tended to shape the Confederate memory. Blight contributes to this topic by saying that like all great mythologies, the Lost Cause changed with succeeding generations and shifting political circumstances (Blight, 2001).

In general, the Lost Cause was perceived as cultural practice as well as a set of arguments; they both served two aims – reconciliation and Southern partisanship. Scholars are not united in setting the proper beginning and end of the Lost Cause era; however, the 1860s are usually marked as the rise of the movement that lasted until the beginning of the twentieth century. The collocation "Lost Cause" was for the first time used by journalist Edward Pollard in the same-named book of 1866. Many of the assumptions of Confederate memory survived up to the 1920s and beyond (Foster, 1988). Especially in racial terms, the legacy of the Lost Cause might be traced up to the middle of the twentieth century.

Under the teaching of the Lost Cause promoters, the Southern victory over Reconstruction replaced Union victory in the war and segregation laws replaced the Fourteenth Amendment in their places of honour in national memory. A segregated society demanded a segregated historical memory. The white supremacist vision as part of the Lost Cause and black Civil war memory, discussed in the first part of this chapter, existed in parallel; however, the emancipationist vision had long been in the defensive within the national memory.

Douglass S. Freeman, the South's most partisan historian, declared the Lost Cause to be the South's civil religion (cited in Blight, 2001, p.291). Both in politics and mysticism, the Lost Cause ruled the American imagination. However, already in the times of the Lost Cause era, the myth raised some opposition predominantly among the Republican Party and its members in the South. In the mid 1950s historian Robert Penn Warren criticised the teaching of the Lost Cause by saying that it was not essentially inhuman in character, but its very existence depended upon dehumanizing a group of people (Warren, 1983). Despite the confrontation over the Lost Cause, it left an enduring burden in national memory.

The Lost Cause developed into a mythology across American society. This ideology encountered resistance especially among the post-war generation. W. E. B. Du Bois was the most challenging writer of the Lost Cause ideology. In *Souls of Black Folk* (1903) he offers a meditation on racial prejudice, political leadership, the economic oppression of black labourers in the South, and the development of African American culture both before and after Emancipation. However, the gap between the racial and sectional reconciliation remained unjoinable for several decades to come.

Regarding the memorializing of Reconstruction, as part of the South's war legacy, C. Vann Woodward observed in the late 1970s that historians now understood how essentially non-revolutionary and conservative Reconstruction really was (Woodward, 1979). In emphasizing that Reconstruction was part of the ongoing revolution of Southern society, the scholars in the second half of the twentieth century made a significant contribution to the re-evaluation of that period.

David W. Blight with *Race and Reunion* contributes to the understanding of the Reconstruction legacy by arguments of W. E. B. Du Bois, who wrote in 1935 that the nation's turning point had been misshaped by white supremacy and the necessity of a mythology of reunion. According to Du Bois, the war and Reconstruction had left too many terrible wounds unhealed – in school textbooks, popular culture, and scholarship. Reconstruction was not only time of political change, but also an era of clashes between "fresh" memories of war and revolutionary shifts in race relations and human rights. First of all, immediately after the conflict was over, both emotional and material lives of the defeated, as well as the victorious, had to be regenerated. Blight considers the regeneration one of the earliest challenges to Civil War memory that would not only determine the character of the Reconstruction, but predominantly of the emerging political culture of the post-war era.

The changes in the North's economy and class structure affected the Reconstruction as well. However, the Reconstruction of the North receives less attention than its Southern counterpart. The historical study lacks a detailed historical literature on the region's social and political structure in these years, as well as an account of the relationship between changes in the North and South. Doubtless, the South remains at the core of the Reconstruction era. The bitter experience of Reconstruction and the impossibility of a post-war consensus on the war's causes strengthen the discord at the heart of the Civil War memory.



Former Confederate President Jefferson Davis in his memoir *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government* placed the responsibility of secession and the war entirely at the feet of the North; the South just protected its natural rights. The Lost Cause promoters argued that the South fought for freedom and liberty, and it lost only because it had been “overborne by superior numbers and weightier munitions (cited in Blight, 2001, p. 265).” Furthermore, statement that slavery was not the cause of the conflict, but only an incident, was omnipresent in the Lost Cause rhetoric. Blight declares that denying the slavery’s centrality to the war was the most frequently used argument in reunion speeches, committee reports, and memoirs. Moreover, in some of the Lost Cause promotion works, certain space was devoted to the glorification of the Ku Klux Klan. At the same time, the description of loyal slaves and benevolent masters was part of the same rhetoric. It can be assumed that ex-Confederates wanted to shape the history into a source of justification. While the history they had lived ruined them, they believed the history they would help write might redeem them.

The language of the Lost Cause transferred the narrative from a defeated mode to a victorious one. The Southerners won the second war over Reconstruction, thrown off Negro rule, and redeemed their states. Moreover, with the construction of the local soldiers’ monuments, the new approach towards history became part of the narrative of Confederate heritage. J. Davis represented himself as a hero; a symbol of the South’s suffering during both war and Reconstruction. After his death in 1889, and unveiling of a giant statue of Confederate General Robert E. Lee the following year – who represented South seeking reunion and respect, the character of the Confederate public memory was marked by a change – it lost some of its influence. However, the philosophy of the Lost Cause was part of the Southern identity for many years to come.

Foner declares that in the 1890s, Confederate memories no longer focused on explaining the defeat; they rather offered a set of conservative traditions to guide the people through racial, political, and industrial disorder. White supremacy, military tradition, patriotic recognition of Confederate bravery, and denying the South’s responsibility for slavery were values of the Old South used as protection against the progressive and democratic society they feared. With a Southern narrative of racial victory and white supremacist vision, they together served as a major force in the collective memory in which Americans moved toward reunion.

The teaching of the Lost Cause approach found its way into school textbooks as well. Short after the war, the Lost Cause promoters launched a decades-long fight

against what many perceived as a Yankee conspiracy to miseducate Southerners (Blight, 2001). The promoters fought to control America's memory of slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction. They delivered public speeches, wrote in the popular press, and lobbied Congressmen. Southern women played the most important role in the promotion of a victimized South and civilization of benevolent white masters and contented African slaves. With time, women's organization together with state departments of education took over much of the responsibility for historical work – they published books containing defences of secession and condemnations of the antislavery movement (Memorial Day Annual Report, 1912).

To sum it up, white Southerners had experienced the psychological trauma of defeat; their world had been turned upside down, and they simply cannot accept the presence of the blacks wearing uniforms, participating in the public sphere, and organizing Union Leagues. This is one of the reasons why, in Southern formal history and eventually in popular culture as well, the Ku Klux Klan attained “a heroic image in American memory (Blight, 2001, p. 111).” The Klan occupied that place until the second half of the twentieth century. The Klansmen were seen as those who saved Southern white supremacy, stopped the corrupted government, and prevented the anarchy of Negro rule.

David W. Blight concludes that the glorification of the Southern soldiers, the victory over the Reconstruction, own interpretation of the war's causes, stressing the white supremacist vision, and nostalgia for a romantic life with faithful slaves and benevolent masters – together these arguments reinforced Southern pride, nationalized the Lost Cause, and rationalized the Civil War memory for the post-war generations.

#### **4.3 Reunion and the Role of Veterans in the Collective Memory**

Over time, a mutual sacrifice and pathos came to dominate national history – influenced mainly through veterans' memory for decades. During the first years after the conflict, Civil War Soldiers' remembrances composed a significant part of the nation's memory on the war. Soldiers went through inconceivable experiences; they fought endless battles, and marched untold miles. Their traumas would never be healed. Soldiers on both sides believed they fight for liberty. On the Northern side, hundreds of thousands of veterans carried home a legacy of victory; Confederate survivors carried

home the legacy of defeat and thus faced an enormous physical and mental challenge of renewal.

The most immediate legacy of the war was its slaughter and how to remember it (Vinovskis, 1989). After the war, women had begun rituals of burial and remembrance. Americans carried flowers to graves and so was born the ritual of Decoration Day, known eventually also as Memorial Day. As a Northern ritual of commemoration, Memorial Day was officially held few years in the late 1860s. All of the death on the battlefields, prisons, and in camps presented an overwhelming burden for memorialisation (Blight, 2001).

Writing of memoirs and stories became an important part of dealing with the past on both sides; among Southerners especially. Many of the wartime stories were written predominantly by veterans who thus moved step by step towards reconciliation. Stories from battlefields were published in newspapers, magazines, and sometimes issued as single books – all of these as part of a new mass-market culture. By late nineteenth century, the American mass culture and booming publishing industry made the soldiers' stories accessible for a large audience. Some magazines purposefully intended to shape a culture of reunion. It can be concluded that in those times literature and written words as such were powerful medium for reunion between the North and South.

Among Northerners, General Sherman's *Memoirs* is one of the most renowned accounts of the war. Published in 1875, the work is considered a Civil War classic. The Commanding General of the Union army and the eighteenth President of the United States, Ulysses S. Grant, wrote in the autumn of his life one of the best-selling books of the nineteenth century – *Personal Memoirs*, that consists primarily of Grant's storytelling of his experience in the Mexican and Civil War. To Grant, "the war's aim of saving the Union made it worth the price in human suffering (cited in Blight, 2001, p. 214)." When Grant died in 1885 it caused the most extraordinary national grief and reconciliation since the war. His funeral was a great symbol of reunion – former Confederate generals together with Unionists participated in the burial ceremony.

A major concern of some veterans was to pass along to the next generation a set of soldiers' virtues – honour, devotion, sacrifice, love of country. Both veterans' memory and soldiers' reunion became the dominant mode of Civil War memory by the 1890s. They represented the sectional healing of the nation and caused nostalgia and sentimentalism; however, the emancipationist legacy of the Civil War was lost in that

epoch's memory. It was mainly caused by racial hatred and violence that reached unprecedented levels at the turn of the centuries.

Blight points out, that no wartime experience caused deeper emotions and lasting hatred than that of prisons (Blight, 2001). Social memories were filled with mutual recriminations and prison horror, which, in turn, left bitter wounds in the psyches of individual men and their families. Nevertheless, prison legacy remains a part of the comprehensive Civil War memory.

Coming back to the memory American Civil War veterans, an event from July 1913 is to be mentioned for sure – the Gettysburg reunion. In 1913, on the fiftieth anniversary of the battle, the fields of Gettysburg hosted the largest ever gathering of civil war veterans, where former soldiers from both sides – many in their 70s – returned to commemorate the war. More than 50,000 men in grey and blue uniforms met and shake their hands on the former battlefield to commemorate the Battle of Gettysburg.

Blight criticises that during Gettysburg reunion neither space nor time was devoted to considering the causes and results of the war; no place was reserved for the legacies of the Emancipation or the conflicted history of Reconstruction. The politics of reconciliation was several decades old by 1913; however, the other great outcome of the war – the failure of racial reconciliation – was given no space in the discussions.

Reconciliation mildened the violence of battle; it softened the failure to secure civil rights for former slaves, as well as the centrality of slavery to the conflict. White veterans of both sides embraced this movement in the 1880s and 1890s, after the "proper" Reconstruction was over and the power was transferred to the Southern state governments. Generally speaking reconciliation hid the true nature and meaning of the war for many Americans; at the same time a narrative of the war was created that almost eliminated the emancipationist legacy of the African Americans.

The sectional reunion was considerably supported by the Spanish-American War fought in the summer 1898 as a result of USA's intervention in Cuban War of Independence. Metaphorically, as well as literally, the sons of the Grey and the Blue now had their war – a desired experience of combat that many in the post Civil War era generation had missed.

On the other hand, African Americans learned that America's imperialism and urgency to control the darker races of the world were given a new direction. How could they help Cubans achieve freedom from Spain when they had not yet managed their own liberation at home (cited in Blight, 2001, p. 347). However, several thousands of

blacks enlisted and served in the American forces; they hoped they could gain recognition through their service to the country.

When dealing with reunion and reconciliation it is important to say that there is a slight difference between these terms, although the words are sometimes used as synonyms. Reunion, or the political reunification of the nation, had been the chief goal of majority of unionist white citizens after the war. It was the legal reality for which Unionist had fought and died. Janney argues that reunion was achieved in the spring of 1865 and refined during Reconstruction (Janney, 2013). Reconciliation is harder to define; it usually refers to the emotions and impulses than to reason. It could be defined as an expression of harmony between Union and Confederate sympathizers; a predisposition to build a prosperous political and economic future. Many Americans, both experts and general public, have believed that only when the wounds of war had been left to the past would the United States be free to achieve its true potential greatness (Janney, 2013).

On the centennial, the pioneer on the field of the Civil War memory, Robert P. Warren declared that many clear and objective facts about America are best understood by reference to the Civil War; the most obvious fact is, despite particular criticism, that the Americans are a united nation; a second clear and objective fact is that the war abolished slavery, even if it did little or nothing to abolish racism (Warren, 1983). The new nation came not merely from a military victory – it was a complicated process shaped by the war.

By the end of the nineteenth century, reconciliation has transferred into a memory of the war that emphasized the shared American values of valour and devotion to one's cause. The hand-clasping veterans served as the chief symbol of a reunited and reconciled nation, although deep bitterness and refusal to cast aside judgements about the worthiness of war's causes remained in the memory of the generation that had survived the war. Debates over slavery sometimes proved to be among the most powerful obstacles to reconciliation. Janney declares that for many white Yankee veterans the task of saving the Union could not be separated from slavery. On the contrary, abolitionist like Frederick Douglass believed that emancipation was being forgotten by the white North (Janney, 2013). Janney argues that white Unionist had not forgotten that African Americans and slavery had been part of the war; but this does not mean that all white Yankee veterans or Northerners in general sought civil and political rights for the newly freed men and women.

In comparison, very few ex-Confederates admitted that slavery had been in the core of the conflict; majority of them denied this fact and argued that the central aim of their struggle was to protect state rights. Although most Northerners did not accept the Lost Cause, and the Union veterans never forgot that they fought against treason, by the 1920s and 1930s it seemed that the Confederate memory triumphed over the Unionists memory and their cause of the war.

However, Yankee and Confederate soldiers would eventually find a common path to fraternalism and mutual glory. It can be concluded that Americans have had to work through the meaning of their Civil War at its core, in the politics of memory – the political means by which events are remembered, recorded, or forgotten. Blight argues that as long as the politics of race exists in America, the politics of Civil War memory remains as well (Blight, 2001).

#### **4.4 Remembering the War in the Modern Times**

Various individuals and communities would consciously, as well as unconsciously, highlight certain aspects of the war while reshaping and neglecting others. Caroline E. Janney states in *Remembering the Civil War* that despite pronouncements by some that the past needed to be forgotten in the interest of national healing, every monument, Memorial Day, Emancipation Day, soldiers' reunion, or textbook was about remembering (Janney, 2013). These are the factors indicating why the Civil War still resonates and raises heated debates. Janney adds that remembering has had a powerful social and political connotations and she formulates the central question of the conflict as follows: "How would a nation that had been so divided that it went to war move forward as a truly United States of America (Janney, 2013, p. 5)?"

Although the Civil War commemorations reached a high point of visibility between the 1880s and 1910s, the understandings and interpretations of the conflict and their meanings have been continually created and re-discussed. These debates have had a profound effect on the government policy, citizenship, ideas about gender and race, and the future of the nation.

Besides monuments and Memorial Day, the Civil War has also been remembered through visual art, popular songs, cemeteries, private letters, legislation, folklore, movies, tourist souvenirs, as well as by veteran organizations and various associations. When memory takes such wide range of forms, it becomes a challenging task for the

historians to cover all the aspects. The professional historians have focused traditionally on the military, political, and economic aspects. The rest thus became an object of myth and popular culture (Janney, 2013). Regarding the works on the wartime topics, what dominated the popular culture were the pieces based on the sentimental fiction – with Margaret Mitchell’s *Gone with the Wind* as the most famous one. Through their stories, women authors remembered the Civil War as a time of suffering and joint sacrifice.

By the late twentieth century film and television dominated popular memorial forms to the point that memory itself came to be seen as "a kind of entertainment." Approximately in the same time, historical memory has become more visible as an object of study among scholars. Popular history and public history were discussed in works by professional historians as well as journalists who tried to reach a broader audience. S. McConnell sums up that by the 1980s it was a commonplace of scholarly discourse that many versions of the past existed in parallel – all potentially true from somebody’s point of view (in Fahs, Waugh, 2004).

Every form of remembrance exists within particular cultural boundaries; different groups have access to different memorial forms. Stuart McConnell declares in *The Geography of Memory* that in the years since 1900 the memory of Civil War has changed in several ways; first of all, the members of the Civil War generation have all died. In this connection he presents an argument that there is a great difference between personal and social memory (in Fahs, Waugh, 2004). Without the presence of those who lived through the war certain practices – singing of war songs or worshipping the Memorial Day, faded away.

On the occasion of the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Civil War, the war itself as well as nation’s remembering has been re-discussed in countless essays, articles, and lectures. Essays from specialist in art, literature, and history have been collected and put together in the work by Thomas J. Brown in *Remixing the Civil War: Meditations on the Sesquicentennial*. The essays examine how contemporary culture represents and interprets the Civil War. Historians and authors continue with the study Robert Penn Warren began on the centennial – to understand the memory of the Civil War in its various forms. Contemporary authors found out that Americans today openly and playfully manipulate familiar images of the Civil War to explore the flexibility of the traditional social categories like national identity, gender, and race.

In 1961, R. P. Warren argues that the Civil War was “for the American imagination, the great single event of our history (Warren, 1961, p. 3).” In 2011 the

evidence is not clear that it remains so. Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen reported in 1998 that only a small percentage of Americans felt a connection to any aspect of the national past; except short stories of their own family history (in Brown, 2011). The results were even more shocking because shortly before their survey, best-selling novels as well as television miniseries on the Civil War topic dominated on the market.

Race is the social category that experienced the major shift in the nation's understanding of the 1960s compared to the twenty first century. Unlike nationality or gender, this category was at the core of Warren's thinking in 1961. In the times of the civil rights movement, Warren understood the race question in the South as the conflict between segregation laws and demand for racial equality (Warren, 1961). Decades later, the achievements of the civil rights movement continues to reshape American memory of the Civil War.

If the Civil War was for Warren in 1961 and event that lived in the American imagination, it is now and event undead in the American imagination, Brown argues (2011). The armed conflict has not only attracted the Hollywood; the "only felt history" is the most frequently re-buried history, preserved history, as well as the most commercially exploited history.

At the same time, it has been shown that the visibility of the Civil War in American culture today, including the most thoughtful expressions, often reflects only superficial interest rather than a deeper insight. Moreover, the study demonstrates that visual images have overcome stories as such. The Civil War has turned into a storehouse of images, characters, and stories available for manipulation.

As studies on the sesquicentennial have revealed, the remembrance of the Blue and the Grey can be viewed in the twenty first century as a pattern for the blue-red competition between Democrats and Republicans (Brown, 2011). Several more factors, e.g. equality of all people, citizenship as a natural right, free labour, have been shaping the characteristics of the contemporary life. These now seen as natural conditions were unimaginable on the war's semi-centennial or centenary respectively.

One of the most important developments in the Civil War scholarship during the last twenty five years has been a trend of writing about the demonstrations of the war in the popular culture. David Blight's *Race and Reunion* (2001) is viewed as probably the most influential academic interpretation of the Civil War published in the new millennium. While Blight reconstructs the political debate regarding the sectional



conflict, other recent scholars have explored the Civil War and its aftermath as a relation between imaginations produced by the public and personal experience.

The Civil War in the United States remains to this day a high point in national history, endlessly studied and celebrated for its glories and its achievements. Even as the collective memory changes with the changes in demography and the public sphere, it still functions as the ruling cultural metaphor of American nationality to which not only politicians return, but artists and scholars as well. Kirk Savage challenges this fact in *War/Memory/History*. He asks if it would be so forever. It is notoriously difficult to predict the cultural memory and where it might be heading. However, Savage declares that despite the romanticized cliché of "brother versus brother," Americans have in fact had immense difficulty facing up to the war within their own communities and even within their own hearts (in Brown, 2011).

To this day, in the twenty first century, much of the Civil War nostalgia is still rooted in the memory choices made in the latter two decades of the twentieth century; the story of the "Blue and Grey" – the reconciliation vision – is much more acceptable than the story of the black and the white – represented by the emancipationist vision.

One legacy of the Civil War centennial has survived to the beginning of the twenty-first century – the flying of the Stars and Bars, the Confederate battle flag. After the war ended, the symbol became a source of Southern pride and heritage, as well as a remembrance of Confederate soldiers who died in battle. But as racism and segregation dominated in the nation in the century following, it became a divisive and violent emblem of the Ku Klux Klan and white supremacist groups.

In the 1960s, some of the South's state governments began to fly the flag over their state capitols, mainly as part of the centennial observances. However, when the centennial ended, none of the states took the flags down. In the 1980s and 1990s the responsible states were sued; the last flag flying over the state capitol in South Carolina was removed in 2000. In general it can be said the Confederate battle flag itself represents the controversy of the white supremacy and suppression of the black rights.

In July 1993, the public debate over the Confederate flag found its way onto the floor of the United States. The Senate's then only African American member, Illinois Senator Carol Moseley-Braun criticized the use of the Confederate flag by some of the Southern associations. She pointed out that everybody knew what the Confederacy stood for; and when the flag was flying in 1993, everybody knew what that meant (Coski, 2005). Certainly in 1993, or in 2005 when the book by Coski on Confederate

Battle Flag was issued, a lot of people are certain what Confederate symbols meant to them: a proud heritage and the honour of their ancestors.

The racial violence of June 2015 in Charleston, South Carolina has renewed the debate over one of this controversial Southern symbol. As already mentioned, the last flag flying over the state capitol in the South was removed from South Carolina in 2000. But as part of this act a compromise was reached — the battle flag would be removed from atop the dome and a smaller version would be placed at a less-prominent place on the Statehouse grounds. After tough political debate, demonstrations, and approval of the Legislature, this flag was definitely removed in July 2015.

Every now and then, the issue of the flag is raised among the public – either by politicians in their campaigns or by various interest groups promoting the white supremacy. As John S. Coski underlines in his work on the flag, it is important to distinguish between what Confederate symbols mean to one person and what they mean in general. His study is based on the proposition that a symbol's use determines its meanings and affects the way people perceive it. Another crucial point in his study is the fact that most people who follow the debates over the Confederate flag are emotionally or ideologically engaged with the issue – the proud of the Confederate heritage, or, in contrary, offense that African Americans feel toward the flag. Brown argues in *The Confederate Battle Flag* that the official symbol of the Confederate States of America has transformed into a marketing logo that raises controversy predominantly among those with ties to the slavery and racial injustice of the U.S. history.

Coski concludes that the debate over the battle flag represents one of the most intensive ongoing public dialogues about U.S. history. These debates are an important means by which the citizens deal with the meaning of the Civil War and its legacies. Moreover, the flag tells us a lot about the modern popular perceptions of the Confederacy. The conflicting attitudes toward the flag – and at the same time toward the Confederacy – reflect the varying views on constitutional and racial issues that have persisted from the nineteenth century to the twenty first century. On the example of the understanding of the battle flag it can be assumed that it reveals fundamental disagreements among Americans about their past, their present, and their future.

## Conclusion

The Civil War is a defining event on which Americans often base their unity and continuity. It has been showed that the Civil War still haunts the nation's citizens; the persistent discussions over the "race problem" in the political and ideological terms since the nineteenth century has proved that American society could not easily remember its Civil War syndrome.

The Civil War, as the most decisive conflict in American history, has had a revolutionary social and political impact that continues to be felt today. The purpose of this study was to trace the ways in which American society as a whole was remodelled and thus influenced the understanding of the Civil War legacy.

After the war, Americans faced a task of how to understand the conflict and Emancipation. The devastating effects of the war and questions regarding the status of former slaves divided Northerners and Southerners. Even during Reconstruction, white Americans began to seek common ground on which they could unite and forget the pain and loss of war. The reconciliation movement portrayed the conflict as a fight between white Americans, Northern and Southern, proving the honour and dignity of both sides.

This work started with an account of the main causes that led to the outbreak of the fraternity war. Being familiar with these causes is an inevitable part of understanding the war itself. The work continued with a very brief description of the wartime years and moved on to Reconstruction era; this short period in history is a fundamental component of our comprehend understanding of the vast topic of the Civil War, since it changed the racial relations drastically and introduced few Amendments to the Constitution regarding citizenship and right to vote.

Based on this pre-knowledge the work proceeded to its main aim, and thus to dealing with the Civil War memory in the nation's memory. This task was divided into four areas – the black Civil War memory; collective memory of the Southerners regarding war, Reconstruction, and the Lost Cause approach; veterans' remembrance; and how the modern Americans view the war 150 years after its end. The study focused mostly on immaterial memory partially excluding some important forms of recollections such as monuments building, music, and literature.

Regarding the war legacy in the memory of the African Americans, their emancipationist vision has experienced the most significant shift throughout the history. Slavery was almost completely excluded from the war memory among both white

Southerners and Northerners in the first decades after the war. The war was generally seen as a white man's war. No attention was paid to the role of the black slaves in the war and its aftermath; Southerners never truly accepted slavery as one of the causes that led to the outbreak of the war; they rather referred to defence of their state rights.

The most challenging task for the freedpeople was how to deal with the slavery. Moreover, violence, the terror of Reconstruction, and the long history of lynching dominated in black folk stories. The blacks tried to keep their story at the centre of national attention. Their struggle of commemorating black freedom was suppressed by both reconciliationist and white supremacist visions on the war's semi-centennial and beyond.

In the literature before the 1960s, the blacks were perceived as passive victims of the era. Just later, thanks to changes in the racial relations in the society and re-interpretation of the history, African Americans were viewed as active agents in the making of Civil War and Reconstruction. The war's centennial anniversary, which coincided with the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s, was overwhelmed with controversy especially over the question of the role of slavery played in the war. In comparison, slavery has been a focus during the sesquicentennial. Martin Luther King, the most outspoken orator of the 1960s movement, often referred to the legacy of the war and its Amendments to Constitution. However, the emancipationist vision was still suppressed by the white supremacist ideology even hundred years after war had ended.

It can be said that in the new millennium the place of slavery during the war and the role of African Americans in the formation of a new nation was the most discussed and examined aspect on the war's sesquicentennial. From 1865 to the present day, each generation has actively reinterpreted the Civil War according to own ideology. As this work revealed, too often in the decades after the conflict was the racial aspect missed out from the Civil War memories. Thanks to new studies and new approaches to history, it is widely accepted that it is impossible to separate the Civil War memory and the role of slavery in past and connected racial issues.

At the same time it must be mentioned that for blacks descended from slaves, the subject on slavery evokes feelings of shame and embarrassment associated with the degradations of slavery. It can be concluded that even in the twenty first century, there are issues with their roots in the Civil War era that still provokes controversy – racism among the most critical ones. On the example of the display of Confederate flags in the Southern states it has been proven that this war legacy invokes heated debates up today.

The memory of the white Southerners is closely connected to the legacy of the Confederate battle flag as well. After the war ended, the symbol became a source of Southern pride and heritage, as well as a remembrance of Confederate soldiers who died in battle. But as racism and segregation dominated in the nation in the century following, it became a violent emblem of the Ku Klux Klan and white supremacist groups. Despite that, many Southerners view the flag as part of their past.

For most of the history the memory of the white Southerners was marked by the Lost Cause philosophy stressing white supremacy, opposition to Reconstruction, and exclusion of the blacks as agents of the war and from formation of the new society. The Lost Cause was an approach of how to deal with the profound sense of loss – loss in the war, loss of slaves, and of property. This understanding dominated the collective memory of the Southerners on both the war's semi-centennial and centennial.

The Lost Cause memory affected the national culture in a profound way by forming an approach that even when Americans lose, they win. The legend of Robert E. Lee might be explained in the same spirit – through noble character, he won by losing.

Regarding the reunion legacy of the war, reconciliationist version dominated in the collective memory in the first decades after the war – mainly based on the soldier's reunion and veterans' memoirs. The major concern of veterans was how to deal with the slaughter and, at the same time, to pass along to the next generation a set of soldiers' virtues – honour, devotion, sacrifice, love of country. These virtues build part of the nation's identity up to today, especially in the context of American soldiers engaged in campaigns around the world. It can be summarized that sectional reconciliation almost eliminated the emancipationist legacy of the Civil War for a century.

Although being stated that the Civil War commemorations reached a high point of visibility between the 1880s and 1910s, the mass culture, print, and television of the twentieth century dominated popular memorial forms as kind of entertainment. They influenced the understanding of the war towards romantic sentiments of Southern plantations, loyal slaves, and brave soldiers.

The American Civil War ended in April 1865, but the debate over the political, social, and economic legacy of the war continued well into the next century and into the new millennium as well. The institution of slavery left an enduring legacy of hate and suspicion in America which survives until this day. It has produced severe scars on America's collective psyche. These scars are the result of two hundred years of mental and emotional abuse that still haunts American society.

As a conclusion it can be summarized that the memory of Civil War has changed in several ways since the nineteenth century; first of all, the members of the Civil War generation have all died, thus the most visible symbol of reconciliation in the form of soldier's reunion faded slowly away. On the war's centennial, the white supremacist vision and remembering the war as white brothers' war were in the foreground of the commemorations. Sesquicentennial witnessed a different approach towards history – it has been widely accepted that slavery was one of the most notable features of the war; that former slaves played a crucial role during Reconstruction; and foremost a significant shift occurred in the understanding of the racial relations in the last decades of the twentieth century. Today, African Americans are equal citizens, were given the right to vote, are represented in every occupation, and are visible at the highest levels of American society. The single most significant sign of the progress African Americans have made is, without question, the election of Barack Obama to the presidency of the United States in 2008.

Compared with hundred years ago, the situation of black Americans today is obviously much improved. The journey of racial equality, however, is far from accomplished. Some people conclude that with Obama's election the USA has finally become post-racial. But, on the other hand, racial violence that is still present in the modern society suggests the contrary might be true. To understand white-black relations in present requires understanding of all related events from slavery, segregation, civil rights movement, up to racial pluralism. Since this work focused on the occasion of the Civil War and its legacy, the connection between history of slavery and the place of African Americans in modern U.S. society could not be discussed in more depth.

Every generation understands the past, whether it be the Civil War or another event, through a different lens that is filtered through their own contemporary issues or time. Because every generation's lens is different it is rather impossible to tell how the U.S nation will reflect on the Civil War in the years to come. The Civil War in the United States remains to this day a high point in national history, endlessly studied and celebrated for its glories and its achievements. Even as the collective memory changes with the changes in the public sphere, and the war memory becomes superficial and based on forms of entertainment, it still functions as the ruling cultural metaphor of American nationality.

## Résumé

Predložená záverečná práca sa venuje jednej z najvýznamnejších udalostí v histórii Spojených štátov amerických, a to je občianskej vojne z rokov 1861-1865, známej aj pod názvom Sever proti Juhu. Vo všeobecnosti sa dá toto obdobie bojov medzi Úniou a Konfederáciou považovať za najstrašnejšie v dejinách USA. Američania boli svedkami nespočetného množstva väčších aj menších bitiek, ktoré zanechali státisíce obetí a vryli sa hlboko do mysli vtedajšej generácie, ako aj nasledovných generácií.

V tejto súvislosti sa vytýčil cieľ samotnej práce, a to porovnať, ako sa menila spomienka na občiansku vojnu v mysliach Američanov počas troch významných míľnikov: na päťdesiate, sté a stopäťdesiate výročie od konania sa občianskej vojny. Aby sme mohli pochopiť tieto zmeny vo vnímaní histórie z pohľadu viacerých generácií, je potrebná znalosť nielen o vojne samotnej, ale aj o príčinách, ktoré viedli k jej vypuknutiu, ako aj vedomosti o období, ktoré po vojne bezprostredne nasledovalo.

Z tohto dôvodu je práca rozložená na štyri chronologicky po sebe nasledujúce časti. V prvej kapitole sa rozoberajú faktory, ktoré spôsobovali rozpory medzi severskými a južnými štátmi, až napokon viedli k vystúpeniu niektorých štátov z Únie na čele s Južnou Karolínou. Značná časť tejto kapitoly je venovaná histórii otroctva na severoamerickom kontinente a formácii hnutia za jeho zrušenie. Okrem otroctva sú ako príčiny vypuknutia vojny uvedené aj ďalšie tri oblasti faktorov, a to zmeny v smerovaní ekonomík, zmeny v spoločenskom živote, a situácia na predvojnovnej politickej scéne.

Po vystúpení siedmich južných štátov z Únie a vytvorení Konfederácie spojených štátov na čele s prezidentom Jeffersonom Davisom prišiel v apríli 1861 útok na pevnosť Fort Sumter, ktorý predstavuje začiatok Americkej občianskej vojny. Jej priebehu, najvýznamnejším bitkám a veliteľom sa venuje druhá časť práce. Na zjednodušenie prehľadu zodpovedá jedna podkapitola jednému roku vojny. Okrem vojenského ťaženia sa do popredia dostávajú aj politické témy, najmä vyhlásenie prezidenta Abrahama Lincolna o oslobodení otrokov z 1. 1. 1863, vládna prevaha Republikánskej strany, Lincolnove znovuzvolenie za prezidenta, či smrteľný atentát na jeho osobu.

Po štyroch krvavých rokoch a najvýznamnejších bitkách pri Bull Run, Shiloh, Chancellorsville, či Gettysburgu prišla 9. apríla 1865 kapitulácia Juhu pod vedením generála Roberta E. Leeho. Existuje viacero teórií vysvetľujúcich dôvody pre porážku Juhu. Väčšina z nich sa odvoláva na priemyselnú prevahu Severu, ich lepšie vybavenie vojenskou technikou a vyvinutejšiu infraštruktúru. Na druhej strane treba podotknúť, že

vojská Konfederácie boli pod vedením tých najlepších vojenských veliteľov hoci ich vojaci často bojovali nedostatočne vyzbrojení a bez akýchkoľvek predchádzajúcich skúseností.

Keď boje na americkej pôde utíchli, Američania stáli pred ťažkou úlohou – obnoviť vojnu zničenú krajinu. Obdobie, ktoré nasledovalo bezprostredne po ukončení vojny sa v americkej literatúre označuje ako rekonštrukcia. Popri materiálnej obnove išlo predovšetkým o obnovu politického systému, rekonštrukciu vzdelávacieho systému a novú definíciu postavenia bývalých otrokov s ohľadom na spoločenské a pracovné vzťahy. V rámci rekonštrukcie je tretia kapitola zameraná na tri hlavné aspekty tohto obdobia, a to na turbulentné zmeny z pohľadu Afroameričanov, na rekonštrukciu pod vedením prezidenta Andrewa Johnsona a následnú obnovu pod vedením radikálnych Republikánov.

Dôvodov, prečo je toto obdobie zahrnuté v práci venujúcej sa americkej občianskej vojne a jej odkazu, je hneď niekoľko. Najväčšou negatívnou spomienkou na vojnu je smrť, ktorú spôsobila. Jednou z najťažších úloh po skončení vojny bola výzva, ako sa s touto spomienkou vyrovať. Zároveň obdobie rekonštrukcie prinieslo do americkej spoločnosti inú výzvu, a to začlenenie (alebo pokus o začlenenie) bývalých otrokov do spoločnosti. Počas vojny bol prijatý trinásty dodatok k Americkej ústave rušiaci otroctvo. Po vojne schválil kongres aj štrnásty dodatok, ktorý udelil bývalým otrokom občianstvo a pätnásty dodatok udeľujúci volebné právo pre "čiernych". Tieto radikálne zmeny predstavovali pre mnohých bielych Američanov, a to hlavne južanov, nepochopiteľný posun v spoločnosti. Rekonštrukciu vnímali ako pokus severanov o získanie úplnej moci nad južnými štátmi a nútenú rovnosť pre černochoch. Zvrhnutie štátnych vlád zostavených severnými republikánmi vnímali ako záchranu pred záhubou. Spôsob, akým sa americký národ vyrovnal s týmito zmenami a spomienkami na ne, tvoril súčasť cieľa práce.

Posledná, štvrtá kapitola predstavuje výstup záverečnej práce. Zaoberá sa spôsobom, akým Američania spomínajú na občiansku vojnu a ako si uctievajú jej pamiatku. Ako tri hlavné body výskumu boli zvolené okrúhle výročia od jej ukončenia: päťdesiate výročie, ktoré si národ pripomínal v druhej dekáde dvadsiateho storočia, sté výročie zo šesťdesiatych rokov a stopäťdesiate výročie, ktoré majú Američania ešte čerstvo v pamäti z rokov 2011 až 2015.

Z tematického pohľadu sa v práci dostali do popredia predovšetkým štyri okruhy povojnového dedičstva. Najdiskutovanejšou témou od minulosti až do dnešného dňa je



bezpochyby téma otroctva a spôsob jej uchovania v myšliach Afroameričanov. Práve chápanie tohto výsledku občianskej vojny prešlo v histórii pod vplyvom zmien v rasových reláciách najdramatickejšími zmenami. Stredobodom druhého okruhu sú vojnoví veteráni a ich miesto v kolektívnych spomienkach národa. Je potrebné vyzdvihnúť, že práve bývalí vojaci boli hlavnými aktérmi zjednocovania a uzmierenia medzi bývalými vojnovými rivalmi. Tretím bodom štúdie bola spomienka na vojnu a obdobie rekonštrukcie z pohľadu obyvateľov južných štátov. Pri vyrovnávaním sa s vojnovou porážkou sa na juhu vytvoril mýt "Lost Cause," ktorý obhajoval prehru na bojisku, zdôrazňoval nadvládu bielych nad čiernymi a vyzdvihoval ukončenie rekonštrukcie ako víťazstvo nad Severom. Štvrtý okruh poslednej kapitoly tvoril pohľad na modernú americkú spoločnosť a jej aktuálne vnímanie vojnovnej histórie.

V americkej literatúre je téma vojny Severu proti Juhu, jej príčinách a následkoch veľmi často predmetom výskumu alebo námetom v beletrii. Vo všeobecnosti sa autori zameriavajú skôr na vojenský a politický aspekt vojny a vydávajú niekoľkozväzkové diela snažiac sa čo najdetailnejšie opísať všetky dôležité fakty. Z dôvodu rozsahu skúmanej témy sa v tejto práci uplatňuje metóda syntézy, ktorá nám umožňuje spojiť viacero pohľadov a aspektov do jedného celku. V poslednej časti práce, ktorá sa zameriava na pamiatku vojny, sa aplikuje metóda komparácie, pomocou ktorej sa porovnávajú spomienky z troch rôznych časových období. Vďaka tomu práca odhaľuje zhodujúce sa spomienky v kolektívnej pamäti národa a odlišnosti zároveň. V tejto súvislosti je potrebné vyzdvihnúť prínos predloženej práce, keďže podľa dostupnej literatúry sa ešte žiaden autor nepokúsil o porovnanie vnímania vojny v americkej spoločnosti počas jej troch najväčších míľnikov. Každý z autorov sa venuje zväčša jednému časovému úseku, či už päťdesiat alebo sto rokov od vojny. Z tohto dôvodu je táto komparácia obohatením vo výskumnej oblasti.

Skúmanie kolektívnych spomienok sa opieralo predovšetkým o dve významné diela americkej literatúry z tohto odboru. Priekopníkom v tejto relatívne mladej vedeckej disciplíne je Robert Penn Warren a jeho dielo *The Legacy of the Civil War* (1961), v ktorom sa zameriava na analýzu postojov Američanov pri príležitosti stého výročia od ukončenia bojov. Zároveň táto práca stavia na výskume Davida W. Bligha, ktorý sa v *Race and Reunion* (2001) detailne venoval odkazu vojny počas prvých piatich desaťročí od jej konca. Sústredil sa najmä na rasovú otázku a opätovné zjednotenie severných a južných štátov na politickej, ale hlavne mentálnej úrovni.

Z diela Davida W. Bligha pochádza aj metóda rozlišovania troch druhov spomienok na občiansku vojnu: prvá vízia sa zameriava na uzmierenie medzi oboma stranami konfliktu (reconciliationist vision), druhá vízia dáva do popredia nadvládu bielych ako hlavný prvok povojnovej pamiatky (white supremacy vision), a tretí spôsob uchovávanía spomienok vyzdvihuje úspechy súvisiace s oslobodením otrokov (emancipationist vision).

Ako porovnanie vývoja týchto troch prístupov v pamäti národa ukázalo, najväčšími zmenami prešli spomienky založené na oslobodení otrokov. Prvé dekády po ukončení vojny a zrušení otroctva boli sprevádzané odporom zo strany bielych južanov. Verejne odmietali občianske práva pre bývalých otrokov a ich začlenenie do spoločnosti. Z týchto spoločenských nálad pramení aj charakteristika osláv päťdesiateho výročia od ukončenia vojny. Akékoľvek spojenie otroctva s vypuknutím vojny alebo jej priebehom bolo ignorované. Afroameričanom sa nepripisovali žiadne zásluhy na ukončení vojny a čo i len spomienka na nich bola vylúčená z pamätí národa. Najdôležitejšiu úlohu zohrávalo zjednotenie medzi severanmi a južanmi a nadradené postavenie belochov nad černochochmi.

Podobná situácia prevládala ešte aj počas osláv stého výročia od ukončenia vojny. Treba však vyzdvihnúť skutočnosť, že v období stého výročia dominovalo v americkej spoločnosti hnutie za občianske práva, ktoré úzko súviselo s odkazom, ktorý po sebe zanechala vojna. Martin Luther King, najvýznamnejší predstaviteľ tohto hnutia, sa často vo svojich prejavoch odvolával na posolstvá, ktoré boli zakotvené v dodatkoch k ústave prijaté počas vojny a v období rekonštrukcie. Napriek tomu, že zrušenie segregácie bolo témou číslo jeden v americkej spoločnosti šesťdesiatych rokov, ešte stále v kolektívnych spomienkach dominoval prístup nadradenosti bielej rasy.

O zmene vo vnímaní otroctva ako jednej z príčin vojny a aktívnej účasti bývalých otrokov na jej priebehu môžeme hovoriť až v posledných dekádach dvadsiateho storočia. Najväčšiu zásluhu na tejto zmene má pozitívny vývoj v chápaní rasových relácií a uznanie Afroameričanov ako plnohodnotných občanov Spojených štátov. Preto sa téma otroctva a jeho odkazu stala najdiskutovanejším aspektom pri spomienkach na vojnu počas jej stopäťdesiateho výročia. Z tohto poznania nám vyplýva, že každá generácia interpretovala minulosť na základe vlastného politického a spoločenského pohľadu, ktorý v danom období medzi občanmi prevládal.

Na druhej strane je ale potrebné podotknúť, že zmienka o otroctve a segregácii vyvoláva do dnešného dňa u Afroameričanov pocity hanby a odporu zároveň. Ako

príklad uvádzame protesty ohľadom vojnovej vlajky Konfederácie, ktorá viala nad štátnymi inštitúciami niektorých južných štátov až do konca deväťdesiatych rokov a jej adekvátnosť sa riešila aj na pôde senátu. Pre bielych južanov predstavuje vlajka súčasť ich histórie a vnímajú ju s hrdosťou. Avšak vlajku si privlastňujú aj rôzne sporné skupiny na čele s Ku Klux Klanom, ktoré naďalej zdôrazňujú nadvládu bielych nad čiernymi. Politickú debatu rozvírila kontroverzia ohľadom vlajky aj počas leta v roku 2015, čo potvrdzuje fakt, že tento vojnový odkaz žije čerstvo v pamätiach obyvateľov južných štátov do dnešného dňa.

Proces zmierenia sa medzi štátmi Únie a bývalej Konfederácie začal hneď po ukončení vojny. Jeho hlavným pilierom boli vojnoví veteráni ako symbol bratského zjednotenia. Najťažšou úlohou pre nich bolo vyrovnanie sa s vojnovým terorom. Zároveň sa ale snažili na ďalšie generácie preniesť pre nich najdôležitejšie vlastnosti vojaka: česť, oddanie, a hlavne láska k vlasti. Vplyv tohto posolstva môžeme pozorovať do dnešného dňa v súvislosti s misiami amerických vojakov vo svete.

V nadväznosti na vplyv odkazu občianskej vojny do dnešného dňa je potrebné spomenúť úlohu masovej kultúry. Nielenže sa z vlajky Konfederácie stal marketingový predmet, spomienka na vojnu ako takú je často chápaná ako spôsob zábavy. Američania vnímajú vojnu prostredníctvom filmov či beletrie. Tieto vo všeobecnosti zobrazujú hrdinstvo vojakov či romantiku južných plantáží. Je dôležité oddeliť vedecké fakty a fikciu, pretože postupom času sa z prikreslených skutočností môžu stať vedecké argumenty.

Napriek tomu, že americká občianska vojna skončila v roku 1865, jej politický, spoločenský a ekonomický odkaz siaha až do súčasnosti. Najsilnejšie postavenie v pamäti národa má spomienka na otroctvo. Znamky rasizmu a násillia sa vyskytujú v americkej spoločnosti aj v súčasnosti. Keď sa Barack Obama stal prezidentom USA ako prvý občan s africkým pôvodom, mnohí sa domnievali, že táto udalosť je dôkazom konca nerovného postavenie medzi bielymi a čiernymi. Avšak tento proces ešte stále nie je dokončený.

Z predloženej práce môžeme vyvodiť záver, že to, ako americký národ vníma svoju občiansku vojnu z devätnásteho storočia, sa v priebehu rokov a desaťročí mení. Päťdesiat aj sto rokov po vojne dominovali v pamäti národa myšlienky o zjednotení a nadradenosti bielych. Akákoľvek zmienka o otroctve a Afroameričanoch bola úplne vylúčená pri uctievaní si pamiatky. Od konca dvadsiateho storočia a hlavne v novom tisícročí sa razantne zmenil v tejto súvislosti pohľad na otroctvo. Táto téma sa dostala

do stredobodu diskusií pri príležitosti stopäťdesiateho výročia vojny. Prispel k tomu hlavne fakt, že Afroameričania sú rovnoprávnymi občanmi USA a dosahujú úspechy na politickej, spoločenskej, aj ekonomickej úrovni. V porovnaní so začiatkom devätnásteho storočia sa postavenie Afroameričanov výrazne posunulo k lepšiemu.

Týmto sa v práci potvrdil predpoklad z jej úvodu, že chápanie minulosti je založené a ovplyvňované postojmi a názormi, ktoré aktuálne vládnu v spoločenskom živote a v politike. Každá generácia vníma minulé udalosti prostredníctvom okuliarov, ktoré jej nastavuje súčasnosť. Preto je ťažké odhadnúť, ako sa v budúcnosti bude vnímať toto náročné obdobie v dejinách USA. Vo všeobecnosti však môžeme tvrdiť, že americká občianska vojna z rokov 1861 až 1865 ovplyvňuje identitu Američanov do dnešného dňa a ostáva udalosťou, na ktorú či už politici, umelci, alebo bežní občania často vo svojich slovách odkazujú.

## **Bibliographical References**

AHLSTROM, S. E. 2004. *A Religious History of the American People*. Yale University Press; 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 2004. 1216 pp. ISBN 978-0300100129

BERINGER, E. R. 1991. *Why the South Lost the Civil War*. University of Georgia Press, 1991. 624 pp. ISBN 9780820313962

BROWN, T. J. *Remixing the Civil War: Meditations on the Sesquicentennial*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011. 256 pp. ISBN 978-1-4214-0251-2

BURLINGAME, M. 2011. *Lincoln and the Civil War*. Board of Trustees. Southern Illinois University, 2011. 176 pp. ISBN 978-0809330539

CASH, W. J. 1991. *The Mind of the South*. Vintage Books, 1991. 496 pp. ISBN 978-0679736479

COBBS-HOFFMAN, E. – BLUM, J. E. – GJERDE, J. 2011. *Major Problems in American History, Volume II: Since 1865*. Wadsworth Publishing, 2011. pp. 544. ISBN 978-1111343163

COSKI, J. M. 2006. *The Confederate Battle Flag: America's Most Embattled Emblem*. Belknap Press, 2006. 448 pp. ISBN 978-0674019836

COULTER, E. M. 1950. *The Confederate States of America, 1861-1865*. vol. 7. Louisiana State University Press, 1950. 644 pp.

DAVID, P.A. 1976. *Reckoning with slavery: a critical study in the quantitative history of American Negro slavery*. Oxford University Press, 1976. 398 pp.

DAVIS, B. 2002. *To Appomattox: Nine April Days, 1865*. Burford Books. 2002. 464 pp. ISBN 978-1580800976

DEAN, A. W. 2015. *An Agrarian Republic: Farming, Antislavery Politics, and Nature Parks in the Civil War Era (Civil War America)*. The University of North Carolina Press, 2015. 237 p. ISBN 978-1-4696-1991-0

DONALD, D. 1962. *Why the North won the Civil War*. Callier Books, Macmillan Publishing Company. New York, 1962. 126 pp. ISBN 0020316607

DRAY, P. 2010. *Capitol Men: The Epic Story of Reconstruction Through the Lives of the First Black Congressmen*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2010. 480 pp. ISBN 9780547526911

- DU BOIS, W. E. B. – LEWIS, D. L. 1935. *Black Reconstruction in America 1860-1880*. Simon and Schuster, 1935. 746 pp. ISBN 978-0684856575
- DUNNING, W. A. 1907. *Reconstruction, Political and Economic, 1865-1877*, Harper & brothers, 1907. 378 pp.
- DULLES, F. R. 1956. *A History of Recreation, America Learns to Play*. Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965. 441 pp. ISBN 978-0133919530
- ETCHESON, N. 2004. *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era*. University Print of Kansas, 2004. 384 pp. ISBN 978-0700614929
- FAUST, D.G. 1990. *The Creation of Confederate Nationalism: Ideology and Identity in the Civil War South*. LSU Press, 1990. 110 pp. ISBN 9780807116067
- FONER, E. 2005. *Forever Free*. Alfred A. Knopf of Random House, Inc. 2005. 268 pp. ISBN 0-375-40259-4
- FONER, E. 1988. *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution 1863 – 1877*. Harper & Row, 1988. 690 pp. ISBN 0-06-015854-4
- FONER, E. *The Fiery Trial: Abraham Lincoln and American Slavery*. W. W. Norton, 2010, 448 pp. ISBN 9780393066180
- FREEMAN, D.S. R.E. 1934. *Lee: A Biography*. 4 vols. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936. 2578 pp.
- FREEMAN, D.S. R. E. 1943-44. *Lee's Lieutenants: A Study in Command*. 3 vols. Simon & Schuster; abridged edition 2001. 912 pp. ISBN 978-0684859798
- FREEMAN, E. – SCHAMEL, W. B. – WEST J. 1992. *The Fight for Equal Rights: A Recruiting Poster for Black Soldiers in the Civil War*. In *Social Education* vol. 56, nr. 2. pp. 118-120
- FOSTER, G. M. 1988. *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause and the Emergence of the New South, 1865-1913*. Oxford University Press, 1988. 320 p. ISBN 978-0195054200
- GOTTFRIED, B. M. 2011. *An End to Innocence: The First Battle of Manassas*. In *Hallowed Ground Magazine*, Spring 2011. ISSN 0009-8094. vol. 13, nr. 1
- HARRISON, L. 1975. *The Civil War and Kentucky*. Lexington, 1975. 144 pp. ISBN 978-0813192475

- HAGEDORN, H. 1926. *Fellow feeling as a political factor. American Ideals, the Strenuous Life, Realizable Ideals: The Works of Theodore Roosevelt*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.
- HARLAN, L.R. – SMOCK, R.W. 1972-1980. *Address to the Negro Society in Virginia in The Booker T. Washington Paper*, 14 vols. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972-1980
- HEWITT, N.A. 1988. *Women's Activism and Social Change: Rochester, New York, 1822-1872*. Cornell University Press, 1988. 282 pp. ISBN 978-0801495090
- HUNT, A.N. 2006. *Haiti's Influence on Antebellum America: Slumbering Volcano in the Caribbean*. Louisiana State University Press, 2006. 196 pp. ISBN 9780807131978
- JAMES, W. 1911. *Robert Gould Shaw in Memories and Studies*. New York: Longman's Green, 1911.
- JANNEY, C. E. 2013. *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation*. The University of North Carolina Press, 2013. 464 pp. ISBN 978-1469607061
- LEDERER, N. 1973. *Ethnic Voters and the Election of Lincoln by Frederick C. Luebke*. In *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society (1908-1984)*. 1973. vol. 66, no. 1. pp. 111-113
- LEVINE, B. 1992. *Half Slave and Half Free: The Roots of the Civil War*. Hill and Wang. The Noonday Press, 1992, 312 pp. ISBN 9780374523091
- LEWIS, L. 1993. *Sherman: Fighting Prophet*. University of Nebraska Press, 1993. 720 pp. ISBN 978-0803279452
- MAHIN, D. B. 1990. *One War at a Time*. Potomac Books, 1990. 320 pp. ISBN 978-1574882094
- MCPHERSON, J. M. 2002. *Crossroads of Freedom: Antietam, The Battle That Changed the Course of the Civil War*. Oxford University Press, 2002. 224 pp. ISBN 0-19-513521-0
- MEMORIAL DAY ANNUAL, 1912: *The Causes and Outbreak of the War between the States, 1861-1865*. Richmond, Department of Public Instruction and Confederate Memorial Literature Society, 1912. Rutherford Scrapbooks 60, MOC.

- MONTGOMERY, D. 1981. *Beyond Equality: Labor and the Radical Republicans, 1862-1872*. University of Illinois Press, 1981. 552 pp. ISBN 978-0252008696
- MOUNTJOY, S. 2009. *Causes of the Civil War: The Differences Between the North and South*. Chelsea House Pub, 2009. 136 pp. ISBN 978-1604130362
- NIEBUHR, R., 1949. *Faith and History: A Comparison of Christian and Modern Views of History*. Nord Press, 2007. 272 pp. ISBN 978-1406704754
- PAGE, T. N. 1904. *The Negro: The Southerner's Problem*. C. Scribner's Sons, 1904. 316 pp.
- SEWELL, R.H. 1980. *Ballots For Freedom: Antislavery Politics in the United States, 1837-1860*. W. W. Norton & Company, 1980. 396 pp. ISBN 978-0393009668
- STEWART, D. 2010. *Impeached: The Trial of President Andrew Johnson and the Fight for Lincoln's Legacy*. Simon & Schuster; 2010. 464 pp. ISBN 978-1416547501
- VINOVSIS, M. *Have Social Historians Lost the Civil War? Some Preliminary Demographic Speculations*. *Journal of American History* 76, June 1989, pp 35-39.
- WARREN, R.P. 1961. *The Legacy of the Civil War*. University of Nebraska Press, 1998. 109 pp. ISBN 9780803298019
- WASHINGTON, B. T. 1995. *Up from Slavery*. Dover Publications. 1995. 176 pp. ISBN 978-0486287386
- WILSON, D. L. 2011. *Lincoln's Sword: The Presidency and the Power of Words*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 2011. 352 pp. ISBN 9780307487537
- WOODWARD, C.V. 1979. *Review of The Confederate Nation* by Emory M. Thomas. In *The New Republic*. Issue 19. 1979. pp 25-27
- WRIGHT, G. 1986. *Old South New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy since the Civil War*. Basic Books, Publishers New York, 1986. 275 pp. ISBN 0465051936



## Online Sources

BASLER, R. P. 1953. *Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*. [online] [cited 16 January 2016] Available on world wide web < <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/l/lincoln/lincoln3?view=toc> >

FARNHAN, JEFFERSON, T. *The Oregon Question*. [online] [cited 16 January 2016] Available on world wide web < <http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/100257386>>

LEVIN, K. 2015. *With Malice Toward None, With Charity For All*. [online] [cited 25 March 2016]. Available on world wide web < <http://cwmemory.com/2015/03/04/with-malice-toward-none-with-charity-for-all/> >

MARKEY, D. *Civil War-Era Political Parties of the North Vs. the South*. [online] [cited 16 January 2016] Available on world wide web <http://classroom.synonym.com/civil-warera-political-parties-north-vs-south-8901.html>

Minutes of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1899. Nashville, Tennessee, 1900. [online] [cited March 25 2016] Available on world wide web <<https://archive.org/details/MinutesOfTheSixthAnnualMeeting>>

PETERS, G., WOOLLEY, J. T. *Woodrow Wilson: Address at Gettysburg, July 4, 1913*. [online] [cited 25 March 2016 ] Available on world wide web < <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=65370>>

RAFUSE, E.S. *John C. Calhoun: He Started the Civil War*. in *Civil War Times Magazine*. Vol 15. No 1. [online] [cited 16 January 2016] Available on world wide web < <http://www.historynet.com/john-c-calhoun-he-started-the-civil-war.htm> >

RUSSEL, K., HAUN G., RAUBENSTEIN, B. 2012 *Antebellum Education*. [online] [cited 16 January 2016] Available on world wide web < <http://antebellumeducation.weebly.com/antebellum-mindset.html> >