

quacy of the courts to right any kind of balance. Athanson sums up:

As in many similar cases, Gallina's defense was weakened by his indigency. Not only were my services rendered gratis but I personally spent several hundred dollars. To counter Italy's "evidence," witnesses residing

abroad and able to testify with authority as to the political character of the Giuliano movement would have been invaluable. . . . But no funds were available. . . . A defense adequate to face up to the resources of a foreign government can be very expensive. People mistakenly think that supplying an indigent with an

attorney is sufficient for . . . defense.

It appears anomalous indeed to have the dispensation of justice to an American citizen in his own courts dependent on the relations between the extraditing nation and his country. Standards of fairness should not be dependent on the vagaries of the bi-national climate . . .

Who Won the Civil War, Anyway?.. by L. Jesse Lemisch

FOR THE NEXT four years Americans of North and South will commemorate a Civil War that never was. We will be treated, over and over again, to the meaningless pageantry of blue alongside gray and stars and bars mingled with stars and stripes. The celebration of the death of 600,000 men—all heroes, all dead fighting for freedom and independence—will be continuous and will pervade every aspect of our lives. We will hear it done over in rock 'n roll; we will taste it in our bourbon, renamed "Johnny Reb"; we will see it on every scale, from postage stamps to billboards, from *The Americans* on the TV screen to revivals of *Gone with the Wind* and *The Birth of a Nation* on the movie screen. (On television, each side will be given equal attention, lest someone be offended and decide not to buy Max Factor pancake make-up.)

All of this will be terribly oppressive to those dedicated to achieving "Equality Now." They will sense that the Civil War *was* a war, that it involved real issues, and that one side was more nearly right than the other. But their realization will not be reflected in the Centennial.

How did this come about? How did it happen that for the next four years we will be celebrating an unprecedented event—a war without villains? In large part, this perverse festival has its origin in the psychic needs of a people who fought for

what they know to be a shameful cause—and lost. Their deep guilt, transformed by the apparatus of scholarship, brought forth apologists among historians of the South; they have had their imitators among Northern historians, and the results have filtered into the national consciousness by way of the textbooks. There we find a war which could have been averted by real statesmanship, but statesmanship was lacking; instead there were fanatics—for fanatics read Abolitionists, *never* slaveholders—who persisted in seeing the question in its moral aspects and thus, so the line goes, made a political solution impossible.

The keystone of this version is, of course, the Negro's inferiority. The ante-bellum South had its pseudo-scientists to provide sanction for racism. Dr. J. C. Nott of Mobile justified slavery by proving that Negroes belonged to a different species. Dr. S. A. Cartwright of the University of Louisiana admitted them to humanity—barely—and described the special pathology of the Negro: slaves sometimes suffered from *Dyaesthesia Aethiopica*—a "Hebétude of Mind and Obtuse Sensibility of Body"—which induced them to destroy their master's property, slight their work and attack their overseer; or they might be afflicted with *Drapetomania*—"an irrestrainable propensity to run away." Dr. Cartwright's cure? "Whip the devil out of them."

In the same class as these diagnoses are the views of a historian: slaves were "by racial quality submissive rather than defiant, light-hearted instead of gloomy, amiable and ingratiating instead of sullen";

more than half a century after Emancipation, the Negroes showed "the same easy-going, amiable, seriocomic obedience and the same personal attachments to white men, as well as the same love of laughter and of rhythm, which distinguished their forebears" (Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, *American Negro Slavery*: 1918).

Unhappily, the progress of social science has not been as rapid as that of medical science; historians sensible enough to laugh the mad doctors of the nineteenth century out of court have cried caution when confronted with one of their own. Americans have given racist attitudes an absurdly prolonged hearing; they have often seen in the Negro no more than Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man*: "They see only my surroundings, themselves, or figments of their imagination—indeed, everything and anything except me."

Phillips has been the leading advocate among American historians of this sort of perception. Richard Hofstadter has called Phillips' work "a latter-day phase of the pro-slavery argument" and has revealed serious methodological flaws, distortions and omissions. But *American Negro Slavery* still remains firmly lodged in the minds of the nation's teachers as the "standard work."

HISTORIANS who have rejected the Negro's inferiority often stumble over the next obstacle on the path to enlightenment: the beneficence of the peculiar institution of slavery. Phillips saw in the plantations schools of civilization; they were "the best schools yet invented for the mass training of that sort of inert and backward people which the

L. JESSE LEMISCH teaches American history at Yale University and has written an introduction to Benjamin Franklin's Autobiography and Selected Writings, shortly to be published by New American Library.

bulk of the American Negroes represented." Modern colonialists use precisely the same argument when they delay self-government on the grounds that Black Africa must be "prepared for freedom"; in neither case is there preparation for anything but continued slavery. Recent events have disabused us of the fantasy of contented servants and tea on the veranda of the British Officers' Club, but the myth of happy slaves and mint juleps on the Old Plantation dies harder, and it still dominates large areas of the American scholarly establishment. The sole concession of these historians to the twentieth century has been to substitute the epithet "paternalistic" for "benevolent."

Scholars sufficiently obtuse to see even the merest glint of a silver lining in slavery have had no difficulty labeling Abolitionists fanatics. The "objectivity" which guides James G. Randall in his treatment of Southern extremists fades as he vents his fury on an Abolitionist whose speeches reveal "that failure to see life whole, that lack of a sense of humor, that pertinacious meddling, and that tendency toward insulting bitterness, which mark the uncompromising crusader." Randall disregards the fact that Southerners had taken no steps toward freeing the slaves, but had instead pulled down an iron curtain on dissent, lynching or mobbing those few who dared suggest, in speech or print, that the slave might be free, even if not equal. Southerners were content with slavery; no matter how much the individual slave might feign ineptness in order to avoid work, the system was profitable, and there was much capital invested in it. Just as Southerners at the time used the attacks of the Abolitionists as a pretext for hardening their stand, so do many historians today repeat the error and condemn the Abolitionists as meddlers and troublemakers who refused to let well enough alone. The implication must be that these historians are themselves content with slavery, for they do not present convincing evidence that it was on the way out.

In this view the Civil War becomes needless, a war without substantive cause: a mere failure of

statesmanship. Slavery, the textbooks say, was not significant; it was the slavery *issue*, manufactured by crackpots and inflated by a blundering generation of opportunist politicians—this is what led to the Civil War. "Instead of talking about what had to be done," says Bruce Catton (the real winner of the Civil War), "people talked about what ought to be done." The blame clearly rests with the Abolitionists, who caused all the trouble by injecting the moral issue.

THIS Civil War, the one blamed on crackpots, is no more real than a World War II blamed on those who opposed the Nazis in the thirties. (To say that the Civil War was caused by a failure of statesmanship is simply to say that the North should have compromised with slavery even more than it did; Lincoln's moderate program called for preventing the spread of slavery and preserving it where it already existed, but even this was too much for the South.) But this is the Civil War which we commemorate today and will celebrate for the next four years. We commemorate a war in which the South fought nobly and well in behalf of high ideals which are valid despite military defeat. The Governor of Virginia commemorates the battle for States' rights and comments on the parallel between 1861 and 1961:

It has unfortunately been the course



Battle of New Orleans.

of our history that men raised false issues which could influence the minds and stir emotions instead of exercising constructive leadership in the effort to mold common opinion in support of that which is best for the nation and the world.

The Chancellor of Washington and Lee University commemorates the South's fight for "freedom": "Both sides," he recently told a group of Centennial celebrants, "were fighting for freedom as they understood that precious term." The people of Montgomery commemorate the Civil War in so overtly ugly a fashion that attorneys for *The New York Times* must request a change of venue in a trial for libel occasioned by the newspaper's printing an advertisement soliciting funds for the Rev. Martin Luther King; pro-Southern sentiment, intensified by the war commemoration, makes impossible an impartial trial.

THE official commemoration of the Civil War constitutes a surrender to the South. Sometimes the mawkish celebrations even call for a mock capitulation; recently the Adjutant General of the State of New York announced his intention of returning to Virginia two Confederate battle flags captured by the Seventy-Ninth New York Volunteers one hundred years ago. Clearly the Adjutant General does not understand what the war was about; he is the victim of a basically Southern interpretation of the War. The Southerners, by contrast, are aware of precisely what it is they are commemorating, as Roy Wilkins of the NAACP remarked after the harassment of Charlayne Hunter at the Athens of the South:

As every Negro knows, the Civil War is still being fought, and play-acting battles of the current centennial celebration are merely historical backdrops for the continuing action downstage.

Yesterday, however, Southern men with arms fought other men with arms according to the rules of warfare. The breed is so improved that today young white Georgians feel the odds are about right when 1,000 of them can stone a single Negro girl.

The Southerners are commemorating a war against Negro rights, and they are commemorating it by con-

tinuing their fight against the rights of the Negro. Since the official celebrations will represent a surrender to the Southern view, they must be challenged as ardently as the rest of the structure of segregation of which they are a part. Just as we condemn schoolbooks which gloss over the atrocities of the Nazis, so must we condemn theatrics which conceal the real issues of the Civil War. That war was fought because the South

would not allow the Negro freedom. Now, a century later, the Negro fights for equality. That fight must not be stifled by invocation of the dignity of the Southern cause. That cause was and is unworthy of a free people, and we must be no more patient with it than was the great Abolitionist, William Lloyd Garrison:

I will be as harsh as truth, and as uncompromising as justice. On this subject, I do not wish to think, or

speak, or write, with moderation. No! No! Tell a man whose house is on fire to give a moderate alarm; tell him to moderately rescue his wife from the hands of the ravisher, tell the mother to gradually extricate her babe from the fire into which it has fallen,—but urge me not to use moderation in a cause like the present. I am in earnest—I will not equivocate—I will not excuse—I will not retreat a single inch—AND I WILL BE HEARD.

HOW to WIN with FOREIGN AID .. by *Walter E. Packard*

THE SPIRIT of President Kennedy's new approach to our relationship with the people of Latin America is refreshing, but its content is basically inadequate. It leaves the most meaningful issues untouched: Who is to own the industrial resources of Latin America? Who is to control their use? The questions are vital because the resources involved are Latin America's basic capital.

At present these resources are owned largely by the stockholders of American corporations in partnership with vested interests in Latin America—the classic capitalist pattern. Communists favor ownership and control by the “workers and peasants” on the syndicalist pattern. There is another method of ownership and control: the pattern exemplified by the TVA, the Federal Bureau of Reclamation, the State and Federal Forest Services and municipal and other district organizations, for instance, or by consumer cooperatives of various sorts, such as the International Cooperative Petroleum Association (which has headquarters in Kansas City and branches in twenty other countries of the world). I might add that the last named of these three divergent patterns of collective ownership has been by far the fastest growing segment of our own

dual economy since the beginning of the twentieth century, if military expenditures are not credited to the private-profit segment.

The evidence is clear that the people of Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, Indonesia and countries of Asia identify colonialism not only with political domination, now rapidly passing from the scene, but, more meaningfully, with the economic exploitations of their industrial potentials by foreign corporations seeking profits. If the President's program does not meet this issue to the satisfaction of the people of Latin America, there is very real danger that Latin America will follow Cuba into the Communist orbit.

OUR official position with regard to the issue posed by the three divergent patterns of collective action is strikingly inconsistent. Where our policies are governed by the State Department's interest in protecting American investments abroad, we usually support the capitalist pattern. Where our policies are controlled by agencies of the government whose aims are to promote the welfare of the people of other countries on a basis which serves our interests as well as theirs, we usually support public and consumer cooperative ownership and control.

In Greece, for example, where our aid program was eminently successful, 85 per cent of our non-military aid was used to finance public and consumer cooperative enterprise. The establishment of such policies, how-

ever, was not always without conflict. Some individuals in the Economic Cooperation Administration in Greece favored a plan by which a large American corporation would own and operate the power systems that were to be built. This policy was supported by the head of the power division of ECA in Washington, a former vice president of a privately owned power system, and by his assistant in the Paris office who was also a former employee of private-power interests. The man in the American Embassy in Athens, who represented the State Department policies on power, also supported the private-power program. But the people of Greece, who had been the serfs in a feudal order governed by the Turks who owned the land, did not want their second most important resource owned by the stockholders of a foreign corporation to whom they would have to pay a never-ending tribute. The Greek-American Power Committee recommended public power. Within days after the committee's report reached the Paris office, the U. S. power representative came to Athens to find out what was going on. His first question was “Who wants public power?” The answer was “The people of Greece want it.” His reply was highly disturbing: “What have they to say about it? Who's putting up the money?”

To make a long story short, the public-power policy prevailed. A Public Power Corporation was established on the TVA pattern and a

WALTER E. PACKARD, an agricultural engineer, has had a distinguished career administering various resettlement and reclamation projects both here and abroad (including Puerto Rico and Greece).

Copyright of Nation is the property of Nation Company, L. P. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.