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“Stephen D. Lee and the Making of an American Shrine”

BY BRUCE ALLARDICE

The Nevins-Freeman Award is given annually by the CWRT of Chicago to persons who have made outstanding contributions to Civil War scholarship and to the Round Table movement. Past award winners include Bruce Catton, Bud Robertson and Ed Bearss. This night we will honor a noted scholar, a leader in battlefield presentation and preservation, and a true gentleman: Terry Winschel.

Terrence J. Winschel, the long-serving historian at Vicksburg National Military Park, will trace the remarkable course of Stephen Dill Lee’s life, focusing on his activities to memorialize his comrades in arms. The former Confederate lieutenant general was a planter, educator, legislator, and statesman who in the aftermath of war devoted his life and energies to forge bonds of fraternity and brotherhood between those who had worn the blue and gray in the nation’s bloodiest conflict. A leader in the “New South” movement, Lee threw his considerable influence behind the efforts of Union veterans to establish a national military park at Vicksburg, comparable to those established previously by Congress at Chickamauga/Chattanooga, Antietam, Shiloh, and Gettysburg. Although defeat at Vicksburg had sealed the doom of the Confederacy, Lee (who commanded a Confederate brigade at Vicksburg) believed that the Southern soldiers who had fought so valiantly there deserved to be honored rather than shadowed by shame. In recognition of his work, Stephen D. Lee was appointed to the park commission and was elected Chairman by his fellow commissioners, both of whom were Union veterans. Winschel will detail the work of both the Association and the Park Commission under Lee’s leadership.

Terry Winschel is a native of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and a graduate of The Pennsylvania State University. He also holds both M.S.S. (Master of Social Science) and Ed.S. (Education Specialist) degrees from Mississippi College. Terry is a twenty-eight year veteran of the National Park Service and is currently Historian at Vicksburg National Military Park.

Terry has written 50 articles on the Civil War and more than 90 book reviews. He is author of Vicksburg is the Key: The Struggle for the Mississippi River (University of Nebraska Press 2003); The Civil War Diary of a Common Soldier (LSU Press 2001); Vicksburg: Fall of the Confederate Gibraltar (McWhiney Research Foundation Press 1999); and Triumph & Defeat: The Vicksburg Campaign (Savas Publishing 1998). A long-time friend of this Round Table and the Civil War Round Table movement, Terry will be one of the tour guides for our 2005 Vicksburg Campaign battlefield tour.
Our CWRT of Chicago’s 2005 tour to Vicksburg is a “key” to Battlefield Preservation, because it focuses our attention and educates us about a given point in history. As the Battlefield Preservation Committee has repeatedly stated, if “someone” had not preserved the sites for us to tour, we would have no place to learn more about that phase of our Nation’s history on a first-hand basis. The current issue of the Camp Chase Gazette really makes the point. In putting together a battlefield preservation project—these things do not just “happen”—we must remember that the goal is to attract and to expand the interest of people from all walks of life. Our membership reflects that very diversity, and many of us do understand the need for commitment to saving battlefields and historic sites.

It is a real challenge to put together an educational program that will focus the attention of all the people necessary to establish the reasons for saving a battlefield from development. The fact that a skirmish or battle took place on a site is often not reason enough to warrant protection. An educational program has to show who the men were who fought there, what their pasts were, and what the survivors did later in local or American history that was noteworthy. The decision to preserve a site ultimately comes back to the politicians representing the community, and there must be a variety of historical reasons for them to act on behalf of preservation. It is up to us to provide those reasons.

The city, county, state, or federal politicians, however, will follow the course of least resistance and will invariably choose putting in a new superstore for sales and business tax purposes over preserving a piece of land for historical purposes…unless there is an organized resistance to it by the “educated” citizens. A “living history” community is capable of attracting tourists and providing a much broader tax base to all local businesses, instead of just one or two. In recent years, the preservation efforts in the Franklin, Tennessee area illustrates and proves the point.

To quote the Camp Chase Gazette, “Our best sword for the cause of historical preservation is going to be found in education.”

The Civil War Preservation Trust (CWPT) recently recapped the benefits of heritage tourism, reports The Civil War News. “Battlefields land, once preserved, attracts tourists. The tourists pay for services in the community, which means more local jobs, higher incomes for residents, and increases in local and state government income from taxes.” The CWPT survey found that the average visitor age is 50; 54% have college or post-graduate degrees; average household income is $68,000; and they spend $52 per person per day during their visit. In addition, they average three nights in paid hotel accommodations.

A sampling of annual tourist spending was reported: $20 million at Fredericksburg, $120 million at Gettysburg, $13 million at Shiloh, $1.7 million at New Market, $350,000 at Port Hudson, $220,000 at Corinth, and $185,000 at Mill Springs.

Fort Fisher, a 1998 CWRT Tour site, is the “most visited state historic site in North Carolina,” and it had more than 700,000 visitors last year. Much of the treasured battlefield, however, has been lost to coastal erosion and man-made encroachment. The new “battle” is to save and preserve the site—but they simply do not have enough money to operate and maintain the facility. Membership in the Friends of Fort Fisher would help, which is $25 for individuals, or $40 for families. Log onto www.friendsoffortfisher.com…or call 910-458-5538 for more information.

John Latschar, Superintendent at Gettysburg National Military Park, reports that the car dealership will be gone in August of 2005. This is in agreement with the negotiated purchase of the 6.4 acres, which gave the Ford dealership until that time to relocate the business. “By summer 2006, our visitors will be able to visit the battlefield of the first day’s fighting and never even know there was once a car dealership there.” As we know from our 2003 CWRT Tour, the change will be much appreciated.

President Bush signed a bill allowing for Fort Donelson expansion, adding Fort Heiman on the Tennessee River in Western Kentucky. The Park’s boundary goes from 600 to 2000 acres. The bulk of the privately owned lots were purchased with money raised by Calloway County, Kentucky, where Fort Heiman is located. The total of 263 acres will be donated to the National Park Service. Fort Heiman and Fort Henry (both on the Tennessee River west of Donelson) were captured by Union General Grant in February of 1862. As you remember from our CWRT Tour in 2000, Fort Henry is now submerged—maybe they could build a bridge so that Ed Bearss won’t have to don swim-fins and goggles to visit the site.

Currently, our own CWRT battlefield preservation project is Newtonia, Missouri. The drawing was held at the December meeting for the Rocco print donated by Ruth Kliger. Bob Miller was the winner, but he returned the print for a “re-drawing,” to raise additional funds… thanks, Bob! Tickets for the new drawing will again be a donation of $10 for one and $20 for three, and they will be available at the January meeting. It is a great print and it is a very worthy cause.
On December 10th, Dr. David Zarefsky gave an insightful and fascinating address entitled “Lincoln, Douglas and Slavery” in the Crucible of Public Debate” before 95 members and guests at the 636th regular meeting of The Civil War Round Table of Chicago. A Professor of Communication Studies at Northwestern University, Zarefsky has authored five books, including one from 1991 that has the same title as his speech. His presentation dealt with the distortions and misconceptions most Americans have about the famous 1858 debates between Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas.

These seven debates, asserted Zarefsky, were more about conspiracy allegations, subplots, and analogies to the Founding Fathers rather than an incisive clash of ideas and ideologies. Zarefsky focused on the issues and attitudes of a politically turbulent 1858 Illinois electorate. Many Americans think that the Lincoln-Douglas debates were a superior model for present times, a prototype for presidential debates that have occurred every four years since the 1960 Kennedy-Nixon debates. According to Zarefsky, these positive perceptions of the Lincoln-Douglas debates stem from the fact that very few Americans have ever read the text of the debates, and even fewer Americans realize the substance and style of the debates.

In 1858 Lincoln and Douglas, Lincoln running for Douglas’s U. S. Senate seat, debated in seven cities. Douglas set the time and place for the debates, while Lincoln determined the format. At each city the first speaker would speak for 60 minutes, his opponent would have 90 minutes for a rejoinder, followed by a 30 minute retort by the first speaker. Unlike present-day debates, the format allowed the candidates time to develop their ideas. Zarefsky estimated that, of the 21 total hours of speechmaking, only one or two hours concerned the issue of the morality of slavery, the issue with which the debates are most usually associated.

“Perhaps the most important thing to remember about the debates is that party allegiances were in flux”, stated Zarefsky. Douglas, the incumbent Democrat, strongly desired vindication of his concept of popular sovereignty, which allowed each territory to decide by majority vote whether to allow slavery or not. Opposition to the spread of slavery into the territories held the newly-formed Republican Party together--and eventually led to the prominence of Abraham Lincoln. Southern Illinois, largely Democrat and settled largely by people from the border states, favored Douglas, while northern Illinois favored Lincoln. The electoral fight was for former Whigs in central Illinois. These ex-Whigs, who were against slavery in the abstract but who also detested abolition as too extreme, held the key to the election, and both Lincoln and Douglas fashioned their appeals to these voters.

“Candidate who determined the issues and set the agenda would probably win the election,” explained Zarefsky. “Lincoln wanted to focus on slavery; Douglas wanted to focus on race. Each labeled the other as an extremist.” According to Lincoln, Douglas had a moral indifference towards slavery, and Douglas’s election would ensure slavery into perpetuity. Douglas accused Lincoln of being a closet abolitionist and a proponent of eventual “perfect” equality--code words for interracial marriage. Zarefsky observed, “Neither man ever espoused the extreme positions of their opponent’s rhetoric.”

Zarefsky gave several examples illustrating his theme that the function of the 1858 debates was to serve the strategic and electoral interests of the debaters, and not to make lofty philosophical pronouncements. For example, in an attempt to label Lincoln an extremist, Douglas tied Lincoln to the 1854 platform of the Republican Party of Illinois, a platform that endorsed abolition. Douglas also claimed that Lincoln changed his views on race depending on which section of the state he was speaking in. According to Zarefsky, Lincoln largely succeeded in blunting this attack. “At Freeport Lincoln stood pledged to the 1854 platform but personally disagreed with portions of it. An amazing aspect of the debates was the little evidence that these two lawyer used [to justify these charges] and how artfully they used this small amount of evidence!”

In 1857 the Supreme Court issued the Dred Scott decision, which in part stated that a slave owner could legally take his property (slaves) into any territory. At Ottawa Lincoln charged that Douglas was a major player in a plot to spread slavery over the entire country with a second Dred Scott decision. Lincoln claimed that this possible decision would expand slavery into every state. At first, Douglas ignored the charge as ludicrous. Douglas finally replied that he did not care if slavery was voted up or down; he was amoral on the question of slavery. Trying to appeal to anti-slavery ex-Whigs, Lincoln accused Douglas of being indifferent to slavery. Lincoln suggested that Douglas’s attitude would spread and allow the Supreme Court to rule in favor of the extension of slavery into the free states.

According to Douglas, the Founding Fathers, in the U. S. Constitution, wanted states to be perfectly free to deal with slavery as they wished. Douglas accused Lincoln of opposing the wishes of the Founding Fathers. To Douglas, Lincoln’s positions smacked of abolitionism, and implied that Negroes were the equal of Whites. Lincoln responded with a denial that he was for “perfect” racial equality but argued that the Negro should have equality in job opportunity and land ownership. Lincoln blunted the Founding Fathers argument by noting that, with the prohibition of slavery in the Northwest Territory, the Founding Fathers themselves anticipated the limitation and eventual extinction of slavery. In effect, Lincoln tied to fend off Douglas’s charges by creating, and occupying, a middle ground between racial prejudice and racial equality.

Zarefsky concluded, “These two giants of Illinois politics--Lincoln and Douglas--were masterful strategists and tacticians of public arguments, skillfully using flimsy evidence.” The immediate election result was a victory for Douglas--he won reelection to the Senate. However, the tall, gangly, homespun Lincoln received favorable publicity which led, two years later, to his election as president and his ultimate greatness.

**T-Shirt Color Choice**

The 2005 battlefield tour will offer members the chance to order logo t-shirts. On some copies of the tour form that was mailed out last month, the line giving the choice of t-shirt color was omitted. The choices of color are USA blue or CSA gray. When ordering your t-shirt, make sure to specify which color you prefer.
On Nov. 16th CWRT ex-president Brooks Davis led 38 students of his Civil War class on a tour of Chicago’s Civil War historical sites. Brooks teaches at Northwestern University’s Institute of Learning and Retirement, at the downtown campus.

Pat Brennan has an article on “The Battle of Franklin” in the current issue of North & South magazine. Pat is an associate editor of N&S and this is his eleventh article to appear in that magazine.

CWRT ex-president Brooks Davis will be leading a one-day tour of the new Abraham Lincoln Museum and Library in Springfield. A bus will pick up people in Chicago and take them down. The tour will cost $30 and take place March 15th. For further information, contact Brooks Davis at 312 944-5082.

CWRT ex-president Charlie Falkenberg’s grand-daughter has died after a long illness. Colleen was only 17 years old. Charlie asked that this information be made public to the members of the Round Table.

Marshall Krolick, past president and Nevins-Freeman Award winner, will be giving a talk before the Palm Beach County (FL) CWRT Feb. 9th on the fighting at East Cavalry Field, Gettysburg.

Know of any upcoming talks, events, or publications? All members are welcome to contribute items to the newsletter. Contact the editor at bsallardice1@aol.com or (847) 375-8305.