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Northern and Southern Intentionality in the Civil War:
Using Graphic Representations to Help Students Visualize the Past

by

Allison Tavino
Introduction

Few topics in American history are as thought-provoking as the Civil War. As a seventh grade teacher, the Civil War is my favorite unit of the year because it serves as a culmination of all of the year’s learning. I often tell my students that our study of the Civil War really begins in September because everything that we learn is a build up to the Civil War. It is such an immensely important time in our nation’s history because of the social, political, and economic implications that still impact us today. The challenge for me is always to decide how to take such a complex, multi-dimensional topic and make it accessible for my students.

With this challenge in mind, I set out to answer an impossibly general question for the first part of my thesis: Why did the South lose the Civil War? It quickly became clear that I would need to categorize each historian’s interpretation under four major categories. This categorization led me to what would be the focus for my own original research: Desertion in the Confederate army and the impact of war on families. Once I examined diary entries, letters home, newspaper articles, and Confederate publications, I reached the conclusion that the ideals that I previously perceived, and taught, as an advantage to the Confederacy were, in reality, a cause of the South’s downfall during the war. As the conflict progressed, the harsh reality of war caused many men to lose hope and Confederate Nationalism and devotion to a common cause disintegrated (if it ever existed at all). I concluded that the ideals that were supposed to rally the Southerners to victory were actually the ideals that pressured soldiers to desert and contributed to a willingness on the part of family, friends, and community members to aid them.
This conclusion served as a launching point for developing a teaching tool to help my students best understand the intentions of Americans living during the Civil War era. My original research provided me with a sound understanding of the intentionality of the men who deserted in the Confederate forces. I wanted my teaching application to help my students to develop a sound understanding of the intentions of Abraham Lincoln and the Union forces. I determined that the best avenue for them to develop this understanding would be to conduct an in depth research of the Union war goals as stated in Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address.

I want my students to have a chance to communicate their thinking and understanding through multiple venues which is why I would like to utilize the nonlinguistic approach. Inspired by a beautiful picture book by Sam Fink called The Declaration of Independence: The Words That Made America, my teaching application is for students to create a similar book with the text of the Gettysburg Address. In small groups, students will be assigned a small portion of text – one to two lines of the speech. Students will use research materials to help them more deeply understand their particular statement and will create a pictorial representation to accompany that statement. All compiled, we will create a book which will serve as a powerful final product when students to see how their individual work fit into a larger effort. The impact that I hope to achieve is for students who struggle with written expression to be able to have multiple venues through which to showcase their understanding and increase their confidence.
Part I: Historiographical Analysis: Why the South Lost the Civil War

In the classic film *Gone with the Wind*, the crude “Yankee” Rhett Butler debates with Southern gentlemen about the chances of Southern victory during the Civil War. The Southerners drink their brandy and proclaim that they will lick the Yankees because “gentlemen always fight better than rabble”. Butler is quick to reply, and quick to offend claiming that the Southern victory is unlikely given the fact that “there’s not a single cannon factory in the whole South... all you have are slaves, and cotton, and arrogance.”¹ Though the movie is riddled with historical inaccuracies and the scene presents an oversimplified view of the Southern defeat, the point of discussion between these characters is not far off from what historians argue when they venture to explain the reason for the Southern defeat in the Civil War. Questions that arise in the debate over why the South lost the Civil War include: Was the Southern defeat inevitable given the North’s statistical advantages? Did the North win the Civil War by numbers alone? Was the Southern defeat, or Northern victory inevitable? Could the South have won under other circumstances? And if so, to what can the Southern defeat be attributed?

Middle school and high school history textbooks, social studies exams, or review books take a similar one-dimensional approach as the one taken by Rhett Butler’s character in *Gone with the Wind*. These sources almost always contain charts that show the war as a war of numbers, including categories such as “farmland, miles of railroad track, value of manufactured goods, number of factories, and

¹ *Gone With the Wind*, 1939
population.” Questions that textbook publishers consider “interpretive” include “Which side had the advantage in all the resources shown?” and “How might these advantages have helped that side during the war?” or “based on this chart, who would you expect to win the war?” In addition to making the war a war of numbers, textbooks also create one dimensional characters in order to provide contrast between leaders. The American Nation (Prentice Hall) says, “Davis wasted time arguing with his advisers” while “Lincoln proved to be a patient but strong leader and a fine war planner.”

Though it is tempting to accept these neat versions of history, advancing this flawed type of history could do much more damage than good. Any teacher of the Civil War would be remiss if she merely read the Social Studies textbook or curriculum guide and failed to consider what historians say about the nature of the conflict and the reasons behind the ultimate outcome of the war. An in-depth study of the Civil War reveals that the answer to the question: Why did the South lose the Civil War? is not that simple. In fact, the historiography inspires more questions than it does answers. Since engagement with the text through questioning is what teachers want from their students, a historiographical examination of the outcome of the Civil War is a valuable exercise for teachers to help recognize their own misconceptions and to determine how to teach this period of history to young students.

---

2 The American Nation (New York: Prentice Hall, 19 ), 454.
3 American Nation, 454.
4 American Nation, 455.
In his foreword to the book *Why the North Won the Civil War*, David Herbert Donald acknowledges, “how wary writers must be of oversimplification.”5 The reasons for the Southern defeat in the Civil War are much more multidimensional than the explanation typically presented by popular culture or textbooks accounts that do not acknowledge the complexity of the reasons behind Northern Victory, and Southern defeat. Historians offer a wide variety of explanations for the outcome of the Civil War. It is the reader’s job to make sense of these complementary, and sometimes competing, versions together to create a multidimensional explanation of the outcome of the Civil War. That is the task that I intend to present in the following pages. The best way to organize this vast amount of information is to group historical arguments about the Southern defeat into two overarching categories: those that argue that the Southern defeat was inevitable, and those that support a contingency thesis that explores possibilities for Southern victory. The former category includes a variety of factors.

In my research, I have determined four major factors that historians consider to support the inevitability argument: 1. The Union’s superior logistical management of the war and, by contrast, the Confederacy’s inability to manage its resources during the war. 2. Southern internal conflict within Confederate leadership and the ranks and the administrations of North and South. 3. Desertion and the economic toll of war on families and 4. The military tactics and combat leadership of the North and the South and the North’s ability to employ new tactics to best adapt in the context of “modern war”.

---

First is the logistical management of the war. Everything from the management of resources, to the utilization of technology and transportation systems falls under this category. Historians such as John E. Clark (Railroads in the Civil War: The Impact of Management on Victory and Defeat), George Edgar Turner (Victory Rode the Rails), believe that Union commanders’ and Lincoln’s proper management of their resources and technologies, and their willingness to embrace modern strategies during America’s first modern war illuminated the North’s obvious statistical advantages in industrial production and railroad mileage.

Frank E. Vandiver author of Rebel Brass: The Confederate Command System wrote that “mass war meant mass logistics.”6 Logistics is the topic of John E. Clark’s book Railroads in the Civil War: The Impact of Management on Victory and Defeat. Clark opens his book with two definitions of logistics. A dictionary definition: “the procurement, distribution, maintenance, and replacement of material and personnel”; and a soldier’s definition: “Beans, bullets, and bodies.”7 The latter definition is consistent with some scholars’ understanding of the Civil War as a war of numbers. The Union’s victory seems inevitable given its statistical advantages in population, miles of railroad track, industrial workers, factories, and agricultural production. The soldiers’ slang definition was blunt, but accurate. Though much of his argument is not new, Clark’s approach brings new insight into this inevitability argument by examining two specific rail movements of Northern and Southern troops in the fall of

---

7 John E. Clark, Railroads in the Civil War: The Impact of Management on Victory and Defeat (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001), 1.
1863. This micro approach helps to support his overarching thesis that the Union's proper management of resources helped the Union win a war that it could have lost.

Clark places a special emphasis on logistics because of the Civil War's characterization as the first modern war in American history. He argues that Union management of railway lines was a critical element of northern victory because as the nature of combat changed and Union and Confederate soldiers battled in sparsely populated areas of the South both sides of the conflict had to rely on transportation systems to move troops, food and supplies that in previous wars had been obtained by fighting in more populated areas. Clark uses his case study to show that the North was able to transform a numerical advantage into a tangible one through the proper management of railways whereas the South's inability to utilize their resources led to defeat. As Clark explains, these two rail movements, "provide a unique opportunity to compare and contrast the quality of war management exercised by Union and Confederate leaders" to prove his argument that "superior organization and management, as demonstrated by its skillful use of railroads, made a genuine contribution to the Union victory." and that "the confederacy's leaders, in contrast, proved unable to recognize or adapt to the demands of an increasingly logistics-driven conflict." The two case studies of the Longstreet and the 11th and 12th Corps movements prove that the Union's
management of rail systems contrasted sharply with what Clark refers to as “Jefferson Davis’s administrations wretched war management” that led to Southern defeat.\textsuperscript{10}

Clark adds that “By studying the contributions of railroads to the Union and Confederacy war efforts, one gains insights into the elements of victory and defeat, an understanding of why the Union won a war that it could have lost, and why the Confederacy lost a war that it might have won.”\textsuperscript{11} This quote illuminates one of the central considerations of studying the Civil War: how the North managed to win, and how the South managed to lose. But most interestingly, it also implies that the Union victory was not inevitable; that apparent advantages could only lead to Northern victory if Northern leaders were organized and properly managed their potential advantages to turn them into real victories.

This is consistent with Bruce Catton’s description in Glory Road of the Union as an “industrialized nation waging industrial warfare.”\textsuperscript{12} Emory Thomas’s assertion in the Confederacy as a Revolutionary Experience (1991) that the Civil war began as a Confederate revolution but that the Confederacy “did not use revolutionary means to fight it, while the Union revolutionized the art of war.”\textsuperscript{13}

Russell F. Weigley in his biography of M.C Meigs asserts that it was not the North’s sheer numerical advantages alone that led to their victory; it was the management of their resources and their willingness to embrace modern technologies in the nation’s first modern war. He claims, “the Union’s allegedly vast war making capacities existed only as a potential advantage at the start of the war. The successful

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{10} Clark, 21.
\textsuperscript{11} Clark, 25.
\textsuperscript{12} Bruce Catton, Glory Road (New York: Anchor Books, 1990), 29.
\textsuperscript{13} Emory Thomas, Confederacy as a Revolutionary Experience (14.}
marshalling of its assets converted that potential into a genuine advantage, as the North's use of its railroads demonstrate."

Other historians argue that while the Union was implementing modern techniques to capitalize on their numerical advantages, the Confederacy failed to manage their resources effectively. Historians Paul W. Gates (Agriculture and the Civil War) and Charles W. Ramsdell (Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy) argue that the South's mismanagement of resources, particularly declining agricultural production, was a major reason for the Southern defeat. Norman A. Graebner in his article "Northern Diplomacy and European Neutrality" argues that the Confederacy's mismanagement of cotton resources led to the South's downfall.

During the era of Westward expansion, Southern political elites proclaimed that, "Cotton Is King!" Southern pamphlets, books, and personal diary entries expressed arrogant confidence about the power of cotton as a diplomatic weapon. To be certain, England did depend heavily on Southern cotton. English sources in the 1850s warned of overdependence on America proclaiming the, "dangers of our continued reliance upon the United States for so large a proportion of our cotton." England had reason for concern. Of the total population of 21,000,000 in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales in the 1850s, 4,000,000 people were directly dependent on the cotton industry.

When Southern planters read these warnings in British publications they became even more confident in cotton's power as a diplomatic weapon. This

---

14 Russell F. Weigley Quartermaster General of the Union Army: A Biography of M.C. Meigs (1959), 162.
15 Owsley, p. 4
16 Owsley, 8.
confidence easily turned to arrogance as Southern politicians published material designed to influence public opinion on the eve of secession. Senator Henry Hammond, infamous for writing the *Mudsill Theory* to justify slavery, proclaimed

“What would happen if no cotton were furnished for three years? England would topple headlong and carry the whole civilized world with her, save the South. No, you dare not make war on cotton. No power on earth dares to make war upon it. Cotton is King!”

One Southern planter told *London Times* reporter William Howard Russell,

“Why sir we have only to shut off your supply of cotton for a few weeks an we can create a revolution in Great Britain. There are four millions of your people depending on us for their bread, not to speak of the many millions of dollars. No sir, we know that England must recognize us.”

As Frank Lawrence Owsley explains, “by 1860, the belief in the power of cotton to force European intervention was almost universal.”

Southern local and state governments demonstrated their confidence in King Cotton when they issued cotton embargos and urged planters to “send none of their cotton to market until the blockade is expressly removed from all ports of the Confederate States.” But by the Spring of 1862, the cotton embargo was slowly relaxed until it completely ceased. Southerners had begun to lose confidence in the

---

18 Owsley, 20.
19 Owsley, 23.
20 Owsley, 29.
power of cotton. But an even more pressing reason why embargoes ended was the South’s absolute and immediate necessity for obtaining supplies from abroad; and by the Spring of 1862, cotton was the only medium of exchange left in the South which was acceptable overseas. The South was running out of supplies and theory and confidence were no match for the Union’s material advantages and proper management of its resources. Thus, the Confederacy failed to turn an ideological theory into a tangible advantage and “King Cotton” failed as a diplomatic weapon.

Many historians point to the South’s defeat at Antietam, and Lincoln’s issuing of the *Emancipation Proclamation* as the final blow that eliminated all hope of European intervention on behalf of the South. James McPherson believes that had the South won the Battle of Antietam, the outcome of the war may have been different. In *Battle Cry of Freedom*, he suggests that historians ought to avoid generalizations about the North and South that support the argument that the South’s defeat was inevitable. McPherson’s thesis is that “Most attempts to explain southern defeat or northern victory lack the dimension of contingency – the recognition that at numerous critical points during the war things might have gone altogether differently.”

McPherson cites four major turning points to support his contingency thesis claiming that if the outcome of any of those events had been different, the South could very well have won the war.

The first of these four events is the Battle of Antietam. McPherson encourages his audience to entertain the argument that had the South won the Battle of Antietam, the outcome of the war may have been different. European powers might have

---

21 McPherson, 857.
recognized the Confederacy, the Democrats might have won in the northern election, Lincoln may not have issued the Emancipation Proclamation as early and that might have given the South enough time to win more key battles. McPherson views the unwillingness of European nations to intervene in the American Civil War, and the Republican victory in the northern election of 1862 as direct consequences of the Battle of Antietam in order to support his contingency thesis. His argument is not convincing. Even if the South had won at Antietam, it was highly unlikely that the European powers would have recognized the Confederacy because it was not in their best interest to do so.

Norman A. Graebner presents a convincing argument that discredits McPherson’s contention that the European nations may have lent their support to the Confederacy. He points out that European powers would have been unlikely to enter into the conflict because of their own domestic issues, the smart decisions of Abraham Lincoln, and the South’s mismanagement of their cotton resources.

First, Lincoln was quick to maintain that the war was a war of rebellion. As Graebner explains, “There is here as there always has been one political power, namely the United States of America, competent to make war and peace and conduct commerce and alliances with all foreign nations. What existed, Lincoln explained, was an “armed sedition seeking to overthrow the government”22. This struck a chord with European powers, struggling with their own desire to maintain monarchy in the nineteenth century. These nations could not possibly have recognized the South

---

because that would have indirectly legitimized the rebellion within their own borders. Napoleon was particularly concerned with the possibility of rebellion. The French leader made it clear that he was willing to join the war only if England did so as well. But domestic situations in France made Napoleon weary of entry on the side of the Confederacy. French people disagreed with the South’s practice of slavery and would be pleased to see the United States grow in power that rivaled that of England.

Therefore, France’s involvement was contingent on England’s involvement. Graebner explains that English intervention was unlikely because “Britain enjoyed too much lucrative trade with the North, requiring especially high quantities of Northern grain, and because the textile workers most affected by the cotton famine remained staunch friends of the Union.”23 What Graebner means is that even when local and state governments in the South passed embargoes to create a cotton famine in England and France, ordinary citizens in those nations continued to support the North because of their belief in America’s status as a the great democratic experiment and because of their disapproval of slavery.

The threat of “King Cotton” could not overpower popular sentiment that the United States was a model of democracy that needed to be upheld. Moreover, slavery was considered an evil institution. England, a nation that had abolished slavery in 1803, could not possibly support a Confederacy that fought to maintain the institution, especially after Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation explicitly made the war a fight to end slavery as well as to preserve the Union. Ultimately, sources that

---

23 Graebner in Donald, 68.
examine wartime logistics share in their consensus that the North out-managed the South.

Logistical management is ultimately a reflection of the effectiveness of a nation’s political administration. In this category, historians such as Margaret M. Storey (Georgia Lee Tatum *Disloyalty in the Confederacy*), Robert E. Beringer *Why the South Lost the Civil War*, and David Williams’ *Bitterly Divided: The South’s Inner Civil War*, point to divisions within the Confederacy at a leadership level as well as a lack of will on the part of soldiers to explain the Confederacy’s defeat.

Historians cite Southern desertion and correspondence between soldiers and their families as proof that the Southern rebels were not dedicated to the cause or could not justify fighting given the practical considerations and problems their wives faced on the home-front. Letters from home indicate that the economic burdens on families were too great for men to justify long tours of service.

Historians who offer the interpretation that internal conflict led to the Confederate defeat claim that Confederate leaders and confederate ideals that grew out of the South’s traditional views of states’ rights and political autonomy did more to create disunity than a shared purpose among Confederate leaders and soldiers. These authors claim that the same political views that united Southerners in the cause of secession created conditions that led to high levels of desertion and a lack of unity among Southern forces.

One historian who presents this argument is David Donald. In his article *Died of Democracy*, Donald presents a clear picture of the Confederate soldier’s
expectations of government during the Civil War in order to explain that the Southern defeat at Antietam and in the war at large was because of Southern views of political freedom which led to alarming rates of desertion. Donald explains the autonomy to which Southern Soldiers felt entitled. He writes,

"the Southern soldiers who volunteered at the outbreak of the war considered it their right to determine for themselves the length of their service. After a victorious battle in the early days of the war 'many would coolly walk off home, under the impression that they had performed their share.'"  

Donald makes a convincing argument that the Southern soldier’s lack of discipline was fostered by the Confederacy’s lenient policies that protected the rights of free men. He explains, "The Southern soldier reserved his democratic right to interpret his orders broadly." Furthermore, "soldiers simply disobeyed order that they deemed unreasonable."  

Donald’s explanation of desertion challenges the notion that one major Southern advantage at the start of the Civil War was fighting on their home field and their dedication to their cause. When Jefferson Davis passed a draft law in 1862, Donald explains, "Southern soldiers expressed their resentment by deserting in droves."  

Robert E. Lee’s, in his correspondence with Jefferson Davis wrote, “our great embarrassment is the reduction of our ranks by straggling, which it seems impossible to prevent . . . Our ranks are very much diminished – I fear from a third to

---

24 Donald, 81.
25 Donald, 83.
26 Donald, 85
one half of our original numbers.” Lenient confederate policies created many problems. The Confederacy’s tolerance of democracy made it easy for Southerners to criticize their government in speech and in press. Dissent was common even among Davis’s key advisors. Robert Toombs, the Confederacy’s first Secretary of State, declared “Davis’s incapacity is lamentable.” Vice President Alexander H. Stephens proclaimed that Davis was “weak and vacillating, timid, petulant, peevish, obstinate, but not firm.” Thus, Men of influence made their voices heard through speech and press.

Common soldiers, on the other hand, had a different, but equally powerful weapon: their feet. Desertion became a clear sign of disunity in the Confederate ranks. David Williams, author of Bitterly Divided: the South’s Inner Civil War uses women’s letters to their husbands as evidence to show the factors that motivated men to desert. In letters, women explained the hardships they faced and some went as far as to insist that their husbands return home. Williams explains that one woman wrote to her husband communicating the life or death circumstances that she and her children faced: “My dear, if you put off a’ coming, ‘twont be any use to come, for we’ll all hands of us be out there in the garden in the old grave yard with your ma and mine.”

In addition to pressure from their families, soldiers were criticized by Confederate newspapers that appealed to Southern ideals about manhood and courage. An article in the August 25, 1853 edition of The Spectator entitled “Our

27 Donald, 85
28 Donald, 86.
"Strength" read, “If we lose our liberties it will not be because God has withheld from us the means and the strength to defend them; but because we will have thrown them away through cowardice or meanness of soul.”  

Despite such press, an individual soldier’s identity as a Southerner was not always enough to guarantee support for the confederacy, especially when his family and home needed his attention. Deserters found support from family and friends who valued their commitment to family more than their commitment to a cause that they believed only benefitted the planter class at the expense of the ordinary citizenry. David Williams explains that “deserters who made it home found plenty of neighbors willing to help them avoid further entanglements with the Confederacy.”

Any apparent advantage of fighting a home field battle was diminished because fighting so close to home, combined with lenient Confederate policies and Southern ideals that promoted individual rights, made desertion appealing, feasible, and widespread. Williams’ book shows that not all soldiers exercised unwavering support for the Southern cause.

In *Battle Cry of Freedom*, McPherson includes brief descriptions of desertion. One Southern man that McPherson quotes had overextended his furlough. He wrote to the governor on December 1, 1861, “Poor men have been compelled to leave the army to come home to provide for their families... We are poor men and are willing to defend our country but our families [come] first.”

This quotation is significant on a number of levels. First, the date is of particular interest. For a man to

---

30 August County, Virginia, Our Strength: Valley of the Shadow: Two Communities in the American Civil War, Virginia Center for Digital History, University of Virginia (http://www.iath.virginia.edu/vshadow2/Browser2/aubrowser/ssaug63.htmL#8.11e.)
31 Williams, 109.
be writing this so early in the war proves that the level of desertion could only increase as time passed and families grew more and more impoverished. Secondly, it shows that despite a commitment to the cause of Southern independence, practical concerns outweighed ideological ones for Southern heads of family.

Richard E. Beringer, co-author of *Why the South Lost the Civil War* describes the class tensions that contributed to desertion stating that “a selfish and short-sighted ruling class had led its region into secession and then proven unwilling to make sacrifices or to surrender its privileges for independence.” He adds that, “These class differences in the demands of the war effort created another drain on the limited supply of Confederate nationalism.” Thus, poor soldiers deserted in large numbers. Ultimately, Beringer argues that “the Confederacy succumbed to internal rather than external causes. An insufficient nationalism failed to survive the strains imposed by the lengthy hostilities.” Sources that claim that Southern disunity led to the Confederate defeat argue that perceived Southern advantages, (fighting for a common cause and fighting on their homefield) were, in reality, no advantage at all. Beringer acknowledges that “It confuses the historian who desires to know why southerners lost the Civil War to realize that many Confederates harbored conflicting notions of why they fought.” To be fair, desertion was a major problem in the Union army as well and support for the war was far from universal. The Conscription Act of 1863 and the New York City Draft riots are full proof of many Northerners’ indifference or

34 Beringer et. al., 439.
35 Beringer, 437.
all out objection to fighting in the Civil War. But the North had enough advantages to compensate for a lack of unity. The South did not have that luxury.

Though there are so many avenues from which to analyze the reason for the Southern defeat in the Civil War, one would be remiss to ignore Cyril Falls’s assessment that “it is remarkable how many people exert themselves and go through contortions to prove that battles and wars are won by any means except that by which they are most commonly won, which is by fighting.” Falls’s quote reminds us that military tactics cannot be ignored as a major factor that propelled the Union to victory.

Historians call the Civil War the first “modern war”. Many attribute the Northern victory to its ability to adapt its strategy and military tactics to fit the conditions of the time. T. Harry Williams reminds his reader that at the start of the war, both the North and South failed to adapt amidst an era of modern technology. The vast majority of generals during the Civil War were West Point graduates. All were well versed in Jominian tactics. Jomini emphasized the importance of building up a concentrated force that maneuvered as one for the purposes of overwhelming the enemy. Jomini made no connection between war and national life and political objectives. Instead, war was an isolated event that was waged on the battlefield and only on the battlefield. In Attack and Die: Civil War Military Tactics and the Southern Heritage, Grady McWhiney and Perry D. Jamieson explain that traditional tactics were no longer practical and that they affected the Confederacy’s ability to win battles.

---

36 Williams in [Donald et. al.], 39.
37 Williams, 46.
Operating under Jominian principles early in the war, Union General McClellan was slow to move. Wanting to amass as many men as possible, he often defied Lincoln’s instructions to move or go on the offensive. Fortunately for the Lincoln, by the wars end, he had found the generals who would adopt new strategies in order to win a war that was waged in a new age. Williams explains that the South was not modern minded and that “Lincoln’s first generals did not understand that war and statecraft were parts of the same piece. But none of the Confederate generals, first or last, ever grasped this fact about modern war.”\textsuperscript{38} The North’s willingness to adopt new strategy and the outstanding leadership of generals Grant and Sherman were definitive factors that led to Union victory.

In \textit{Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat in the American Civil War} Gerald F. Linderman explains how both sides, North and South, clung to traditional notions of courage but that Northern Generals, particularly Grant and Sherman, were much more willing than Southern Generals to abandon previous notions of courage in light of the changing technology of the war in favor of modern tactics such as Total War. Linderman explains that in 1861, Civil War soldiers on both sides of the conflict valued honor, duty, manliness, and godliness. At the center of all of these values was courage. At the start of the war, he argues, civil War soldiers looked at war as the ultimate arena in which to showcase their courage and honor. This is consistent with Williams’ description of Jominian logic. Battle was like a litmus test of courage. In battle, a man’s true nature manifested. A courageous man would hold firm in battle. A coward would run. A coward would die but a courageous man

\textsuperscript{38} Williams in [Donald et. al.], 53
would live because cowardice was a sin and courage, a moral virtue, was rewarded by God.

By 1864, it became clear that the Civil War would not be won through courage and divine providence. It was about numbers. Manpower, supplies, food provisions, what the soldiers cited in Clark's book described as "Beans, bullets, and bodies", those were the deciding factors of war, not courage, honor and moral conviction. Linderman argues that, though many men in the ranks had recognized that courage was not enough to win a war, Sherman and Grant were exceptional because they were the first to allow this mindset to influence their command strategy. Instead of relying on courage and divine providence, two idealistic bedrocks, Sherman and Grant built their strategy on something more solid, relying on tangible advantages, rather than idealistic ones.

Gary W. Gallagher takes a different approach. In *The Confederate War*, Gallagher challenges the notion that Southern defeat was inevitable. Gallagher's work is based on the wartime writings of Confederate soldiers, civilians, and newspaper editors. Gallagher is quick to criticize Shelby Foote for his romantic conclusions of the war and lumps him under the category of authors who "have worked backward from Appomattox to explain the failure." Gallagher seems to think that popular writers like Foote do more damage than good by romanticizing the war and making overarching statements like, "I think that the North fought that war with one hand behind its back" or "the North would have simply would have brought that other arm out from behind its back. I don't think the South ever had a chance to win that war."

---

This same quote appears in Ken Burns’ documentary history of the war which is perhaps the most widespread account that ordinary Americans have of the Civil War. He criticizes Foote for picking and choosing quotes that satisfy his thesis without looking at the larger context of the war.

One such quote is that of Mary Chesnut, another diarist who Ken Burns uses in numerous parts of his Civil War documentary. Gallagher calls Foote’s use of Chesnut, “a summary quotation to clinch his points. The quotation reads: “It’s like a Greek tragedy, where you know what the outcome is bound to be. . . . We’re living a Greek tragedy.”

Gallagher encourages readers to critically examine the type of romantic conclusions that writers like Shelby Foote have made about the Civil War.

Instead of considering the question “Why did the Confederacy fail?” Gallagher uses wartime testimonies from soldiers diaries, letters and newspapers to provide an explanation of why the Confederacy was able to hold on as long as it did. Gallagher contends that it was because Southerners firmly believed that they were fighting for a worthy cause. Gallagher quotes many soldiers in his book. One quotation that he uses to show the steadfast dedication of Southern soldiers reads, “I am in for the War let it be long or short if I never come home don’t think the time long for we have got to whip the Yanks or submit to them. . . . and I had rather be a Guard dog in Some Good mans yard than to be a rebel and Submit to the Yanks.”

Gallagher’s use of this quote, made by a soldier in early 1865 suggests a more determined war effort than those described by authors like Beringer and a less
hopeless assessment than Shelby Foote’s conclusion that the South never had a chance.

Moreover, in sharp contrast to Beringer’s description of women who insisted that their men come home, Gallagher quotes Lucy W. Otey who penned a letter in March 1864 describing the contributions of women to Lee’s army. Otey explained that, “they are raised through the energetic and persevering efforts of Southern Women who can never faint or tire, in animating and sustaining the brave Soldiery of this Confederacy, while struggling for our independence!” Gallagher disagrees with arguments forwarded by historians like David Williams Bitterly Divided: The South’s Inner Civil War and David J Eicher in Dixie Betrayed: How the South Really Lost the Civil War that the Confederacy failed because of its own internal conflict. Instead, Gallagher asserts, “Contrary to what much recent literature proclaims, defeat in the military sphere, rather than dissolution behind the lines, brought the collapse of the Confederacy.”

In his introduction, Gallagher is candid about the risks of writing a book that celebrates the Confederate’s robust devotion. He writes, “Any historian who argues that the Confederate people demonstrated robust devotion to their slave based republic, possessed feelings of national community, and sacrificed more than any other segment of white society in United States history runs the risk of being labeled a neo-Confederate.” Gallagher calls to mind an important consideration of which all students and writers of history should be mindful: the fact that ones own time and
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place colors ones perceptions and interpretations of history. Moreover, Gallagher impresses upon his reader the importance of critically examining modern historical writing.

With Gallagher’s approach in mind, I realize that this research has raised more questions than it has answered. The sources communicate a variety of explanations for the Southern defeat. To recap, logistics, leadership and administration, divisions within Confederate ranks illustrated by high levels of desertion, and military tactics and battlefield leadership are all factors that historians consider when tackling the broad question: Why did the South lose the Civil War. A multi-dimensional approach is important when determining the answer to this question. Looking forward, I will take a similar approach to Linderman’s and Gallagher’s by examining Civil War diaries and letters home to determine what ordinary soldier’s experienced and how their experiences ultimately shaped the outcome of the war. I am intrigued about this topic particularly because Linderman and Gallagher reached different conclusions and I wonder how my original research will influence my perspective of each author’s work. At the moment, I am inclined to agree with Linderman’s thesis.
Part II: Original Research: Courage, Honor, and Devotion to Family: The Values of a Deserter in the Confederate Army

The Civil War was unique for the American Southerner, because Confederate soldiers were motivated by the necessity to defend their wives, children, homes, and way of life. Traditional Southern values regarding family, local ties, courage, and manhood motivated men to enlist in the exciting days following the attack on Fort Sumter. But as the war progressed, idealistic pursuits gave way to practical concerns and desertion rates increased. This progression from sheer enthusiasm to demoralized disillusionment is evident in the wartime journals of private Thomas Gaither who in March 1861 cheerily wrote home reporting, “We have the joliest [sic] crowd that I ever saw.” Two weeks later in a letter to his brother his tone was more somber when he said, “Be satisfied at home as long as possible for this is know place for to come . . . Ever boddy [sic] is anxious for this war to close.” By April 3, 1863 he lamented, “Mother there is soldiers deserting every day & I hope they will continue to desert until this war is ended.”

In my teaching of the Civil War I have extended the argument that the South’s major advantage at the start of the war was its dedication to the cause due to traditional Southern cultural ideals about government, power, and community ties. This is the perspective that the textbooks present. The American Nation writes, “The

South had the key advantage of fighting a defensive war... Defending their homeland gave southerners a strong reason to fight." I was always weary of this simplistic view of the Confederate mindset and the start of the war, so I set out to answer an impossibly general question: Why did the South lose the Civil War?

My historiographical study of the topic necessitated a multi-dimensional approach that took into account the following explanations: 1. The Union’s superior logistical management of the war and, by contrast, the Confederacy’s inability to manage its resources during the war. 2. Southern internal conflict within Confederate leadership and the ranks and the administrations of North and South 3. Desertion and the economic toll of war on families and 4. The military tactics and combat leadership of the North and the South and the North’s ability to employ new tactics to best adapt in the context of “modern war”.

As I looked ahead to my own research, I decided to narrow my focus to the third factor that contributed to the Confederacy’s defeat: desertion and the impact of war on families. By examining diary entries, letters home, newspaper articles, and Confederate publications, I have reached the conclusion that the ideals that I previously perceived, and taught, as an advantage to the Confederacy were, in reality, a cause of the South’s downfall during the war.

After the initial excitement following the attack on Fort Sumter, the harsh reality of war caused many men to lose hope and Confederate Nationalism and devotion to a common cause disintegrated. Desertion became commonplace because

---

state governments and local kinship ties protected deserters. Lenient Confederate
government policies, combined with the attitudes that motivated men to enlist in the
first place (devotion to family and a determination to preserve their traditional way of
life) made desertion an attractive option. The ideals that were supposed to rally the
Southerners to victory were actually the ideals that pressured soldiers to desert and
contributed to a willingness on the part of family, friends, and community members
to aid them.

One can easily conclude that desertion was a large problem for the
Confederacy after reading the abundant references to desertion in Civil War era
newspapers. The Confederate media published countless articles that emphasized the
evils of “running” or “croaking”. Each of these articles appealed to Southerners’
notions of manhood, courage, and the rich Southern tradition of military prowess.
Writers described deserters as evil and deceitful. Moreover, they stressed the
importance of fighting in order to save wives, children, and the southern way of life.
Newspaper publications regarded desertion as the ultimate manifestation of
cowardice and played off of Confederate notions of manhood and dedication to a
cause in order to discourage desertion. The press appealed to Southern ideals in an
effort to sway public opinion by portraying deserters as evil, claiming that they were
cowards who betrayed their wives, children, and countrymen.

Among the most valued characteristics of true Southern gentlemen on the eve
of the Civil War was courage. “Courage at the Core” is the title of Gerald F.
Linderman’s notable work Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat in the
American Civil War. In his work, Linderman draws from first hand accounts written
by soldiers during the Civil War. He explains that numerous soldiers filled their journals, letters home, and memoirs "with the moral values they knew to be at issue in the conflict between North and South: manliness, godliness, duty, honor, and even . . . knightliness. At their center stood courage."\footnote{Gerald F. Linderman, *Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat in the American Civil War* (New York: The Free Press, 1987), 7.} Battle was a litmus test of courage. A courageous man who held the line; a coward would retreat. A courageous man would serve out his full term of service; a coward would desert. A Civil War era dictionary entry described courage as "a distinguishing trait in the character of good men."\footnote{Linderman, 11.} "Good men" would remain strong even amidst the most horrifying experiences.

The value that soldiers placed on courage is evident in their letters home. In June, 1861, William Clegg wrote home after the Confederate victory at Bethel Church, Virginia. Clegg describes the horrific scene saying, "I saw bones mangled in almost every imaginable way . . . Great pools of clotted blood could be found all over the field, proving the unerring aim of our gallant rebels."\footnote{Bonner, 82.} Amidst horrid images of war, soldiers clung to traditional notions of courage and heroism. The word gallantry usually conjures up images of knights defending their ladies fair, not mangled bones and clotted blood. But in the early days of fighting, men masked the horrors of war with descriptions of courageous acts in order to cope with the atrocities that they beheld. One can't be sure whether soldiers truly believed what they wrote when it came to acts of courage in battle of whether their tales of heroism were mostly for the
benefit of their readers who included mother’s, wives, and sisters whose minds they no doubt sought to ease. But regardless of whether they were trying to convince themselves, or their readers, or whether they truly believed in the notions of courage that they expressed on the page, courage remained a constant theme in Civil War letters home.

Despite initial optimism, as the war progressed it became all too clear that gallantry was the stuff of storybooks and that the horrors that these men witnessed were not at all romantic. As Jim Murphy explains, “Suddenly the war that had been a romantic dream was all around them like angry bees.”

50 Young men, some only in their teens, were confronted by the harsh reality of war. Elisha Stockwell after the battle of Shiloh wrote:

“The first dead man we saw was a short distance from the clearing. He was leaning back against a big tree as if asleep, but his intestines were all over his legs and several times their natural size. I didn’t look at him the second time as it made me deathly sick.”

51 Moreover, it became painfully clear that “courage” could not repel bullets, protect a man from disease, or ensure against one’s capture by the enemy. Amidst such horrors, men looked for ways to shirk their duty. As more men deserted, the Confederate media published newspaper articles that criticized desertion as a cowardly act that dishonored the rich tradition of Southern chivalry.

Editors often printed, and reprinted, speeches given by Jefferson Davis that stressed the need for manpower in order to secure victory. Articles stressed that
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desertion contributed to the Confederacy’s defeat on the most basic level of not having enough manpower. Newspaper editors and Confederate leaders argued that if all those who were supposed to be serving reported for duty then the Confederate manpower would equal that of the Union Army’s. “Our Strength,” was an article published in the August 25, 1863 edition of the Staunton Spectator, a newspaper distributed in Augusta county, Virginia. The story read:

“If we lost our liberties it will not be because God has withheld from us the means and the strength to defend them; but because we will have thrown them away through cowardice or meanness of soul.”

Failure would not be the result of a weakness of physical strength. Instead, it would be the result of a weakness of heart. The latter assertion was much more damaging to the psyches of men who grew up in a militarist culture that emphasized the importance of courage and chivalry.

The southern press made it clear that deserters were the most dangerous and vile culprits of a weakness of heart. Newspapers compared deserters to devoted soldiers and communicated the evils of desertion to the civilian population. In the August 11, 1863 issue of the Spectator, an order appeared under the heading ‘To the soldiers of the Confederate States” which stated that men who deserted were guilty of “grievous faults, and place the cause of our beloved country, and of everything we hold dear, in imminent peril.” Articles such as “Stragglers and Deserters” called the deserter “The vilest of malefactors!” “Soldiers vs. Deserters” reminded civilians that, “Those who feed them, harbor them, or who, knowing of them, do not promptly

inform the proper authority, partake of their crime, and stab their country.”53 Thus, newspapers appealed to southern patriotism by stressing to civilians that aiding and abetting a deserter would make one just as guilty of injustice to his or her country as the deserter himself.

When newspapers used such harsh language as “enemies”, “cowards”, and “beggars” to describe deserters it was not surprising that some in the general public demanded stricter enforcement of furlough orders and harsher punishment for desertion. In an editorial to the Spectator, one citizen wrote:

“I think it is the duty of all officers and men to be at their posts without any further delay, and it is the duty of those, who have it in charge, to arrest every deserter, and meter out to him such punishment as the military code provides.”54

Though this citizen echoed the newspaper’s sentiments about the crime of desertion, the fact that this person felt compelled to write this editorial provides further evidence that desertion was a major problem in the Confederate forces that had not been adequately addressed by the Confederate government.

In addition to appealing to a man’s sense of duty and branding deserters as cowards, another tactic that newspaper editors used to discourage desertion was appealing to southern soldiers’ sense of duty towards home and family. Newspapers portrayed women on the home front as patriots who supported soldiers by sending food and making uniforms. “The Patriotic Ladies”, appeared in the April 1862 edition of the Staunton Spectator. The article praised the efforts of southern women and argued that, given the women’s dedication and Christian piety, it was crucial that
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any able bodied men protect them from, “being polluted with the unhallowed tramp of vassal invaders.” It was a man’s duty to protect his family from the aggressive Yankees and any man who deserted was ridiculed for hindering the cause of the Confederacy and likely to be branded a coward for life.

Union publications used similar tactics. While the Southern gentlemen protected their wives and children from Yankee aggressors, the Union soldier fought for wives and the Republic. Many Thomas Nast images that appeared in *Harper’s Weekly* illustrated the quintessential Republican mother. One such image, figure 1, portrays a wife and mother at Christmas praying for the success of the Union. Her husband, who represents courage, integrity and honor, does not shirk his duty. Instead, he spends Christmas in camp, no doubt thinking fondly of the wife, children, and country for which he fought.

Figure 1

55 *Staunton Spectator* (Augusta County, Virginia) April 1, 1862
Another example is the cartoon (figure 2) that was printed in the August 10, 1861 edition of *Harper’s Weekly*. It communicates the same message about devotion to the cause but does so in a much more comical tone.

![Figure 2](image)

**AN UNWELCOME RETURN.**

THREE MONTHS' VOLUNTEER. "What! don't you know me—your own husband?"

DAUGHTER OF COLUMBIA. "Get away! No husband of mine would be here while the country needs his help."

Cartoons and articles like the ones showcased here made it clear that no honorable husband would come home before his tour of duty had expired.

Many references to the link between desertion and a lack of manhood are found in the journal entries of Confederate women during the Civil War. Kate Cumming, who worked as a nurse during the war, recorded a conversation that she

---

had with a lieutenant about the lack of civilian morale. She told him, “a man did not
deserve the name of man, if he did not fight for his country.”

Some Confederate women’s group went as far as to reject men who were known to be deserters in what amounted to a kind of boycott of the cowardly. The Ladies of Mobile published a broadside of resolutions and pledged to socially cut off any men who were known deserters and described such undesirables as “marked – as of leprous soul – and
unworthy of the respect of woman, whom they have not the manhood to defend.”

In addition to calling into question a deserters manhood, newspapers, the
Confederate government and women’s societies also appealed to Southern patriotism as a means of recruiting soldiers and discouraging desertion. A letter from the War Department printed in the April 1, 1862 edition of *The Spectator* read, “We appeal to them in the name of all that they hold sacred – country, home, wives, friends, altars, and firesides - - hasten at once to the field.” Clearly, anyone who chose to desert would be betraying everything sacred to southern life. In the same letter, the War department appealed to a man’s sense of patriotism asking:

“Men of the South, will you be found wanting on such an occasion? Your former history proves that you will not. Wherever your duty calls you, there will you be . . . your country calls you and you will not fail her.”

Failure to serve was not an option. Use of historical analogies was a frequent tactic to boost morale. The success of the Thirteen Colonies in their war of independence

---
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against Great Britain was the favorite analogy of Confederate editors. Confederate publications made it clear that being a good southerner meant serving for the Confederacy because this was the way to pay tribute to the brave Southerners of the past and the wives and children of the present and to set the example for the future. This is evident by the use of language such as “your former history” and “your country calls.”

Thus, the Confederate Press, in an attempt to appeal to southern ideals about courage, manhood, and duty to one’s country made it clear that deserters were not to be trusted and were certainly not to be aided. But as the war progressed, desertion rates rose and more and more accounts written in newspapers attempted to affect public sentiment about desertion. Therefore, one must conclude that the Confederate press, the War Department, and even Jefferson Davis’ concentrated use of the press to degrade deserters and pressure men to enlist is a clear sign that dedication to the Confederate cause was lacking and that desertion was a widespread phenomenon.

This begs the questions, why? And how? One explanation is that deserters had support networks based on kinship and community ties. Diaries from the home front and articles published in newspapers reveal that friends and relatives harbored deserters. Desertion became commonplace because the attitudes that motivated men to fight in the first place were the same ones that pressured them to return home and flee in large numbers. By 1863, more and more soldiers were writing home expressing their concern for their farms, wives, children, and mothers. Daniel Snell of Harris County, Georgia wrote home to his wife Sarah:
"You spoke of a riot in Columbus . . . . it is no more than I expected. I understand there was also one in August . . . What will become of the women and children with the food situation?" 61

Other men's fears about their families had already been realized. One soldier, writing from Tennessee wrote:

"I have been in all the battles of the West, and wondered more than once, and my family, driven from, their home, and stript of everything, are struggling in Georgia to get a shelter and something to eat. Little sympathy is shown my suffering wife and children . . . We might as well be under Lincoln's despotism as to endure such treatment." 62

This quotation is telling on a number of levels. First, it indicates that after serving long tours of duty, men no longer clung to the romantic ideals of war. Instead, they were tired, wounded, and demoralized. Second, even a man who fought courageously and was willing to die for his country could not rest assured that his wife and children would be provided for. This directly conflicted with the messages sent by the Confederate press that urged men that going to arms! to arms! was the best way to defend their wives and children. Lastly, with little sympathy shown to the suffering of his wife and children, this man lamented that "Lincoln's despotism" would be better than the treatment he endured as a soldier. This is evidence that Southern nationalism was lacking, particularly for poor men whose families were left homeless or starving in their absence.

As early as 1862, men had stopped volunteering altogether. Able bodied men throughout the Confederacy were staying home. The Augusta Chronicle and Sentinel reported that "one who walks Broad Street and sees the number of young men, would
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come to the conclusion that no war . . . was now waging.” In Brooks County in South Georgia it was said that, “several large families of young men in this county have not sent out soldiers.”

By April of 1862, the lack of volunteerism prompted the Confederate Congress to pass its first Conscription Act. The draft was extremely controversial because the wealthy could be exempted if they were willing to hire a substitute. Substitution was commonplace and newspapers often ran articles with advertisements for substitutes. But what is even more interesting than the advertisements is a set of articles published in the December 15th, 1863 and January 8, 1864 editions of the Spectator. In reference to substitutes, the December 15th publication read:

“As some persons, speaking at random have asserted that there are as many as twelve or fifteen hundred substitutes in the army as the representatives of citizens of this county, we deem it proper to state that this is a very great exaggeration, as the Enrolling Officer says that the number is less than four hundred.”

This small reference speaks volumes about the social and political climate in Augusta County, Virginia in 1863. Clearly, people were talking and were very up in arms over the issue of substitution. Moreover, the newspapers stance indicates that they are attempting to downplay the problem of substitution. This conclusion is even more sound when one examines the edition of the Spectator that ran just a couple weeks later that was still asserting that the number of substitutions was largely exaggerated. In January 8, 1864, Substitutes from Augusta read:

“We have frequently heard it stated that there were twelve hundred Substitutes from the County of Augusta alone, and as we had no data to go upon we
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supposed those who asserted it knew best and of course did not refute the statement, but we have lately taken occasion to ascertain the number and find it to be three hundred and sixty-seven. Quite a difference.  

65

It was as if the media was trying to convince the people of Augusta County that Confederate nationalism was not faltering and that substitution rates were not a concern. But the fact that the number of substitutes was even rumored to be so high is proof that conscription and substitution were hot topics in Augusta County that were creating a rift between the rich and poor.

Men began referring to the conflict as a rich man’s war and a poor man’s fight. Some took their concerns directly to Jefferson Davis. A group of men calling themselves “Many soldiers” wrote “what are we fighting for?” and complained that they were “tired of fighting for this negro aristocracy- for them that won’t fight for themselves.” They argued that “this war must fall on all classes alike or we are determined it shall cease as far as we are concerned.”

66

Poor men continued to desert because they lacked dedication to a cause that they believed did not serve any of their interests. The more men that deserted, the easier desertion became. In some cases, entire regiments of men deserted.

67

In the same month that the Conscription Act was passed, the Staunton Spectator printed the following commentary to compliment the new law:

“Our soldiers who have manifested so much devotion, so much self denial, so much patriotism, will bear this cross without a murmur. We appeal to them in the name of all that they hold sacred--country, home, wives, children, friends, altars, and firesides--hasten at once to the field.”
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Unfortunately for the Confederate authorities, the relatives that these men “held sacred” were appealing just as strongly for their return home. As men sat in camp with downtrodden spirits, empty stomachs, and wounded limbs, the letters they received from their wives, mothers, and sisters made their situation even more disparaging and desertion all the more tempting. In February 1864, a North Carolina government official wrote: “Desertion takes place because desertion is encouraged ... And though the ladies may not be willing to concede the fact, they are nevertheless responsible.” 69

Indeed, women’s letters to their husbands motivated men to desert. Some women demanded that their husbands return home from the field. At a rail depot in Charlotte, North Carolina, one woman shouted to her husband “Take it easy, Jake – you desert agin, quick as you kin – come back to your wife and children.” This public display of indifference for the war effort is a stark contrast to the images that the media portrayed of women such as the one of the Daughter of Columbia (figure 2, page) and indicates that the media’s attempt to influence public morale in favor of the war effort was unsuccessful. Another woman voiced her concerns in a more private forum. In a letter to her husband she urged, “My dear, if you put off a-coming, ‘twont be any use to come, for we’ll all hands of us be out there in the garden in the old grave yard with your ma and mine.” 70 Letters from home were convincing enough to persuade a young Georgia volunteer to return home. He expressed his concerns for his family in a letter to a friend which read:
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“I don’t want mother to suffer for anything as long as I live. I am willing for her to work and I know she will do it; but when I hear she is in want of provisions and can’t get them, I am going home . . . the last two letters I received from her don’t suit me.”

Once men were persuaded by their wives to desert, they were protected by local kinship networks. According to David Williams, “Deserters who made it home found plenty of neighbors willing to help them avoid further entanglements with the Confederacy.” A disgusted head of the Bureau of Conscription complained that desertion had “in popular estimation, lost the stigma that justly pertains to it, and therefore the criminals are everywhere shielded by their families and by the sympathies of many communities.” This proves that Confederate presses attempt to shame people who helped deserters was largely ignored. One article that appeared in the *Augusta Examiner* read:

“The house that gives such a one shelter is disgraced. Those who feed them, harbour them, or who, knowing of them, do not promptly inform the proper authority, partake of their crime, and stab their country.”

Clearly this criticism that bordered on a threat did little to discourage people from helping deserters. The same edition of the *Examiner* published the following description of a “real soldier”:

“On the real soldier the country should, and will, shower its blessings and rewards. But he must be the real soldier; he who remains at his post; he who asks few furloughs, and is never absent without leave; who never straggles on the march; who does not skulk from the fire; who is seen in the ranks of

---
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the army or in the hospital, but never at home, never in the wayside house, never in the cities, unless with a broken limb.73

But many men were more concerned with being the real husband, father, and provider and so the title of "real soldier" was not the top priority.

Thus, the ideals that the Confederate media appealed to as a means of pressuring soldiers to remain in the ranks, were actually the ideals that brought them home to their wives and families. Confederate nationalism was weakened by the harsh realities of war and for some, it devotion to the cause never existed at all.

The ideals that were supposed to serve as a rally cry to battle were more often the ones that contributed to a willingness on the part of family, friends, and community members to aid deserters. The press’s efforts to demoralize deserters and portray them as evil traitors were unsuccessful. Idealistic pursuits gave way to practical concerns and men shirked their soldierly responsibilities in order to uphold the responsibilities that mattered: their responsibility to their wives, children, home, and modest way of life.

73 Augusta Examiner (Augusta County, Virginia), April, 1863.
Part III: Curriculum Development
The Gettysburg Address and Northern Intentionality: Using Graphic Representations to Visualize the Past

Background

My original research helped me understand the intentionality of Confederate soldiers who deserted during the Civil War. Operating under the New York State curriculum standards, and considering the National Council for the Social Studies themes, I have decided that the best focus for my students will be to investigate the intentionality of Abraham Lincoln and the Union forces by having the students analyze the Gettysburg Address. This document is such an important one from a standards standpoint; but even more importantly, this document is a masterful piece of writing that defined the values of a young nation in its most critical hours.

The culmination of my and my students’ efforts will be a picture book in which each page corresponds to a specific line of Lincoln’s famous speech. I have portioned the text into lines that I think are manageable, but still carry a powerful message.

1. Four score and seven years ago
2. our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation,
3. conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.
4. Now we are engaged in a great civil war,
5. testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure.
6. We are met on a great battle-field of that war.
7. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final
resting place for those who here gave their lives that that
nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that
we should do this.
8. But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate -- we can not
consecrate -- we can not hallow -- this ground. I
9. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have
consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract.
10. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say
here,
11. but it can never forget what they did here.
12. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the
unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far
so nobly advanced.
13. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task
remaining before us
14. that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to
that cause for which they gave the last full measure of
devotion --
15. that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have
died in vain
16. that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of
freedom
17. and that government of the people, by the people, for the
people, shall not perish from the earth.
Each portion of the text lends itself to a specific area of research. I will assign 5 to 7 students to each statement, provide them with research materials to help them more deeply understand that particular statement and have them create a pictorial representation to accompany their portion of the speech. Each group can use its own approach. Students can design their visual with the use of computer programs, or good old fashion paper and pencil.

All compiled, we will create a book that will serve as a powerful combination of all of our efforts into one final product. The final step to the process will be tied to our schools service learning initiative. Students will present the material to school children at the elementary level schools in the district. Elementary teachers can use our picture book to help teach the higher level concepts of the Gettysburg Address to their elementary level students.

**Rationale**

The idea of a picture book stems from two sources: my own experience and my research of best practices in the field. Literacy is a huge area of need in this country. The expectation in my district, and on a state wide level, is to have students communicate their understanding through writing. In fact, administrators in my district have asserted that “writing is thinking” meaning that the two tasks are synonymous. I have a problem with this philosophy because I view it to be too narrow-minded. I want my students to have a chance to communicate their thinking and understanding through multiple venues. Since so many of my students struggle with reading and writing, I am always motivated to implement new strategies to help students comprehend complicated text. Thus, my personal experience led me to seek
research best practices for helping students who struggle with literacy in social studies.

A general search took me to the work of E.B Bernhardt. According to Bernhardt, texts may be viewed as authoritative objects, unbending in their representative of knowledge, or they may be viewed as "dynamic forces that can change and grow in concert with their readers."\(^{74}\) Ideally, I want my students to ascribe to the latter viewpoint. Unfortunately, most students who struggle with reading view texts as authoritative objects. They take a text at face value failing to engage in their own criticism of the text or make connections to their own understanding. Struggling readers have not yet developed the potential for critically analyzing a text because they do not understand that they can assign their own meaning to what they read. This eliminates any ownership over the information they read resulting in a lack of engagement. What Bernhardt suggests, is that teachers need to help students to see that they can create their own meaning and think critically about the information that is presented to them. But what is the best way to help students with develop higher order skills?

**Improving Student Understanding: Graphic Organizers for Comprehension**

One option is through graphic representations. According to the dual coding theory of information storage, knowledge is stored in two forms – a linguistic form and an imagery form. The imagery mode is expressed as mental pictures.\(^{75}\) By allowing students to use both forms of expression – linguistic and non-linguistic –


research suggests that they will be better able to recall information and understand key concepts. Students who struggle to read also struggle to communicate their ideas through written expression. Therefore, a powerful way for students to organize their ideas and communicate their understanding is through the use of graphic organizers and visual representations. Students who generate visual representations, particularly through the use of graphic organizers showed greater levels of comprehension of complex expository text.\textsuperscript{76}

In addition to being powerful tools for organizing knowledge and communicating ones comprehension, graphic organizers also help students to engage in higher level thinking tasks. Generating non-linguistic representations forces students to evaluate text and distinguish between relevant and irrelevant information. Moreover, when a student has generated a graphic representation of her understanding of a text, she has inherently elaborated on her ideas and gone beyond basic knowledge and comprehension.\textsuperscript{77} Studies show that by synthesizing the information and making their own connections, students are more likely to internalize the information since it holds personal meaning.\textsuperscript{78}

With this sound research in mind, as my students conduct their research on their respective portions of Lincoln’s speech, they will organize the information that they read in graphic representations. They will assess information from primary source documents and book sources and communicate their understanding of that


information by organizing the information in graphic organizers, and drawing pictures.

**Impact and Assessment**

A non-linguistic approach will provide students who struggle with written expression with an alternative venue through which to showcase their understanding. Since writing is a necessary skill, my hope is that by expressing their understanding through non-linguistic representations first, that student writing will ultimately improve because they will be able to use the non-linguistic representations as a starting point for their written expression. Through numerous formative assessments that take on a non-linguistic approach, I hope that my students will be able to construct their own meaning in a way that makes sense for them. Then, through a summative, linguistic assessment, I can test whether the non-linguistic approach taken in the formative assessments throughout the unit helped to improve their writing.

In addition to impacting students, I am hoping to impact the teachers in my department by showcasing a new approach to helping students who struggle with linguistic expression. Ultimately, this will serve as good data that can inform our future instruction and help us determine the benefits of integrating more non-linguistic performances of understanding into our curriculum.
Lesson Guide

These lesson plans meet the following National Council for the Social Studies standards:

I: Culture
- Give examples of how experiences may be interpreted differently by people from diverse cultural perspectives and frames of reference
- Describe ways in which language, stories, folktale, music, and artistic creations serve as expressions of culture and influence behavior of people living in a particular culture;

II: Time Continuity and Change
- Identify and use various sources for reconstructing the past, such as documents, letters, diaries, maps, textbooks, photos, and others;
- Demonstrate an understanding that people in different times and places view the world differently

IV: Individual Development and Identity
- Describe personal changes over time, such as those related to physical development and personal interests
- Identify and describe ways family, groups, and community influence the individual’s daily life and personal choices

V: Individuals Groups and Institutions
- Identify examples of institutions and describe the interactions of people with institutions
- Identify and describe examples of tensions between and among individuals, groups, or institutions, and how belonging to more than one group can cause internal conflict
- Identify and describe examples of tensions between and among individuals, groups, or institutions, and how belonging to more than one group can cause internal conflicts
- Give examples of the role of institutions in furthering both continuity and change
- Show how groups and institutions work to meet individual needs and promote the common good, and identify examples of where they fail to do so.

VI: Power, Authority, and Governance
- explain the purpose of government
- give examples of how government does or does not provide for the needs and wants of people, establish order and security, and manage conflict
• recognize how groups and organizations encourage unity and deal with diversity to maintain order and security

• identify and describe factors that contribute to cooperation and cause disputes within and among groups and nations

X: Civic Ideals and Practices

• identify key ideals of the United States’ democratic republican form of government, such as individual human dignity, liberty justice, equality, and the rule of law, and discuss their application in specific situations

• recognize that a variety of formal and informal factors influence and shape public policy

• explain how public policies and citizen behaviors may or may not reflect the stated ideals of a democratic republican form of government

• recognize and interpret how the "common good" can be strengthened through various forms of citizen action.
Lesson Schedule

• **Day 1:** Students will read Sam Fink’s *American Revolution: The Words That Made America* to serve as a model for their final product. They will complete artistic critiques of Fink’s work and establish criteria for their own final product. See Appendix A.

• **Days 2 and 3:** Students will gain background knowledge about the *Gettysburg Address* through whole group instruction and teacher modeling of reading strategies. We will use the book *The Gettysburg Address in Translation: What it Really Means* by Kay Melchisedech Olson. See Appendix B.

• **Days 4 – 8:** Read assigned sources and organizing research into meaningful graphic representations through the use of teacher provided graphic organizers. See Appendix C for assigned readings. See Appendix D for graphic organizers for all research groups.

The list of assigned sources includes:

- *We the People: The Declaration of Independence* by Michael Burgan
- *Let Freedom Ring: The Declaration of Independence* by Lora Polack Oberle
- *Secession: The Southern States Leave the Union* by Judith Peacock
- *The Emancipation Proclamation: Hope of Freedom for the Slaves* by Michael J. Martin
- *Landmark Events in American History: The Battle of Gettysburg* by Dale Anderson
- *We the People: The Battle of Gettysburg* by Michael Burgan
- *Gettysburg: Bold Battle in the North* edited by Lou Waryncia

---


• **Days 9 and 10:** Students will synthesize the common themes that they see in their graphic representations to create a visual representation that communicates the meaning of their section of text.

• **Next Steps:** I will compile the work into one book that will be bound by our district media resources group and the students will present the information to elementary school students as part of their work in our school service learning program. See Appendix E for vision of final product.

---

Lesson Guide
Day 1

- As a class, we will read the *Declaration of Independence: The Words that Made America* by Sam Fink
- Students will use this book as a model for our final product.
- Students will complete a museum walk activity where they critique certain aspects of the book. See Appendix A.
- Following the critique, students will generate a list of the elements that they view as essential to creating a good illustrated book. See Appendix A.
- This list will serve as a set of criteria for their own final product.
Lesson Guide
Days 2 and 3

- Day two will be used to build background knowledge about the Gettysburg Address and the Battle of Gettysburg.
- Students will watch scene selection from Ken Burns’ documentary The Civil War.
- I will read a selection from the book *The Gettysburg Address in Translation: What is Really Means*
- I will model for students how to organize information from the reading into the different graphic organizers that they will be expected to use during their research process. The reading and the models are attached. See Appendix B.
- This will meet two goals:
  o First, students will gain more background knowledge by analyzing the readings.
  o Second, I will be able to directly instruct them on how to use the graphic organizers so that by the time they have to use them for their own research, they will have mine as a model.
Lesson Guide Days 4 – 8
Students will be placed in research study groups based on the section of the text that they are assigned. Each group will focus on specific readings that will help them to best understand their section of text. See Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of Text</th>
<th>Research group</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Four score and seven years ago</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>We the People: The Declaration of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation,</td>
<td></td>
<td>by Michael Burgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are</td>
<td></td>
<td>Let Freedom Ring: The Declaration of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ...we are engaged in a great civil war,</td>
<td></td>
<td>by Lora Polack Oberle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated,</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Declaration of Independence in translation: What it Really Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. can long endure.</td>
<td></td>
<td>by Amie J. Leavitt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                                                 | Group 2        | Secession: The Southern States Leave the Union                                              |
|                                                                 |                | by Judith Peacock                                                                           |
Lesson Guide Days 4 – 8 Continued
See Appendix C for lesson materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of Text</th>
<th>Research group</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. We are met on a great battle-field of that war.</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Landmark Events in American History: The Battle of Gettysburg by Dale Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place</td>
<td>&quot;We are Met on a Great Battlefield&quot;: Army Life, Civil War Battles and Turning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate -- we can not consecrate -- we</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>We the People: The Battle of Gettysburg by Michael Burgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. the brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gettysburg: Bold Battle in the North edited by Lou Waryncia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. but it can never forget what they did here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson Guide Days 4 – 8 Continued
See Appendix C for Lesson Materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of Text</th>
<th>Research group</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced.</td>
<td><strong>Group 4</strong></td>
<td><em>Secession: The Southern States Leave the Union</em> by Judith Peacock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us</td>
<td><strong>“The Unfinished Work”: Progression of Union war Goals</strong></td>
<td><em>The Emancipation Proclamation: Hope of Freedom for the Slaves</em> by Michael J. Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. that from those honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion –</td>
<td>• This group will examine Lincoln’s goals for the Union in order to best understand what Lincoln meant by “the unfinished work” that the living needed to complete on behalf of the soldiers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. that we here highly resolve that those dead shall not have died in vain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom</td>
<td><strong>Group 5</strong></td>
<td><em>The Declaration of Independence in translation: What it Really Means</em> by Arnie J. Leavitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.</td>
<td><strong>“A New Birth of Freedom”: Slavery and Independence</strong></td>
<td><em>Secession: The Southern States Leave the Union</em> by Judith Peacock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This group will research the history of slavery in America at compare and contrast the slave system that existed with the ideas in the <em>Declaration of Independence</em> in order to recognize the inherent contradictions in America that existed from 1776 until the Civil War. They will also research the Emancipation Proclamation</td>
<td><em>The Emancipation Proclamation</em> by Michael J. Martin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

By providing my students with a chance to communicate their understanding through non-linguistic representations, I hope to promote their self-confidence and help them tap into their own potential as learners. The work that is attached as Appendix E was created by a very talented student, Sierra Martin. Sierra is a seventh grader at Dake Jr. High in West Irondequoit. I am excited to use Sierra’s work as a model to inspire other students as we work on this process and learn together.
Appendix A

Illustrated Book Critique

Directions: Please complete the following critique for book pages 20, 30, 38, 49, 96, 123, and 137 of *The Declaration of Independence: The Words That Made America* Illustrated and Inscribed by Sam Fink

Page: ________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Write your answers here. Do not make judgments. Simply write what you see, your first impressions. Describe, analyze, and interpret.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What stands out the most when you first view this image?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Explain the reason you notice what you mentioned in number 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. As you keep looking, what else seems important?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What feelings and meanings does this artwork represent?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What title could you give this artwork?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What key language, symbols, or vocabulary terms stand out as particularly important?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights,
laying
its foundation
on such principles
and organizing its powers
in such form, as to them
shall seem most likely
to effect their Safety
and Happiness.

---

93 Fink, 30–31.
But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism,
For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world;
Appendix A continued

A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

---

93 Fink, 122 - 123.
do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these United Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be, Free and Independent States.
Appendix A Continued

Elements of a Successful Illustrated Book

Directions: Let's put our heads together and brainstorm some elements of a successful illustrated book based on our analysis of Sam Fink's illustrations.

Directions: Now based on your initial brainstorm, rank the elements/characteristics by placing them under the following categories.

Our illustrated book must include . . .

Our illustrated book should include . . .

Our illustrated book can include . . .
Appendix B continued

Reading selection from the book *The Gettysburg Address in Translation: What is Really Means*^96

For use in direct teaching of how to use graphic organizers

---

^96 Olson, 6-7.
Appendix B continued

Teacher Models of Completed Graphic Organizers

ReadingQuest.org
Making Sense in Social Studies

VOCABULARY WORD MAP

DEFINITION or SYNONYMS

TO SET FREE

ANTONYMS

SLAVE

VOCABULARY WORD

EMANCIPATE

WRITE A SENTENCE USING IT MEANINGFULLY

One of Lincoln's goal during the Civil War was to emancipate the slaves.

DRAW A PICTURE of IT

---

97 Graphic Organizers accessed from: readingquest.org
Appendix B continued

Teacher Models of Completed Graphic Organizers

**ReadingQuest.org**

**Story Mapping**

**HISTORY FRAME**

**TITLE OF EVENT:**
The Civil War

**PARTICIPANTS / KEY PLAYERS:**
- Abraham Lincoln (President, Union)
- Grant, Sherman (Union)
- Jefferson Davis, Lee, Jackson (Confederacy)

**PROBLEM or GOAL:**
- Union goal—Preserve the Union

**WHERE:**
America

**WHEN:**
1861-1865

**KEY EPISODES or EVENTS:**
- 1860 - Lincoln elected President
- 1861 - Secession - Confederacy forms
- 1861 - Fort Sumter attacked
- 1862 - Battle of Antietam
- 1863 - Jan. - Emancipation Proclamation
- July - Battle of Gettysburg
- July - Surrender of Vicksburg
- 1864 - Sherman captures Atlanta
- 1865 - Confederate surrender

**RESOLUTION / OUTCOME:**
- Union victory
- Union preserved
- 13th Amendment - end to slavery
- 14th Amendment - citizenship
- 15th Amendment - suffrage

**THEME/LESSON / So What?**
- America remained one united government
- Rebuilding would be difficult

**ReadingQuest.org**

Copyright 2006 by ReadingQuest.org. All Rights Reserved.

---

*Graphic Organizer accessed from: readingquest.org*
Appendix B continued

Teacher Models of Completed Graphic Organizers

CONCEPT of DEFINITION MAP

[Schwartz & Raphael, 1985]

WHAT IS IT?

WHAT IS IT LIKE?

INDEPENDENCE

LIBERTY

FAIRNESS

JUSTICE

WHAT ARE SOME EXAMPLES?

- American Democracy
- The Bill of Rights
- Freedom of Expression

ReadingQuest.org

Copyright © Raymond C. Jern. All Rights Reserved.

Graphic Organizer accessed from: readingquest.org
Appendix C

Sampling of Research Materials\textsuperscript{100} for Research Group 1:  
"Four Score and Seven Years Ago": The Roots of American Democracy

\textbf{A Decision About Independence}

On June 7, 1776, members or delegates from the thirteen American colonies gathered in Philadelphia. They met at the Pennsylvania State House (now Independence Hall).

These men formed the Second Continental Congress, the colonists were rebelling against Britain and its king, George III. The Congress now had to decide whether America should declare its independence. It was a very important decision.

Fighting between the colonists and British forces broke out in April 1775 in Massachusetts. The Continental Congress then named General George Washington commander of the American troops. The soldiers had already won the Battle of Bunker Hill.

The British had built up an American army in Canada and were now preparing for an attack.

\textsuperscript{100} Burgan, 4-5.
Sampling of Research Materials\textsuperscript{101} for Research Group 1: "Four Score and Seven Years Ago": The Roots of American Democracy

along America's East Coast. And spies in London, England, had learned that King George had hired foreign troops to fight in America.

The delegates of the Continental Congress discussed their next step. The colonists had mixed feelings about declaring independence from Britain. About one-third of the American people wanted independence. About one-third believed the colonies should remain under British rule. The rest couldn't make up their minds.

The delegates in Philadelphia were also unsure, but they knew time was running out. They had to make a decision.

Robert Edward Lee of Virginia rose and addressed the Congress. He presented a resolution, or statement. It said, "We these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent states." Within a month, the Continental Congress finally made its decision. It approved one of the world's most important patriotic documents—the Declaration of Independence.

\textsuperscript{101} Burgan, 6-7.
Appendix C

Sampling of Research Materials\textsuperscript{102} for Research Group 1: "Four Score and Seven Years Ago": The Roots of American Democracy

Chapter Five

What the Declaration Means

The Declaration of independence contains three general parts. The first part is a preamble, or introduction, that presents the ideas on which the Declaration is based. It is the most famous part of the Declaration.

The preamble includes the famous words, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

These words of the preamble were only revolutionary at the time they were written. They said that people's rights did not come from kings. They were natural, or God-given, rights. These rights did not have to be proved ("self-evident"). And these rights could not be taken away ("unalienable").

\textsuperscript{102} Oberle, 32 - 33.
Appendix C

Sampling of Research Materials\textsuperscript{103} for Research Group 1: 
"Four Score and Seven Years Ago": The Roots of American Democracy

\textsuperscript{103} Leavitt, 6 - 7.
Chapter One

One Nation

On December 20, 1860, bells rang throughout Charleston, South Carolina. The cannon by the post office boomed. People poured into the streets, waved flags, jumped, and shouted. Delegates to a special state convention had just passed a law. The law mandated that South Carolina was seceding, or withdrawing, from the United States.

Within the month, 10 more Southern states left the United States, or the Union. These 11 states formed a new nation, the Confederate States of America, or the Confederacy. The Confederacy was a group of independent states that came together for mutual support. The breaking away of Southern states is known as secession. The secession of the Southern states came after many years of conflict between the North and the South. It led to the U.S. Civil War (1861-1865) between the Confederacy and the Union.

104 Peacock, 4-5.
Appendix C

Sampling of Research Materials for Research Group 3: "We are Met on a Great Battlefield": Army Life, Civil War Battles and Turning Points

The First Day

Troops Reach Gettysburg

The first troops began moving on June 10, 1863. Confederate soldiers marched in on the left side of the battlefield. They spotted Union soldiers about 4 miles from the south and gathered troops, sending Union orders to the Union troops. They marched back north on McPherson's Road and then east to the Emmitsburg Road, where they joined forces.

Shooting Begins

At 9:00 A.M. on June 1, troops began to engage. The first soldier, Captain John Harsh, stated that the battle was the most intense he had ever seen. By 1:00 P.M., the 3rd Pennsylvania Light Infantry had been completely overwhelmed.

In the meantime, other soldiers were advancing, and the battle intensified. By 2:00 P.M., the Union troops were in full retreat, and the Confederates were in control.

103 Anderson, 16 - 17.
Appendix C

Sampling of Research Materials for Research Group 3: “We are Met on a Great Battlefield”: Army Life, Civil War Battles and Turning Points

106 Warvencia, 33 - 34.
Sampling of Research Materials for Research Group 4: "The Unfinished Work": Progression of Union War Goals

Chapter 5

Emancipation

As January 1, 1863, approached, many people wondered if Lincoln would be forced to change his mind. No one could tell for sure. On December 31, 1862, church services were held in many parts of the North. These meetings were called "watch meetings." African Americans and whites met to pray that the president would keep his promise to free the slaves.

The next afternoon, Lincoln sat down to sign the Emancipation Proclamation. He assured everyone that he was more certain of what he was doing. "If no one ever goes into history," he said, "it will be for this law."

Word of the Emancipation Proclamation spread quickly. Yes, it did not free many slaves.

The proclamation only declared that slaves in Confederate states were free. Since slave owners in Confederate states did not feel that they were part of the United States, they did not feel they had to obey the proclamation. Slave's

107 Martin, 30-31.
Appendix C


Chapter Two

Slavery and the Birth of a Nation

Slavery had been a problem between the North and South when the United States was founded. For years, American leaders tried to solve the problem with compromises. People on both sides of the slavery issue hoped to gain a little to reach an agreement.

Slavery in the American Colonies

In 1619, the Spanish brought the first slaves to St. Augustine, Florida. In 1619, a Dutch ship carried a cargo of African people to North America. They were brought to Virginia to work in the tobacco fields. Over the next 200 years, thousands of Africans were captured, packed into slave ships, and shipped to America. Most slaves went to the tobacco, cotton, and rice growing areas of the South. But slavery existed in all 13 American colonies.

Appendix D

Graphic Organizers to be used by all groups

109 Graphic organizers accessed from readingquest.org
Appendix D

Graphic Organizers to be used by all groups

ReadingQuest.org

VOCABULARY WORD MAP

DEFINITION or SYNONYMS

ANTONYM

VOCABULARY WORD

WRITE A SENTENCE USING IT MEANINGFULLY

DRAW A PICTURE OF IT

110 Graphic organizers accessed from readingquest.org
Appendix D

Graphic Organizers to be used by all groups

ReadingQuest.org
Making Sense in Social Studies

CONCEPT of DEFINITION MAP
(Schwartz & Raphael, 1985)

WHAT IS IT?

WHAT IS IT LIKE?

WHAT ARE SOME EXAMPLES?

---

111 Graphic organizers accessed from readingquest.org
Appendix D

Graphic Organizers to be used by all groups

ReadingQuest.org

Story Mapping

EVENT / STORY PYRAMID

MAIN CHARACTER'S NAME

TWO WORDS DESCRIBING THIS PERSON

THREE WORDS DESCRIBING THE SETTING OR PLACE

FOUR WORDS DESCRIBING AN IMPORTANT EVENT

FIVE WORDS DESCRIBING THE MAIN IDEA OR THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS EVENT

112 Graphic organizers accessed from readingquest.org
Appendix E: Vision for the Final Product$^{114}$

$^{114}$Artwork Created by Sierra Martin, 7th grade student in Ms. Tavino's 5th period class
Appendix E: Vision for the Final Product

Four score...

Declaration of Independence

One nation under god...

and Seven years ago

---

114 Artwork Created by Sierra Martin, 7th grade student in Ms. Tavino's 5th period class