

VETERANS' COMMITTEE

- GEN. C. IRVINE WALKER
Honorary Comdr. in Chief U. C. V.
Chairman—Mt. Pleasant, S. C.
- GEN. JULIAN S. CARR
Com. Army No. Va. U. C. V.
Durham, N. C.
- GEN. CALVIN B. VANCE
Comdr. Army Tenn. U. C. V.
Batesville, Miss.
- GEN. VIRGIL Y. COOK
Com. Transp., Miss. U. C. V.
Batesville, Ark.
- GEN. A. J. TWIGGS
Com. East Ga. Brigade, U. C. V.
Augusta, Ga.

United Confederate Veterans and Sons
Daughters
 Rutherford Committee

TO DISSEMINATE

The Truths of Confederate History

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN
MT. PLEASANT, S. C.

April 27, 1922

SONS' COMMITTEE

- REV. ALBERT SIDNEY JOHNSTON
Charlotte Birmingham, Ala.
- DR. JOHN W. HOOPER
Roanoke, Ala.
- W. C. CHANDLER
Memphis, Tenn.
- W. S. LEMLY
Temple, Texas
- J. J. SLAUGHTER
Muskogee, Okla.

The State Board of Education
 Raleigh N.C.

Dear Sirs: The Rutherford Committee composed of representatives from the three great Confederate organizations, the Veterans, *Daughters* and their Sons, have reviewed an American History by D. S. Muzzey, which is now on the adoption for your High Schools ^{we are advised} ~~is advised~~ has some years yet to run on the contract. We have found it so objectionable & so unfair & untrue to North Carolina & the South, that we think, whatever may be the cost, that your board should break the contract & drive it out of every High School in the State.

We would respectfully ask that this be done - a History which teaches North Carolina youths that their forefathers in the South were fighting for an unworthy cause;

Should have no place on the School curriculum of
your State.

Yours Respectfully

C. Irvin Walker

Chairman -

Books put in the hands of the children in our North Carolina schools should be carefully selected, having in view the influence the books will exert on the impressionable minds of the pupils.

As far as practicable, the children should be led to have a pride in their ancestors and in their State.

A history that is calculate to stimulate a pride in the breasts of children of New England may, simply by omissions, put the people of North Carolina at such a disadvantage, that the North Carolina children might naturally feel sahamed of the difference.

Yet one cannot expect a book written for Northern children to give an adequate account of matters occurring at the South; for Southern action will naturally be minimized - it does not concern the children of the North.

As an illustration - take what is said of the settlement of North Carolina in a history that has been selected for the use of our High Schools.

That statement was made by way of exaggerated wit by a Virginian. It is not an historical statement. It served as a vehicle of contempt. The author uses it to express his contempt, and the North Carolina children who are so unfortunate as to have to study this book have doubtless partaken of the Author's contempt and have themselves imbibed a contempt for the early settlers of their State.

As a matter of fact, the statement is untrue ~~xxx~~ both in its tenor and its detail.

The original settlement was made by respectable planters - men of substance and means ; and there were no " renegates " in Albemarle. It is true that as the settlers came as individuals, they did not bring any ministers of religion along with them, and there were for fifty years no tithes collected for the Established Church as in Virginia. The great historian Bancroft instead of such words of contempt, pays a noble tribute to the settlers at Albemarle.

An author in sympathy with the people of whom he was writing would never have defamed them as this author does.

Passing from that, an author should dwell on the progress, improvement, morals of the community; and the same treatment should be given to all. When England proposed to enforce the Navigation Acts -- it was laudable and patriotic for New England to seek to evade them; but when under the influence of New England leadership, the people of Albemarle sought to evade them - they are painted as turbelent, etc.

The South is not fed out of the spoon provided for New England!

The interesting and important public action in North Carolina is passed over. In 1775, Great Britain sent a large and well equipped army to subjugate North Carolina, and had it succeeded, probably that would have ended the Colonial Movement. It was defeated -- and quickly afterwards, North Carolina instructed her delegates for Independence and Separation. --

There is no particular mention of that first action - exceeding all others in importance.

And so, histories written for Northern consumption proceed -- ignoring matters of consequence of the South and magnifying the importance of whatever happens at the North.

Eventually we come to the great sectional disturbance of 1861. Certainly no one can expect a writer of ~~xxx~~ a history to be used in Northern schools to assert that the North was wrong in its action -- and yet the millions of whites at the South stood as a unit, for their rights.

The Southern people ought to insist that with regard to that period, the facts should be stated historically - and that the claim of the Southern people that their action was lawful, proper and righteous should be fully and impartially stated. The children of the South should not be taught that the slightest obliquity was attached to the venerable men whose fame will in the years to come be a valued heritage of the whole American people.

I imagine that the school histories taught in Northern schools are bitterly sectional. I do not know. But there are reasons to think so.

I do not advocate a sectional history; but I do advocate one that is fair and just towards the South in general and North Carolina in particular. And while I have no connection or association with either a Southerner writing school history, or any publishing house whatever, I wish to urge that as far as possible histories written by Southerners should be favorably considered. We have long lain under the obliquity of not being literary - of not fostering authorship. We cannot hope to make a change in that regard unless we show appreciation of literary efforts. If we are animated by a patriotic spirit, we will hail with satisfaction every worthy attempt to remove this stain upon our good fame. And in this connection, I hope I may be permitted to say that a history written by three Professors of History - one of Tennessee - one of Virginia - and one of North Carolina - very properly named "Our Republic" is a book of superior merit.

If it is not thought immodest, I probably have as correct a judgment as to that as any other teacher; and Our Republic is so comprehensive and so excellent that even were it not a Southern production, it ~~surely~~ certainly should be on the High School list.

The American History of Mr. Matthew Page Andrews we find most excellent, containing much valuable research, except to quote Mr. Lyon G. Tyler, former President of William & Mary College, "for the inordinate opinion that he has of Lincoln". Mr. Andrews admits to a member of the Rutherford Committee that he does not accept the apotheosis idea of President Lincoln that prevails very generally throughout the country, but at the same time says: "I find the 'Lincoln Legend' very useful for my purpose." Thus using and supporting a legend as a fact, which he admits he does not believe in.

Also in dealing with the War between the States, he speaks of Sherman of serving with distinction. (pp 333, 345, 346) and omits all reference to his barbarous actions in the Carolinas; congratulates him on his good judgment and prowess, and yet in the sketch of R. E. Lee (pp 326, 422) while he says he served with distinction in the Mexican War, no mention is made of his wonderful record in the War Between the States, i.e. "Lee at the outbreak of the War of Secession, declined command of Federal Army and resigned to enter the service of his state" -- that is all, yet Mr. Andrews

is even fulsome in his praise of the Federal Generals. He speaks in the most commendatory term of that abomination, the Freedman's Bureau, "That had been formed for the protection of the negro. The purpose of this body as outlined by its founders was laudable and proper, etc. "

The vagrancy laws as they were known, alarmed many good (?) people in the North, who thought they were designed to reduce the free negroes to a state of bondage.--- "

"The Southern student (p 365) especially should comprehend clearly that the element that had drifted into the South after the war was not typical of the northern people. There is no doubt that if the northern people generally had known of the true conditions under reconstruction misrule, they would have come to the aid of their fellow-countrymen." "All this tommyrot excusing the brutalities and supine indifference of the Northern people, and not a single word of sympathy for the people who were the innocent victims of all these horrors.

Of the administration of Lincoln, which he praises so fulsomely, (p 289, 305, and 308) Judge Heremiah Black of Pennsylvania, in Black's Essays (p 153) has this to say "Of the wanton cruelties that Lincoln's administration has inflicted upon unoffending citizens, I have neither space, nor skill, nor time to paint them - since the fall of Robespierre, nothing has occurred to cast such disrepute on Republican institutions."

With certain limitations, we can recommend the histories of Wadley Thompson and Dr. Latane. This history of Dr. Latane's within the past year has been adopted for state-wide use in Texas, for the Agricultural High Schools in Mississippi, and some 50 odd leading high schools of Mississippi. Among the noteworthy individual adoptions may be mentioned such cities as Mobile, Alabama, Athens, Macon, and Valdosta, Ga., and Charleston, S.C.

Under the auspices of Mrs. Schuyler, Pres. Gen. of the U. D. C., Dr. Lyon G. Tyler is now preparing a history of America, which we have good reason to hope that emanating from such a source will represent a true and fair history of America and its people. This history is being very generally supported and contributed to by the various divisions of Georgia, Virginia, Alabama, Florida and Texas, and it is generally hoped that at the next general convention in Birmingham, this history will be ready to be adopted as the official history of the U. D. C. Mrs. Hanna, Historian General, sees the brightest prospects for these plans to be carried through and until that time it is our purpose only to recommend those histories we have mentioned, as in the greatest measure fulfilling the needs for fair, just and truthful history, which are so obvious.

VETERANS' COMMITTEE

GEN. C. IRVINE WALKER
 Honorary Comdr.-in-Chief U. C. V.
 Chairman—Mt. Pleasant, S. C.

GEN. JULIAN S. CARR
 Com. Army No. Va. U. C. V.
 Durham, N. C.

GEN. CALVIN B. VANCE
 Comdr. Army Tenn. U. C. V.
 Batesville, Miss.

GEN. VIRGIL Y. COOK
 Com. Transp., Miss. U. C. V.
 Batesville, Ark.

GEN. A. J. TWIGGS
 Com. East Ga. Brigade, U. C. V.
 Augusta, Ga.

United Confederate Veterans and Sons

Rutherford Committee

TO DISSEMINATE

The Truths of Confederate History

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

MT. PLEASANT, S. C.

SONS' COMMITTEE

REV. ALBERT SIDNEY JOHNSTON
 Birmingham, Ala.

DR. JOHN W. HOOPER
 Roanoke, Ala.

W. C. CHANDLER
 Memphis, Tenn.

W. S. LEMLY
 Temple, Texas

J. J. SLAUGHTER
 Muskogee, Okla.

THE CONFEDERATE VETERANS AND THEIR SONS

TO ALL COLLEGE AND SCHOOL AUTHORITIES OF THE SOUTH:

There is no sectionalism in this appeal. If we are wrong and there is, then let any blame rest upon those who by defamation have rendered defense necessary.

The young of the South should be taught historical truth. Their forbears of Confederate days should be judged not by conditions existing today, but by those which prevailed in 1861. When the States seceded in the sixties, each seceded from a constitutional, and universally recognized, federation of Sovereign States. Our country as a centralized nation did not exist in 1861. So our text books should, in all fairness and truth, teach that the motives of the actors in that great drama were influenced by facts then existing and not by those obtaining today. Too many of the histories used in teaching our young, even when the authors are disposed to be impartial, which, alas, many are not, present secession viewed through the glasses of today and not those of 1861. It is due to the Veterans and mothers of the Confederacy that the young be taught to "Honor thy Father and thy Mother" and not to despise them as either traitors or imbeciles.

Our Rutherford Committee in the name of and authorized by the great Confederate Federations, the veterans and sons, appeal most earnestly to all educators to see that no histories are studied or even placed upon library shelves which do not render impartial justice to the Confederates.

We send "The Measuring Rod," by that eminent Southern educator and historian, Miss Mildred L. Rutherford and ask that all educators will apply this "Rod" to all books offered for use in their institutions and promptly reject any which does not measure "fair to the South" by this rod.

Rutherford Committee,

C. Irvine Walker
 Julian S. Carr
 Calvin B. Vance
 Virgil Y. Cook
 A. J. Twiggs

Albert Sidney Johnston
 John W. Hooper
 W. C. Chandler
 W. S. Lemly
 J. J. Slaughter

CRITICISM OF MUZZEY'S AMERICAN HISTORY, SO FAR AS IT RELATES TO DOING JUSTICE
TO THE SOUTH

By the Rutherford Committee U. C. V.; S. C. V.; U. D. C.

Pp. 136-141. Fourteen pages to account of Revolutionary history, battles, etc. in the North and eight lines to same in the South. Whereas, there were more battles fought in North and South Carolina than in all the rest of the country, and the crowning battle, which turned the tide in favor of the patriots, was fought at King's Mountain, near the border of these two states.

Chapter VI- The Constitution- fails to state which it should:

First, that the adoption of first ten amendments was to more clearly define State Sovereignty, and that only after these were passed and this point clearly defined, did North Carolina and Rhode Island enter the Union.

Second, that all through the document adopted, the United States is referred to in the plural, "their"- never once in the singular "it."

Third, that on a direct vote in the Convention it was decided not to create a Nation or to establish a perpetual Union.

Fourth, the Author also refrains from stating that the states of South Carolina, New Hampshire, Virginia and New York, in agreeing to the Constitution, did not relinquish to the federal government any powers but those explicitly stated.

Fifth, the Author also fails to note that many of the leading statesmen attending the Convention, and most of them named by him (pp 167) bear witness, in their writings and statements, to the fact that they were building a federal Union of force and independent sovereignties.

All this is important that the young should know so as to justify the subsequent acts of their forefathers. Pp.190-191- the tariff was not intended when first passed, as stated in the last sentence of page 190, but was to raise revenue and incidentally encourage only the manufacture of the prime necessities of life and the munitions of war for defense. The South agreed to such a tariff and John C. Calhoun advocated it, but not one to stimulate general manufacturing and the domestic production of pins and toilet powder.

Chapter VIII- pp.229-236- Description of a growth of "National Consciousness" is perhaps true of the commercial and manufacturing states of the Union, but not of the agricultural states of the South.

Pp.247. Eli Whitney did not invent the practical Cotton Gin. He invented a gin and was the first to patent the same. But the practical Saw Gin was invented by Hogdin Holmes of Hamburg, S. C. and later of Augusta, Ga. After the burning of the Patent Office, inventors were asked to renew their papers, and on that paper Whitney or his heirs interpolated a clause claiming the Saw. A copy of the original patent is in the U. S. Court Records at Savannah, Ga., and shows no such claim.

Pp. 266. The first long railroad in the world and the first to use locomotives was the South Carolina Railroad from Charleston to Hamburg- not those names by the author. See Encyclopaedia Brit. Vol XX pp.253. Partiality to the North, as usual with Northern Historians.

Pp.268, end of 2nd part. The protection theory had not "commended the protective tariff to the voters of the country", but only to those who would be benefitted thereby in the manufacturing states.

pp.268-89. It was not foreign interference which destroyed our shipping, but the tariff acts which diminished foreign trade.

²⁶⁹
~~Paragraph~~, last 6 lines. The South did not contribute to the passage of the tariff of 1816. See pp.272. The greater part of the South, as shown by the map, voted against it.

Pp.280-81. In the Hayne-Webster debate the author gives too much prominence and praise to Webster. He was a magnificent orator, but he was well known to be in his public career, the mouthpiece of the tariff protectec manufacturers of New England, whose principles were so loose that he repeatedly contradicted himself. His utterances depended upon how much New England rum he had taken. The falseness of his information is shown by his statement that the Union was "made by the people" whereas he well knew it was made, not by the people, but by the states. He lost sight of the fact (pp.291) that when the constitution was adopted "only some 120,000, out of a population of nearly 4,000,000 had the right to vote"- about one in seven of the adult made population made up the people of the states making the Union. All this is perfectly consistent with the attitude of most Northern Historians in presenting facts, true or otherwise, favorable to Northern ideas and suppressing those favorable to the South.

Pp.290. The first steam locomotive did not appear on the Baltimore and Ohio railroad, but on the South Carolina Railroad.

Pp.304. The Author should be commended for showing that New England Rum was used for enslaving the African. He fails, however, to say that the bringing out of slaves was in New England ships and controlled by New England men. They damned the South for using and caring for the slaves the Yankee inhumanely brought from Africa, purchased largely with the product of New England distilleries.

Pp.364. Next to last line 2nd part. Calls the kindly southern gentleman "a revengeful master".

Pp.366. Author calls slavery "the terrible system of gondage", whereas the negro in the south was the happiest and best cared for peasantry the world ever saw.

Pp.384, 3rd part. Author says of "Uncle Tom's Cabin", that it was an exaggerated but powerful portrayal of the moral degradation to which slave-holding reduce a man". Horrid tommyrot! Only the ignorant or vicious can believe that slave-holding, as it prevailed in the south was "morally degrading". The purest and noblest men that God ever created, forebears of the young of North Carolina, were, according to the author, "morally degraded".

Pp.384, referring to Brook's attack on Sumner, the author is unjust and untruthful. Not only that, but anything Butler could have done was fully justified by Sumner's vile attack upon Senator Butler.

Pp.400. Author says "Lincoln undeviatingly honest in thought". Glad to know that there was something in which Lincoln was honest.

Pp.405. First sentence false. The North did not yield to the South for "the sake of securing peace and preserving the Union". Any yielding was because the South had the most votes. By constant agitation of their fanatics, they kept the angry feelings alive and illegally threatened the institution of slavery, lawful by the Constitution.

Pp.406, Part 1. Some few cargoes of slayes were illegally brought into the South but so few as not to be noticeable.

Pp.408-9. The reference to Davis' resolutions in Congress and Lincoln's Cooper Union speech, are misleading and lean too much to the northern side. The are not fair and the language used by the author should not be in any school book from which the young of the south are taught.

Pp.410. Paragraph referring to Charleston Democratic Convention is not fair to the south.

The foregoing are comparatively minor objections to the book. What follows debars it or should, from every southern school.

Pp.414-428, descriptive of the causes of and the opening of the war are false, and no southern child should be taught from such. It follows the usual plan of northern historians of misrepresentation, suppression and absolute falsehood, which they have systematically adopted to defend their unjust side of the controversy.

Let us call attention to the most glaring errors.

Pp.415. False and misleading. The author says, "The southern leaders spoke much of the 'tyranny' of the North-----But this simple facts of the case warranted no such language". How about the legal robbery of the South by the tariff laws passed when the northern states gained a majority in Congress?

Pp.415. "Southern statesmen all knew that Abraham Lincoln's plighted work was good". What a farce! These statesmen did not know it, because it was not so- (see pp.421). "Lincoln's inaugural address was a reassertion of his kindly feelings toward the South", yet eight days thereafter he ordered an act of war by the landing of troops to reinforce Fort Pickens and soon thereafter commenced the preparation of the expedition to reinforce Fort Sumter. The very title he had bestowed upon him of "Honest Abe" was given in derision and not in praise.

The author's quotation from Alex H. Stephens is unfair, as it evidently is intended to show that some leaders of the South had leanings toward northern opinions. It is well known that Stephens opposed secession not because it was unjust, but unwise.

Pp.417. "Congress bent its whole effort to devising a plan of compromise which should keep the Union intact". Bosh! Why did it not pass the Crittenden Resolutions? Because Abraham Lincoln explicitly directed the republican members not to do so. Congress had no notice or idea of the least inclinations of Lincoln to force war upon the South.

Pp.418. "It was precisely the unrestricted extension of slavery and its unqualified recognition by the government for which the South was contending". False! If slavery had anything to do with secession, the South was opposed to northern interference with the legal and constitutional property rights of the slaveowner in his slave.

Pp.411. "The 'tyranny' which drove the seven cotton states into secession was the election of Abraham Lincoln on a platform which declared that the spread of slavery must stop". False!

Pp.418-19. Sec.607, not fair to the South.

Pp.419. Sec.608, false.

Pp.420. "That the causes of the revolt(?) of the southern states in 1861 was not sufficient to justify secession and war". So false that this alone ought to condemn the book for use in southern schools. If this were true, the grandfathers of the young of today were traitors. Is North Carolina willing to so condemn her sons?

Pp.420. Sec.610, not fair to the south.

Pp.421. Sec.612. "He (Lincoln) disclaimed any intention of using force or of invading the South", yet he had then determined to force war upon the south and eight days thereafter commenced preparations and issued orders therefor.

Pp.425. "On the first of April, therefore, with the consent of all his Cabinet except Seward and Smith, he notified Gov. Pickens of South Carolina, that an attempt would be made to supply Fort Sumter with provisions, etc." Incorrect, for on the same day Seward, representing Lincoln, stated to Judge Campbell representing the Southern Peace Commissioners, "The President may desire to supply Fort Sumter but will not do so", and added, "There is no design to reinforce Fort Sumter."

Pp.424. Sec.616. "The bombardment of Fort Sumter opened the Civil War". False! The night before that bombardment opened, United States troops had reinforced Fort

Pickens, by direction of Lincoln and committed the first clear act of war.

Pp.431. Sec.625. False, that "a majority of the white inhabitants of the South were in comparative poverty and idleness.

Pp.432. Sec.627. False.

Pp.434. Sec.628. False.

Pp.435. When the shot fired on Fort Sumter roused the North as one man, to pledge President Lincoln to aid in defending the Union. False! The North was far from being thoroughly united. How about the draft riots in New York? How about Vallandigham and the thousands of men thrown into Yankee prisons for alleged disloyalty?

Pp.437.Sec.633. "The ugly institution of negro slavery, which for decades----- outraged the consciences of half its people". False!

Pp.439.Note 3. Congress did not ratify Lincoln's acts in calling out the militia, etc., etc.

Pp.445. Fight between the Virginia and the Monitor not correctly stated.

Pp.446. Note 2. False, that "immense stores of Louisiana sugar and Texas beef and grain for the armies of the Confederacy" ever came from the west of the Mississippi.

Pp.467. "It is impossible for the student of history today to feel otherwise than that the cause for which the South fought in 1861-65 was an unworthy cause". Yankee calumny! Scandalous to teach the children of North Carolina that their heroes of Bethel and Gettysburg and Appomatox were fighting for "an unworthy cause"!

MUZZEY'S HISTORY

In the account of the settlement of the colonies, the New England colonies are given much space, while North Carolina and the southern colonies have little showing.

Page 578- "There is little in the history of the Carolinas to detain us. It is the story of inefficient government, of wrangling and discord between people and governors Boston Tea Party related, but no mention of similar instances in the South, such as, Edenton Tea Party, burning of teaship "Peggy Stewart" at Annapolis, etc.

Pages 124-125- Map of route of Paul Revere's ride and full account of it given, also picture of Battle of Lexington and account of it, while the first real fight of the Revolution, Battle of Alamance, merely mentioned in a footnote (page 133). The Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence is also mentioned footnote (page 133).

Ethan Allen and his Green Mountain boys are mentioned, but not one of the patriots of N. C. and S. C. battles, and one sentence describes the battle of King's Mountain. Miss Rutherford says to reject a book that says the South fought to hold slaves.

Page 305- "We must now trace briefly the development of that institution (slavery) which led directly to the Civil War for the preservation of the Union".

Page 419-420- Paragraph 608. "Slavery the sole cause of secession and Civil War".
Repd.

Page 467- "It is impossible for the student of history today to feel otherwise than that the cause for which the South fought the war 1861-65 was an unworthy cause".

Page 469- "Altho slavery was the cause of the Civil War, both North and South insisted that war was not begun on account of slavery".

Miss Rutherford says reject a book that calls the Confederate soldier a traitor or rebel and the war a rebellion.

Page 420- "Until a revolt is successful it is rebellion, and the author of it and the participants in it are in the eyes of the law traitors".

Page 439- "----- accompanied by congressmen who went to see the 'rebellion crushed by a single blow'".

Page 451- "A hundred led Armistead, pierced the Union line and planted the flag of the Confederacy on the ridge- 'the high-water mark of the rebellion'".

Page 477- "Except for a momentary wave of desire to avenge Lincoln's murder by the execution of prominent 'rebels'---- there was no thought of inflicting on southern leaders the punishment of traitors". (Footnote) "The single exception to this policy of mercy was the treatment of Jefferson Davis---- brought to court and Richmond to answer charge of treason".

Page 479- "Southern states, which but a few months ago had been in rebellion against the authority of the United States----".

Pages 461-62. To send the South's leading men to Congress in 1865---- "seemed a piece of defiance and bravado on the part of the South, a boast that they had nothing to repent of and they had forfeited no privilege of leadership."

Page 489- Lincoln "had emancipated all the slaves of men in rebellion against the authority of the United States".

Miss Rutherford says reject a textbook that glorifies Abraham Lincoln and villifies Jefferson Davis, unless a truthful cause can be found for glorification of villification before 1865.

Pages are devoted to praise and eulogy of Lincoln- (read especially 467-69). Davis' name appears but seldom in the text and only a few times in the footnotes. Not one word of praise for him.

Reject a book that omits South's heroes when those of North are made prominent. Many great southern leaders such as Raphael Semmes and Forrest are not mentioned.

J. E. B. Stuart's name appears once, Beauregard's twice. Stonewall Jackson's name is given once in text- and in the footnotes, page 441, he is described as a "combination of fighter and religious fanatic".

Page 467- "The women of the South----- knew no hardships but the failure of fathers and brothers and sons in battle; they were visited by no calamities except the presence of the hated "Yankee" soldier.

Page 433-34- Slavery the curse of the South. Read!