

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA BARBARA**

**600,000 AND A HANDSHAKE: What Led To The
Speedy Reconstruction And Recovery Mood
After The United States' Civil War
1861 - 1865**

**SENIOR THESIS
IN
HISTORY OF PUBLIC POLICY
JOHN B. MARCIANO**

**ADVISING COMMITTEE:
PROFESSOR ROBERT KELLEY
PROFESSOR JACK TALBOT**

DEC 1986

Like many wars, the American Civil war was wrought out of years of peculiar and diverse antagonism. Scholars linked to the interest of this war have taken all avenues of approach and have probed tenaciously at those reasons for the Civil War's beginning. Tied to this, historians have then attempted to lay blame on some particular personality, facet or institution for that war. My interest is quite different. Conversely, I choose to explore those reasons for the American Civil Wars sudden ending. Not the battles persay, but more specifically the mental fervor that was involved in fighting the war, and which brought speedy reconstruction.

After the last battle campaign and formal treaty agreement at Appomattox Courthouse, occupying Yankee troops withdrew their forces and reconstruction began almost immediately. In fact, before the formal end of the war, politically, reconstruction was already at hand. In Abraham Lincoln's second Inaugural Address, the keynote theme was that of the moral reconstruction of the nation. Indeed, the war had still been underway. Why like in so many wars - Civil wars, was there no

guerrilla tactics, terrorism or the like to follow the war? I ask then, how committed were the Confederate Southerners? Why did they not continue the cause to the very last penny and ounce of blood and courage? Was it their lack of nationalism? Was it the cultural context; morality of the South not to be a behind the back duelist? Or, did it have to do with the fact that their interim President Jefferson Davis, and their Commanding General Robert E. Lee were educated graduates of the United States Military Academy at West Point, which was largely a Federalist institution? That, which was behind the cause for bringing the war and its fatal results, and that which was so deeply engrained in the hearts of the fighting peoples, was suddenly shifted to a course of reunion. What provoked this alteration? Indeed, probing at the topic of the American Civil War's abrupt ending and meshing together of a sound functioning nation, is no less perplexing than exploring the genesis of its beginning. It is my intention then, with this paper to raise questions of the aforementioned sort, and to generate thought upon this topic, which I have found through my experience of historical study to be looked over.

Aluding to the year 1861 and summarizing the war

in a brief clod of facts would be superfluous, so, I should like to begin discussion of this subject during the winter of 1864-65, when the military might of the ConFederacy was crumbling. Upon this, I would assume that the reader have a general understanding of the American Civil War between the Northern and Southern United States. Understanding the formal end; the surrendering of the ConFederate Army is imperative before attempting to answer some of the already mentioned questions concerning this topic. So, it is here that this discussion will begin.

It was the morning of Palm Sunday, April 9, 1865 where Commanding General of the ConFederate Forces, Robert E. Lee stood near the village of the Appomattox Court House. With the remnants of his scattered troops strung along a four mile stretch of road, they stood steadily awaiting the return message of LTC Charles Venable. COL Venable had been sent across lines by General Lee to gather information on the conditions of other Forward regiments, in hopes of consolidating and reorganizing, so that they might hold their already over extended lines against the ever pursuing massive Union Forces, led by General Ulysses S. Grant. Venable's report would determine whether Lee's Army would fight

on or surrender. If the message read positive as Lee had hoped, then he would have continued the cause and withdrawn his troops to the west, parallel to the railroad lines where supply depots were to have food and other reserves awaiting his Army. At this point, it was then planned to turn South and join the remains of General Joseph E. Johnston's troops who were presently opposing Union General Sherman's march North through the Carolinas from Savannah.

It is quite evident then, with this little bit of historical narrative, that the beleaguered Confederate Army were, as a Maryland boy used to seeing only Federal troops describes, "...the dirtiest men I ever saw, a most ragged, lean and hungry set of wolves..."¹ Some weeks earlier before this April 9th morning, it had been confirmed that the Northern Front of the Confederate States of America had collapsed. Thereafter, Lee's Army drudged westward across an expanse of one hundred miles, marching and fighting in an effort to break away from pursuing Federal columns. Three days prior to that infamous Sunday, eight thousand of Lee's men were captured at one stroke. No food had been supplied by the Confederate Fifth Column, starving men and their horses had collapsed and died in place. Distraught

soldiers who had once been gallant warriors, now threw away their muskets and lay down in the fields, awaiting to be captured as prisoners. On that morning, Lee's Army of once seventy thousand strong had been reduced to eleven thousand withering men awaiting Colonel Venable's return report which read, "I have fought my corps to a frazzle, and I fear I can do nothing unless I am supported by Longstreet's Corps."² Lee knew that Longstreet's Corps were assigned rear guard, and were at present already holding off twice what they could handle. It was fact then that the Confederates were worn out. Lee's only recourse was to personally visit General Grant, which he would have rather died one thousand deaths. Indeed, the moment came when surrender was inescapable. But, it wasn't until every last option down to eleven thousand convicted men willing suicide, had been exhausted. This documented commitment that was opt for at one point in that morning haze on April 9th, is exactly what is ment by the mental zeal that was involved which leads me to explore and probe at this thesis.

Robert Lee's reasons for his entering the Corps of the South and his decision to resign his commission to the Union makes quite a statement, lending

significance to the culture of the South, as well as the mental capacity with which the Confederates fought throughout the war. It is true that Lee did not believe in secession, or in slavery for that matter. In fact, it is said that he had freed his own negroes. For these two reasons alone it would be spiteful to say that General Lee had any share in bringing the war between the States. Nevertheless, it was equally true that Lee did not believe in the Federal Government's right to invade and coerce the Southern States which he thought the South aggrieved. These facts contribute to Lee, and I think, the majority of the Southerners at this time. Although, their significance as to the reasons why they engaged in such a perilous commitment is rather shallow. It was drawn from a much deeper spirit, especially from someone as distinguished as General Lee. In a letter to his son, Lee writes, "I feel the aggression, and am willing to take every proper step for redress. It is the principle I contend for, not individual or private benefit. As an American citizen I take great pride in my country, her prosperity and her institutions, and would defend any State if her rights were invaded. But I can anticipate no greater calamity for my country than a dissolution of the Union. It would be an accumulation of all the evils we complain

of, and I am willing to sacrifice everything but honor for its preservation. I hope, therefore, that all constitutional means will be exhausted before there is a resort to force... A union that can only be maintained by swords and bayonets, and in which strife and Civil War are to take the place of brotherly love and kindness, has no charm for me. I shall mourn for my country and for the welfare and progress of mankind..."³

Indeed, the ardor of this letter questions Lee's motives for engaging in the cause with which he was so intently against. What is also true in regards to this letter, is that any stamp put upon him of being vindictive in making his ultimate decision can be eliminated. Lee loved his brother-southerners; the people among whom he had been born and with whom he had lived with much of his life. It was with them that he shared his dearest interests of family and friendship. But even blood in this case only amounts to a footing by which his final decision was to be made.

Lee was a man of a splendid moral and spiritual class. In General Garfield's eulogy on virginian,

George M. Thomas, he puts Lee, I think, correctly in perspective. "The political ideas of a generation just gone - have taken Lee to heir hearts as a peerless exemplar of all that is honorable and pure and exquisite and noble in humane life and character."⁴ Even President Lincoln had formed a high opinion of General Lee. Having this fallen upon Lee as a recommendation of his character and all else that has been mentioned, it might then be determined what was at the core and conviction of his ultimate decision. Presumably it must have had of do with a mix of high moral regard for what he held as such, and an utterance of sympathy as a Southerner. Lee may have deplored the political actions of both the North and the South, but still he believed deep down that the South had been wronged. Recall that Statesism was deep and had been bred into all that inhabited them at this point in time. And that Government by democracy, as we know it today, was yet at this point in history, very experimental and vaguely defined. It was a Crux to the American mind. Statesism was not. And after the Confederate surrender in August 1865, Lee exclaims, "having been decided against us, it is the part of wisdom to acquiece in the result, and of candor to recognize the fact. The interests of the State (Virginia) are therefore

the same as those of the United States. It's prosperity will rise or fall with the welfare of the country..."⁵ It was thought of in a way similiar to those who fought the Revolutionary War, which was based on a Lockean philosophy of Liberalism, bestowing natural unalienable rights upon all. Statesmen understood this philosophy which had been by now expounded into the American mind. This was why America had truely bled red. So, to Lee, being the exemplar of an honorable American, felt obliged to his State in drawing his sword against an American institution being wronged by the actions of the North. For Lee had no illusions as to the power of the Union and the weakness of the ConFederacy. A man of his stature's conscience was not made to be twisted, and in fact was not. Any facet of temptation was behind him upon making his decision. On April 23, Lee was introduced to the Virginia Convention, and this was the way he addressed himself, "Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention, - Deeply impressed with the solemnity of the occasion on which I appear before you, and profoundly grateful for the honor conferred upon me, I accept the position your partiality has assigned me, though I would greatly have preferred that your choice should have fallen on one more capable. Trusting to Almighty God, an approving conscience,

and the aid of my fellow citizens, I will devote myself to the defense and service of my native state, in whose behalf alone would I have ever drawn my sword."⁶ As historian Trent put it, "If ever words bore the accents of high truth and holy purpose, these words bear them."⁷ This was Robert Edward Lee, the General of the Confederate Forces. The leader for whom all had high regard and induced opinion. The person to which the fighting men of the South so loyally convicted themselves, and to the South who so passionately gave to Lee.

The great calamity of war, from which cultures have sprung, is the wrangling and lingering of its survivors, giving it rebirth to generation after generation. This is what has hampered many civilizations and their nations, causing stagnation and idleness toward growth and prosperity. This can be seen in many countries such as those in the Far East, and in Latin and South America. There, Political Systems are yet to be refined and made steady. Much of this is due to the upwelling of bygone generations of war, in fighting, and feud. Had this been the case at the end of the Civil War and the close of the century, then perhaps the South would have risen again, and

in fact, our country would be in progressive straits if a country at all. This although, was not the case of the war's destiny. It was exactly the opposite, and the calamity was ironically made a triumph in this way; those who fought for the causes of the Civil War, "Slept in Silent graves in which the issues for which they had contended were buried with them. The old had given way to the new...and no discontent accompanied their departure. How different it would have been had the generation of the war died unreconciled and begueathed to children the antipathies of their lives."⁸ This was the way the union survived and as Lee once put it in a similar context, "the gentleman does not needlessly and unnecessarily remind an offender of a wrong he may have committed against him. He can not only forgive, he can forget. He strives for that nobleness of self, and mildness of character which impart sufficient strength to let the past be but the past." The men who had followed Lee and Jackson felt no duty more imperative than to see to it that our children do not grow up with false notions of their fathers, and with disgraceful apologies for their conduct."⁹ Indeed, the passion and conviction that engaged the war, was perhaps the very catalyst for its reunion, and both it might be said, were brought

by Robert E. Lee.

There were clearly many similarities between the opposing sides of the Civil War. First, they were both of the same blood, bound together by Anglo-Saxon ideology and a force of a gloriously remembered past - their Revolution for Freedom as a nation. And as Henry Watterson put it, "war or no war, we are all countrymen, fellow citizens." This was expounded in the minds of both the North and South, which never changed throughout the war, or thereafter. It was in common with the nation. As Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. put it in 1884, "without getting at least something of the same brotherhood for the enemy that the North Pole of a magnet has for the South - each working in an opposite sense to the other, but each unable to get along without the other." "And consequently when the war ended it was the soldiers who first forgave."¹⁰ "The Confederate veteran returned to the Union as a friend with no humble apologies, no unmanly servility, no petty spite, no sullen treachery, he is a cheerful, frank citizen of the U.S. accepting the present, trusting the future and proud of the past."¹¹ Another facet of similarity was that of travel. Before the war, rarely did someone leave their home state, they would

for that matter be conceived, married and buried in that same town. The war changed all this, men having to travel about the states in battles and for other reasons that which the war demanded, brought them to discover new styles and ways of life. It also brought people together in a certain context of friendship. So, after the war, cultural ignorance did not get in the way as it once might have. Recall also that geography was merely "the accident of a man's birth, and not the difference between virtue and moral turpitude, which had divided equally patriotic americans into Federals and ConFederates."¹² In this connection then, travel in fact hastened the efforts of reunion. An intinerant, documenting "glimpses of dixie"¹³ for Harper's, noted how easily Union veterans traveling in the South exchanged reminiscences, and how often in relating their stock of anecdotes they found common ground for friendship. Still, there were other nationalizing forces at work which might be suggested as aids in bringing together the torn Union. One in particular that has been given much attention, is the institution of education. Surely there had to be at least one dominant force to wield the Union beyond personality and outside of government. In a wholistic effort to shape reunion, this task fell upon the

endowment of education. "The country rededicated itself to faith in education as the agency for molding the complex forces of modern life."¹⁴ The teaching of a common curriculum on American ideals, systematically brought both the Northern and Southern societies together in one classroom. This helped to bridge the gap of geographical dislocation, so that both farmer and city dweller could attain universal education together simultaneously. In the South, more so than in the North, a system of universal education was imperative to finding its way in progressive national life. The past culture of the South had demonstrated to the North that barriers had been erected against the currents of progress. The institution of slavery had incorporated into the South a limited, very literal and rigid way of being. In the many years of slavery, defining its existence and defending its purpose, conditioned the South's way of thinking. It caused the South to freeze over and become static in a dull succession of everyday life. So in fact, the "men and women who represented the old order of things could inculcate social and political principles alien to American ideals."¹⁵ This, nonetheless was all to be futile, in that "Common Faith and common objectives made possible common understanding and common endeavor between the sections,"¹⁶ which

was manifest in the universal program of education. Editorial exchange was equally significant to its contribution. "The editors sought frankly to promote the sentiment of national unity by encouraging papers which eschewed all resentment, prejudice, and bitterness. They wanted sincere contribution that celebrated the skill and valor of both sides, and cultivated the feeling of mutual respect which cemented the restored Union"¹⁷ No one page "invoked God's aid in damnation of the enemy".¹⁸ There was unquestionably a sincere effort put forth to the success of noble recollection. But why, after some 600,000 men had died and others maimed for life would they contribute to this? How they could bring themselves to do this in a mental capacity had to be above the impulse of affluence, and beyond the bounds of glory.

The war ended with few unquestionable illusions. And one discerningly true, was that the South had been devastated to where the North could not afford to neglect its need to be reconstructed. The desire was empire with industrialization at its forefront, which at the time was the common denominator in the equation of restoration. In great measure, the necessity for joining with the North, so that the South could revive itself

and support the quest for empire, is perhaps the answer for why these veterans of the war could espouse so glorious a celebration in so costly a war. "The history that the veterans told was of a war in which valor countered valor, and each side devotedly served the right. The blood that was shed was baptismal blood, consecrating the birth of a new and greater nation."¹⁹ Still, how did the veterans see through to this? What was the inspiration that drove this rationale?

Although there were many agencies to which reunion of the sections could be given credit, I think there were none so powerful as personality. Both to Ulysses Simpson Grant and to Robert Edward Lee should light be shed, and to the latter most distinctly. For they were the soothsayers of reconstruction. They both guided the rationale and invoked the inspiration. "In the tradition of Lee and Grant at Appomattox," it was said, "the South was prepared to grasp hands with its Northern Brethren and resume the joint task of building a great America."²⁰ Recall the terms by which Lee was surrendered. His first desire was that his men be obliged their wares less their arms, and their horses. Both Lee and Grant cared deeply about the fighting men and neither wanted to see the other

suffer any longer. Sustenance of the South was Lee's concern, and Grant could bequest nothing less than Lee's wishes. In fact, it was more of an accommodation Grant was offering. So, perhaps the mentality needed in the soles of whom bore the most burden - the soldiers and their families, concerning reconstruction and all that it entailed, was being shaped at Appomattox. Also, which should be brought to mind, is the cloak of nation above section, which was foundation for reason whereby a particular reconstruction intellect could be built. Attached to this creed was a liberalized state of mind, which was inherent in both the peoples of the North and those of the South. They were First Americans whether Confederates or otherwise, and without this, the power of personality in the task of chasting mental harmony may have proved unyielding.

Lee died an early death, just five years after the war, but to the new South he resurrected and lived on as a prophet. In the last words of a elderly Southern woman, she declares, "I am not affraid to die, I expect to go to heaven. There I'll see three whom I've always loved my husband, Jesus, and Robert E. Lee."²¹ Although the south was in Yankee hands, one thing was for certain, and that was the South had Lee and nothing could alter

that. Lee, was for the South, the perfect American in which to idealize themselves. For the North, Lee was admired and respected for embarking upon a policy of painful upbuilding within the Framework of a broad nationalism. And this was exactly fitting to the needs of an ambitious, industrial middle class, which the North so vigorously strided and in time would represent. Now, after his death, Lee was no longer seen as a martyr for the cause of the South, but was instead, becoming in the minds of the North, a kind of monument in which to be graven. In time, historians, people of prominence and worldly credentials, would equate Lee to a class of demigods, and of being Christlike. Indeed, "some of Lee's exploits were considered little short of miraculous. If he did not make the lame walk, he definately made them fight and in a land of insurgent nationalism, this counted for more."²²

In a commencement speech upon accepting the presidency of Washington College, Lee writes, "I have led the young men of the South in battle; I have seen many of them die in the field; I shall devote my remaining energies to training young men to do their duty in life."²³ As inscribed beneath his burst in Hall of Fame, Lee is quoted, "Duty then is the sublimest

word in our language. Do your duty in all things. You cannot do more. You should never wish to do less."²⁴ This was Lee's guidance throughout his life and so it was thereafter to a promising empire. And it was in this way that both the North and South preserved Lee after death. Replace Lee for Lincoln, and this is how Henry Grady at Delmonica's banquet in 1886 put it, "National admiration for the great Lee should unify former enemies and still leave ample room for reverence of your forefathers and... mine."²⁵ This is precisely the effect Lee had on the country after the war and after his death. Politicians, men of law, general citizens and virtually countrymen and women of all whereabouts memorialized his person, so that oneday, they too might cast upon theirs, that which Lee stood for. None other than Lee's greatest admirer Douglas Southall Freeman, who at the conclusion of his study and ironically Lee's life writes, "There he lies now that they have shrouded him, with his features so white against the lining of the casket that he seems already a marble statue for the veneration of the South. His cause died at Appomattox; now, in him, it is to have its apotheosis"²⁶

In the opening statement, "Our leaders are the

reformers of a new reformation,"²⁷ General John E. Roller in 1905 commemorates Robert E. Lee's ninety-eighth day of birth. For the South, it was an event almost characteristic of a religious holiday. And by 1910, Lee had become in fact, an idolized symbol. "A mania for Lee swept the country as if America could not praise him enough...."²⁸ Harper's called Lee "the pride of the whole country." All people, rich, poor, high and humble seemed to covet the old generals likening. In Heroes Every Child Should Know written in this same early twentieth century era. Hamilton Wright Mabie puts Lee among the highly acclaimed David, Hercules, Robin Hood, Kings Arthur, Richard, and Alfred, Siegfried, Sir Galahad, Roland and The Cid. A kind of Southern Renaissance was being born in this era, and Robert E. Lee, the undying symbol, was its flint and stone.

Aluding to some of the more specific forgone questions raised, the Civil War's abrupt ending for one, is rather simply understood. In a war type scenario, where men, rations, equipment, intelligence and the like are essential tools to becoming either victor or the vanquished, is all very practical. And for the South to have found themselves among the most

trodden and destitute, while the North found among themselves the antithesis, warfare reason would bring the horrid campaign to an end. Thus, having been the Confederate Army of 11,000 beleaguered, surrounded by a spirited force of 70,000 at the height of essential capacity, brought the war to a close. So, to understand why the war came to a sudden halt would be to understand Darwinian mechanics - the Fittest will survive and hence, overcome the weaker. This was the case of the Civil War. But, because the war ended in the view of Darwinian, or that of economic explanation, or any other school of practical thought for that matter, is conclusive. What is not however, is that, true, the war ended with a sudden halt, but also, a handshake.

With the outcome characteristic of a brother and sister spat, where a hug, handshake and promise are the concessions, one would think immoral warfare terrorism, guerrilla tactics etc., were non-existent. Guerrilla operations and terrorists acts were on the contrary, very large a part of, and within the realm of human hostile thought. For instance, in the latter part of the 1850s, the territories of Kansas reigned in terror, Bands of "Boarder Ruffians made their incursions."²⁹ The most remembered event of this

circumstance, in which history has termed "Bleeding Kansas", was the Pottawattom massacre led by the blood thirsty John Brown. Another mention of this type of immoral warfare which lends evidence to its existence, is, when after the war between the States, the descendant of two Yankee presidents, Charles Francis Adams, who once faced Lee at Gettysburg, praised him in saying, "By prohibiting guerrilla warfare...Lee saved both sides untold misery."³⁰ So indeed, whether organized or not, such a system of subversive warfare did exist. Nevertheless, its purpose which preceded the war was, I don't think, for the good of the State to which one was affiliate - Confederate or Union, but came more from the auspicious of a personal undertaking than anything else. It was a vendeta wrought of personal reasons, but only in a limited sense, which proved to last only a short time after the war. Therefore, one might conclude, that although such immoral deeds did occur both before and after the war, its significance as to the measures and causes of the war was confined to personal retribution, which stymied organization at any effective level. And lastly, because of the trumpeting of reconciliation, and the fact that the causes of the war died with the veterans who brought them, immoral warfare ceased to exist. This of course,

yields yet further analysis by which the Confederate commitment can be judged.

The facts that have been presented in the foregoing discussion speak for themselves. There can be no doubt that a multitude of entities, institutions and personalities have attributed to the reconstruction of the South, and thus, to the reunion of a more vigorous nation. But, it is equally clear that there must have been some, or one particular, yet instinctive binding facet which functioned as reunion's main organ. And through analysis I have found this organ to have pumped from the heart of the ever impressionable, Robert E. Lee. His relationship to the circumstance, and conditions presented to the era, could have fitted no one better for such omnious a task, than the divine Lee. In a war where men were first drawn by novelty, the success of a Military leader was almost doomed. In a letter found near a camp in New Baltimore, VA, a soldier writes, "...as for my own part, I have not found a soldier's life as hard as expected. Although I can assure you it is hard enough. It makes some of them grumble some to march all day, and carry about 60 pounds on their backs. And there are some that find considerable fault with their fair, but the most

of them are those that did not consider what they were coming for. But came more for novelty of the thing than anything else."³¹ But for Lee, this was not a contention, for it was he, who first set the example, and from this, his brotherly South ever faithfully followed, and so fatefully sacrificed. To be so poised, and yet have such power and control over emotions and mens actions, inspired a charactor in him whereby men would both cheer at his presence, and weep by his words. Prompted by his farewell speech to his troops, consequently displayed a response of sobs. On the other hand, Lee is graced with this letter written, "Dear Gen; we have been fighting hard for four years, and now the Yankees have got us in Libby prison. They are treating us alwful bad. The boys want you to get us out if you can, but, if you can't, just ride by the Libby, and let us see you and give you a cheer. We will all feel better after it."³² So it was to the South, that Lee was as big a man after the war as he was in leading the war.

It was plainly understood that "there were many people in the country who were willing for the States to transform themselves, but not willing to use Federal authority to transform them."³³ So what better than

an established prominent personality such as Lee, to act as the totem for reconstruction? Indeed, it was editorial rampaging which created this image of Lee after the war. But, it was an idol, someone to spark off of that this country craved in this time. It was beyond the authority of politicians and the scopes of large institutions to wit the nation. The responsibility was to lay with something more than material. It had to be something in which penetrated the many peoples minds. So it was found in a certain context of mind affair, with which all could clamour and participate. It was found in the indullable image of Robert Edward Lee, that would set a blaze of progress, and yet, incinerate the conditions of the past. Here was Lee in the words of his once greatest foe General Grant, "All the people except a few politiaal leaders in the South will accept whatever he does as right and will be guided to a great extent by this example."³⁴ "On the rare occasion when he was persuaded to appear in public places, he was received with an enthusiasm, a deference, a universal esteem and affection..."³⁵ "His example had been more important than his administration. He had meant less to education than to reconciliation."³⁶ And in Gamaliel Bradford's last analysis, he writes, "I have referred in an earlier

chapter to the immense importance of this general influence in bringing about reconciliation and peace. It is almost impossible to overestimate this."³⁷ "Here was a man who said that human virtue should be equal to human calamity, and showed that it could be equal to it, and so, without pretense, without display, without selfconsciousness, left an example that future Americans may study with profit, as long as there is an America."³⁸

FOOTNOTES:

1. Flood, Charles B., Lee. The Last Years, p.16
2. IBID p.4
3. Trent, William, Robert E. Lee, pp. 37-38
4. IBID p.42
5. Buck, Paul H., The Road To Reunion, p. 260
6. Trent, William, Robert E. Lee, p.47
7. IBID p.47
8. Buck, Paul H., The Road To Reunion, p.310
9. Fishwick, M.W., Lee. After The War, p. 226
10. Boston Advertiser, as quoted, May 31, 1884
11. Buck, Paul H., The Road To Reunion, p. 252
12. IBID p. 262
13. Deshler, C.D., Harper's Monthly LI 1875, p. 667
14. Buck, Paul H., The Road To Reunion, p. 310
15. IBID p. 317
16. IBID p. 311
17. IBID p. 257
18. IBID p. 256
19. IBID p. 257
20. Gaston, Paul M., A New South Creed; A Study in Myth Making, p. 90
21. Fishwick, M.W., Lee. After The War, p. 223
22. IBID p. 228
23. Buck, Paul H., The Road To Reunion, p. 260

FOOTNOTES

24. Longed, A.L., Memoirs of Robert E. Lee. etc. etc., pp 692-693
25. Gaston, Paul M., A New South Creed; A Study In Myth Making, p. 88
26. Freeman, Douglas Southall, R.E. Lee, VOL 4, p. 493
27. Roller Gen., John E., Inspiration By Heroic Exemplar, p. 1
28. Connelly, T.T., The Marble Man, p. 99
29. Potter, David, Division and The Stresses of Reunion, p. 74
30. Fishwick, M.W., Lee. After the War, p. 224
31. A collection of miscellaneous letters from a Stanford VT Library Collection
32. Bradford, Lee The American, pp. 250-251
33. Potter, David, Division and Stresses of Reunion, p. 163
34. Bradford, Lee The American, p. 265
35. IBID p. 253
36. Freeman, Doulgas Southall, R.E. Lee, VOL 4, p. 482
37. Bradford, Lee The American, p. 265
38. IBID p. 266

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams, Charles Francis, The Confederacy And the Transvaal. A Peoples Obligation To Robert E. Lee. (Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1901).
2. Bradford, Gamaliel, Lee. The American, (Houghton Mifflin Company, Riverside Press Cambridge 1912).
3. Buck, Paul M., The Road To Reunion (Little Brown and Company, New York, 1959).
4. Connelly, Thomas L., The Marble Man; Robert E. Lee And His Image In American Society (Alfred A Knopf Press, New York, 1977).
5. Davis, Jefferson, Constitutionalist His Papers and Speeches (Dunbar Rowland, Jackson, Mississippi, 1923, VOL VI)
6. Davis, Jefferson, Stephens Alexander, Robert E. Lee (Mill Junior College Press 1983 - Limited to 1000 copies).
7. Deshler, C.D., "Glimpses of Dixie", Harpers Monthly LI 1875.
8. Field, Henry Martyn, Bright Skies and Dark Shadows (C. Scribner's and Son, New York, 1890).
9. Fishwick, Marshall W. Lee After The War (Greenwood Press Publisher, Westport, Connecticut, 1963).
10. Flood, Charles Bracelon, Lee. The Last Years (Haghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1981)
11. Freeman, Douglas Southall, R.E. Lee (Charles' Scribner's Sons, New York, London, 1935 VOL IV).
12. Gaston, Paul M., The New South Creed; A Study In Myth Making (Alfred A Knopf, New York, 1970)
13. Jones, Rev. John W., Life and Letters of Robert Edward Lee; Soldier and Man (Neale Publishing Company, New York and Washington, 1906).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

14. Mabie, Hamilton Wright, Heroes Every Child Should Know (Double Day Page & Company, New York, 1906).
15. Riley, Franklin L., Gen. Robert E. Lee; After Appomattox (The MacMillan Company, 1930)
16. Roller, Gen., John E., Gen. Robert E. Lee; Birthday Celebration, Thursday January 19, 1905, addressed. (Special Collections Library, Wyles of University Santa Barbara, CA)
17. Sellers, Charles, The Southerner As American (Chapel Mill, University of North Carolina Press, 1960).
18. Stampp, Kenneth, The Era of Reconstruction; 1865-1877 (Vintage Books, 1965).
19. Time Life Magazine, "Spies, Scouts and Raiders; Irregular Operations." (1986).
20. The Annals of America, Resconstruction and Industrialization (VOLS IX, X Encyclopedia Britannica 1858-1865, 1866-1883).
21. Trent, William P., Robert E. Lee (Small Maynard and Company, Boston, 1899). Press of George M. Ellis.
22. Whipple, Wayne, The Heart of Lee (George W. Jacobs and Company, Philadelphia, 1918).
23. Wise, John Sergeant, The End of an Era (Houghton, Mifflin and Company, Boston, New York, 1899).
24. Woodward, Vann C., Mary Chestnut's Civil War (Yale University Press, 1981).