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SPEAKERS
Gary R. Matthews, Question

Gary R. Matthews  00:00
Well, I want to thank you all for being here. And I want to thank the Felson. And I'm pretty impressed this first time, I've been no ox more, although I've studied the bullet family quite extensively, their papers, particularly at the Filson, in writing this latest book that I've done, and Tom bullet, particularly when I was who was a friend, but also Duke when I did the biography on basil Duke. So it's and this being the book I wrote, has a lot to do about slavery in Kentucky and, and the Louisville area. So this is a very appropriate place. And being Lincoln's birthday, it's also good day for, for giving this lecture. My grandmother would have never allowed me to say that. But times have changed. I want to give you a little bit of background on the book before I start my lecture tonight, to let you know a little bit of what Genin generated my interest in in writing this book. When I was doing the Duke book, Basil Duke was a fascinating individual. He was a rabid secessionist that's had grown up in the Bluegrass, but he grew up in a family. He lived with his uncle, and he lived with his aunt and had 10 cousins that grew up in that same family. But they were a very When the war came, they were a very union families, they stuck with the unions. Matter of fact, two of his cousins, female cousins, married union major generals, one married green clay Smith, from Richmond, Kentucky, another one married John Buford, of Gettysburg fame from Versailles, Kentucky. And when I was doing the biography and reading the letters going back and forth, and finding out what was going on. I was I began to wonder why Dooku was such a rabid secessionist and ended up being a Confederate General came from this background. And I started reading more into it as I as I was doing that, and I read II, Coulter, Mertens, Immortan Coulter's book on civil war and readjustment in Kentucky, which was published in 1926, by University of North Carolina Press. I got a lot of information out of that. But but it was, I could see it was really a dated book. A lot of information had come out before, after that. And I started to think, Well, what was the real reason that Kentucky did not secede from the Union? Evidently a southern state of slave state size, I started getting interested in possibly writing a book that would be an update of Coulter's book. Now, Coulter's book does an introductory chapter about antebellum Kentucky. And then the rest of the book is about Kentucky during the Civil War. And after, well, when I started doing the research for this book, more American than southern. And that's just philosophically speaking, at that. I found there were some very interesting things that really have been put
together in sort of a game plan to understand what Kentucky was all about in 1861. And what were the what were the reasons that they didn't succeed? And what I went into was to look at the differences between Kentucky and the other southern states. And when I looked at those differences, the question changed from why Kentucky didn't succeed, succeed to why would they have succeeded? Now, a lot a lot of the reasons I found while there were three principal areas I looked at I looked at the social, political and economic reasons in in a book when I get to the part on secession crisis in Kentucky. I point out the economic reason reasons what I think we're probably believe that Paramount reasons at that time. But when I wrote this book, as I told you a little few minutes ago, Coulter had one chapter on Alabama, antebellum Kentucky and you By the time I got to the secession crisis, I had written nine chapters on Alabama, Kentucky. So I knew this book wasn't going to go through the Civil War, as a matter of fact, but the publisher, University of Tennessee press would like to see a second volume that takes it through the Civil War. So this book goes up to September 1861, when both Union and Confederate troops came into Kentucky, and Kentucky was forced to make a choice. And what I'm going to try to do today is give you a little background on that choice. And we're gonna go way back, historians, as they do work, they keep wanting to go further and further back. And that's what happened in in this book, I actually went back to 1700. In Virginia, I'm going to talk about some topics that are a little bit different. And in a historical lecture, some of you may think they're more social sociology, type of issues, but they're very important issues, that ultimately, when you combine the differences that these issues created, it really put together. The reason Kentucky did what it did in September of 1861. Now, I don't want you to get too excited. But when I talk about the South, in this lecture, I'm going to talk about all the states, meaning all the southern slave states, except Kentucky, and I'm doing that so I can really teach you the differences between them. It's not that I didn't think Kentucky was southern. I grew up Virginia. It was my family. My grandmother, particularly, was very pro Confederate, obviously, being there. And she had pitcher, Stonewall Jackson, Lena, in the living room, and we had a library, not quite this extensive, but a nice one. And it was all books about the Confederacy, except in a very dark corner of the library. When I was about nine years old, I found a biography of Abraham Lincoln. And I started reading that biography. I remember us nine, that's when I found out the south lost the Civil War. So I'm gonna take it from there. I'm gonna talk a little bit about class structure in the south. And I'm going to talk about what is referred to as the master class. Now, the master class, were those slaveholders that owned 20 or more slaves most of whom, who were in that class, owned quite a bit more than that. And then I'm going to talk about Southern pheums. And how southern this was defined by that master class, southerners was looked upon by the master class as how committed you were to slavery. Now, if you know anything about Kentucky history, you know that in 1850, there were several times each one of the constitutional conventions in Kentucky there were attempts to pass some sort of legislation relative to the emancipation of slaves by pretty vociferous minority, but they weren't they never gained any ground. And by 1850, Kentucky was you could say Kentucky was pretty well committed to slavery, although the deep south slaves question that because of some of the things that were going on up here. Things like caches Marcellus Clay running around and expounding things about how bad slavery was John fee setting up a a multiracial school and in Berea, Kentucky, just they were they felt that perhaps Kentucky was a little and Kentucky was was trying to die fused the number of slaves they had. So southern this was determined by what commitment you had to slavery. But there was a co commitment. What some people forget or didn't realize was just as important as that commitment to slavery. And that CO commitment was the commitment to the political and economic structure that the master class at created In a South class system that they had created, and we'll get into that, in a few minutes here, the experience and perception of slavery different was different in various parts of the South. And there was not one single variation that may have made a difference in Kentucky, but it was the aggregate of different different types of experiences that
when put together, it gave Kentucky a different perception of slavery than it did in the lower South. The reason I use the lower South because the states in the lower South of seven states in the lower South were the first ones to secede and then later pulled in the other four states, and what would you call the Mid South. This relationship but but when you talk about differences in slavery, there was one element of slavery that was not different anywhere, and that difference was the master slave relationship. And that that relationship naturally, was was one that was based on class interests, the master class over the slave class, and that in and of itself, would create distinctions and would perpetuate what the master class was trying to do. And that was to further their interests over that as the low or the slave class, this ultimately would lead to conflict, as time went on. This conflict would also expand to not only and when I when I talk about conflict, I don't mean actual fighting, but I mean, conflict and objectives or goals that people had in achieving what they wanted to achieve, you know, socially, politically or economically in their life. I knew it was a conflict regarding the implementation of those implementation of those objectives. Now, Henry Clay, understood the conflict between the slave and the owner in 1829. In Frankfort, he gave a speech to American Colonization Society. On any outline what he felt that conflict was, and I'm gonna, quote, read what he said he, he stated, our laws mean the laws of Kentucky in Southern States continuing to regard them the slaves, as property, and consequently, as instruments of labor are bound to obey the mandates of others. They are rational beings like ourselves, capable of feeling of reflection, and of judging of what naturally belongs to them, as a portion of the human race, by the very condition of the relation which subsists between us, we are enemies of each other, they know well the wrongs, which our ancestors suffered at the hands of our ancestors, in the wrongs, which they believe they continue to endure, although they be unable to avenge them, they are kept in such good subjection only by superior intelligence, and superior power of a predominant race. And that thing would carry on, on and on into Kentucky. Now, we when we talk about class, you know, you wonder why do we need to talk about class when we're talking about when we're talking about slavery or the political issues that we're evolving here in the antebellum south? It is a class is important for two distinct reasons. One is that slavery is a Quintessence example of inequality between classes. And a second is that slavery was the foundation of the class structure, or the stratified class structure structure that held the majority of the wealth in the south. And these people who did the master class, perpetuated an ideology and social philosophy that was distinctly unAmerican. By that I mean, you go back to studying the Declaration of Independence when they say all men are created equal. And then you had the dichotomy in the South. Yes, all men were created equal. And in some southern states all All men, white men are created equal that own property, unlike in Kentucky never had a property requirement. The nuances of these relationships. And our coexistence of wealth, power and prestige, are part of the things we're going to take a look at. Prior to the pre pre industrial in the pre industrial era of the United States, which was generally before 1840, there was no class format in the north, or in the frontier of Kentucky. Now, there were enclaves of class in the northeast, but they weren't large enough to create a class structure. The only class structure that existed at that time was in colonial Virginia, where the plantation complex came into being, and in that complex, the right to labor, capital, and production were in the hands of one class, and nothing in the hands of the other class. And that involved into society. That principally was a dominant form of inequality that we wanted to talk about. Now, as time went on this class structure developed into three components of wealth, race, and conflict. Wealth itself was a very important aspect of this, John Euston. Oh, about 15 years ago, wrote a book call the price of union, it was an interesting, it was a economic assessment of the value of slavery to the to the south. And his, his whole thesis was the Civil War was, was driven by the South trying to protect the wealth that they had. And then there was some offshoots to that. But it's a very important analysis that he made, because when I give you some numbers here, it's going to it might seem very impressive to you. There were four approximately for me and
slaves in the United States in the southern states, in 1860. Out of those 4 million slaves, over half were owned by the master class, and the master class was a composite of 46,000 individuals, or approximately one half of 1%, of the southern white population. So you had all this power and wealth that was basically concentrated in one one set segment of the society. And it could create critical to the survival of that master class was a relationship between the value of the slaves and that wealth. In other words, the value of the slaves went down, their wealth went down. And that correlation was always subject to whatever price cotton was able to be sold that now between 1845 and 1860. The South was experiencing a cotton boom. LED drove up the value of slaves and the value of the property that they owned. It's it's significant that prior to 1840, this wealth, the South is probably the wealthiest section of the country. In 1860, the value of slaves was approximately $3 billion. That was 18.7 35% of the entire wealth in the United States. So slaves equaled approximately 1/5 of the value of everything that's unimaginable today. There's nothing in this country that has 1/5 of the now you have all the wealth this correlation between wealth. There's a direct correlation between this wealth in southern political sensitivities. The wealth recognized by this by the South made them feel in order to preserve that wealth. The only way they could preserve it by 1860s was to form an independent nation. And the structure if you look at how the secession went, the wealthiest slave states in slave values started with the first secession, the first tier of secession. And then as you went up north, the second tier was less wealthy. And then when you got up to the border, South states, the wealth attributed as slaves was not the same proportion as it was in the Deep South. Now in 1860, Kentucky had 225,000 slaves. The value of those slaves between 1850 and 1860, doubled because of the cotton boom. In Kentucky, the slaves were valued at $171 million. Slaves are 19.5% of the population of Kentucky, with 26% of the wealth. Those are huge numbers too. But here's another factor to consider. Georgia, we go back down to the deep South Georgia with a similar population and wealth factor, as Kentucky had twice as many slaves as Kentucky, the slave ratio in Georgia was over fit was almost 50% of the population, but represented 56% of the wealth. Now, when you look at the slave states, including Kentucky and 1860, and you take away the slave wealth on each one of those slaves, slave states, Kentucky becomes the wealthiest southern state. In other words, they'd had more wealth, and slaves were encountered than any other southern state, including Virginia and Louisiana. The closest in value to Kentucky, Kentucky, absent the values that are slaves a wealth was, and remember, slaves were 26% was 495 million. The closest was Virginia, which was 420 million, and Missouri would 414. But what that what those numbers tell me is that and should tell you also is that Kentucky, even though they had 26% of their value tied up in slaves, they still had more wealth, that the slaves did not necessarily mean that that was the way the future was going to go for them as far as our economic prosperity, and that that was a very important decision making factor. In Kentucky, they had other choices they could make because they have more wealth than the rest of the southern states. I did something one time. That was pretty interesting. They used to when they did the census to put the census data together in 1830. And 1860s, they would do a lot of separation by region. And they would call it they would do what they call the middle Atlantic states, which is basically Pennsylvania and New York in that area. They do New England, they would do the Midwest, and they would do the south. And the South was very competitive in those numbers. But if you took as far as wealth, look, but if you took the states of Missouri, Kentucky and Virginia to those numbers, it was a drastically different picture. And of course, you know, majority in Kentucky, neither one of those succeed but Virginia did it if it's already in and Kentucky had gone What the Confederacy could have been a whole different, different scenario. What happened now you have this master class you had the slave class. What made the difference between Kentucky and the rest of the south where Kentucky had a middle class. The middle class started very early in Kentucky. had a look at my clock I'm talking a lot more than I thought I would. The middle class in Kentucky is very very important. For one reason, the south and remember I'm excluding Kentucky here the
South really didn't have much of a middle class until it started to emerge in the 1850s. And that middle class that emerge principally in cities like Charleston, in New Orleans, in the urban areas, recognize that the interests they had, they wanted to achieve the same interests that the northern middle class had begin began to achieve. But they rarely recognized in order to do that, their perception, or their goals of economic performance, were in direct conflict with the master class now, and eight, but they weren't strong enough to remove that obstruction. A lot of them wanted to create it what we refer to as industrial slavery, they thought that perhaps that the slaves instead of just being used for agriculture, could be turned in the worked in manufacturing, the master class didn't did not want like that. They feared putting slaves in an industrial situation would get word in some way, reduce the control they had over the slaves, that slaves would be mixed with wage earners or somehow it would destroy the whole class system that they had. They had created. Now they tried slaves and manufacturing concerns here in Connecticut rather successfully. They did it here in LAX or they didn't Lexington. They did it here in Louisville, particularly, particularly in the hemp industry. So the southern states other than Kentucky did not have a middle class that that could do. To compete with the master class. It was an altogether different situation. And Kentucky, Kentucky had a middle class. And the reason Kentucky had a middle class was Kentucky other than Baltimore and Maryland, and New Orleans port city in Louisiana, Kentucky had more of an urban population than the rest of the South, and the urban population, or urban centers like Louisville, Northern Kentucky, in Lexington, to a lesser extent, were areas in which the middle class could develop. And that middle class in Kentucky basically was a mercantile and commercially oriented middle class. They're they create their own wealth. They purchased their own slaves, and they became a social elite outside of the agricultural regime, so they became a social elite with wealth separate from any kind of planter or Gentry class here in Kentucky. And and the amount of wealth, the Kentucky middle class here had was fairly substantial. It was substantial enough to tilt the balance in a power struggle with the with the wealth distribution with those slave owners that owned 20% or more in 20, or more slaves in this state. What that did was the so called master class and Kentucky, the only way they were able to achieve any sort of sort of political power to preserve their position was a formal alliance with the middle class within the Whig Party, and that for years, that's how at KIPP, they were able to keep basically no form of emancipation occurring. The middle class and he thought he also was taking Kentucky into different economic and political direction than the master class in the south. The master class in the South was doing everything they could to perpetuate and protect their class interests. The middle class in Kentucky, particularly in Louisville, I think more than anywhere else. Right. It was developing interests with Northern financial institution trading with the northmor knew that that saw the growing northern middle class where the money was being made in the north and saw that slavery in the long run was not going to going to help Kentucky at all. In fact, most people realize that principally because of climate, Kentucky could You get the same profit out of slaves that the lower South states did. They didn't have cotton, although they tried to grow it in and south western part is state, rice or sugar. The crops that were grown in Kentucky really weren't conducive to massive slave labor like they were in the Deep South. Mostly grain crops corn. Now they tobacco really didn't become a major crop in Kentucky until the late 1840s. And hemp probably was the was a crop that was more most conducive for slave labor. But very few slaves are needed for a hemp crop to make it profitable. So even though Kentucky had all these states, slaves, most of them were underutilized and taken care of slaves that aren't producing profits for you cuts down those profits. So from a practical standpoint, most Kentuckians realize that they slavery was was not something that was going to, to it has become an actually becoming a burden. That, you know, what are we going to do with all these slaves in Deep South, the US intellectual arguments to try to make slavery circle around the argument that all men are created equal by slaves, slaves weren't created as equal, as, as white men that slaves couldn't take care of themselves, they'd be a burden on society, we use
different arguments of paternalism that it was a slave owners responsibility to take care of these slaves and the slaves in in consideration that were supposed to give them an uncompromising obedience. They tried to say that slavery what they call slavery in the abstract, was was good was a good thing. That it produced profits for them. It was good for the for the slaves, because you couldn't like the slaves go, they wouldn't be able to take care of themselves. But in Kentuck, going back to a clay stated, everybody knew that to have slavery or they felt that slavery, slavery wasn't evil. But because of slaves had been for so long. They become in bondage, they become institutionalized. They became lazy, they said they and they just, and they became angry. And they were afraid that if they emancipated slaves, and they stayed around, that they would compete with the poor whites, and they would compete with them both from economically, and the big argument, they would compete with them sexually, and there would be an amalgamation of races. So Kentuckians, unabashedly stated that we're going to keep slavery principally just to control the, the the African American population within the state. We can't just let them go. Now, there was some argument that somebody gave us $171 million, that's a different story. We would let him go. But that didn't happen. It was never going to happen. So the master class would actually, for the master class succeed. They needed to have the non the white non slaveholders to support them. And there was there's no timeline when they got that support. It almost happened simultaneously with the expansion of slavery. The reason they got the support was they were able to convince the poor whites many home are uneducated, most of whom are not were uneducated. That you know, we have enough of slaves in the state here in us in the south here. If as long as we have slavery, you'll never have to do menial labor. And they bought into that. One of the arguments the other argument being you, you could not if we freedom, they would compete with you And you wouldn't be able to earn a fair wage. Plus the poor white recognize the fact that the only way in the Deep South, for them to become wealthy was to own slaves. So they support it, even though the fact was very few, if any, actually achieved becoming a member of the master class. As a matter of fact, in the lower South, wealth and slave ownership became so concentrated, that between 1830 and 1860, the number of families owning slaves in the Deep South, decreased by 1/3. So you had all these poor whites supporting them. And it's interesting when they, when secession came in order for the states to secede, that's where they really got their support was from from, from the poor whites, there was some question amongst the actually the Master master class as to let's try to work this out, fearing that they what would happen ultimately did happen. Now, one thing that we talk about, in Kentucky I hear an awful lot about as the slavery was not as harsh in Kentucky as it was in the Deep South. Physically, that's probably true. Now, slavery mentally is no different. Wherever it is, whether you're picking cotton in Alabama, or setting a table and law of all, you're still a slave. And that mentality is is, which is going to be the same no matter what. But certainly in Kentucky. The climate and the type of work that most slaves did, was a lot less harsh than it was in the Deep South, you know, the weather alone permitted the slaves to function better than it did in the deep south. So let me summarize real quick here, because I can see I'm running out of time. One of the big differences between Kentucky and the lower South when it came to the time to decide whether to stay in the Union was, number one. Kentucky recognize that slavery was not the ultimate. They weren't dependent on slavery, for their ultimate economic success, success. They had other means they'd be they had other wealth in which to put their money. And if it came to war, as long as that slavery was protected, those slaves were protected. And that's what Lincoln told them initially, then, the slaveholders were fine with with staying in the union. You also had that strong middle class that really controlled the political power in Kentucky. Even though there were slave owners in that class, if you looked at the demographics or the who was in who was in the legislature, particularly in the Upper South states, including Kentucky, you'd be surprised how many were non slaveholders on the air, there were slave owners, but there there were just as many that if not more, that weren't. So you had that
strong middle class that understood they had economic ties with the North that they didn't want to break. And the other thing, which we didn't talk about, but I wanted to tell you, which was probably very important, even though the class structure was more balanced in Kentucky than the South was that middle class in Kentucky recognize that Kentucky had never been integrated into the economy of the lower South, that it was integrated into the economy, the Ohio Valley. And when the railroad started moving west, from the east in the 1850s, those economic ties kept moving further and further north. The merchants and the commercial people in Kentucky recognize as if Kentucky seated they would be in a micro economic situation where their economy was different than the rest of us other southern states, and they would be cut off from the source where their economy was going. Those factors were very pretty determinative and a lot of reasoning going into not succeeding. Also a lot of promises coming from Washington, things haven't changed. That solidified that. Well, I wanted to talk about a lot more, but I always run out of time. But if you I would love to entertain some questions. Yes, sir.

Question 40:38
From a period of January to September of 1861, I get the impression that the public debate in Kentucky you touched on the summer, the public debate in Kentucky was held best to protect slaver

Gary R. Matthews 40:58
there. It was all based on self interest. That's right. They felt that if they wanted to, and this is what I said when I said they got some guarantees. Cretan and Garrett Davis, had gone to Washington and talked to Lincoln. Buckner had gone to Washington and talked to Lincoln. But they felt they were would be more secure in the union, they would be in the Confederacy, principally because the Kentucky was right on the edge. Kentuckians knew the North would fight just because of how they they had to deal with them on. You know, there were 100,000 Kentuckians living in Indiana who had moved in and that's those types are and moved in 60,000 and never Louis, another 100,000. In Missouri. They knew what the mind set set was up there. And they and they felt that if there was going to be a war and the union would protect them, protect their slaves. In other words, by protection, not emancipating them. There was no reason for them from from an economic standpoint, to join in with.

Question 42:31
The writer said secession means remove the Canadian border.

Gary R. Matthews 42:37
Yeah. Yeah. You know, Breckenridge, Breckenridge. His argument was, if Kentucky did secede, it would be dangling down and ready, ready to be grabbed, you know, secession was a close call in Tennessee. It was manipulated in Tennessee. And of course, half of Virginia broke off it's it's interesting, but they thought they thought the slaves would be protected. They eat when in Missouri in I think it was August of 1861. Fremont made some proclamation that he was going
to free all the slaves a Confederates owned in the state, immediately can tell Kentuckians row two. Row two Lincoln ended Joseph Holt Joseph Holt was was wrote, wrote a lot about Joseph Holt, in his book, he was pretty instrumental in holding Kentucky together. That you need to do something to stop that, because that’s getting everybody excited here. And Lincoln did he told him that, you know, they pull that proclamation back, but you know, a year later after Tina, and they were, I mean, the whole political landscape changed when the Emancipation Proclamation happened in January of 1863. Kentuckians didn’t vote for Lincoln in 1864. Because of that, you know, and other reasons. But they were concerned about in the Union sphere, you know, there were different different groups of union as you know, you had some real hardcore unions, but they were a real minority. You had Unionists that were Unionists if slavery would be protected. Yeah. Do you need us if slavery was okay if slavery wasn't protected, but if we got conquered say that there were a lot of slaveholders in Kentucky, even though there weren't a lot of the master class. Kentucky had a lot of you know that the average number of slaves owned by a slave owner in Kentucky was 5.4. You know, in in Mississippi, it was 15. And South Carolina was 18. But there were a lot of slaveholders. And if you're a small slave holder, those slaves are more valuable to you. Because they're much bigger proportion of your wealth. So, yeah, I mean, they weren't concerned about that. But they thought, you know, they didn't. Kentucky never had the secession was they didn't to them. Now. They had that teachings from Henry Clay and critten that were with a Whig philosophy of the Union. And it was difficult for them to grasp. Why would you do that? Although a lot, a lot of Kentuckians fought for the Confederacy. Any other questions? Yes, sir.

Question 46:13
Did you come across any, like a balance sheet for only a slight, you know, you obviously have the purchase price, but then you have to provide maintenance, as I was saying whatever versus what income you could expect, especially in Turkey, versus

Gary R. Matthews 46:35
it was more merchant marginal in Kentucky. I think. Economic historians have concluded that slavery was profitable, particularly in the Cotton States. I have seen various figures as to what type type of percentage of profits. Most agree that the Cotton States during the boom per slave was probably 8%. Profit. In Kentucky, nobody's really done a study on that. Because slaves were used for for diverse purposes in Kentucky, you in a lot of slaves in Kentucky, perhaps as many as a third, were permitted to be leased out or hired by other and that offset some of these under under utilization factors. But slavery probably in the hemp area was profitable. Maybe in manufacturing. And it would depend, you know, if you had, let's take the Bluegrass for example. That's where the highest concentration of slaves were. I mean, Woodford County was 48%, Black in 1860. And Lexington Fayette County was in a high 40s. All those counties, I think even one county have a bit over 30%. But in even then, they were raising livestock, not particularly thoroughbred horses, but they were they were raising livestock. And he needed less slaves than likes Dukes fam out. I saw the census they had, they had 50 slaves. And that doesn't mean 50 Working slaves, that old slaves, they had young slaves. They had the, you know, slaves in our 20s and 30s or toward the, you know, from 15 onwards or productive years. But if and they were raising, they had cattle on on there, and they didn't use if they use only if 10 or 15 of those slaves were under utilized. They still had to maintain them. They still had to feed them. And it cost costs quite a bit. I even saw a census from Christian County I think.
Believe it or not, they had a slave on there who was a female slave who was 100 years old. How long do you think they were keeping her alive? You know, she wasn't generating anything for them. But I would say the profit in Kentucky would have been marginal at best. Which means saving didn't make a little bit of money. Yes sir.

Question 49:56

We find one you recall Think back to your grandmother. But my mother's was somewhat the same way. So don't feel so old. When I was 60, rereads, at least once a year, although he had a little different type change, she was talking about language, he said, she should have it go get good enough job, he should go and get one more than at all they have this conflict with the tariff sale. So that was our take on it. But I was mentioning about that you're here. You got so many chapters. And so you know, that was expensive. So are you actually sort of teasing your editor and have other issues when you're talking about really close issues and some of them so you kind of hinted a number of other issues?

Gary R. Matthews 50:51
Yeah, they want me to do a second volume to this, to take us through the Civil War, and uptaking 77. Now, I've got a couple projects on the on the burner right now. Brian McKnight, who teaches down over at UVA, a friend of mine, he's written that book contested border land. In a biography on champ Ferguson, him and I are working on a biography of Simon Buckner sort of a dual thing, not because there hasn't been anything written on that. So I gotta get that out of the way. I made that promise. And you know, sometimes you make promises, and you think about it later. Well, you have to have a little honor in your life. So I've got to complete that one. And I've been working on on a more national type of project on Annabelle, on, which I've found that era to be really fascinating. You know, Kentucky was a very important state then. And, you know, they, they were pretty perceptive as to what was going on. But I think I think there's been some there's been a book already done on Tennessee, very similar to my book that covers the secession crisis in in Tennessee, and actually what it is, it's called politics parties and the sectional conflict and tendency. It's because Tennessee was split into three segments. You had the Eastern, Central and the Western, the Western was really where they grew cotton was really, for secession. The East was like, yeah, the East was always a unit stronghold during the war, even though Tennessee succeeded. And the central part was sort of like Kentucky, you know. So they they had it's an interesting story, how they succeeded. Yes. Yes, ma'am.

Question 53:06

Just anecdotally, sort of in the same strain. What was your grandmother's reaction? When you told her that you found the book on Lincoln? Because actually, first of all attitudes, I think, are very important part of history of conflict.

Gary R. Matthews 53:21
Yeah, I read it for a while before I told him why I was interested in it. I don't know where that I've tried to find that book. Elsewhere. You know, it's one of those things. When you're a kid, you don't think how important it is to talk to people who are older than you to learn about it.
you don't think how important it is to talk to people who are older than you to learn about it. Then when you're 50 years old, you look back and say, I wish I would have talked about but I remember the book I was reading the reason that grabbed my interest was that it started out with Lincoln was working on a on a little ferry boat or something, he helps people get across to St. Maarten, and they threw him some money. I for some reason, I remembered that. And I sort of got my interest. It may have been more of a juvenile type of book when I read it at that time, but I never went back afterwards. And I started talking to her about it. And, and she talked about me she she she had some very distinct ideas, you know, I mean, she didn't you know that her generation was only when she was alive. I guess maybe when I was I'm old enough. Now there would have been a she. There were veterans, you know that she was related to for for ancestors that fought the Confederate army. And so they, you know, she would have and some of them had you know, they weren't too happy about the outcome. And and I think that grew as time went on and and they you know it's but I should never say anything harsh about him like, you know, we need to celebrate John Wilkes Booth birthday or something