Born in Mercer County, KY on June 3, 1837 Elijah was the son of Ebenezer and Margaret Hutchinson Magoffin and the nephew of Beriah Magoffin, Governor of Kentucky during the war. He was graduated from Missouri State University and in 1856, he moved to Boone County, Missouri. The next year he moved to Pettis County, and there lived with his father until the war came on. His father was a warm southern man, and took an active part in the struggle. In a skirmish at Georgetown, in Pettis County, Ebenezer killed two militia men, for which he was tried at Lexington and sentenced to be hung. He was released, however, in exchange for Gov. King and Judge Ryland, who were held as prisoners by Major Elijah Magoffin. In December, 1861, Col. Magoffin and his sons started south in Robinson’s regiment of recruits, and were captured on Blackwater, December 19, 1861. Col. Magoffin was again tried, and sentenced to be shot; the sentence was delayed, and he was put in close confinement at Alton, Ill. Before the sentence was executed, he escaped from Alton. Thirty five POWs broke out using a tunnel and a bribed guard. The three Magoffs based somewhere in Arkansas for the rest of the war. Soon after his escape, he was stabbed and the murderer was pursued by Major Elijah Magoffin, caught and hung. In April, 1865, Major Magoffin was promoted to Lt. Col. at the battle of Jenkins’ Ferry. He was in every important battle fought during the war in the trans-Mississippi department, and distinguished himself as a soldier. He surrendered at Shreveport, and returned home. In February, 1872, he married Miss Nannie Fackler, daughter of George and Elizabeth Fackler, of Pettis County and moved to Independence, Missouri. They had 4 children together before Lt. Col. Magoffin was killed in a head on train wreck in Greenwood, MO on 27 Nov. 1886.
Message From The Commander,
Jason Coffman

Confederate Patriots:
I went down to the Battle of Monte-vallo last month down in Vernon county. Camp members Bob Capps, his son Robert Capps Jr. and Dale Crandell were there along with some members from the Coffee Camp. It was a well attended event. Good job to Bob Capps for being the chief organizer of that event.

I went down to Osceola last week to the annual Coffee camp Heritage supper. James Bradley and his wife Deborah went too. James won an award for his due diligence with the Missouri Division website. The award was given to him by the Missouri Division Commander Darrell Maples. I went on the tour that Coffee camp sponsored and it was very interesting. Rick Reed, a member of the Coffee camp really knows his history of St. Clair county Missouri during the war and was the narrator of the tour.

Hughes camp had Confederate Memorial Day at Woodlawn cemetery in Independence last week and it was well attended. Thanks to everyone who attended that event. Pictures of these three events were taken and they can be viewed on the John T. Hughes and Missouri Division SCV facebook pages.

Our very own 1st Lt. Commander of Hughes camp Kurt Holland has been selected as the Missouri Division Sergeant of Arms. He will be taking care of the Missouri Division flags for a while.

Continued on Page 3...

Hughes Camp would like to give a warm southern welcome to our newest member, Arnall Early. Arnall lives in the Lone Jack area and is from Georgia originally. Welcome aboard Arnall!
What’s been happening on the Western Front..

April 12th– Camp Meeting…

This month our speaker was Dave Wells of Omaha, NE. Dave is one of the curators of a place called the “Civil War Veterans Museum at the G.A.R. Memorial Hall” in Nebraska City, NE. Now one would think that such a place would have a decidedly Yankee slant to it, which it does, but they do fly both the US and Battle Flag full time in front of their museum. Which is more than the Museum of the Confederacy does these days, so thanks to this museum for doing that! I commend them!

The museum’s motto or mission statement says, “Dedicated to the memory of Union and Confederate Veterans of the Civil War 1861-1865. Dave says about 40% of the archives and exhibits are Confederate and 60% of the items are Union.

The museum is located in an actual GAR Hall, which is a pretty cool old building. Nebraska was a territory during the war and did not provide many Union troops for the war, but many Union vets moved there after the war. I think Dave said there are over 800 GAR halls that were built in Nebraska after the war.

As a territory, Nebraska was required by king Lincoln to send men to put the South down. Nebraska sent 3300 men, about 1/3 of the male population. With most of the men gone, the locals were in great fear of Indian attacks.

Dave talked about how when the secession happened, President Buchanan washed his hands of it, he wrote a letter to the south complaining about it, but left it to Lincoln to deal with it. Once inaugurated, Lincoln acted as a dictator. Congress was out of session that time of year, and while Lincoln could have called Congress into session to deal with Secession, he chose to leave them out, and used the War Powers act to call up troops and invade the South. He did it that way so he could call the shots and not have to deal with Congress, who might not have voted for war.

Thanks to Dave for speaking to us!

www.civilwarmuseumnc.org
Commander Coffman continued...

I am going down to Jefferson City this weekend to the reenactment and Division GEC meeting and will fill you all in on what is going on and what Commander Darrell Maples has in store for the Hughes camp. I hope to see you all at the next meeting on the 10th.

Yours in the Bonds of Confederate Brotherhood,
Jason-Nathaniel: coffman
John T. Hughes Camp 614 Commander

2012 Hughes News Sponsors Wanted!
Thanks to the many donors in the past! Thanks to the 2012 sponsors of the Hughes News, Steven Cockrell, Joe Ferrara, John Yeatman, George Baker.

Dave Wells tells us about Nebraska’s participation during the war.
Chaplain’s Corner, Hughes Camp Chaplain Richard W Rudd

The virtues of states’ rights are being rediscovered in some of the most unexpected quarters. The most recent spark to ignite this rediscovery is the Defense of Marriage Act enacted by Congress in 1996. While still recognizing the right of states to define marriage within their own jurisdictions, this law defines marriage as a union between one man and one woman for the purpose of distributing government benefits associated with access to family insurance, social security, and the joint filing of income tax.

Last month, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Boston heard arguments by the State of Massachusetts and proponents of the legalization of sodomy that the Act is discriminatory and interferes with states’ right to legislate concerning marriage. As it has done with immigration laws, the current administration again refuses to perform its constitutional duty by not upholding the Defense of Marriage Act and defending it in court. The Justice Department abdicated responsibility on the alleged grounds that it could not ascertain a sound basis on which to build a defense of the law. Failure to ascertain a sound basis on which to build a case did not prevent the solicitor general from making a feeble attempt to defend the administration’s health care law. The administration has arrogantly “advised” the judicial branch that it should defer to acts of Congress. Why is the administration not consistent in following its own advice regarding the Defense of Marriage Act? Consequently, the House of Representatives established the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group and hired former solicitor general Paul Clement to defend the law in court.

Thirteen states and the District of Columbia have given some form of legal recognition to sodomy or grant benefits to such arrangements. Thirty-six states have laws against this practice and 30 states’ constitutions prohibit it. Although the majority of Americans repudiate sodomy, in 2004 and again in 2006 Congress failed to muster the 2/3 majority required for a constitutional amendment to define and protect in America the 6,000-year-old institution of marriage. As an Illinois senator, the current White House resident voted against the proposed amendments. Posing as a defender of states’ rights, he justified his votes with the argument that only the states should define marriage. The minority who seek legalization of sodomy know they cannot prevail against a constitutional amendment. Instead, they pretend to advocate states’ rights while chipping away at the institution of marriage and subverting the family, the basic foundational unit of civilization, one state at a time.

The offensive attack to redefine marriage and subvert the family unit earnestly began in 1967 with Loving vs Virginia. In that case, by judicial edict, the Supreme Court abrogated the laws of 30 states and over 300 years of legal precedent in America against miscegenation. Such laws had existed in America since the 17th century and were in effect in the 13 colonies. After the legalization of both miscegenation and sodomy, the next target will be legalization of polygamy. The crux of the plaintiffs’ argument then against miscegenation laws, now against sodomy laws, and in the future against polygamy laws was, is, and will be discrimination. Not all discrimination is bad; there are legitimate reasons why we should not only permit, but insist on the practice of discrimination. Decency, morality, marriage, the family, America as we have known it, and civilization depend on it. To be indiscriminate is to drift along with situation ethics based on the myth of relativism; there is no God, no absolute standard of right and wrong, no sin.

God created Adam and Eve, not Evan, and performed the first marriage in the Garden of Eden. (Gen, 2:22) Christ said, “Have you not read that He Who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, ‘For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one?’” (Matt. 19:4) St. Paul wrote this warning: For this reason God gave them up to dishonorable passions. Their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural, and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in their own persons the due penalty for their error. (Rom. 1:26)

If those Americans who share complicity in this abomination refuse to honor God’s Word, God will surely give America up to its dishonorable ways and we as a nation will receive the due penalty for this error.

Fr. Richard Rudd
Historians Corner, Donald Gilmore

This month the Hughes News is excited to introduce Donald Gilmore as a contributing columnist! Each month we’ll alternate between Donald Gilmore and Paul Petersen. So we now have two great guys on board that really know their stuff when it comes to the War in Missouri!


Orders No. 11: “The Rest of the Story” by Donald L. Gilmore

Although it’s generally understood that Orders No. 11 was a response to the sacking of Lawrence, Kansas, and the killing of 150 to 200 people there, a plan almost exactly like Orders No. 11, in many respects, had been in the planning stage as early as August 3, 1863, and later, in the form of Orders No. 9 and Orders No. 10 published on August 18—all of which took place before the raid on Lawrence, Kansas in August 21, 1863.

Rumors of these impending actions were probably known even earlier than the above-mentioned dates. So that at least three weeks, in some cases, before the Lawrence raid, plans nearly as severe as Orders No. 11, in some ways more severe—which were seemingly the prototype for Orders No. 11—were specified, and plans for enforcing them were proceeding. These plans, known by the guerrillas, could have been the reason for the sacking of Lawrence, in fact.

In a message from Brigadier General Thomas Ewing, Jr. to his commander’s adjutant general on August 3, 1863, Ewing suggested that “The worst rebel families” in Western Missouri were be arrested and escorted to “colonies on the St. Francis and White Rivers in Arkansas with only their clothes and bedding to accompany them.” This was a sort of concentration camp solution to the problem of the guerrilla families, and was a more severe solution by the Federal authorities than Orders No. 11, which allowed the guerrilla families to haul out some of their belongings, those that had wagons, horses or oxen still available to carry them. Orders No.11, also, was just a banishment that ordered the vast majority of people in Western Missouri to remove themselves to other areas of Missouri. The earlier plan was to segregate the families into fixed cantonments or concentration camps, outside of Missouri, where they could have been contained and their freedom abridged, a much more severe and extreme policy, in fact.

On August 18, 1863, at Ewing’s direction, Major Preston B. Plumb, Ewing’s chief of staff, promulgated General Orders No. 9 and General Orders No.10. Among other things, General Orders No. 9 stipulated that:

Lieutenant Colonel Walter King, Fourth Missouri State Militia, will . . . make and certify a list of all such Negroes at each of such [military] stations, and of all the persons by whom the disloyalty of their master can be shown, and will deliver one copy of such list of names to the commander of such station and forward one to this headquarters. . . .

Continued on Page 6...
Commanders of such stations will furnish from time to time, as they may be called for by the commander of escorts, copies of the list so prepared and filed with them, and will issue rations, where necessary, to Negroes named in such list who are unable to move from such station or to earn a living there, until escort can be furnished them to a place of safety where they can support themselves.

Commanders of companies or detachments serving in that part of Missouri included in this district will give escort and subsistence, where practicable, to all negroes named in such certified lists to Independence, Kansas City, Westport, or the State of Kansas, sending direct to these headquarters all such Negroes fit for military duty and willing to enlist.

What was being enacted in General Orders No. 9 was (1) that the slave property of western Missourians, their expensive human chattel, paid for by themselves, was being taken from them irreversibly, without repayment in any form; and (2) their freed slaves, perhaps many of them, were to be encouraged to enlist into the U.S. Army to fight for the North, possibly even against their old masters in Missouri.

Then, propounding this injury, General Orders No. 10, promulgated at the same time, was designed to deliver the coup de grace to western Missourians. It stated:

... The teams [that is, horses] of persons who have aided the rebellion since September 25, 1862, will be taken from them to help such removal [of former slaves to freedom], and, after being used for that purpose, will be turned over to the officer commanding the nearest military station, who will at once report them to an assistant provost-marshal or to the district provost-marshal, [the military police] and hold them subject to his orders [It doesn’t say the horses will be returned to the owners, you will note.]

Such officers will arrest, and send to the district provost-marshal for punishment, all men and all women not heads of families who willfully aid and encourage guerrillas [This means the sons and daughters of slave owners and others], with a written statement of the names and residences of such persons and of the proof against them... the wives and children of known guerrillas, and also women who are heads of families and are willfully engaged in aiding guerrillas, will be notified by such officers to remove out of this district and of the State of Missouri forthwith... if they fail to remove promptly, they will be sent by such officers, under escort, to Kansas City for shipment south, with their clothes and such necessary household furniture and provision as may be worth removing.

I think it’s easy to see the many similarities of the decree of August 3, 1863 and Orders No. 9 and 10 of August 18, 1863 and the later Orders No. 11, published and enforced after August 25, 1863. The earlier orders seem as severe or more severe in some respects than Orders No. 11.

Clearly, Orders No.11 was not the result of the sacking of Lawrence. But the sacking of Lawrence was used as an excuse for implementing Orders No. 11, which was based on the earlier planning I have cited. Also because the order freed the slaves and seized the property of Western Missourians, it violated their constitutional rights. Furthermore, in divesting Western Missourians of their slave property without payment could be construed as a form of theft. Even when the British, during their colonial period in Africa, freed slaves, they ensured that their owners were compensated for them. There was never a plan to pay alleged rebel Missourians for their slaves before the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863. Of course, Missouri slaves owned by Northern sympathizers were NOT freed until 1865, two years after the Emancipation Proclamation, which only addressed slaves in most of the South, not all of the South.

Donald L. Gilmore
Confederate Memorial Day, Woodlawn Cemetery, April 29th

Thanks to all who attended our Memorial Day Service. A special Thanks go to all the ladies of Independence Chapter 710 UDC. The day started off quite rainy, but the rain stopped about an hour before we began. Sure enough, not long after we were done, it started raining again! We’ve been lucky like that several times in the past and have never been rained out or rained on while doing our Confederate Memorial Day. I figure God must like the Confederates!

We did our pretty normal service, with speeches from Commander Coffman, Trish Spencer-President of Chapter 710, and Kurt Holland of Boyd Chapter 236, MOS&B. Our keynote speech was by Jim Beckner, who talked about the Confederate Constitution, and how much better our Country would run nowadays if we would adopt some of the things the CS Constitution did. We then read the names of the 125 or so Confederate Soldiers who are buried there at Woodlawn.

Afterwards, Chapter 710 took over and we helped them dedicate a new grave marker for Col Elijah Magoffin.

Here are some pics below, who are provided to us by Carl Wilder, who was a guest in attendance and is interested in joining Hughes Camp.