

Racial Violence Reported in Norfolk Newspapers, 1866 (page 1 of 2)

INSUBORDINATION AND CRIME.

If the result of yesterday's operations are to be judged of as a sample of the effects of the Civil Rights Bill, we pray God turn from us the bitter cup. Does the negro suppose that freedom means to butcher indiscriminately white men, women and children, whenever they may choose to have a procession. Are these drunken carnivals of the blood of white people to mark each step of the negro in his march to superiority over the peaceable white citizens of the South? If so, it is surely time the white people should know it.

We dreaded this thing—yesterday, when we saw what purported to be a civil procession of colored people, headed by a number of men, bearing muskets, rifles and swords, without any regular military officer to command them. If there is anything calculated to boil hot blood, it appeared to us this was.

Citation: "Insubordination and Crime" (excerpt), Norfolk Day Book, April 17, 1866, Library of Virginia

PRIMARY SOURCES FOR EDUCATORS AND STUDENTS

Racial Violence Reported in Norfolk Newspapers, 1866

(page 2 of 2)

~~POSITION TO A LAWFUL CELEBRATION.~~

Nothing is more shocking than that the papers of this city have been so untrue in the account they have given of the riot on Monday last.

We have carefully gathered the facts in the case, which may be found in another column, and our limited space forbids that we make many comments here.

These papers inquire why these liberated slaves were allowed to carry arms and wear a uniform on that occasion? This inquiry is raised as an excuse for the citizens interfering with the procession, virtually acknowledging that the citizens commenced the attack, as we have stated.

These liberated slaves are soldiers just from the war; these arms the Government allowed them to purchase to take to their homes for this very purpose. It has been a custom, not only in this, but in every nation, for returned soldiers to attend national celebrations with their arms. Our revolutionary soldiers did it; why not these soldiers? Shall we have any more respect for those who fought against us than our forefathers did?

Returned Confederate soldiers wear uniforms with Confederate buttons, and carry concealed arms, not only on celebration days but all the time. Do the Norfolk city papers ever say anything about this?

Maj. Stanhope justified this act in these returned soldiers. During the excitement two of the muskets were loaded; the Major ordered the charges drawn; this was proper.

These papers state that the procession moved through all the streets without molestation. This is untrue; they were molested.

They say "no provocation was given." We acknowledge that the whites attacked the negroes without provocation.

This "armed detachment meant" no mischief, and there would have been no mischief done had they not been attacked.

These papers inquire "Where was Maj. Stanhope?" We answer: He was in his place doing his duty like a man and a soldier, as is evident from the fact of his being shot at by the white mob that paraded the streets all night while honest men were at home and abed.

It is said that Gen. Terry is also to blame for allowing any celebration. What does this mean? Are we to be forbidden to hold national celebrations in our own country, lest we offend the enemy? Gen. Terry is right, and the loyal public will sustain him.

It is to be regretted that this disturbance occurred. And it is now clearly the duty of every citizen to wait and look to the law for redress. Before we close we would inquire why it is when the whites made the attack at two different points in the city, and at night shot at the commander of the Post, there was no arrests made but among the colored people, until the military took the matter in hand?

Citation: "[Opposition] To a Lawful Celebration," *True Southerner*, 19 April 19, 1866, Library of Virginia.