Introduction

> "The future historian will award the highest praise to those who hold out longest against the efforts of madmen to destroy this great country." *Carolina Watchman* (Salisbury, NC), 12 March 1861

On 28 July 1862, Confederate soldiers of Colonel Solomon William's Second North Carolina Cavalry were doing the tedious and unexciting work of picket duty in coastal Jones County, North Carolina when they destroyed a family. In their zealous effort to interrupt the flow of information from local inhabitants to the U.S. Army then occupying New Bern only a dozen miles to the east, they arrested Moses Taylor, a white farmer in his early fifties. As Moses's wife Eliza later explained, "My husband was a Union man. Confederates accused him of carrying news to the Yankees." While it is impossible to know what information, if any, Moses may have passed to the Union troops, it is clear that his alleged activities were viewed as dangerous and disloyal by the Confederates. "It is well understood and known in the neighborhood by all there acquainted with the family, that they were all considered loyal to the U.S. government," one of their Unionist neighbors later stated. Moses wasn't alone. Eliza had two other brothers sent away with her husband to the Confederate military prison at Salisbury, North Carolina, and another brother who "forsook his home and went to the Union Army at Newbern N.C. and rendered service to it." While she did receive at least one letter from Moses after his incarceration, Eliza never saw her beloved husband again after his arrest. Moses Taylor died of smallpox at Salisbury Confederate Prison in February 1864. The American Civil War shattered this Unionist family.[1]

[1] Estate of Moses Taylor (Jones, no. 2,198), Southern Claims Commission Case Files, 1877–1883, Records of the Government Accounting Office, Records of the Third Auditor's Office, RG 217, National Archives, College Park, MD (hereafter cited as Southern Claims); Roger H. Harrell, *The Second North Carolina Cavalry* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland Co., 2004), 37–38; On the

After some gumshoe historical detective work, I made the trek to the Confederate military prison cemetery at Salisbury hoping to find the grave of Moses Taylor. Taylor, a peaceable farmer, now rests in grave plot number 76 below a headstone that states simply, "Moses Taylor U.S. Soldier," a misidentification of his wartime occupation but one that is easily understood given his incarceration alongside 11,700 U.S. soldiers buried at the prison and the hasty record keeping of U.S. officials as they reburied the dead. Taylor's grave is less than thirty feet from a monument to U.S. soldiers that reads, "To Live In Hearts, We Leave Behind, Is Not to Die" and "Neither Hunger, Thirst, Nor Offered Bribes, Affected Their Loyalty" and another monument that reads "They Died That Their Country Might Live." These monuments highlight the irony of Moses Taylor's story, since few Southerners, indeed few Americans, today remember the lives of Southern Unionists or the broader group of anti-Confederates living in the region during the four years of the Civil War.[2]

When Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter Tony Horwitz visited North Carolina in the late 1990s while researching his national bestselling book, *Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches from the Unfinished Civil War*, he was surprised to find a military prison and national cemetery in the little town of Salisbury filled not just with Yankee prisoners of war but also with "Southern deserters, Carolina Quakers jailed for being conscientious objectors, and convicts imprisoned for petty theft, drunkenness, or 'trading with the Yankees and inducing Negroes to go to Washington D.C.'" "Like most Civil War buffs," Horwitz reflected, "I'd always focused on the grim but glorious history of battle." Yet even though Horwitz took notice of these "odd" additions to the Salisbury military prison cemetery, he did not mention others who were imprisoned there during the war: the uncompromising, stalwart Southern Unionists. Upon reading this chapter of Horwitz's fascinating tour of the former Confederacy, I puzzled over how, despite his well-meaning and dedicated attempts to come to grips with America's Civil War, he had not found even one person in Salisbury or North Carolina familiar with or willing to talk about North Carolina's dissident population. Indeed, Horwitz did not find one person in the entire South who mentioned Southern Unionists. This is both frustrating and fascinating at the same time. The Piedmont region of North Carolina, where Salisbury prison is located, had been home to many of these Unionists as well as numerous other anti-Confederate resistors, including recusant conscripts, deserters, anti-Jefferson Davis or anti-Confederate government agitators, conscientious objectors, peace advocates, politically active slaves and free blacks, and even criminals, and at least two inflexible Unionists, Enoch Jones and Moses Taylor,

operations of the Second North Carolina Cavalry, see Charles D. Sanford Report, 28 July 1862, U.S. War Department, *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, 128 vols. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880–1901), Ser. 1, Vol. 9, 349 (hereafter cited as *Official Records*).

[2] Salisbury National Cemetery, Salisbury, Rowan County, North Carolina, n.d. http://www.interment.net/data/us/nc/rowan/salisnat/salisbury_soto.htm (15 September 2008).

and possibly more who died at Salisbury. Not all dissident people disliked the Confederacy for the same reasons or were paragons of morality, and this emerges as North Carolina's loyalty stories are recovered. Certainly Horwitz's experience did much to prove the assertion of another Pulitzer Prize winner, historian Douglass Southall Freeman, who argued in his 1939 work, *The South to Posterity*, that Lost Cause authors were rewriting the history of the war with their own vision of the conflict and passing down the story of a united Confederate South to their children.[3]

This assertion is highlighted by another event of that year, the debut of the Academy Award-winning film *Gone with the Wind*. Producer David O. Selznick's adaptation of Margaret Mitchell's book created a Civil War popular culture icon in the fictional Southern belle Scarlett O'Hara, and the movie went as far as any to imbue the nation with a Lost Cause vision of a united white Confederate South fighting "the dirty Yankees." Only recently, within the last fifteen years, has popular culture turned back toward the darker side of the Civil War's home front irregular war in North Carolina with Charles Frazier's fictional work and later 2003 movie *Cold Mountain*. Yet, even in the film *Cold Mountain,* only the conflict between deserters and home guards is brought to the fore, not the story of resolute Unionists and the wide range of other militant dissidents. For the 150 years since the American Civil War ended, the bulk of fictional and non-fictional books, movies, and popular culture works on the conflict have conveniently left out the Moses Taylors and Eliza Sutherlands of the Civil War South.[4]

Who were the Southern Unionists no one mentioned or discussed with Tony Horwitz in the 1990s and who were left out of the films *Gone with the Wind* and *Cold Mountain*? Where had the story of the Unionists and anti-Confederates gone? Had someone suppressed it? Had some author written their lives out of existence? These questions prompted me to research and write this book. Yet a host of other questions emerged as the long hours of work unfolded in distant archives amid dusty, musty old papers. How did the Confederate military treat this group of individuals? What role did Confederate military policies, like conscription, impressments, the tax-in-kind, and the Partisan Ranger Act, play in their lives? For that matter, how did the local Confederate military forces deal with the white and black dissidents in their home communities? Why and

[3] Tony Horwitz, *Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches From the Unfinished Civil War* (New York: Pantheon, 1998), 21; Douglas Southall Freeman, *The South to Posterity: An Introduction to the Writing of Confederate History* (New York: Charles Scribner Sons, 1939), Introduction.

[4] Margaret Mitchell, *Gone With the Wind* (New York: MacMillan, 1936); *Gone With the Wind,* prod. David O. Selznick, 4 hours, MGM/United Artists, 1939, videocassette; Charles Frazier, *Cold Mountain* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1997); *Cold Mountain*, prod. Sidney Pollack, William Horberg, Albert Berger, and Ron Yerxa, 154 mins., Miramax Films, 2003, DVD; for an analysis of *Cold Mountain* as an historical text, see "Appalachian Odysseus: Love, War, and Best-sellerdom in the Blue Ridge," in John C. Inscoe, *Race, War, and Remembrance in the Appalachian South* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2008).

how had Unionists become involved in militant resistance to the Confederate government? What were the origins of the irregular wars that developed? Were these irregular wars responsible for the collapse of Confederate authority at the local level in North Carolina? This narrative seeks to answer these questions.

Moses and Eliza were not famous leaders of the Confederate or Union cause during the American Civil War. Neither of them ever fought on any major battlefield of the conflict. In fact, they spent their entire war experience on the Confederate home front in different regions of an upper South slave state. What separated these Southerners – members of their families and neighborhoods and many more like them across North Carolina and the Confederacy – was their political support of the old, antebellum Union of states. When push came to shove during the American Civil War, these people were forced to make a choice about where their respective loyalties were vested, and it was their decisions and the consequences of those determinations and actions that this book explains.

While a great deal has been written about the major battlefield leaders and conflicts of the American Civil War, military policy and its role on the home front and especially its impact on the dissenting population living in the Confederacy have not received the same careful attention. Only recently have scholars begun to reevaluate the wartime role of Southern Unionists and the broader population of anti-Confederates who resisted local Confederate authorities. North Carolina, with its large dissident population, has oddly never been the subject of a statewide study looking at the Unionist population's uneasy relationship with the Confederate and Union armies. Furthermore, no scholar has explored the origins of irregular warfare in North Carolina in a statewide study. At its center, this work uncovers the close relationship between Southern Unionists, deserters, recusant conscripts, and the military policies of the Confederate and Union authorities operating in North Carolina and, subsequently, the emergence of militant resistance (and in particular, irregular wars at the county level) on the home front. This work blends the techniques of social, political, and military history to train a high-powered lens on the home front of the Old North State – a state that evolved during four years of war from a political and economic battlefield to a military battlefield for Southern dissenters.[5]

[5] For authors who have addressed Southern Unionism, see Georgia Lee Tatum, *Disloyalty in the Confederacy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1934); David William's enlightening preface to the 2000 edition of Tatum's work addresses the important, if limited, role she played in offering an early challenge to the Lost Cause myth; Carl N. Degler, *The Other South: Southern Dissenters in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974); Wayne K. Durrill, *War of a Another Kind: A Southern Community in the Great Rebellion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Noel C. Fisher, *War at Every Door: Partisan Politics and Guerrilla Violence in East Tennessee* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); Thomas G. Dyer, *Secret Yankees: The Unionist Circle in Confederate Atlanta* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999); Daniel E. Sutherland, ed., *Guerrillas, Unionists, and*

The stories of the "rebels against a rebellion," the white and black, men and women who remained loyal to the U.S. government in North Carolina, confront in the starkest manner the Lost Cause mythology of an overwhelmingly united white Confederacy, where African Americans were only loyal slaves when mentioned at all. This myth has fundamentally denied and continues to deny the very existence of Southerners like Moses and Eliza. The goal of this narrative is to recover the lost, stolen, and forgotten stories of North Carolina's loyal, unconditional Unionist population and provide a small dose – and long-needed inoculation – against that myth as it relates to the state of North Carolina. By rebuilding their world, scholars cannot only learn about Unionists' lives but also more about the world Confederates created around them. To better understand the world of these Unionists, it is also necessary to explore the wider world of dissent within the Confederacy, which is integral to both understanding Southern Unionism and the Confederacy itself.[6]

Only a handful of book-length studies on North Carolina have addressed the question of unconditional Unionism or anti-Confederate resistance, and these studies have focused primarily on white Unionists at the county and regional level. Among the most important local studies in North Carolina – books that have offered invaluable contributions – are the work of Phillip Shaw Paludan in his *Victims* on the Shelton Laurel Massacre in Madison County; Wayne Durrill's *War of Another Kind* on Washington County; Martin Crawford on Ashe County; and John C. Inscoe and Gordon McKinney's, *The Heart of Confederate Appalachia,* on western North Carolina's mountain war. The work of Judkin Browning in his *Shifting Loyalties* and Barton Myers in *Executing Daniel Bright* have added new dimensions to the study of Unionism on the coast of North Carolina, in New Bern and the Great Dismal Swamp region respectively, offering important insight on irregular warfare and

Violence on the Confederate Home Front (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1999); John C. Inscoe and Gordon B. McKinney, *The Heart of Confederate Appalachia: Western North Carolina During the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); John C. Inscoe and Robert Kenzer, eds., *Enemies of the Country: New Perspectives on Unionists in the Civil War South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2001); Catherine Clinton ed., *Southern Families at War: Loyalty and Conflict in the Civil War South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); William W. Freehling, *The South vs. The South: How Anti-Confederate Southerners Shaped the Course of the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); David Williams, Teresa Crisp Williams, and David Carlson, *Plain Folk in a Rich Man's War: Class and Dissent in Confederate Georgia* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2002); David Williams, *Bitterly Divided: The South's Inner Civil War* (New York: The New Press, 2008); Margaret Storey, *Loyalty and Loss: Alabama's Unionists in Civil War and Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004); Brian D. McKnight, *Contested Borderlands: The Civil War in Appalachian Kentucky and Virginia* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2006).

[6] James W. Savage, *Loyal Element of North Carolina During the War* (Omaha, NE: Nebraska Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, 1886), Pamphlet Collection, North Caroliniana Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Savage used the phrase "rebels against a rebellion" in his speech to describe North Carolina Unionists.

military occupation. Few scholars have contributed more to the study of North Carolina during the war than Paul D. Escott, whose works *Many Excellent People* and *After Secession* used North Carolina to confront scholarship on Confederate nationalism that argued for intense commitment among a broad cross-section of the white Southern population. Historian Victoria Bynum's *Unruly Women* and recent *The Long Shadow of the Civil War* likewise opened a new avenue for scholars of the war by addressing dissident white and black women of the North Carolina Piedmont. William Auman's unpublished dissertation on the central counties of North Carolina also offered valuable work on the intersection of Unionism, recusant conscript, and deserter sentiment, clandestine political networks, and irregular war in Randolph County.[7]

Where this project diverges from these earlier important studies is both in the scope and depth of analysis it gives to the topic of North Carolina Unionism, as well as in its address of new questions about the treatment of dissidents – both during and after the war – by Confederates and ex-Confederates. At the center of this project are several overarching questions. Who were the unconditional Unionists of North Carolina during the four years of the American Civil War? How did they view the Confederacy and, by extension, how did Confederate citizens and officials treat them? Did their militant resistance lead to the erosion of Confederate command and control at the local level? How extensive was this erosion of control from a geographic perspective? What happened to the story of Southern Unionism and wartime dissent during the postwar period? In order to answer these questions, the narrative explores the political backgrounds and motivations of Unionists during the secession crisis of 1860 and early 1861; the experience of Confederate military occupation within the counties of North Carolina under Confederate control during the war; the origins

[7] Philip Shaw Paludan, *Victims: A True Story of the Civil War* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1981); Durrill, *War of Another Kind*; Martin Crawford, *Ashe County's Civil War: Community and Society in the Appalachian South* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 2001); Inscoe and McKinney, *The Heart of Confederate Appalachia*; Judkin Browning, *Shifting Loyalties: The Union Occupation of Eastern North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011); Barton A. Myers, *Executing Daniel Bright: Race, Loyalty, and Guerrilla Violence in a Coastal Carolina Community, 1861–1865* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2009); Paul D. Escott, *Many Excellent People: Power and Privilege in North Carolina, 1850–1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985); Paul D. Escott, *After Secession: Jefferson Davis and the Failure of Confederate Nationalism* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978); Victoria E. Bynum *Unruly Women: The Politics of Social and Sexual Control in the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992); Victoria E. Bynum, *The Long Shadow of the Civil War: Southern Dissent and Its Legacies* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010); William T. Auman, "Neighbor Against Neighbor: The Inner Civil War in the Central Counties of North Carolina," (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1988); on antebellum western North Carolina, see John C. Inscoe, *Mountain Masters: Slavery and Sectional Crisis in Western North Carolina* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989); Richard Reid, *Freedom For Themselves: North Carolina's Black Soldiers in the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008) presented the first group regimental history of the black soldiers recruited in the state.

of political, social, and militant resistance to this new Confederate world; the participation of Unionists and the emergence of other anti-Confederate resistance as part of the irregular wars that erupted across North Carolina from 1862 through 1865; and finally, the role of ex-Confederates and Lost Cause mythologizers in suppressing the history of dissent within North Carolina.

The most important single source for analyzing Southern Unionism in the Civil War South is the records of the Southern Claims Commission (SCC). The SCC was a body set up during the 1870s to adjudicate the validity of Southerners' assertions of wartime Unionism and recompense the claimants for property taken by the U.S. Army while operating in the South. These claims consist of an average of thirty pages of court deposition from Unionists and supporting witnesses to a list of eighty standardized questions (see Appendix C). The commission eventually heard 22,298 separate claims from white and black Southerners during its years of service. In all, 7,092 survived the rigorous tests for loyalty and property loss administered by the commission. While this study is primarily concerned with determining the cultural nuances of Unionism and the self-identification of political dissenters – not with quantifying dissent – it does offer a systematic analysis of the most reliable source on Unionism: the 362 extant-approved SCC claims from the state of North Carolina. The study also evaluated the entire collection of disallowed claims to determine the accuracy of the commission's evaluation of claimants. (See: Appendix B for how these claims were analyzed.) Nevertheless, for a wide variety of reasons, these claims should not be received as a hard number for uncompromising Unionists, as many allowed claims were destroyed; a large number of other Unionists emerged from the shadows of time to testify on behalf of others yet never filed claims themselves; some African American Unionists had been slaves or free blacks who owned no property; many Unionists doubtless could not afford the process of filing a claim; other Unionists could not prove their property was taken by the U.S. Army during the war; and still more Unionists simply had no property taken for which to file a claim.[8]

Both to the Unionists themselves and the SCC commissioners, unconditional fidelity meant doing enough for the Union to overcome anything done under coercion. The bar for overcoming anything disloyal was quite high, and in order to overcome the deep suspicion of disloyalty, the aid to the Union had to be convincing to very skeptical commissioners. Unionists themselves understood the world of fear and coercion in which they lived during the

[8] For a listing of claimants, see Gary B. Mills, *Southern Loyalists in the Civil War: The Southern Claims Commission* (Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1994); also, see Frank W. Klingberg, *The Southern Claims Commission* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955) undertook a quantitative analysis of the small number of claims filed for more than $10,000; Sarah Larson, "Records of the Southern Claims Commission," *Prologue: The Journal of the National Archives* 12 (1980): 207–218; for the disallowed SCC claims, see Records of the Southern Claims Commission, 1871–1880, Disallowed Claims, RG 233, NARA, Washington, DC (hereafter cited as Southern Claims Disallowed).

war. For example, paying taxes was no tacit recognition of the Confederacy or acceptance of Confederate identity; it was coercion that sometimes had to be acquiesced to in order to resist in covert ways – an alternative to direct confrontation when that would have meant imprisonment, violence, or death. In his brilliant work *Inside War*, Michael Fellman introduced the concept of "survival lying" for understanding the mental reservations of many Unionists caught in a guerrilla war in Missouri. It is clear that Unionists from all walks of life and in many home front situations – not just guerrilla wars – were frequently forced to lie in order to remain on the home front and find ways to support the Union cause. Clearly, however, in order to be considered an unconditionally loyal Unionist by the SCC commissioners and for this study, one had to demonstrate through thought, speech, and action that one had remained a principled Unionist throughout the whole period.[9]

The service, pension, and military records of the eight U.S. Army regiments recruited within North Carolina during the war provide another important window into the lives of Southern Unionists. While the SCC claims privilege propertied individuals, the service and pension records allow for another view of the economic, political, and family backgrounds of the men who served the Union Army from the state. The military service of these men provides a fascinating view of the Union soldier experience that has previously been largely overlooked. These records, coupled with deep research into Confederate military records of North Carolina, provide a multivalent Unionist and Confederate perspective on the lives of a diverse group of dissident Southerners.

In addition to the SCC testimony and military records, which are at the base of the quantitative analysis, this book also draws from the three extant book-length primary sources written by unconditional Unionists. W. H. Younce's *Adventures of a Conscript*, a postwar memoir that addresses Younce's political beliefs and wartime experience, offers important insight into the experiences of mountain Unionists. Alexander Hamilton Jones's memoir, *Knocking at the Door,* also addresses these issues from the perspective of a politically influential local figure in the mountains. The diary of Basil Armstrong Thomasson, in turn, presents a Unionist's perspective from the Piedmont.[10]

These three sources, which focus on white Unionists, are aided by an analysis of all of North Carolina's Federal Writers' Project Slave Narratives that paint a picture of the wartime experience of resistant African Americans. An evaluation of North Carolina newspapers for evidence of black Unionist politi-

[9] Michael Fellman, *Inside War: The Guerrilla Conflict in Missouri During the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 49–52.

[10] W. H. Younce, *Adventures of a Conscript* (Cincinnati: The Editor Publishing Co., 1901); Alexander H. Jones, *Knocking at the Door: Alex H. Jones, Member-Elect to Congress: His Course Before the war, During the War, and After the War. Adventures and Escapes* (Washington: McGill & Witherow, Printers and Stereotypes, 1866); Paul D. Escott, ed., *North Carolina Yeoman: The Diary of Basil Armstrong Thomasson, 1853–1862* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996).

cal activity during 1860–1861 also offered an important source to broaden the evidentiary base for unconditional Unionists in North Carolina.[11]

The background and motivations behind unconditional Unionism have provoked an intense scholarly debate among Civil War historians during the last decade. What emerges in this narrative is the multifaceted nature of Southern unconditional Unionism and the diverse backgrounds of those who subscribed to it. These Unionists rebelled against what they viewed as a false Southern Confederate identity. Though white Unionists did not all completely agree on the purpose of the antebellum Union or on the future of slavery as an institution in the United States, they all did believe that there was no reason to break up the Union in 1860. Many went further, insisting the Union was indivisible. For white Unionists, their loyalty stripped them of many of the antebellum protections that their race afforded them. White Unionists faced constant suspicion, threats of violence, treason charges, torture, and sometimes death. In many cases, for African Americans – whether free or enslaved – their loyalty to the Union placed them in even greater danger than they had experienced before the war. This project adds to the work of historian Steven Hahn, who has recently argued that Southern African Americans had clearly defined politics and political networks during the Civil War. It does so by examining the lines of the political fissures within the black community. African Americans were not only politically engaged, they actually made up two distinctive political coalitions, one anti-Confederate and one actively Unionist. When this study uses the term "South," it is usually to describe the seceding states that made up the Confederacy from 1861 to 1865. When referring to Southerners, the study clarifies between white Confederate Southerners, Unionist Southerners, who were either white or black, and another subset of black Southerners who were not Unionists.[12]

North Carolina offers the perfect laboratory to study the role that Southern Unionism ultimately played in the destabilization of the Confederacy and its armies. The importance of North Carolina as a manpower source for the Confederate army, ranking second in terms of the per capita male population that it contributed and fourth in raw enlistment numbers for the Confederate armies, also makes it an ideal place to ask questions about the importance of dissent for recruitment, conscription, and desertion. North Carolina's large total of deserters, which scholars have speculated was between 14,000 and 24,000 out of 125,000 soldiers enlisted from 1861–1865, put the total desertion rate at between 12 and 20 percent from the ranks of North Carolina regiments. Indeed, one scholar has referred to North Carolinians as the "most

[11] "Born in Slavery: Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936–1938," (23 March 2001) http://lcweb2.loc.gov/ammem/snhtml/snhome.html (15 August 2008). The Works Progress Administration collected 180 narratives of North Carolina slaves during the 1930s.

[12] Steven Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), chapter 3.

discontented" group of soldiers in the Confederacy's Army of North Virginia. The perceived regionalism of Unionism within North Carolina also presents a question for more systematic study as historians pursue answers to what caused Confederate collapse locally in 1865 as opposed to 1866 or afterward.[13]

Chapter 1 explores the question of who Unionists were at secession. In addition to examining the transition of many conditional Unionists to Confederates during the early months of 1861, this chapter explores the background of those who remained loyal after the fall of Fort Sumter and the secession of North Carolina. While many scholars, including Paul Escott and David Williams, have highlighted class as a clear division between those who remained loyal and those who did not, this study complicates that picture. Although roughly two-thirds of Unionists were farmers of modest means, roughly 20 percent fell into commercial, professional, and artisan occupations that made up a Southern middle class by 1860. The 19.6 percent of white Unionists who owned slaves owned on average only 8.2. A handful of Unionists did express antislavery views, and an even smaller number were abolitionists, but their status as non-slaveholders was more commonly a phenomenon of poor economic standing, not progressive racial beliefs. The ambivalence among many white Unionists who owned slaves is closer to what Frank Bryne, in *Becoming Bourgeois*, has found among Southern merchants. This study also confirms the continued strength of the antebellum Whig Party among white male Unionists. White Unionists were more likely to mention Whig Party membership and policies than any other single political reason for continued support of the Union.[14]

The new Confederate government in North Carolina was instituted by force. For Unionists, this military force became a military occupation that restricted their dearly held civil liberties and replaced them with fear and violence. Chapter 2 examines this world of Confederate military enforcement. The new state in North Carolina was repressive and kept Unionists in a near-constant state of fear. While Unionists did not all react the same way to this new Confederate occupation in their home neighborhoods and communities, they all recognized the rapid and devastating change that had occurred in their lives, frequently describing the new government as a monarchy or tyranny. Historians Mark Neely and Paul Escott offered important contributions to the Civil War field by addressing how dissident Southerners were frequently denied civil liberties by the Jefferson Davis government. This study goes further than their studies to examine the role that local Confederate military forces in North Carolina played in constructing an aggressive military regime on the Southern home front where Unionists lived. Confederates constructed highly restrictive communities around Unionists by denying them civil liberties: freedom of

[13] Joseph Glatthaar, *General Lee's Army: From Victory to Collapse* (New York: The Free Press, 2008), 413.
[14] Frank Byrne, *Becoming Bourgeois: Merchant Culture in the South, 1820–1865* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2006), Introduction.