

## Institutional Database of Staff Publications Tennessee Division of Archaeology

Title: The Fort Pillow Massacre: A Statistical Note.  
Year: 1989  
Name(s): John Cimprich and Robert C. Mainfort, Jr.  
Source: *The Journal of American History* 76(3):830-837

Publisher Link: <https://www.tennesseehistory.org/publications/tennessee-historical-quarterly/>

# The Fort Pillow Massacre: A Statistical Note

John Cimprich and Robert C. Mainfort, Jr.

---

Federal recruitment of blacks during the Civil War was an important part of the process that destroyed slavery and necessitated the reordering of American race relations. Enlistment, especially for those who fled slavery, provided opportunities to help defeat the proslavery Confederacy and to promote changes for blacks. Ominously, the Confederate government refused to recognize captured black troops as military prisoners and left to its member states the options of returning them to owners or executing them as insurrectionaries. Confederate soldiers could not help but feel antagonized when their enemy armed runaway slaves, and when the two sets of soldiers collided amidst an already bloody war, it was no surprise that ugly violence and controversy resulted.<sup>1</sup>

The most dramatic and publicized incident of this sort occurred on April 12, 1864, at Fort Pillow, Tennessee. The issue of whether or not Confederate troops massacred much of the garrison provoked an intense, often partisan, debate. Only during the last fifteen years have most general works on the Civil War accepted the massacre interpretation; some doubt still surfaces in print.

A massacre is commonly understood to involve a significant number of deaths, but no complete casualty report was filed by Federals after the Battle of Fort Pillow. The victorious Confederates not only captured or destroyed the post's records but also killed its two ranking officers. The resulting lack of a full casualty report has hampered previous analyses of the event.<sup>2</sup> As the first researchers to utilize relevant military records at the National Archives, we have derived a more precise casualty estimate than those found in prior studies. The results provide conclusive support for the current interpretation that a massacre, particularly of the black Union troops, occurred at Fort Pillow.

The incident took place at a Federal outpost located on a Mississippi River bluff

John Cimprich is associate professor of history at Thomas More College, and Robert C. Mainfort, Jr., is regional archaeologist, Tennessee Division of Archaeology. The authors wish to thank the Southeast Missouri State University Grants and Research Funding Committee and the Tennessee Division of Archaeology for financial assistance.

<sup>1</sup> Dudley Taylor Cornish, *The Sable Arm: Negro Troops in the Union Army, 1861-1865* (New York, 1956), 158-62, 262-66, 289-91; Bobby L. Lovett, "The West Tennessee Colored Troops in Civil War Combat," *West Tennessee Historical Society Papers*, 34 (1980), 53-70.

<sup>2</sup> William F. Fox, *Regimental Losses in the American Civil War, 1861-1865* (Albany, N.Y., 1889), and Thomas L. Livermore, *Numbers and Losses in the Civil War in America, 1861-65* (Boston, 1901), focus on major battles and do not attempt to calculate figures for Fort Pillow.



This scene appeared on the cover of the May 7, 1864, issue of *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper* with the following caption: "The war in Tennessee—rebel massacre of the Union troops after the surrender at Fort Pillow, April 12."

about fifty miles north of Memphis, Tennessee, where Maj. Lionel F. Booth commanded a garrison of about 600 men, divided in roughly equal numbers between white and black troops. Many of the black troops were runaway slaves; the whites were Tennessee Unionists. Confederates despised both groups, but the blacks especially disturbed them because these soldiers raised the specters of slave rebellion, race war, and white subordination. While raiding through west Tennessee, Maj. Gen. Nathan B. Forrest attacked Fort Pillow with about 1,500 men who had never before faced black troops. The initial fighting boxed the Federals into a small half-moon-shaped fortification. Over eight hours later, shortly after Forrest had unsuccessfully requested the fort's surrender, it fell to the Confederates. This minor engagement gained notoriety only because the Federal survivors accused the victors of massacring much of the garrison after capturing the fort.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Albert Castel, "Fort Pillow: Victory or Massacre," *American History Illustrated*, 9 (April 1974), 46–47; John Cimprich, *Slavery's End in Tennessee, 1861–1865* (University, Ala., 1985), 92–96; U.S. Congress, *Senate Committee Reports*, 38 Cong., 1 sess., no. 63.

Forrest's initial report on the battle claimed that his force killed 71 percent of the Union forces. Writing about the same time, one of Forrest's surgeons thought that the deaths reached 79 percent, while a Confederate cavalryman suggested 81 percent. The flush of victory, inability to count escaping soldiers, and overestimation of the garrison's size clearly affected these figures, but such high estimates by experienced soldiers also reveal an awareness that the bloodletting reached massive proportions. A federal congressional investigation concluded that over half of the garrison was massacred, although the precise number of victims could not be determined.<sup>4</sup>

For many years afterward, southern writers vigorously sought to exonerate the Confederate troops and especially their commander, who became a folk hero because of his military prowess. In their defense of Forrest, several authors attempted to calculate the Federal casualties at Fort Pillow. Forrest's major biographers started with a Federal adjutant's statement that the garrison numbered 557 "by last reports" and subtracted from that figure their estimates of the wounded (based on references in Federal reports) and captured soldiers (based on a prisoner list published in the general's authorized biography). The biographers claimed that no massacre occurred, even though they judged that 40 to 45 percent of the Union soldiers had died. Like Forrest, they attributed most of the casualties to a desperate defense of the fort, although a few writers conceded that some unnecessary killing occurred.

In a 1947 article, John L. Jordan shifted attention to a more detailed casualty estimate that projected the lowest Federal death rate of all writers—31 percent—by raising the garrison's supposed size to 580. To the adjutant's figure of 557 troops, Jordan added (*a*) all civilians reported to be present—something not normally done in estimating battlefield casualties—and (*b*) a number of men on the published prisoner list who belonged to units not stationed at Fort Pillow. Additionally, he relied heavily on several sketchy references to groups of escaped Federal soldiers picked up by naval vessels after the battle. Jordan concluded that too low a proportion of the Federals died to indicate a massacre.<sup>5</sup>

Three major problems undermine the estimations of Jordan and his predecessors. First, the authors missed hints in Federal reports that recruiting took place at the post. Enlistments significantly enlarged the garrison by the time of Forrest's attack. Second, the published prisoner list was misleading. A handwritten prisoner list in the National Archives' collection of Confederate records, as well as Federal army files

<sup>4</sup> U.S. War Department, *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (128 vols., Washington, 1880–1901), ser. 1, XXXII, pt. 1, p. 610; John Cimprich and Robert C. Mainfort, Jr., eds., "Fort Pillow Revisited: New Evidence about an Old Controversy," *Civil War History*, 28 (Dec. 1982), 300; W. R. Dyer diary, April 12, 1864, Confederate Collection (Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville); *Senate Committee Reports*, 38 Cong., 1 sess., no. 63, pp. 1–3.

<sup>5</sup> War Department, *War of the Rebellion*, ser. 1, XXXII, pt. 1, p. 556; Thomas Jordan and J. P. Pryor, *The Campaigns and Life of Lieut. Gen. N. B. Forrest* (New York, 1868), 428, 444, 704; John Allan Wyeth, *The Life of General Nathan Bedford Forrest* (New York, 1899), 354–61; Robert Selph Henry, "First with the Most" Forrest (New York, 1944), 258–59; Eric William Sheppard, *Bedford Forrest: The Confederacy's Greatest Cavalryman* (New York, 1930), 170–72; Andrew Nelson Lytle, *Bedford Forrest and His Critter Company* (New York, 1931), 279; John L. Jordan, "Was There a Massacre at Fort Pillow?" *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, 6 (June 1947), 111–14. See also Charles W. Anderson, "The True Story of Fort Pillow," *Confederate Veteran*, 3 (Nov. 1895), 326; and J. Harvey Mathes, *General Forrest* (New York, 1902), 227.

on several of the soldiers, makes it clear that the Confederates captured a number of the listed men elsewhere, prior to the battle. This includes nearly all troops from units not stationed at Fort Pillow. Third, the use of incomplete and sometimes ambiguous sources rendered the pro-Confederate writers' estimates of the number of wounded Federals inaccurate. As we demonstrate below, the correction of these shortcomings would have significantly changed earlier findings.<sup>6</sup>

Jordan's article represents the last attempt at total vindication of the Confederates. Beginning in the 1950s, most studies of Fort Pillow have argued that a massacre occurred. These works relied on the army's internal investigation as the conclusive evidence, rather than on the congressional report, which the Confederates' defenders had denounced as propaganda.<sup>7</sup> Most general works on the Civil War at first hesitated to accept this conclusion and took the neutral stand that allegations of a massacre remained unproven. Only since 1973 have syntheses unanimously labeled the incident a massacre. Lonnie E. Maness stands as the only writer to have diverged from this trend, mostly by recapitulating earlier defenses for the Confederates. Like Jordan, Maness saw great significance in casualty figures: "The fact that there were so many survivors [he estimates 59 to 69 percent of the Union garrison], given the nature of the battle, challenges the accuracy of the charge of an indiscriminate slaughter."<sup>8</sup>

The number of deaths suffered by the losers is unavoidably a central point in a massacre debate. It is significant that no previous research has utilized the National Archives' military service records for the troops stationed at Fort Pillow. These and other records provide the keys to generating an accurate casualty count. The task is arduous and complicated; the authors must admit that our first efforts resulted

<sup>6</sup> *Senate Committee Reports*, 38 Cong., 1 sess., no. 63, 25, 97. The handwritten prisoner list, which has identical misspellings of some names but does not include most of the captured blacks appearing on the published list, is housed in Publications File (ser. 1, XXXII, pt. 1, p. 619), RG 109 (National Archives). Relevant Compiled Service Records are those of Charles E. Pratt (1st U.S. Artillery), H. W. Holloway (2nd Illinois Cavalry), and Ranson B. Springer (2nd Iowa Cavalry), Compiled Service Records, RG 94 (National Archives). The prisoner A. Baker claimed to belong to the 52nd Indiana Infantry but, as he has no Compiled Service Record, he was probably a civilian.

<sup>7</sup> Cornish, *Sable Arm*, 173–75; Albert Castel, "The Fort Pillow Massacre: A Fresh Examination of the Evidence," *Civil War History*, 4 (March 1958), 46–49; Castel, "Fort Pillow: Victory or Massacre," 47. The army report appears in War Department, *War of the Rebellion*, ser. 1, XXXII, pt. 1, pp. 502–40; a handwritten copy is located in the Mason Brayman Papers (Chicago Historical Society, Chicago, Ill.).

<sup>8</sup> Mark Mayo Boatner III, *The Civil War Dictionary* (New York, 1959), 296; J. G. Randall and David Donald, *The Civil War and Reconstruction* (Boston, 1961), 394; Bruce Catton, *Never Call Retreat* (New York, 1965), 335; Allan Nevins, *The War for the Union* (4 vols., New York, 1959–1971), IV, 60. Two books that took a firm stand early were Benjamin Quarles, *The Negro in the Civil War* (Boston, 1953), 206, and James M. McPherson, *The Negro's Civil War: How American Negroes Felt and Acted during the War for the Union* (New York, 1965), 216–17. Recent studies following that mold are Robert Cruden, *The War That Never Ended: The American Civil War* (Englewood Cliffs, 1973), 142; Shelby Foote, *The Civil War: A Narrative* (3 vols., New York, 1958–1974), III, 108–12; William L. Barney, *Flawed Victory: A New Perspective on the Civil War* (New York, 1975), 147; Peter J. Parish, *The American Civil War* (New York, 1975), 260; Leon F. Litwack, *Been in the Storm So Long: The Aftermath of Slavery* (New York, 1979), 90–91; James M. McPherson, *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York, 1982), 353; Ira Berlin, ed., *Freedom: A Documentary History of Emancipation, 1861–1867* (2 vols., New York, 1982–), ser. 2, vol. 1, 21; Richard H. Sewell, *A House Divided: Sectionalism and the Civil War, 1848–1865* (Baltimore, 1988), 178; and James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York, 1988), 748. The opposing view appears in Lonnie E. Maness, "The Fort Pillow Massacre: Fact or Fiction," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, 45 (Winter 1986), 287–315, esp. 310–11. Patricia L. Faust, ed., *Historical Times Illustrated Encyclopedia of the Civil War* (New York, 1986), 278, and Mark Mayo Boatner III, *The Civil War Dictionary* (New York, 1988), 296, take ambivalent stands.

in some small errors.<sup>9</sup> But additional research and cross-checking of sources at the National Archives have refined our figures as far as seems possible.

We began by examining the compiled service records of garrison members. The War Department tried to build these files for every soldier, documenting all major status changes and the cause whenever possible. Because the black troops at Fort Pillow belonged to the Sixth U.S. Colored Heavy Artillery and the Second U.S. Colored Light Artillery, which were headquartered in Memphis, Tennessee, their statistics could be calculated exactly and their files required only minor supplementation.<sup>10</sup> In marked contrast, Maj. William Bradford's battalion of white unionists lost most of its papers with the fort's fall. Since the reconstructed service records are sketchy and incomplete, it was necessary to consult a number of additional sources simply to narrow the range of estimates.

Relevant data on Bradford's men appeared in medical records, pension files, a muster-out roll, military correspondence, and a newspaper report. Army hospital registers list every patient with the reason for admission, the occasion of the problem, and the outcome of treatment. Medical cards are brief compilations of information about treatment received by each soldier; they are the only source of data from registers that have not survived. Pension files contain documents related to application for and reception of veteran's benefits; they may include a soldier's or heir's account of his service. Muster-out rolls, compiled when a unit disbanded at the end of the war, list every member—in this case, every remembered member—and his status.<sup>11</sup>

The impact of the Fort Pillow incident on the individual is not always directly stated in his papers. The authors drew inferences in a limited number of cases. All men missing in action were considered killed; the only alternative—an unlikely one—would have been for such men to have escaped capture and then to have deserted without leaving a trace. Two men who appear on a list of the wounded released by the Confederates, but who are missing from subsequent records, apparently died aboard ship in route to a hospital, as reported by a St. Louis newspaper.<sup>12</sup> Seven men present before the battle and performing active duty afterward without explication were assumed to have escaped unscathed.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Cimprich and Mainfort, eds., "Fort Pillow Revisited," 293–95; Cimprich, *Slavery's End*, 94.

<sup>10</sup> 11th U.S. Colored Infantry Compiled Service Records; 2nd U.S. Colored Light Artillery, *ibid.*; Bradford's Battalion, *ibid.*; 6th Tennessee Cavalry, *ibid.* The 11th U.S. Colored Infantry later absorbed the 6th U.S. Colored Heavy Artillery. Having lost so many members at Fort Pillow, Bradford's Battalion was shortly thereafter incorporated into the 14th Tennessee Cavalry and was later absorbed by the 6th Tennessee Cavalry. Memphis and Mound City Hospital Registers, RG 94 (National Archives); War Department, *War of the Rebellion*, ser. 1, XXXII, pt. 1, pp. 510, 538–39; Jordan and Pryor, *Campaigns of Forrest*, 704.

<sup>11</sup> Memphis and Mound City Hospital Registers; Medical Cards of Bradford's Battalion, RG 94 (National Archives); Pension Files, RG 15, *ibid.*; Muster-out Roll of Co. E, 6th Tennessee Cavalry (Tennessee State Library and Archives); War Department, *War of the Rebellion*, ser. 1, XXXII, pt. 1, p. 562; *St. Louis Missouri Democrat*, April 16, 1864; Jordan and Pryor, *Campaigns of Forrest*, 704.

<sup>12</sup> Benjamin Lancaster and Franklin Thompson entries on the List of Wounded Received aboard Silver Cloud, April 13, 1864, vol. 31, Letters from Squadron Officers, RG 24 (National Archives); *St. Louis Missouri Democrat*, April 16, 1864.

<sup>13</sup> John Condra, Bradford's Battalion, Compiled Service Records; Samuel Smith, *ibid.*; George W. Crawford, Pension File; Thomas Ruffins, 14th Tennessee Cavalry, Compiled Service Records; Henry I. Wilkins, *ibid.*; Francis

The authors have identified 277 of Bradford's men who definitely were present at the battle. This is a plausible low estimate of the unit's manpower that day, since one report claimed that a large group of white troops deserted the night before the event. Derivation of our high estimate began with Major Bradford's last monthly return, a detailed accounting of present and absent men. This document recorded 295 soldiers present at the end of March, twelve days prior to the battle. Compiled service records indicate that in the interim before Forrest's attack, 10 enlistees entered Company E and 2 deserters returned.<sup>14</sup> However, 2 soldiers were captured by Confederates a few days before the battle, 3 men left on detached duty, 4 definitely deserted on the night of April 11–12, and another probably did (given the implausible story on his pension application).<sup>15</sup> When these additions and subtractions are made to the March 31 sum, the result is a high estimate of 297 men present. Supporting the possibility of a figure greater than our low estimate of 277 is the fact that 18 additional members of Bradford's Battalion have some pre-battle records but do not appear in subsequent documents. One more has a vague medical card stating only that during the month of the incident he entered a hospital (the register of which is no longer extant) and died soon afterward.<sup>16</sup> If some of these soldiers were at the battle rather than deserting, they must have perished as a consequence.

Summary tabulations of our findings appear in tables 1, 2, and 3. Our research indicates that of the 585 to 605 men present on April 12, 1864, between 277 and 297 Federals, 47–49 percent of the garrison, were killed or mortally wounded at Fort Pillow. Clearly the death rate was higher than that calculated in any previous study.

More important, the tables also reveal a differential casualty rate for the black and white units.<sup>17</sup> Black troops suffered a casualty rate nearly double that of their white counterparts (64 percent compared to 31–34 percent). To evaluate the proposition that these figures significantly differ from casualties that could be expected due to chance, a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) test was applied to tables 2 and 3. The results place at less than .001 the possibility that the observed difference was due to chance alone.

---

Peck entry on the Co. E, 6th Tennessee Cavalry Muster-out Roll. None of these men was absent on the Monthly Return of April 8, 1864, Bradford's Battalion, Muster Rolls, RG 94 (National Archives).

<sup>14</sup> John Cimprich and Robert C. Mainfort, Jr., eds., "Dr. Fitch's Report of the Fort Pillow Massacre," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, 44 (Spring 1985), 29; Monthly Return of April 8, 1864, Bradford's Battalion, Muster Rolls; Bradford's Battalion, Compiled Service Records (esp. for David J. Scoby and Franklin Tidwell).

<sup>15</sup> M. E. Baird and H. L. Brogden entries on List of Prisoners Captured by Major General Forrest, April 1864, Publications File (ser. 1, XXXII, pt. 1, p. 619); Hugh A. Hill, 6th Tennessee Cavalry, Compiled Service Records; James Thompson, *ibid.*; John Walters, Bradford's Battalion, Compiled Service Records; Fred Kelso entry on Co. E, 6th Tennessee Cavalry Muster-out Roll; Benjamin Condray, Pension Files; Jonathon Wiggs, *ibid.*; War Department, *War of the Rebellion*, ser. 1, XXXII, pt. 1, p. 568; *Senate Committee Reports*, 38 Cong., 1 sess., no. 63, pp. 32–33.

<sup>16</sup> Francis Anderson, Bradford's Battalion, Compiled Service Records; John W. Curtis, *ibid.*; James W. Dollins, *ibid.*; Josiah M. Forrester, *ibid.*; John L. Gooden, *ibid.*; Laban Hairslip, *ibid.*; Samuel E. Hugeley, *ibid.*; Lewis H. Jones, *ibid.*; James P. Michenor, *ibid.*; Caspar Nipper, *ibid.*; William B. Read, *ibid.*; George Riggs, *ibid.*; John K. Tale, *ibid.*; Addison White, *ibid.*; Matthew Wilson, *ibid.*; William A. Wright, *ibid.*; Robert Kendill entry on Monthly Return of March 9, 1864, Bradford's Battalion, Muster Rolls; Joseph Konnau entry on Monthly Return of April 8, 1864, *ibid.*; Henry F. Williams, Medical Cards.

<sup>17</sup> In addition to Bradford's Battalion, the white units column includes three of the fort's staff who were on detached duty from their regiments: A. J. W. Thompson, 32nd Iowa Infantry, Compiled Service Records; Thomas C. George, 7th Kansas Cavalry, *ibid.*; and John T. Young, 24th Missouri Infantry, *ibid.*

**Table 1**  
Tabulation of Identified Union Troops

	<i>Bradford's Battalion</i>	<i>Other White Staff</i>	<i>6th U.S. Colored Heavy Artillery</i>	<i>2nd U.S. Colored Light Artillery</i>	<i>Total</i>
Killed or missing	61	0	167	18	246
Died from wounds	21	0	10	0	31
Subtotal for dead	82	0	177	18	277
Wounded or sick survivors	39	1	25	5	70
Captured	149	2	39	12	202
Escaped	7	0	29	0	36
Subtotal for survivors	195	3	93	17	308
Grand total	277	3	270	35	585

**Table 2**  
Federal Casualties by Unit (Low Estimate for Bradford's Battalion)

	<i>White</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Total</i>
Died	82 (31%)	195 (64%)	277 (47%)
Lived	198 (69%)	110 (36%)	308 (53%)
Total	280	305	585

NOTE:  $\chi^2 = 70.30$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $\phi = .35$

The percentages of deaths are the most telling statistics; phi ( $\phi$ ), a measure of the strength of association between the variables (that is, how closely surviving or dying was linked to the soldier's unit), stayed in the moderate range, .30-.35.

By themselves, our figures could be used to support the occurrence of a massacre, a desperate defense by blacks, or both. To establish causality, we must turn to written records, in particular to key documents recently published by the authors. Confederate Sgt. Achilles V. Clark wrote shortly after the battle: "The slaughter was awful. Words cannot describe the scene. The poor deluded negroes would run up to our men fall upon their knees and with uplifted arms scream for mercy but they were ordered to their feet and then shot down." A Confederate newspaper correspondent added: "Thus the whites received quarter, but the negroes were shown no mercy." Desperate fighting by blacks fearing a massacre might have occurred, but, if so, these quotations show that the fear was—or quickly became—reality.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Cimprich and Mainfort, eds., "Fort Pillow Revisited," 299, 304.



**Table 3**  
Federal Casualties by Unit (High Estimate for Bradford's Battalion)

	<i>White</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Total</i>
Died	102 (34%)	195 (64%)	297 (49%)
Lived	198 (66%)	110 (36%)	308 (51%)
Total	300	305	605

NOTE:  $\chi^2 = 54.22$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $\phi = .30$

The new quantitative and documentary evidence unequivocally demonstrates that a massacre occurred. Immediately after the battle, however, an intense controversy arose about this conclusion. By April 16, the allegations of Federal survivors had appeared in many Unionist newspapers. Republican editors condemned the victors for uncivilized warfare, which they often portrayed as characteristic of their enemy. Radical Republican papers went farther, attacking President Abraham Lincoln for soft war policies and demanding a program of revenge against the Confederacy. The *Chicago Tribune* typically editorialized: "Retaliation in kind is the only medicine to soothe the fearful memories of Fort Pillow." After a congressional committee began investigating the incident, Lincoln publicly promised: "If there has been a massacre . . . and being so proven, the retribution shall as surely come."<sup>19</sup>

Disturbed by these charges, Forrest wrote a defensive report, claiming that high Federal casualties resulted solely from their refusal to lay down their weapons. By early May, the tone of Confederate newspaper accounts of the battle shifted dramatically from gloating over slaughter to denying it. Some expressed concern about Federal revenge and propagandist use of the matter. When the congressional investigation produced a strongly worded denunciation of Forrest's army, the general forcefully stated that he never ordered, approved, or knew of any maltreatment of captives.<sup>20</sup> Significantly, these Confederate statements implied an acceptance, at least on the public level, of the Federal premise that the execution of blacks for joining the Union army was wrong. Although smaller massacres of black soldiers occurred later, the Confederacy generally treated black military prisoners as property rather than as insurrectionaries to be executed. After Forrest's next encounter with black troops—the Battle of Brice's Crossroads, Mississippi—he felt a need to appear personally before the captured Federals and promise their safety.<sup>21</sup> The high death toll at Fort Pillow expressed the depth of hostilities over a major social change. Oddly enough, the resulting controversy modified the shape of that conflict.

<sup>19</sup> *New York Times*, April 16, 1864; *Memphis Bulletin*, April 14, May 1, 1864; *Cincinnati Commercial*, April 20, 1864; *Chicago Tribune*, April 16, 1864; *New York Tribune*, April 16, 17, 1864; *Cincinnati Gazette*, April 16, 26, 1864; *St. Louis Missouri Democrat*, April 16, 1864; Roy P. Basler, ed., *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* (9 vols., New Brunswick, 1953–1955), VII, 303.

<sup>20</sup> War Department, *War of the Rebellion*, ser. 1, XXXII, pt. 3, 822, pt. 1, pp. 590, 616; Cimprich and Mainfort, eds., "Fort Pillow Revisited," 297, 301, 304; *Charleston Mercury*, April 21, May 2, 3, 1864; *Columbus* [Georgia] *Enquirer*, April 26, 1864; *Mobile Advertiser and Register*, May 6, 7, 1864; *Atlanta Intelligencer*, May 8, 1864; *Memphis Appeal*, May 13, 1864 (published in Atlanta at that time).

<sup>21</sup> Cornish, *Sable Arm*, 176–80; G. A. Hanson, *Minor Incidents of the Late War* (Bartow, Fla., 1887), 75.