




INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

COMMANDER'S LETTER	1
EDITOR'S NOTE	2
ADJUTANT'S CALL	3-4
WHY AMERICANS WANT TO BELIEVE	5-12
TYPICAL CONFEDERATE SOLDIER	13-15



Intelligence Service Europe,
Year 11, Issue 2, July. 2018

Commander's Letter

Members and friends of the Europe Camp,

With concern I look over the „pond” and see the inexpressible attacks on our southern history in the news.

I'm frightened how aggressive groups, supported by a biased press, destroy our southern history.

So it is much more important that we hold together and speak with as many as people we can about the true ideals and the motivation of the soldier who fought for the South.

Please stay strong as a rock in the storm!
 The future will show y'all that we are right!

In the service of the South,



Achim "Archy" Bänsch
Commander

EDITOR'S NOTE

Dear Members, Associates and Friends of the Camp.

Although we are far away from the Southland, we, too, have the blood of Southern patriots in us. I have included some articles which may keep that blood stirring. I am pleased to include the work of another Guest Author with some interesting thoughts on why so many Americans want to believe that the War was 'about slavery`

If they are thinking individuals, and if the evidence says that that cannot be true, then the only explanation for believing this fairy tale is that they want to believe it.

And Dr. Vernon Padgett tells us why.

Then, we have included one of the most inspiring articles on the Confederate Soldier I have ever read.

Finally, there is a framed Battle Flag file at the end, which you may find useful.

At this place, may we send congratulations to Bertil Haggman of Sweden for his 30 years of service to the South through his extensive research and publication of the history of the War, and especially of its Partisan warfare. A long-time member of our Camp as well as numerous other historical organizations, Bertil's contribution to preserving this part of our history is remarkable and worthy of celebration.

The Editor



Chris McLaren



ADJUTANT'S CALL



Chris McLarren
Europe Camp Adjutant.

Dear Camp and Associate Members

Because we live far from America, it is often easy to forget our ancestors for a time. And it is difficult for us to help keep their memory alive in the country of their birth. One of the few things we can do is to make sure that our organization, the *Sons of Confederate Veterans*, remains strong in the defense of their good name. The easiest way to do that is simply to **be a member**.

The good side of that for us is that, through *Confederate Veteran* magazine, we are reminded 6 times a year of the incredible people our ancestors were. And membership only costs the price on one good meal!

I will be contacting you in the next 8 weeks to renew your membership. I will try to make it as easy as possible for you to continue to honor our ancestors and their struggle for **FREEDOM**. If your membership has stopped, then we can start it up again. Remember, your ancestor risked his all for the freedom of his country. He marched and sweated and hungered and risked death itself so that he and your family could live in peace in the country of their choice. *They only asked to be left alone*. And then the Damnyankees came!

Remember, if you let others tell lies about our people, your ancestor's fight was in vain! So long as we continue to insist people learn the truth, their fight is not lost.



Guest author:

Vernon R. Padgett, Ph.D.
Adjutant,
California Division,
Sons of Confederate
Veterans



Editor's Note: In their obsession with present – day racial discrimination, many Americans are now in the grip of a wave of insanity about Confederate monuments and the whole idea of the Confederacy. Somehow, many, many people blame the 19th century Confederate States for continuing racial discrimination in 21st - Century America.

*We have seen the inanity of young white Americans pulling down and then **physically kicking** the statue of a Confederate soldier because they are enraged about their present-day problems and they blame those problems on farmer-soldiers of the 19th century! The ignorance, stupidity and nonthinking of such people is simply beyond words.*

That is one problem. But the background of the problem is that, despite all the facts, despite all the evidence, most Americans want to believe that the United States fought the Civil War to 'free the slaves' and that our Southern ancestors only fought to preserve slavery. You and I of the SCV know that that is obscene nonsense, but it is useful to understand why so many Americans believe this fairytale.

At the SCV reunion in 2012 in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, I had the great pleasure of meeting Dr. Vernon R Padgett, longtime member of the SCV and Adjutant of the California Division. Years ago, he wrote a very incisive article on precisely why Americans want to believe this fairytale. He has kindly allowed us to present his article to you now, in an updated, edited form.

The article is quite extensive and repeats many things that we already know, but we think that having all this information in a collected form may help us when trying to disabuse our fellow Americans of their fairytale.

Why Americans Want to Believe The Civil War Was Fought To Free the Slaves

by Vernon R. Padgett, Ph.D. in Experimental Social Psychology
Ohio State University

We like simplicity. "The War was Fought Over Slavery," or "The North Fought to Free The Slaves," is simple, as simple as a Pepsi commercial.

For a society raised on Pepsi commercials, the One Factor theory (slavery) has enormous appeal.

We like to believe that Good Guys Win in the end. Since the blue uniforms won, then what they fought for must have been the right thing. We won all our other wars, except a few that we don't talk about, and we were the good guys in all those wars.

Unfortunately, *it isn't true!*

Unknown Facts About Slavery

How do we fit "The North Fought to Free the Slaves" with these annoying facts about slavery--

1. Lincoln didn't 'emancipate the slaves' until about halfway through the war;
2. Lincoln fired two generals who actually did free slaves in 1861 and 1862;
3. Lincoln didn't emancipate any slaves under his actual control: he only 'freed' the slaves in areas 'in rebellion'. i.e. out of his control. (Imagine U.S. President Trump stating today that the minimum wage is now going to be \$25 an hour-- in Mexico and Canada);
4. The underground railroad didn't stop at the Mason/Dixon line. It reached all the way to Canada. Why? Because such states as Illinois, the Land of Lincoln, had laws that a black could be whipped if found within the state for more than three days;
5. There were five slave states that remained in the Union, and slavery remained legal in these states for some two years after the "emancipation" of slaves in the states not under Northern control;
6. Lincoln's idea of how to deal with emancipated slaves was to remove them to Africa or somewhere in Latin America;
7. The flag that flew over slave ships was the United States ' Stars and Stripes, never a Confederate flag.

Do we really want to bring up these facts about slavery?--

9. That Africans were captured by other Africans to be sold into slavery?
10. That Africans sold their captives to Northern, not to Southern, slave dealers, for transport in Yankee slave ships?
11. That some blacks as well as whites owned slaves?
12. That the institution of slavery had never been safer than in 1860? Lincoln personally supported a new constitutional amendment (the 'Corwin Amendment') protecting slavery forever from Congressional interference, which he signed, which Congress had passed, and which Ohio and Maryland ratified and Illinois ratified in 1862¹.
13. That there were more free blacks in the South than in the North in 1860? According to the United States Census of 1860, the free states had 222,745 Free blacks, and the slave states had 259,078 free blacks. These numbers were given in a small New York Times article on 31 March 1862, with the note that *"the slave-holding states have given a wider extension to the principle of emancipation than the non-slaveholding states. This is a fact which should not be forgotten by those who would admire philanthropy in deed rather than in words."*
14. Slavery would probably have ended in the United States within a generation without war, as it became economically unsatisfactory. Racism, which we find at least as much in the North, was not the basis for slavery -- economic advantage was, and slavery was on its way out as it lost its economic advantage to machinery.

As far as I have been able to tell, all the above statements, with the exception of the last one, are facts -- They are not an author's opinion; they are matters of public record.

Given these facts, how can anyone say "the North Fought to Free the Slaves" or "The Civil War was Fought to End Slavery?"

If it is not hard enough to say that, given the above evidence, it is harder yet, when one considers the body of evidence on black Confederates. If many Southern blacks were shooting at Union soldiers, can we say that the Northern soldiers were there "to free the slaves"? If many blacks *chose* to fight for the South, what sense would a northern war against slavery make?

How many black Confederates is "many"? A few hundred slaves or free blacks would not force us to reconsider our view of black Confederates. But what if some tens of thousands of blacks, both free and slave, actually defended the Confederacy, not just in the army in subsidiary roles, but also in combat? Then we would have to consider why individual black Southerners fought. Some were slave owners themselves, and/or occupied respected positions in their communities as Free Men of Color (especially in Louisiana and Virginia) or Free Women of Color (Charleston-- 6000 free blacks, mostly women).

¹ <http://www.lib.niu.edu/2006/ih060934.html>

There is a large body of evidence, from every state in the Confederacy, much of it in the United States government's ***Official Record of the War of the Rebellion***,² documenting the service of black Confederates in combat, as well as their service as teamsters, cooks, musicians, nurses, hospital stewards, blacksmiths, wheelwrights, shoemakers, sappers, pioneers, foragers, working to take care of horses and mules, hostlers, and of course as servants and laborers, both skilled and unskilled.

Several decades after the War, when Southern states had become financially solvent again, the Southern states paid military pensions to indigent or disabled bona fide former Confederate soldiers. This included black Confederate soldiers who could prove their service, which often meant they had to find two white members of their unit to vouch for their service and they had to have been in service at the end of the War. (That is: didn't desert in the final weeks of the War, like many white soldiers did.

In Tennessee alone 250 Confederate Colored Man's Pensions were awarded between 1921 and 1936.³ How many thousands of blacks must have served Tennessee during the War for there to be as many as 250 still alive by 1921 (56 years later)? Perhaps some 7,000 to 15,000 blacks must have served Tennessee, and if the Tennessee example holds across the South, some 70,000 to 150,000 blacks must have served the Confederacy in some capacity.

And yet despite the factual record of the *Official Records*, of Southern State Pension applications, and of hundreds of individual accounts of black Southern soldiers in battle, many Americans still refuse to accept the evidence, and reject the idea of black Confederates out of hand. Or if they accept the possibility, then the blacks must have been "forced" to fight.

But then, how do we explain black Confederate George Washington Yancey, captured with his Georgia militia, escaped and found his way back to his Southern unit, was captured again at Missionary Ridge, escaped a second time, found his unit at Atlanta, and was captured a third time, at Macon, escaped from Federal custody a third time, and served the Confederacy for the rest of the war as a forager? How exactly was he "forced" to serve the Confederacy?

How do we explain why black Confederate Louis Napoleon Nelson stated after the War that he "rode with Forrest in every major battle," and why he attended 39 United Confederate Reunions, and insisted that he be buried with his medals from those UCV reunions? How was Private Nelson forced to do those things?

How do we explain why 38 blacks attended the 1890 Alabama reunion of the United Confederate Veterans? Who was "forcing" these men, 25 years after the war, after reconstruction, etc.? Look at the Alabama UCV photo and the other photos—judge the evidence for yourself:

http://buildyoursite2.com/websites/pljrtp9/reunion_photos_47.html,

² <https://www.loc.gov/item/03003452/>

³ http://buildyoursite2.com/websites/pljrtp9/tennessee_confederate_states_pensions_13.html

But we have to ignore all this, don't we? We have to disbelieve in black Confederates because otherwise it leads to questioning that the war was "about slavery." We must disbelieve in black Confederates because otherwise we would eventually get around to the question: "So what *was* the War About?"-- Why were 360,000 Northern boys and men killed? For *what* were their lives spent?

Why Did Northerners Fight?

We all understand why 250,000 Southerners died. They died defending their homes and families from an enemy who followed a scorched earth policy that has been rivaled in warfare only by Napoleon in Spain in 1808, or the Nazis and Soviets in WWII.

But why did *Northerners* fight?

We are not really sure. Remarque; Kirst, Böll; McPherson; Ambrose, all tell us that men engage in combat ultimately not for flag or country, or God-- they fight for their comrades.

But we do know why 1 in 5 of them fought-- they were not Americans-- but were literally off the boat from Germany or Ireland. Step off the boat at Ellis Island, and step into a New York Infantry Regiment. Fight in order to get your citizenship.

But what about the other 4 in 5?

Can Modern Psychology Help?

Can modern psychology help? Psychology is the science of human behavior and cognitive processes. Heider's Balance Theory and Festinger's Cognitive Dissonance Theory help explain why we believe what we believe, when the evidence fails to objectively support those beliefs.

In the classic 1957 experiment, students at the University of Minnesota were paid \$1 or \$20 to lie to the next student in line to do their part of the test procedure. In 1957, \$1 and \$20 were like \$5 and \$100 in today's dollars. The lie they had to tell to the next student was that the boring procedure was "really very interesting." Later they were surveyed on just how interesting they thought it was. The students paid the \$100 for lying rated the boring task as-- boring. However, the students paid only \$5 to lie rated the task as very interesting. They had come to believe in their own lie.

Festinger explained these discrepant findings by a new concept: Cognitive Dissonance. His reasoning was that the students paid \$100 had sufficient justification for their lie-- they had the \$100. In their minds, they might have thought about it this way: "I was paid very nicely to tell a small lie, and for another \$100 I'd do it again!" But what about those students who were paid only \$5? They were not paid well for lying-- so how did they justify the lie? They could not-- who would lie for what barely amounts to lunch money? The lying did not balance with their belief that they were basically honest people, and the reward for lying did not justify the lie.

So these lying students rearranged their beliefs-- and remembered the boring procedure as actually very interesting. If the procedure really was interesting, then they had *not* told a lie. This brought their behavior (lying) into balance with their beliefs about themselves (they were not liars). This research has been replicated thousands of times, and is among the most widely-accepted findings of 20th century psychology.

Applying Psychology To Understanding Why We Believe

What does this have to do with believing the North fought to "Free the Slaves"? First: Consider World War II. Imagine for a moment a huge scale of justice. On the one hand place the Nazis-- and on the other hand, the Holocaust of 10 million Jews and others-- Soviet POWs, Polish civilians, gypsies, homosexuals, German mentally retarded and mentally ill.

On the one hand, the greatest criminals of the 20th century, and on the other hand: the greatest crime. There is a rough balance-- the two fit together in this imaginary scale of justice.

Move to 1963 and the assassination of President Kennedy. The suspect was an unemployed, nondescript bum, Lee Oswald. The evidence was that he acted alone. But there was no balance there-- a strong, young, vibrant U.S. president on the one hand, and on the other, a nameless bum with a \$14 mail-order Italian army surplus rifle.

What happens when there is this discrepancy between beliefs? We revise our beliefs to bring them into balance-- like the students did in the 1957 lying study—like many of us did with the JFK assassination.

In the assassination of JFK, many of us in fact simply rejected the evidence. We believed instead that a vast conspiracy caused the death of JFK-- the Mafia did it. Or, the CIA did it. Or the KGB, or FBI, or LBJ, or the Martians.... There are 5000 books on the Kennedy assassination, with nearly as many theories on who killed Kennedy. In each of these cases, a cognitive balance is achieved. A young president on the one hand, and forces on the other hand of such magnitude-- the FBI, CIA, U.S. Army, Soviet KGB-- those provide a rough balance on that huge imaginary scale of justice.

(Note: If you have any doubts that Oswald acted alone, read Gerald Posner's 1993 *Case Closed*. It answers every problem with the evidence in the JFK assassination. Oswald did act alone-- case closed.)

Back to the Civil War, and the death of well over 600,000 Americans: What balances the unprecedented loss of American life - a loss greater than that of all other wars combined? Let's look at reasons typically given for why the North fought against the South.

- 1. Getting even for Fort Sumter?** No-- Some still harp "You started it," but mature adults who can think past their last fist fight tend to look for deeper reasons for the unprecedented slaughter of 1861-1865. But did the war really start "because" of Fort Sumter? True, Fort Sumter was fired on, and the history books record that the war started, but why didn't the war start earlier, when South Carolina fired on a federal ship in January 1861?

Some state that the war started at Fort Sumter because the new president wanted war, and Sumter provided the right excuse, and it would have started at Fort Pickens the following week if it hadn't started at Sumter.

2. Settling States Rights issues? No, that doesn't have the deep appeal to match the deaths of more than half a million Americans. Who can talk about 600,000 dead Americans, and then argue that all that was for "States Rights"? Few people want to couple legalistic argument with the absence of a father, son, and brother from *every* home in the South-- and every 5th or 6th home in the North.

3. Settling Tariff issues? No. Same problem-- only scholars on the tariff see a deep role in that war for tax issues, but few others want to accept the idea that well over 600,000 Americans died to settle any tax problems. In our minds, tax issues on the one hand, and on the other, the death of a family member from every home-- they just don't provide the balance we need.

4. Preserve our Great Experiment in Democracy! This was the "Great Northern Cause" until nearly halfway through the war. Union soldiers died to ... preserve the Union. To force South Carolina back into the Union. This indeed was the true motivating cause for most of the Union soldiers.

But who would accept it today?

Imagine today that North Dakota leaves the country. Who today would give their life to force North Dakota back?

Does anyone today believe that Union boys died because they wanted to force South Carolina back into a country she didn't want to be in? Even abolitionist Horace Greeley said "let our erring sisters go in peace." Why should I care if North Dakota, or South Carolina, or 11 other states, leave the Union? Why should I give my life, or the lives of my family members, to force them to stay with the rest of the country?

Imagine that your ex-wife or husband suddenly discovered that "there is no constitutional right to secede" from your legal marriage, and now they had to be forced back into union with you. Would you want them back?

Did the South want to destroy the "Great Experiment in Democracy"? If the South had won, would the United States have disappeared? No, they still would have been there, still with the same government, same constitution (written by Southerners), same president, same congress, same everything, except 11 states.

If you really believe that the South wanted to take over the Northern states, then you might believe that the Civil War was fought to preserve the "great experiment in democracy." However, President Jefferson Davis, who is not remembered for quotable lines, said "All we ask is to be left alone." Which shows the falsehood of this claim for why the North fought.

And finally, we are left with reason number 5.

5. To End Slavery.

Conclusion

Americans believe the War was about Ending Slavery because that is the only cause that provides the cognitive balance we need to justify the death of over 600,000 Americans. Many of us will never believe that Lee Oswald acted alone in killing John Kennedy, because there is no sense of balance between the stature of the president and the stature of the assassin. In the same way we believe the Civil War was fought to end slavery.

In spite of pages of facts that show that the North had slave states, that the North was at least as racist as anywhere else; in spite of evidence that thousands of Southern blacks fought in defense of the Confederacy, in spite of the evidence that slavery would have died on its own within a generation, the overwhelming majority of Americans still believe that the Civil War was fought to end slavery, because those other reasons just don't provide the cognitive balance that justifies wasting the lives of over 600,000 American men.

~~~~~  
Dr. Vernon R. Padgett

Share comments or corrections with me at [vp09@earthlink.net](mailto:vp09@earthlink.net)

(Editorial support by Christopher McLarren)



## Typical Confederate Soldier



By G.H. Baskette, Nashville, Tennessee

(as published in *The Confederate Veteran*, Volume 1, Dec 1893)

Nearly 33 years have passed since the alarm of war called from their peaceful pursuits the citizens who were to make name and fame as Confederate soldiers. The stirring scenes and the dreadful carnage of a memorable conflict have been removed by the lapse of time into the hazy past, and a new generation, however ready it may be to honor those who fought the battles of the South, is likely to form its idea of their appearance from the conventional military type. The Confederate soldier was not an ordinary soldier, either in appearance or character. With your permission I will undertake to draw a portrait of him as he really appeared in the hard service of privation and danger.

A face browned by exposure and heavily bearded, or for some weeks unshaven, begrimed with dust and sweat, and marked here and there with the darker stains of powder – a face whose stolid and even melancholy composure is easily broken into ripples of good humor or quickly flushed in the fervor and abandon of the charge; a frame tough and sinewy and trained by hardship to surprising powers of endurance; a form, the shapeliness of which is hidden by its encumberments, suggesting in its careless and unaffected pose a languorous indisposition to exertion, yet a latent, lion-like strength and a terrible energy of action when aroused.

Around the upper part of the face is a fringe of unkempt hair, and above this an old wool hat, worn and weather-beaten, the flaccid brim of which falls limp upon the shoulders behind and is folded back in front against the elongated and crumpled crown. Over a soiled shirt, which is unbuttoned and buttonless at the collar, is a ragged gray jacket that does not reach to the hips, the sleeves some inches too short. Below this trousers of a non-descript color, without form and almost void, are held in place by a leather belt, to which is attached the cartridge box that rests behind the right hip, and the bayonet scabbard which dangles on the left. Just above the ankles each trouser leg is tied closely to the limb - a la Zouave - and beneath reaches of dirty socks disappear in a pair of badly used and curiously contorted shoes. Between the jacket and the waistband of the trousers, or the supporting belt, there appears a puffy display of cotton shirt which works out further with each hitch made by Johnny in his effort to keep his pantaloons in place. Across his body from his left shoulder there is a roll of threadbare blanket, the ends tied together resting on or falling below the right hip. This blanket is Johnny's bed. Whenever he arises he takes up his bed and walks. Within this roll is a shirt, his only extra article of clothing. In action the blanket roll is thrown further back and the cartridge belt is drawn forward, frequently in front of the body.

From the right shoulder, across the body past two straps, one cloth, the other leather, making a cross with blanket roll on breast and back.

These straps support respectively a greasy cloth haversack and a flannel covered canteen, captured from the Yankees.

Attached to the haversack strap is a tin cup, while in addition to some other odds and ends of camp trumpery, there hangs over his back a frying pan, an invaluable utensil with which the soldier would be loth (sic) to part.

With his trusty gun in hand - an Enfield rifle, also captured from the enemy and substituted for an old flintlock musket or the shotgun with which he was originally armed - Johnny Reb, thus imperfectly sketched, stands in his shreds and patches a marvelous ensemble - picturesque, grotesque, unique - a model citizen soldier, the military hero of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. There is none of the tinsel or the trappings of the professional about him. From an aesthetic military point of view he must appear a sorry looking soldier. But Johnny is not one of your dress parade soldiers. He doesn't care a copper whether anybody likes his looks or not. He is the most independent soldier that ever belonged to an organized army. He has respect for authority, and he cheerfully submits to discipline, because he sees the necessity of organization to effect the best results,

but he maintains his individual autonomy, as it were, and never surrenders his sense of personal pride and responsibility. He is thoroughly tractable if properly officered, and is always ready to obey necessary orders, but he is quick to resent any official incivility, and is a high private who feels, and is, every inch as good as a general. He may appear ludicrous enough on a display occasion of the holiday pomp and splendor of war, but place him where duty calls, in the imminent deadly breach or the perilous charge, and none in all the armies of the earth can claim a higher rank or prouder record. He may be outre and ill-fashioned in dress, but he has sublimated his poverty and rags.

The worn and faded gray jacket, glorified by valor and stained with the lifeblood of its wearer, becomes, in its immortality of association, a more splendid vestment than mail of medieval knight or the rarest robe of royalty. That old, weather-beaten slouched hat, seen as the ages will see it, with its halo of fire through the smoke of battle, is a kinglier covering than a crown.

Half-clad, half-armed, often half-fed, without money and without price, the Confederate soldier fought against the resources of the world. When at last his flag was furled and his arms were grounded in defeat, the cause for which he had struggled was lost, but he had won the fadeless victory of soldiership.

“To tar the sacrifices of the Confederate soldier as simple acts of racism, and reduce the battle flag under which he fought to nothing more than the symbol of a racist heritage, is one of the great blasphemies of our modern age”.

Former U.S. Senator Jim Webb







# Intelligence

# Service Europe

Bi-monthly electronic newsletter.

E-mail: [cmclvhs@aol.com](mailto:cmclvhs@aol.com)  
Website: [www.scveuropecamp.jimdo.com](http://www.scveuropecamp.jimdo.com)  
Editor: Christopher McLaren



Submissions must be in Microsoft Word or text file and e-mailed to

[cmclvhs@aol.com](mailto:cmclvhs@aol.com)

*© 2018 All rights reserved. Publication herein does not necessarily imply agreement. Permission to reprint is granted on the condition that such reprints give full credit to SCV Europe Camp #1612, supply our address and telephone number, and prominently display the author's name.*

