

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: TEACHERS OF THE LOST CAUSE: THE
 UNITED DAUGHTERS OF THE CONFEDERACY
 AND THE RHETORIC OF THEIR CATECHISMS

Amy L. Heyse, Doctor of Philosophy, 2006

Dissertation Directed by: Professor James F. Klumpp
 Department of Communication

The decades following the American Civil War marked an uncertain and tumultuous time in United States history. After the war ended in 1865, the country experienced racial discord, economic depression, and social unrest. Such conditions endured well into the twentieth century, especially in the South.

Perhaps most devastating to white Southerners during this time were the crises they faced with memory and rhetorical subjectivity. First, ex-Confederates struggled to control how their Southern past would be remembered by present and future publics. Second, they worked to restore rhetorical agency since they could no longer speak and act as a “Confederate people.”

Attempting to ameliorate these crises, many white Southern residents embraced a myth known as the “Lost Cause.” Essentially, the rhetoric of the Lost Cause glorified the days of the Confederacy, valorized the men who fought in the war, and declared the South’s innocence in relation to the war and Reconstruction.

A major purveyor of the Lost Cause was the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC), the largest and most popular white women's memorial association in the South during its reign. The UDC formed in 1894 and was involved in a variety of commemorative activities.

But perhaps the women's most powerful rhetorical impact on the South was achieved through their efforts with the Children of the Confederacy (C. of C.), an auxiliary group of the UDC. Besides commemorative work, the highlight of the C. of C. meetings would be learning Southern history from their textbooks or "catechisms" written by the Daughters themselves.

My project, then, is a historical-critical analysis of the UDC's rhetorical strategies in their catechisms for children. I contend that the UDC exploited Southern myths, especially the Lost Cause myth, to construct collective memories of the South's past. Then, with their mythical memories, I argue that the women constituted the Children as the next generation of "Southern people," which was an effort to help restore rhetorical collectivity and agency to the defeated South. It is my hope that with this study, we may appreciate the complex rhetorical undertaking the Daughters accomplished with their catechisms for children.

Teachers of the Lost Cause: The United Daughters of the Confederacy
and the Rhetoric of Their Catechisms

by

Amy L. Heyse

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2006

Advisory Committee:

Professor James F. Klumpp, Chair
Professor Robert N. Gaines
Professor Shawn J. Parry-Giles
Professor Mari B. Tonn
Professor Shirley W. Logan

©Copyright by

Amy L. Heyse

2006

Acknowledgements

My profound and unending appreciation goes to Dr. James F. Klumpp for advising this dissertation. His wisdom, patience, and unwavering belief in me were invaluable as I worked on this project and found my voice as a scholar. I am also grateful to my dissertation committee, Dr. Shawn J. Parry-Giles, Dr. Robert N. Gaines, Dr. Mari Boor Tonn, and Dr. Shirley W. Logan, for their amazing insights and support throughout this entire process. I also thank the Department of Communication at the University of Maryland, for fostering a resource and support community that has proven invaluable to my graduate career.

The community at Maryland consists of so many remarkable people. My gratitude goes to Dr. Edward L. Fink and Dr. Leah Waks for their constant words of encouragement, and to Bonnie Gaines for just about everything, especially for helping me navigate the overwhelming bureaucracy of the University. To my dissertation support group—Leslie Dinauer, Lisa Burns, Leah Tuite, and Laura Janusik—what would I have done without you? These extraordinary women inspired me on every level, whether professional, emotional, or spiritual, and for that I am eternally grateful.

Even after some of us graduated and/or moved from Maryland, the community held together and I continued receiving precious support, especially from Diane Blair, Lisa Gring-Pemble, Michael Chambers, Michael Philipp, Bjørn Stillion Southard, Belinda Stillion Southard, Jason Black, Michele Mason, Lisa Corrigan, Neil Mansharamani, and Nacho Córdova. You are all remarkable

scholars, inspiring teachers, and dear friends. And to my Pisces soul mates, Leslie Dinauer and Michael Phillips, who let me cry on their shoulders, offered sympathetic ears, and then picked me up and sent me back to work, thank you for being the best friends a fish could ever have.

I consider myself extremely fortunate because when I moved from Maryland, I found another support community in my colleagues at California State University, Long Beach. I thank especially my department chair, Sharon Downey, who is an amazing source of support, and my colleagues, especially Karen Rasmussen, Dawn Kelsey, Norah Dunbar, Amy Bippus, Jose Rodriguez, Marc Rich, Tim Plax, and Catherine Brooks, all of whom would stop by my office to offer their words of encouragement and advice.

Of course, this dissertation would not have existed without the help of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. My infinite thanks go to Ann and Barbara at the UDC headquarters in Richmond, Virginia, who let me scour their collections whenever I needed. Also, I am deeply grateful to Brenda Latham and Kathy Smith Brewer who were invaluable resources in my search for answers. I am also indebted to the many archives and libraries across the country for sharing their treasures with me.

I also thank my family for supporting me throughout this process and my new in-law family for always showing interest in my project. I must also thank my feline children, Paloma and Magic, for reminding me to take breaks by “typing” on my keyboard and for never asking: When are you going finish your dissertation?

Finally, I thank my incredible husband, David Carey, for everything under the sun. You challenge me, inspire me, and encourage me in ways I never thought possible, and your support and love throughout this process have been immense. Thank you for not letting me throw my computer out the window when I was frustrated, for rubbing my feet when I was having a hard day, and for talking about my project with more enthusiasm than I do. You are my everything and I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	v
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Collective Memory.....	7
<i>Defining Collective Memory</i>	7
<i>How to Find Collective Memory</i>	10
<i>Issues in the Literature</i>	13
Constituting “the People”	17
<i>Defining Rhetorical Subjectivity</i>	17
<i>How to Find “the People”</i>	22
<i>An Issue in the Literature</i>	24
The Lost Cause and Other Southern Myths	25
UDC Catechisms.....	30
<i>A Brief History of the Catechism Genre</i>	33
<i>A Brief History of the UDC’s Catechisms</i>	41
Method and Analysis	46
<i>Contextualism</i>	47
<i>Analysis Questions and Contributions</i>	51
Organization of the Study	53
Chapter Two: The Crisis of the Post-War South	57
The Defeated South.....	59
Southern Women Respond.....	79
<i>The United Daughters of the Confederacy</i>	82
<i>The Children of the Confederacy</i>	92
Conclusion	99
Chapter Three: Studies of the Era: Interpretations of the Post-bellum South.....	100
Southern Oratory Literature	101
The Lost Cause Literature.....	108
<i>Organizing the Literature</i>	110
<i>Issues in the Literature</i>	116
The Lost Cause and the UDC Literature.....	121
Research Goals.....	127
Conclusion	130
Chapter Four: The Myths of the Post-War South	132
The “Mythical” South/The Solid South.....	136
<i>The New South</i>	138
<i>The Old South</i>	142
<i>The Lost Cause</i>	144
The “Mythical” Context of the UDC	157
Conclusion	170
Chapter Five: Mythical Memories of the South.....	171
Making Mythical Narratives	174

<i>The Slavery Narrative</i>	175
<i>The Narrative of Secession</i>	179
<i>The War Between the States Narrative</i>	186
<i>The Narrative of Radical Reconstruction</i>	196
Mythical Narratives into Mythical Memories.....	201
<i>Creating the Memories</i>	202
<i>Remembering the Memories</i>	210
Conclusion	214
Chapter Six: “The People” of the South	216
Constituting the “Southern People”	225
<i>Who are the “Southern People?”</i>	226
<i>A New Southern Nation</i>	231
<i>“The People” Must Act</i>	236
Interpellating the “Southern People”	240
Rhetorical Subjectivity Regained.....	247
Conclusion	251
Afterword	254
Appendix I: United Daughters of the Confederacy Catechisms:	
Critical Editions and Essays.....	258
Cornelia Branch Stone’s Catechism.....	259
Mrs. John P. Allison’s Catechism	271
Mrs. St. John Alison Lawton et al.’s Catechism	280
Mrs. James A. Fore’s Catechism.....	294
Decca Lamar West’s Catechism	306
Works Cited	330

Chapter One: Introduction

The decades following the American Civil War marked an uncertain and tumultuous time in United States history. At war's end in 1865, the North and the South counted more than six hundred thousand dead with thousands more wounded and disabled for life (Nolan "The Anatomy" 12). In addition to the overwhelming loss of human life, the country also experienced substantial property loss and the complications of sectional reconciliation. The circumstances in the South were most devastating, with its entire slave-based economic and social system collapsed (Gallagher "Introduction" 1). In 1867, Congress passed the first Reconstruction Act beginning a decade of Radical Reconstruction in the South. The general perception among Southern residents during Reconstruction was that their state governments were being invaded and controlled by "carpetbaggers"¹ from the North and "scalawags"² from the South. By that time, the Ku Klux Klan was

¹ In his book, *Reconstruction: After the Civil War*, John H. Franklin defined "carpetbagger:" "this opprobrious term, used as early as 1846 to describe any suspicious stranger, was applied indiscriminately to all Northerners in the South during reconstruction. It has generally implied that as a group they had nothing in the way of worldly possessions and were thoroughly unprincipled in their determination to fleece and exploit the South until their carpetbags fairly bulged with the possessions of Southerners and they were forced to acquire new coffers in which to place their ill-gotten gains. They have been described as a group at work on a grand master plan to Africanize the country" (93).

² John H. Franklin explained "no group of postwar Southern leaders has been reviled or castigated—or misunderstood—more than the loyal native Southerners, commonly known as 'scalawags'....In the South the term was used by the opponents of reconstruction to describe those they regarded as the lowest, meanest element in society.

already a fully functioning organization and the Black Codes were opening doors for Jim Crow Laws in the South.³ And despite the Fourteenth (1868) and Fifteenth (1870) Amendments, which guaranteed civil rights and suffrage to African American men, the Supreme Court's ruling on *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896 led to legalized racial segregation with its "separate but equal" slogan. Racial discord, economic depression, and social unrest continued well into the twentieth century in the South, even beyond the end of World War I in 1918.

Perhaps most devastating to white ex-Confederates during the post-Civil War era were the crises they faced with memory and rhetorical subjectivity. First, former Confederates struggled to control how their Southern past would be remembered by present and future publics. In other words, they wanted the South to be remembered accurately and favorably in the public memory. Second, and

These were Southerners who could swear that they had never voluntarily given aid, countenance, counsel, or encouragement to persons in rebellion and had exercised or attempted to exercise the functions of no office under the Confederacy. They were largely men who opposed secession" (*Reconstruction* 98-99).

³ Black Codes were laws enacted within a year after the Civil War to restrict the rights of ex-slaves. John H. Franklin argued that Black Codes, "confirmed the North's worst fears. Reformers believed that former Confederates were attempting to re-establish slavery" (*Reconstruction* 49). While they varied from state to state, Black Codes included such measures as vagrancy laws, laws forbidding freed slaves to handle firearms and other weapons, laws that would not allow Blacks to possess alcoholic beverages, and laws that required Blacks to be off the streets by a specified hour (Franklin *Reconstruction* 49). The Black Codes were federally abolished in 1866.

Also intended to limit and control the rights of African American persons were Jim Crow laws. Jim Crow laws first appeared in the late nineteenth century after the Supreme Court's ruling on *Plessy vs. Ferguson* and sought to uphold the "separate but equal" slogan regarding public institutions for blacks and whites. The Supreme Court's *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision overturned *Plessy* in 1954 by arguing that separate schools were not, in fact, equal. Jim Crow laws were finally ended across the nation in the 1960s after Congress passed the 1964 Voting Rights Act.

perhaps most significantly, white ex-Confederates struggled to restore rhetorical agency, because after the war ended, the “Confederate people” no longer existed. As such, Southern residents could no longer speak and act as Confederate subjects, a crisis that brought much distress to the ex-Confederates.

Attempting to ameliorate these struggles, some Southerners of European and African descent spoke optimistically of a “New South.” The myth of the New South celebrated the idea of a peaceful reconciliation with the North, racial harmony, and a new economic and social order. Supporters of the New South were confident that this ideology would lead to the triumph of the South in the reunited nation. Many white Southerners, however, opposed the idea of a new South because it implied that there was something wrong with the old South. These ex-Confederates instead embraced an alternative myth known as the “Lost Cause.” Essentially, the rhetoric of the Lost Cause glorified the days of the Confederacy, valorized the men who fought in the war, and declared the South’s innocence in relation to the war and Reconstruction. Furthermore, Lost Cause supporters maintained that although the South lost the war, they had fought nobly for a just cause.

The Lost Cause quickly became a significant rhetoric for Southerners. Historian Rollin G. Osterweis labeled the Lost Cause “a phenomenon with power” because it helped to produce “a Southern mind” in the post-bellum years (*The Myth* ix). W. Stuart Towns has argued that the Lost Cause was an important myth for Southerners because, “their repeated expressions of how they thought it had been

became gospel for the southern audiences who heard them year after year. Their attachment to the Lost Cause provided white southerners some continuity and stability in a time of rapid change” (140). The Lost Cause, then, supplied Southerners, especially white Southerners, with a rhetoric with which they could construct their realities in a time of uncertainty and instability.

A major purveyor of the Lost Cause was the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC), the largest and most popular white women’s memorial association in the South during its reign. The UDC formed in 1894 and quickly established chapters in every Southern state.⁴ The Daughters were involved in a variety of commemorative activities, such as erecting monuments, decorating the graves of fallen soldiers, organizing parades and banquets, and awarding crosses of honor to veterans of war. Historian David W. Blight has argued that the UDC’s activities made a significant impact not just on the South, but across the entire nation: “in all their efforts, the UDC planted a...vision of the Lost Cause deeper into the nation’s historical imagination than perhaps any other association” (*Race and Reunion* 273). But the most powerful rhetorical impact the women had on the

⁴ Historian Anastasia Sims maintained that by the turn-of-the-century, the UDC was “by far the most popular patriotic group among white southern women” (32). By 1901 in North Carolina, for example, “the UDC had more than a thousand members in thirty-three affiliates and was the second-largest white women’s voluntary association in the state....It more than doubled in size between 1901 and 1905 and continued to attract new members” (33, 45). Even as recently as 2000, the organization boasts a membership of 25,000 with more than 700 chapters in 32 states (Wells 1). For first-hand accounts of the UDC’s history, see Mary B. Poppenheim, et al.’s book, *The History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy*, Margaret M. Fitzgibbons’ *History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy in California, Centennial Edition, 1896-1996*, and Smith et al.’s book, *History of the Virginia Division United Daughters of the Confederacy: 1895-1967*. Also, see the United Daughters of the Confederacy web site at <http://www.hqudc.org>.

“nation’s historical imagination” may have been achieved through their educational programs.

On the education front, the women formed an auxiliary division of the UDC called the Children of the Confederacy (C. of C.) which was primarily concerned with educating children on Southern history. The Children of the Confederacy would meet in their local chapters, usually while their mothers were at the UDC meetings, and learn Southern history from textbooks approved by the UDC.⁵ Some of the Daughters even went so far as to write their own history textbooks which they used at the Children of the Confederacy meetings and placed in public libraries across the South. These textbooks, or “catechisms” as they were normally called, were perhaps the UDC’s most unique and significant contribution to the South. In her book on nineteenth century schoolbooks, historian Ruth Miller Elson argued for the importance of studying these kinds of texts:

However ill qualified to do so, the authors of schoolbooks both created and solidified American traditions. Their choice of what they admired in the past and the present, and what they wished to preserve for the future, was likely to be the first formal evaluation of man and his works to which an

⁵ The UDC historical committees reviewed textbooks used by teachers in the Southern schools, reported on which ones they approved and which they condemned, recommended their selections to state and county school boards, and wrote books on what a “fair” and “unbiased” textbook should look like. Wilson reported that in 1901, the UDC’s historical committee urged the examination not just of histories but also “readers, biographical sketches, poems for recitation, songs, and even geographies” (140). For more on the UDC’s textbook reform campaign, see Gaines M. Foster’s discussion in his book, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South*, page 116. Also, see Anastasia Sims’s book, *The Power of Femininity in the New South*, especially pages 134-135 and 147-148.

American child was exposed. The schoolbooks delineated for him an idealized image both of himself and of the history that had produced the admired American type. (vii)

Given the important potential for textbooks to influence young readers regarding “American traditions” and to shape “idealized images of themselves” for those reading, I focus my project on the UDC’s rhetorical strategies in their catechisms for children.⁶ I contend that the UDC exploited the four Southern myths, especially the Lost Cause myth, to construct collective memories of the South’s past. Then, with their mythical memories, I argue that the women constituted a new generation of “Southern people” to help restore rhetorical collectivity and agency to the defeated South.

In order to make these arguments, I have built a critical perspective from the theories of collective memory and constitutive rhetoric. The theory of collective memory explains how individuals or groups may rhetorically construct the past, and how that construction may be strategically employed in discourse for present or future purposes. The theory of constitutive rhetoric helps explain how a collective “people” and rhetorical subjects may be built with rhetoric. What follows in the

⁶ Arguing for the “effectiveness” of textbooks on children in the nineteenth century, Elson argued, “Books used in the nineteenth-century school were undoubtedly more influential in this respect than are those of the twentieth century. Today’s texts must compete for the child’s attention with an abundance of reading material as well as with radio and television. Not only did the nineteenth-century child read little besides his schoolbooks, but the schoolbook itself occupied the central position in most public schools throughout the century” (vii).

next two sections are more detailed analyses of collective memory and constitutive rhetoric.

Collective Memory

The theory of collective memory has been a popular area of study for several decades. In that time, scholars from academic fields such as sociology, history, and rhetoric have theorized about the forms, functions, and origins of collective memories. Taking into account that I examine the crisis of post-war Southern memory with this dissertation, it is most appropriate that I consult the theory of collective memory to inform my critical lens. Therefore, I review that literature here so as to define collective memory, locate issues in the literature, and craft a critical perspective for analyzing the UDC's catechisms.

Defining Collective Memory

The theory of collective memory has a history all its own. French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs worked extensively with the idea of collective memory in the 1920s and theorized that individuals' memories of their pasts are shared, influenced, and shaped by groups. Since then, scholars have worked to extend, elaborate, and apply his theory. Perhaps the most dramatic change to Halbwachs' original conception of collective memory has been its extension

beyond individuals and their social groups to include even larger collectives.⁷ This elaboration has led many scholars to refer to collective memory as “public memory.” John Bodnar, for one, neatly defined public memory as a “body of beliefs and ideas about the past that help a public or society understand both its past, present, and by implication, its future. It is fashioned in a public sphere in which various parts of the social structure exchange views” (15).

Besides the addition of a larger “public” component, much of the current theorizing on collective memory includes a strategic element. Barbie Zelizer, for one, has talked about how individuals may “use” the past in the present: “the study of collective memory...is much more than the unidimensional study of the past. It represents a graphing of the past as it is used for present aims, a vision in bold relief of the past as it is woven into the present and future” (217).⁸ The strategic use of collective memory results in the past-in-the-present becoming more vibrant and “active” than history. Pierre Nora has expanded on the dynamic nature of memory versus the static nature of history with his contention, “Memory is a

⁷ In other words, Halbwachs looked mostly at the collective memories that were shared between individuals and their friends, families, and social classes. Current scholarship on collective memory draws the limits of “collective” much wider to include such collectives as societies, publics, cultures, and even nations. See Halbwachs’ differentiation of the collective memory from individual memory, historical memory, time, and space in his book, *The Collective Memory*. Also see, *On Collective Memory*, Halbwachs’ look at the intersections between memory and dreams, language, family, religion, and social classes.

⁸ Also see J. Robert Cox’s essay, “Memory, Critical Theory, and the Argument from History.” He contended that, “arguers must . . . use the past” as well (Cox 1).

perpetually actual phenomenon, a bond tying us to the eternal present; history is a representation of the past” (8).⁹

Scholars also typically agree that collective memories are presented to us as narratives. Wagner-Pacifici articulated this point most concisely in her article, “Memories in the Making: The Shapes of Things That Went,” with the claim that, “memories are never formless. They come to us as narratives, pictorial images, textbooks, pamphlets, legal charters, wills, diaries, and statues” (302). Knapp built upon this claim suggesting that the narratives of collective memory may serve to instruct and guide human action:

Beyond the *causal* role they play in influencing people’s dispositions, the narratives preserved by collective memory sometimes play a *normative* role—that is, they may in various ways provide criteria, implicit or explicit, by which contemporary models of action can be shaped or corrected, or even by which particular ethical or political proposals can be authorized or criticized. (123)¹⁰

⁹ Tamar Katriel’s article, “Sites of Memory: Discourses of the Past in Israeli Pioneering Settlement Museums,” elaborated on Pierre Nora’s contention that while history and memory are different concepts, they are also interdependent and “dialectically related” (1).

¹⁰ These statements regarding the narrative form of collective memory fall directly in line with some of the most revered research in communication and rhetoric. One need only consult Walter R. Fisher’s numerous articles and books on narrative theory to see how communication may be related to narrative. See especially *Human Communication as Narration: Toward a Philosophy of Reason, Value, and Action*, “Toward a Logic of Good Reasons,” “Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument,” and, “The Narrative Paradigm: An Elaboration.”

These ideas about collective memories being public, strategic, dynamic, and narratives have shaped my own perspective on collective memory, as has Bruce Gronbeck's essay on, "The Rhetorics of the Past: History, Argument, and Collective Memory." In that piece, Gronbeck explained that,

Some present need or concern is examined by calling up the past, shaping it into a useful memory that an audience can find relevant to the present. The past thus can guide the present, but the present also is reconfiguring the past; therefore, through evocation of collective memories, past and present live in constant dialogue, even in a hermeneutic circle where neither can be comprehended without the other. (57)

Taking all of these ideas together, I define collective memory as a group's or an individual's strategic, rhetorical construction of the past in order to influence the present or future conditions of the public.¹¹ This definition has informed my analysis of the rhetorical strategies developed by the UDC in their catechisms as they "called up the past" and "shaped it into useful memories."

How to Find Collective Memory

The rhetorical criticisms that take a collective memory approach have, for the most part, not offered clear and identifiable methodologies. This has left me to craft my own critical perspective from exemplars in the field and from my own

¹¹ I use the terms "collective memory" and "public memory" interchangeably.

observations of collective memories.¹² Furthermore, collective memory research typically does not study how memories themselves are made. Instead, critics tend to look at how recollections of the past function in public discourse; for example, how the March on Washington functioned in Bill Clinton's speeches or how Sojourner Truth's memory addressed race and gender issues (Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles; Mandziuk). What I am interested in studying are how those memories are actually made or the rhetorical moves needed to turn the past into rhetorical tools. I believe an analysis of this sort will help fill a void in the collective memory literature and answer important questions about the function of rhetoric in public remembering.

There are two exemplars in particular I have consulted in building my critical perspective, both of which have started to look at how collective memories are made. First, in his criticism of Daniel Webster's "Plymouth Rock Oration," Stephen Browne identified some memory-making strategies, such as epideictic form, a focus on ethos, narrative, and temporal vocabulary.¹³ Browne also

¹² Marouf Hasian, Jr. attempted to craft a method called "critical memory studies" in his article, "Nostalgic Longings, Memories of the 'Good War,' and Cinematic Representations in *Saving Private Ryan*." Hasian explained that a critical memory study is "where the critic tries to employ a self-reflexive method that balances the need for inquiry with tolerance for alternative perspectives" (341). Hasian instructed critics to "broaden the scope of the[ir] project to include the voices of various critics and audiences who do not share similar ideological predispositions" (341). Following his own method, Hasian's analysis of the movie included critiques and praises from various sources (the director, movie-goers, war veterans, himself), which allowed Hasian to conclude that none of these interpretations was any better than any other. I will not rely on Hasian's method of analysis because it does not focus on the rhetorical strategies of rhetors in written texts (rather, it focuses on audience reactions to and interpretations of a text).

¹³ Also see Randall A. Lake's article on Native American protest rhetoric for his examination of temporal rhetoric and collective memory in "Red Power" discourse. He

considered the narrative structure of commemorations in his article on “Remembering Crispus Attucks” as a way of building memory. Second is Barbie Zelizer who also explored the relationship between memory and time in her analysis. Specifically, Zelizer argued for “collapsing commemoration” and “retrospective nominalization” as memory-making strategies. Both Browne and Zelizer teach us something about how memories are made, and neither of their perspectives was pre-conceived and then applied to the texts: the perspectives were born from the analyses.

In much the same way Zelizer and Browne found their critical perspectives by way of their analyses, I also found a way of analyzing collective memory from my examination of the catechisms. Quite simply, I first looked for any references the catechisms made to the past because memories are, after all, recollections of past events. I then looked closer at the incomplete and oversimplified representations of the past, especially those appearing in narrative form, because memories are often recalled as abbreviated stories. And finally, I analyzed the ways the authors remembered so as to locate the strategic functions of their memories, because again, collective memories are purposeful constructions of the past in order to influence the present or future conditions of the public. By doing this in chapter five, I was able to identify the authors’ strategies in transforming

argued throughout the article that, “many Native Americans refuse to be silenced in the mute past. Their narrative, grounded in time’s cycle, seeks to renew the ties between this past and the present, and thereby to enact a future, by characterizing Red Power as the rebirth of traditional tribal life” (129). In sum, Lake concluded, “contemporary Native American protest rhetoric voices a coherent temporal narrative that construes the relevance of the past for activism in the present and predicts the inevitable victory to come” (137).

mythical narratives of the South's past into mythical collective memories for the Children.

Issues in the Literature

Two important questions regarding the politics of public memory have emerged in the most recent scholarship on collective memory. First, scholars have addressed the politically-charged question: Who and what gets remembered?¹⁴ Barry Schwartz, for instance, explored this question in his essay, "The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory." Schwartz analyzed the events and persons commemorated in the US Capitol Building to demonstrate "how the significance of historical events changed from one generation to the next according to a changing infra-structure of societal problems and needs" (374). Schwartz argued that after the Civil War, the pattern of commemoration in the US Capitol Building changed along with the political and social climate. Specifically, Schwartz found that the themes that emerged in the antebellum pattern of

¹⁴ See David Thelen's article, "Memory and American History," for a general discussion of the selective nature of remembering. For a more specific discussion, see Michael Frisch's article, "American History and the Structures of Collective Memory: A Modest Exercise in Empirical Iconography." Frisch provided a list of historical figures remembered by college students in his American history survey course. Also see Stephen Browne's article, "Remembering Crispus Attucks: Race, Rhetoric, and the Politics of Commemoration," for his argument on the politics of remembering Crispus Attucks, as well as Robert Hariman's and John L. Lucaites' article on "Public Identity and Collective Memory in U.S. Iconic Photography: The Image of 'Accidental Naplam,'" for how visual rhetoric may contribute to our collective memory of the Vietnam War. Finally, see Roseann M. Mandiziuk's article on the debates and politics surrounding the commemoration of Sojourner Truth, which, Mandiziuk argues, "raise significant questions about the objects and processes of public memory and the shaping of cultural values" (271).

commemoration were “colonization and revolution,” whereas the post-bellum pattern was “more present-oriented, less heroic, and less charismatic, a pattern that attested to the fact that America, at last, had become an unrevolutionary culture” (396). The political atmosphere at the time, then, determined who and what got remembered in the Capitol Building.

A second and equally political question critics have asked is: Which individuals or groups have the “authority” to construct memory for a collective?¹⁵ By examining the literature on collective memory, it appears that the only people who possess the authority to construct public memory are men.¹⁶ David Blight, for

¹⁵ See Shawn J. Parry-Giles’ and Trevor Parry-Giles’ article, “Collective Memory, Political Nostalgia, and the Rhetorical Presidency: Bill Clinton’s Commemoration of the March on Washington, August 28, 1998.” They argued that, “in the United States, in particular, no other individual possesses authority and power to influence collective memory more than the President of the United States” (419). Also, see Stephen H. Browne’s article, “Remembering Crispus Attucks: Race, Rhetoric, and the Politics of Commemoration.” His article “seeks to emphasize a particular point: the contest over the meaning of the past is not limited to *objects* of commemoration alone, but includes the *act* of commemoration itself” (169). In other words, he also looked at who has the “authority” to remember in public. Browne based his argument on John Gillis’s notion of “the politics of commemoration” in his book, *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* (5). And finally, see David Glassberg’s article, “Public History and the Study of Memory,” who claimed, “few can deny that the question of whose version of history gets institutionalized and disseminated as the public history is a political one” (11). See, however, Blair, Jeppeson, and Pucci Jr.’s argument that everyday visitors to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial participate in the authorship of the Memorial (the Memorial being a “postmodern text”).

¹⁶ Another part of this question looks at the places from which authority may be granted; in other words, scholars have discussed the differences between vernacular and official sources of collective memory. Bodnar defined official memories as those constructed by leaders who, “whether in positions of prominence in small towns, ethnic communities, or in educational, government, or military bureaucracies, ... share a common interest in social unity, the continuity of existing institutions, and loyalty to the status quo” (13). Vernacular interests, on the other hand, are constructed by “ordinary people” who are “intent on protecting values and restating views of reality derived from firsthand experiences in small-scale communities rather than ‘imagined’ communities of a large nation...normally vernacular expressions convey what social reality feels like rather than

example, considered the ways Frederick Douglass remembered the Civil War in his public addresses; Stephen H. Browne examined the discourse of Daniel Webster to show how he remembered Plymouth Rock; Shawn J. Parry-Giles and Trevor Parry-Giles looked at how President Clinton invoked the collective memory of the March on Washington to rebuild his presidential image. The only real mention of women in relation to collective memory was made by Jorgensen-Earp and Lanzilotti in their article, “Public Memory and Private Grief: The Construction of Public Shrines at the Sites of Public Tragedy.” Their focus, though, was on the *private* acts of grieving and commemoration on the part of women in the nineteenth-century, not on the *public* work of women as builders of collective memory.

For the most part, women have been mentioned in the collective memory literature as “helpers” of commemoration. In his article, “Remembering Crispus Attucks: Race, Rhetoric, and the Politics of Commemoration,” Stephen Browne mentioned two women who “assisted in the work” of commemorating Crispus Attucks: Mercy Otis Warren and Lydia Maria Child (171). The rest of the article, though, focused on the work of Governor Ames, Mayor O’Brien, John Boyle O’Reilly, John Fiske, Frederick Douglass, William C. Nell, John Rock, Charles

what it should be like” (14). Examples of official sources of memories include government agencies such as the military and the National Park Service whereas vernacular sources of memory are limited to those from ordinary citizens which serve the purpose of sustaining ties of family and local community (Glassberg 12). For more on vernacular and official sites of memory, see Ekaterina V. Haskins’ 2003 *Quarterly Journal of Speech* article, “‘Put Your Stamp on History’: The USPS Commemorative Program *Celebrate the Century* and Postmodern Collective Memory.” Haskins argued that the stamp selection process at the turn of this last century highlights a tension between official and vernacular collective memories.

Remond, Wendell Phillips, and William Lloyd Garrison, to name a few. Additionally, in his treatment of the oratory and rhetoric of the nineteenth-century South, W. Stuart Towns observed, “on the feminine side,” the United Daughters of the Confederacy “contributed mightily to the legend [of the Lost Cause]” (139). The men who did the actual work, though, were Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus Lamar, John Brown Gordon and Charles Colcock Jones, Jr.¹⁷

In this dissertation, I examine who and what were remembered in the UDC’s catechisms as well as who had the authority to remember. Not surprisingly, white Southerners and the historical events that directly affected them were remembered. The agents possessing the authority to remember were the Daughters themselves as they rhetorically positioned themselves as agents of collective memory. To this end, I maintain that the United Daughters of the Confederacy were more than mere “helpers” or “contributors” in building collective memories of the South. As a matter of fact, historian Gaines M. Foster has asserted that memorial associations such as the UDC “sponsored much of the writing and oratory that helped shape southern perceptions of defeat” (4-5). It is my contention, then, that the Daughters were active agents who constructed powerful

¹⁷ The list goes on. In his book, *The Mystic Chords of Memory*, Kammen held up William Sumner Appleton as an exemplar of regional memory construction, Henry Francis du Pont as an exemplar of social class construction, Carter G. Woodson for ethnic memory construction, John Gilmary Shea for religious memories, and George Bancroft for national memory constructions (10). In his book, *Rites of Assent*, Bercovitch looked at the construction of “America” through the rhetoric of men such as Jonathan Edwards, Cotton Mather, George Bancroft, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Herman Melville, and Ralph Waldo Emerson.

and influential collective memories, not only with their commemorative activities, but also with their rhetoric.

Constituting “the People”

Just as it is appropriate to consult the literature on collective memory when studying the South’s memory crisis in the post-bellum era, it is equally fitting to consult the theories of constitutive rhetoric when examining the construction of a rhetorical collective. In the case of this project, the theories that account for how a “people” and rhetorical subjects are constituted are most informative. With this section, then, I define these theoretical concepts, locate some issues in the literature, and continue to build my critical perspective for analyzing the UDC’s catechisms.

Defining Rhetorical Subjectivity

Rhetorical scholars have worked extensively with the idea that the strategic use of language may function to construct identity or a sense of self in discourse, which is not the same as rhetorical subjectivity. For starters, some rhetorical identity studies have explored the ways rhetors create their own identities in discourse¹⁸ while others have analyzed the strategies rhetors employ to construct

¹⁸ For example, Procter et al. analyzed the television advertising of two female political candidates to reveal their “identity-building strategies;” how each candidate crafted their language so as to create “an overall *political identity*, a composite cognitive picture a voter has of a candidate, based upon the interaction of issue positions, image characteristics, and gender” (191). Stephen H. Browne also considered the way a rhetor may construct their identity. In his article, “Encountering Angelina Grimke: Violence,

larger socio-political identities, such as gender, race, class, and sexuality.¹⁹ Much of this work follows the lead of cultural studies theorists like Stuart Hall who

Identity, and the Creation of Radical Community,” Browne argued that in her 1835 public letter to William Lloyd Garrison, Grimke constructed herself as a qualified interpreter of violence in the abolition movement.

In their research on white identity in the United States, Martin et al. asked 371 white Americans how they prefer to self-label (i.e. Anglo, Caucasian, etc). The authors argued that the respondents’ “preferences and meanings for how they label themselves reveal something of the way in which they discursively define themselves as white Americans” (126). Nakayama and Krizek conducted similar research on self-labeling, but instead asked how the rhetoric of white American’s functions to privilege whiteness in our discourse, and in society. They identified six strategies of self-labeling by which rhetoric “makes the center invisible,” thereby privileging white identity in the United States. For further discussion on the “privileging of whiteness,” see Nakayama’s article on the ways white, heterosexual, masculine identity is “recentered” in US popular culture.

¹⁹ For example, Griffin looked at how Mary Wollstonecraft argued for women’s gender “alienation” as a “discursive problem” rather than a “natural” given. Griffin argued that Wollstonecraft encouraged women not to identify with the popular representations of themselves as “naturally weaker” because those assumptions were not “material” truths but “rhetorical creations” (294). Also see Dorris, who looked at how “sex-role identities” are represented in interpersonal communication textbooks, or Kiesling’s discussion of “how we might construct a theoretical framework to account for speakers who use language to display ‘mainstream’ gender identities as well as those who present us with more ‘marginalized’ gender identities” (Dorris 33; Kiesling 13).

Critics have also been interested in the ways race identities are rhetorically constructed. Francesconi’s essay, for instance, “examines the use of Third World musical resources by the Free Jazz Movement in its effort to provide a means of redefining black American cultural identity” (36).

Class remains a largely under-developed area in rhetorical scholarship, but Conrad’s article considered one way “working-class” identity may be constructed. He argued, “The meanings of working life presented through...country music work songs, invite working-class people to participate in a symbolic universe that creates an illusion of self for them” (180).

And finally, critics have analyzed the ways sexual identities are rhetorically crafted. Slagle, for one, examined how homosexual identity has been constructed differently by the gay and lesbian movements, and the more recent queer movements. See also Smith and Windes for a discussion of how “progay and antigay packages define collective identity” with their rhetoric, as well as Dow’s article, “AIDS, Perspective by Incongruity, and Gay Identity in Larry Kramer’s ‘1,112 and Counting,’” for her discussion of the ways “Kramer’s attempts to stimulate AIDS activism [altered] gays’ perceptions of the disease and its implications for their lives and identities” (Smith and Windes 28; Dow 225).

typically base their thinking on psycho-social theories of identity.²⁰ On the topic of identity in his introductory essay to *Questions of Cultural Identity*, Hall argued that “identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being; not ‘who we are’ or ‘where we came from,’ so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves” (4).

Such ideas about identity construction and identity politics have certainly influenced my own thinking about the ex-Confederate post-war dilemma, especially in chapter four where I argue that the content of the four Southern myths helped white ex-Confederates soothe their bruised egos, rebuild their sense of self, and preserve their memories in response to defeat. But these ideas about identity do not sufficiently explain how individuals “become one” as a “people” or how they speak and act as rhetorical subjects.²¹

²⁰ For treatments of identity as psycho-social, see especially Erving Goffman’s book, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* and the corpus of Erik Erikson’s work including *Childhood and Society*, *Identity: Youth and Crisis*, *Dimensions of a New Identity*, and *The Life Cycle Completed: A Review*. Also see Kenneth Hoover’s book, *The Power of Identity: Politics in a New Key*, for more on Erikson’s theories of identity as well as his own argument that the “state” plays a crucial role in creating an environment for identity construction.

²¹ In an article entitled, “Instrumental and Constitutive Rhetoric in Martin Luther King Jr.’s ‘Letter from Birmingham Jail,’” Leff and Utley argued that King constituted a persona for himself and “an invitation [for black readers] to adopt a rather specific conception of themselves as they struggle to attain equal rights” (49). I would argue that the critics were talking about how King constructed identity and a subject position with his “Letter,” not how he constituted a rhetorical “people.”

One article that does consider how a rhetorical “people” was constituted—with a catechism no less—is Nathaniel I. Córdova’s piece on “The Constitutive Force of the Catecismo del Pueblo in Puerto Rico’s Popular Democratic Party Campaign of 1938-1940.” Córdova argued that the Catecismo constituted the Puerto Rican jíbaros as a political constituency.

The theorizing that does account for these rhetorical processes is grounded in the literature on constitutive rhetoric. The general idea of constitutive rhetoric is that beyond creating temporary sites of identity, constitutive rhetorics build rhetorical collectives or “people.” Maurice Charland, for one, explained that, “Constitutive rhetorics are ideological not merely because they provide individuals with narratives to inhabit as subjects and motives to experience, but because they insert ‘narrativized’ subjects-as-agents into the world” (143). To explicate his point, Charland argued that the “White Paper” was a document that not only constituted the *peuple québécois* as a “subject position,” but as a “people” “in the world” with a collective history, identity, and actions. Constitutive rhetorics, then, not only provide momentary identities or subject positions for speakers and audiences, they constitute rhetorical subjects complete with rhetorics of their own with which to speak and act “in the world.”²²

The idea of a rhetorical “people” comes from Michael C. McGee in his 1975 essay, “In Search of ‘The People’: A Rhetorical Alternative.” McGee critiqued rhetorical scholars who define audiences as either “an objective, literal extension of ‘person,’” or as “a mob of individuals whose significance is their

²² Some of the research on subject positions has typically defined them as roles or stances that temporarily situate readers towards the texts that constitute them. For example, according to Brummet and Bowers, “A subject position is a stance, role, or perspective one takes in relationship to a text so as to read or engage the text” (118). Similarly, Hall has argued that the discursive subject “is the category, the position where the subject—the I of ideological statements—is constituted. Ideological discourses themselves constitute us as subjects for discourse” (“Signification” 102). Ede and Lunsford similarly talk about subject positions as the “audience invoked” in written discourse. These conceptions of subject positions are too narrow for the purposes of this dissertation which is why I chose instead to talk about rhetorical subjects.

gullibility and failure to respond to ‘logical’ argument” (238).²³ Instead, McGee asserted that speakers or “advocates” build “the people” into “political myths”:

The audience, essentially a group of individuals, reacts with a desire to participate in that dramatic vision, to *become* ‘the people’ described by the advocate. ‘The people,’ therefore, are not objectively real in the sense that they exist as a collective entity in nature; rather, they are a fiction dreamed by an advocate and infused with an artificial, rhetorical reality by the agreement of an audience to participate in a collective fantasy. (239-240)

But, in a sense, “the people” become “objectively real” when individuals or audiences accept and enact the “basic myths” of “the people.” Becoming “the people,” McGee explained, is “a means of providing social unity and collective identity,” which is exactly what the ex-Confederates in the post-war era needed to do: they needed to become a collective “people” and rhetorical subjects again (245, 247).

Taking together Charland’s conception of constitutive rhetoric and McGee’s idea of “the people,” I define rhetorical subjects as individuals or groups

²³ An important piece on audience is Edwin Black’s article on “The Second Persona.” Black argued that the second persona is the implied auditor in a discourse that may be identified by way of rhetorical criticism. Black stated, “the critic can see in the auditor implied by a discourse a model of what the rhetor would have his real auditor become. What the critic can find projected by the discourse is the image of a man, and though that man may never find actual embodiment, it is still a man that the image is of” (335). McGee took this idea one step further when he argued that “the people” are actually written *into* the “myth” of a discourse; Black seemed to argue that a discourse is written *for* a certain audience/auditor that may be revealed by rhetorical criticism. Also see Philip Wander for a discussion of “The Third Persona,” which refers to the “audiences not present, audiences rejected or negated through the speech and/or the speaking situation” (369).

who sense they belong to a larger collective. In other words, a rhetorical subject identifies with “the people.” As part of “the people,” rhetorical subjects have been acculturated into the discourse of the collective and thereby constituted with a storehouse of rhetorical resources. Such rhetorical resources or appeals enable the subject to maintain their sense of belonging with “the people,” justify and motivate actions, and perpetuate “the people” to other prospective members and even non-members. In this way, a rhetorical subject is “an effect” of constitutive rhetoric as well as a potential source of constitutive rhetoric; put differently, rhetorical subjects are not just constituted *in* rhetoric but also *by* and *with* rhetoric.

How to Find “the People”

The scholarship most informative to my critical perspective has been McGee’s theory of “the people” and Charland’s criticism of the *peuple quebécois*. Actually, Charland worked with McGee’s theory of “the people” in his 1987 article on the rhetorical constitution of the *peuple quebécois* along with the idea of constitutive rhetoric. Charland traced the *Quebécois* construction back to the *Mouvement Souverainete-Association*, an organization dedicated to gaining Quebec’s independence from Canada. He examined the rhetorical document, “The White Paper,” to argue that the rhetoric of this document constituted “the people” of Quebec as a distinct community with a distinct national identity who were therefore deserving of a sovereign Quebec state. What is significant about Charland’s argument is his assertion that the *Quebécois* were not merely

“persuaded” to support the independence movement, but the “support for sovereignty is inherent to the subject position addressed by the *souverainiste* (pro-sovereignty) rhetoric” (134). In other words, support for the sovereignty movement came naturally for those who “became” the *peuple quebécois*.

Another useful piece of criticism in forming my critical perspective has been McDorman’s analysis of black abolitionists’ responses to the Supreme Court’s decision in *Scott v. Sandford*. Also relying on McGee’s conception of “the people,” McDorman argued that black abolitionists’ responses to the Dred Scott case served to expand the definition of “the people” to include African Americans. McDorman outlined three rhetorical strategies developed by the abolitionists in their responses: 1) building African American community with insular arguments, 2) inclusive memorializing by way of insular and redemptive strategies, and 3) redeeming “the people” by “reinforcing the Constitution’s promise for all people” (197). McDorman provided examples from abolitionist texts to support his claim that a more inclusive “American people” was constituted by way of these rhetorical strategies. McDorman was less concerned with how African Americans “actually” felt or identified themselves at this time, like an identity study might do. Rather, his focus was on the rhetorical moves evident in the abolitionists’ discourse and how they functioned to constitute an expanded notion of the “American people.”

In much the same way Charland and McDorman analyzed discourse to make their claims about “the people,” I examined the language of the catechisms to figure out how the women constituted the Children of the Confederacy as the next

generation of “Southern people.” Because a “people” is constituted with a collective identity, a common location, and corresponding actions, I looked for references that signaled the presence of those three requirements. For example, I isolated any allusion to who Southerners were, where they lived, or what they should be doing. And because identity, location, and actions are rhetorically grounded in a shared history, I then looked at how the women’s collective memories helped them build those three requirements of “the people.” Having isolated the “Southern people” with this approach, in chapter six I am able to identify the rhetorical features of the “Southern people” and make some observations about how those features functioned as rhetorical resources for Southern subjects.

An Issue in the Literature

The process of “becoming” a rhetorical “people” has been the subject of some discussion in the literature, yet none have provided comprehensive accounts of the process. McGee only mentioned that individuals “react with a desire...to *become* ‘the people’,” but did not detail how (240). Charland began to account for the “coming-to-be” phase of “the people” by employing Althusser’s theory of interpellation. As Charland explained, “Interpellation occurs at the very moment one enters into a rhetorical situation, that is, as soon as an individual recognizes and acknowledges being addressed. An interpellated subject participates in the

discourse that addresses him” (138).²⁴ Further, he equated interpellation with Burke’s theory of identification: “The process by which an audience member enters into a new subject position is therefore not one of persuasion. It is akin more to one of conversion that ultimately results in an act of recognition of the ‘rightness’ of a discourse and of one’s identity with its reconfigured subject position” (Charland 142). These ideas serve as a departure point for me as I attempt to more fully account for the rhetorical steps of interpellation and becoming a “people.”

The Lost Cause and Other Southern Myths

As I mentioned, the Lost Cause became a significant rhetoric for white Southern residents following the war. Offering a perspective on the significance of the Lost Cause is historian Gaines M. Foster who argued that the Lost Cause, “helped explain to late nineteenth-century southerners how and why they lost the war that marked the end of the Old South. It helped them cope with the cultural implications of defeat” (8). Taking Foster’s assertion into consideration, as well as the claims cited earlier by Osterweis and Towns (on pages 3-4), we may conclude that the rhetoric of the Lost Cause in the post-war South was significant because it

²⁴ Judith Butler, in her discussion of Althusser’s theory of interpellation, argued that, “The act of recognition becomes an act of constitution: the address animates the subject into existence” (25). Furthermore, “To be hailed or addressed by a social interpellation is to be constituted discursively and socially at once....Considered in this way, the interpellation as performative establishes the discursive constitution of the subject as inextricably bound to the social constitution of the subject” (153-154). Butler acknowledged, then, like McGee and Charland, the social and rhetorical dimensions of a subject coming-to-be.

offered explanations and comfort to a defeated people whose memories, identity, and rhetorical agency were in crisis.

The research path towards the Lost Cause and the other Southern myths begins in the literature on Southern oratory.²⁵ The scholarship of Howard Dorgan, W. Stuart Towns, Waldo W. Braden, John D. Saxon, and Francis P. Gaines, reveals that Southern oratory has served myriad purposes, is marked by assorted characteristics, and has manifested itself in various forms. Specifically, these and others have argued that rhetoric in the post-war era was defensive, religious, and at times, even accommodating and apologetic.²⁶ Additionally, researchers have generally agreed that four prominent rhetorical forms were observable in Southern discourse after the Civil War: the New South,²⁷ the Old South,²⁸ the Solid South,²⁹

²⁵ The discussion of Southern oratory literature has been truncated here because it is fully addressed in chapter three. In chapter three, I describe the research context for this project by reviewing the literature on the Lost Cause, Southern oratory, and the UDC's involvement with the Lost Cause.

²⁶ W. Stuart Towns argued that Southern oratory is “defensive” in his book, *Oratory and Rhetoric in the Nineteenth-Century South: A Rhetoric of Defense*, Waldo W. Braden argued that Southern oratory after the war was “accommodating” in *Oratory in the New South*, and Howard Dorgan argued that Southern oratory was “apologetic” and “religious” in his article, “The Doctrine of Victorious Defeat in the Rhetoric of Confederate Veterans” (also revised and reprinted in Braden’s *Oratory in the New South* under the title, “Rhetoric of the United Confederate Veterans: A Lost Cause Mythology in the Making”). For a further discussion of Southern oratory research and these particular arguments, see chapter three of this dissertation.

²⁷ For more on New South rhetoric, see especially Paul M. Gaston’s book, *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking*, Waldo W. Braden’s book, *Oratory in the New South*, and J. Louis Campbell’s article, “In Search of the New South.”

²⁸ For general discussions of the Old South as an era, see *The Old South* edited by Mark M. Smith, and William R. Taylor’s book, *Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and American National Character*. For more on the Old South as a rhetorical form, see

and of course, the Lost Cause. While rhetorical scholars have taken different stances on the character of Southern oratory and most have arrived at seemingly contradictory conclusions, all would undoubtedly concur that the Lost Cause was a major rhetorical form in Southern oratory after the Civil War.

In the literature on the Lost Cause, as well as the literature on the other three rhetorical forms, historians and rhetoricians generally begin their analyses by applying a variety of monikers. For instance, Alan T. Nolan labeled the Lost Cause an “American legend” and a “doctrine” whereas historian Gaines M. Foster has favored the term “tradition” (Nolan 12, 18; Foster 7). David W. Blight referred to the Lost Cause as both an “ideology” and a “myth,” with “myth” being the most popular term among historians such as Paul M. Gaston and Rollin G. Osterweis, and rhetorical analyst Waldo W. Braden (Blight *Race* 452-453).³⁰ In my project, I

especially *Romanticism and Nationalism in the Old South* by Rollin G. Osterweis, and *Domestic Novelists in the Old South: Defenders of Southern Culture* by Elizabeth Moss.

²⁹ Ferald J. Bryan identified the Solid South myth in Tom Watson’s rhetoric in his book, *Henry Grady or Tom Watson? The Rhetorical Struggle for the New South, 1880-1890* (see especially pages 82-88). Waldo W. Braden, in *The Oral Tradition in the South*, argued that Henry W. Grady relied on the Solid South myth, as well as the other three myths, to construct his public discourse (see especially page 66).

³⁰ Braden discussed a unique challenge rhetorical critics may face when analyzing the myth of the Lost Cause: “Since the members of an audience may possess a myth in common and even revere it, the orator or writer who uses the myth seldom needs to present it in a full-blown form; instead he suggests or insinuates it through signs, phrases, allusions, passing references, or gestures...What the reader finds in the printed version of a speech might be only a small part of the myth, the tiny hint of what grinds inside frustrated listeners. Sometimes the trigger for the myth does not even appear in the printed version, because face-to-face the listeners and speaker, feeling a oneness, evoke the myth without verbal expressions” (*The Oral* 74-75). Identifying the Lost Cause in discourse may prove difficult for the critic, then, because only parts of the myth may appear rather than its “full-blown form.”

elect to apply the term “myth” because it touches upon the emotional, simplified, and abstract tendency of these rhetorical forms. The term “myth” also acknowledges a relationship to memory, which is clearly important in my approach to the catechisms.³¹

Beyond merely seeking the proper labels for the Lost Cause, researchers have also succeeded in locating its rhetorical characteristics.³² For example, Lost Cause proponents often claim that the Confederacy was never defeated, “rather, it was overwhelmed by numbers and betrayed by certain generals at pivotal battles” (Blight “For Something” 1166). In his book *Race and Reunion*, Blight reported that many Lost Cause advocates also “placed responsibility for secession and the war entirely at the feet of the North. The South’s action was merely to protect its natural rights against the ‘tremendous and sweeping usurpation,’ the ‘unlimited, despotic power’ of the federal government” (259).³³ Again, these types of arguments were comforting to white Southerners as they sought to explain and understand their defeat, build and preserve their memories, salvage their identity,

³¹ Waldo W. Braden’s definition heavily informs my own thinking about myths: “Myth draws upon memory and imagination; that it results from a collective effort over a considerable period of time; that it represents an oversimplification of events, persons, and relationships; that it is more emotional than logical in its substance; and that it combines both reality and fiction. In other words, it is the product of considerable abstracting on the part of many people” (*Oral* 68). For more on myths in general and the four Southern myths in particular see chapter four of this dissertation.

³² For more on how historians, literary critics, and rhetorical analysts have researched the Lost Cause, see chapter three of this project.

³³ These are only a few of the “unique rhetorical features” that constitute the myth of the Lost Cause. The rest of the Lost Cause myth, as well as the rhetoric of the other three myths (Old South, New South, and Solid South), are analyzed in greater detail in chapter four, *The Myths of the Post-War South*.

and reconstitute their rhetorical subjectivity. It would also make sense that memorial associations in the South, such as the UDC who devoted themselves to addressing these crises, embraced the Lost Cause myth.

The literature that examines the United Daughters of the Confederacy's involvement with the Lost Cause³⁴ comes primarily from the field of history³⁵ and tends to focus on the women's activities without analysis of their rhetoric.³⁶ In other words, the scholars who argue that the UDC was important in preserving the Lost Cause typically look at how the women erected monuments, held banquets for veterans, and petitioned the use of "biased" textbooks in Southern schools without considering the rhetorical dimensions of those activities.³⁷ In my project, I analyze

³⁴ For more on the United Daughters of the Confederacy's involvement with the Lost Cause and the scholarly literature that studies it, see chapter three of this project.

³⁵ I have found one piece of UDC research from the field of communication. It is Mary Jennifer Hunter's 1982 master's thesis, "A Rhetorical Analysis of the Speeches of Mildred L. Rutherford, Historian General, United Daughters of the Confederacy." Her analysis was very traditional in that she examined the invention, style, and arrangement of the speeches, the major premises, minor premises, and conclusions of Rutherford's major arguments, and the pathos and logos Rutherford constructed in her discourse. Hunter's thesis did not discuss the UDC's involvement with the Lost Cause.

³⁶ For research that takes this approach, see David W. Blight's book, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*, Karen L. Cox's dissertation, "Women, The Lost Cause, and the New South: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Transmission of Confederate Culture, 1894-1919," Patricia Faye Climer's 1973 master's thesis, "Protectors of the Past: The United Daughters of the Confederacy, Tennessee Division, and the Lost Cause," and H. E. Gulley's article, "Women and the Lost Cause: Preserving a Confederate Identity in the American Deep South."

³⁷ The person who comes closest to a rhetorical analysis of the UDC's discourse is historian Fred A. Bailey. In his article, "The Textbooks of the 'Lost Cause': Censorship and the Creation of Southern State Histories," Bailey first analyzed the efforts of the UCV, the SCV, and the UDC to remove from Southern schools those textbooks that did not celebrate the patrician South, and second, he explored the rhetorical constructions of the elite patrician class of the South after the war in some of the textbooks written by those groups (only one textbook from the UDC, and not a "catechism"). In another article,

the UDC's rhetoric in their catechisms for children to make arguments about how the women exploited the Lost Cause and other Southern myths to craft collective memories and reconstitute a "Southern people." Hopefully, my analysis will yield an appreciation for the group's rhetoric as an underestimated yet powerful force in the South during the post-bellum decades.

UDC Catechisms

I decided to study the UDC catechisms for several reasons. First, I hope to contribute to our knowledge of rhetoric by way of these catechisms. As Roderick P. Hart argued in his 1986 research editorial, good public address scholarship teaches something new about rhetoric. For example, Hart learned about the "rhetorical parameters of nation-building" from Stephen Lucas's work, about "instrumental rhetoric" from Richard Gregg, and Hart now understands the "role of preservation in discourse" by having read the work of Gerry Philipsen (288). Because the catechisms are such unusual texts in form, content, purpose, and history, they employ unique rhetorical strategies. It is my hope that rhetorical scholars, like Hart, can learn something new about rhetoric from my history and analysis of the UDC catechisms.

Second, I chose to study the catechisms because I would like to make a contribution to the historical record. As Karlyn Kohrs Campbell has argued,

"Mildred Lewis Rutherford and the Patrician Cult of the Old South," Bailey again analyzed a UDC member's discourse in terms of class, not identity, collective memory, or the Lost Cause.

women's activities, work, and rhetoric have traditionally been written out of history or mistreated when they are included: "Even when [women's words are] reprinted, they frequently are treated as historical artifacts from which excerpts can be drawn rather than as artistic works that must be seen whole in order to be understood and appreciated" (1). Campbell's collection of women's speeches from 1832 to 1920 makes a contribution to the historical record by giving voice to many forgotten women, a goal I would also like to meet with my work.

In compiling forgotten women's texts, Campbell noted a problem. She found that once women began to speak outside of the home, "their words often were not preserved, with the result that many rhetorical acts by women are gone forever; many others can be found only in manuscript collections or rare, out-of-print publications" (1). This leads to my third reason for studying the catechisms: historical preservation. Based on my on-line research with databases such as WorldCat and Archives USA, as well as the Library of Congress' catalog holdings, I have concluded that the catechisms are not widely available. It is my assumption that they are not easy to find because they are either few in number, because so few were printed, they have not been preserved, or they are buried in private collections. Whatever the reason for their scarcity, I believe it is important for us to preserve these few texts before there are none left and so that they may be studied and appreciated in the future. As such, I have taken steps to preserve the five available catechisms by donating them to the UDC headquarters in Richmond,

Virginia, and by writing critical editions of each text, which may be found in Appendix I of this dissertation.

The five catechisms I have obtained and studied in this dissertation are Cornelia Branch Stone's *UDC Catechism for Children* reprinted in 1912 (originally published in 1904);³⁸ Mrs. John P. Allison's 1908 work, *A Confederate Catechism for Southern Children*; Mrs. St. John Alison Lawton, et al's *UDC Catechism of South Carolina's Confederate History* published in 1919; Mrs. James Albert Fore's 193? book,³⁹ *A Catechism for the Children of the Confederacy of the North Carolina Division United Daughters of the Confederacy*; and Decca Lamar West's 1934 text, *Catechism on the History of the Confederate States of America*. I obtained versions of these texts via interlibrary loan from special collections and archives across the United States: a version of Stone's catechism at the University of Virginia in their rare books collection; Allison's catechism at the Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County in Charlotte, North Carolina; Lawton et al's at the University of South Carolina's Library; Fore's catechism in the pamphlet collection at Duke University Library; and a copy of West's catechism at the University of Texas Library in Austin. Understanding the rhetorical power and

³⁸ There is no publishing date on Stone's reprinted catechism, but Charles R. Wilson's affirmed in his book, *Baptized in Blood*, that, "In 1912 the "U.D.C. Catechism for Children" appeared, with historical facts about the war and Reconstruction arranged in dogmatic question-answer form" (140). See Appendix I: Critical Editions for more.

³⁹ The version of Fore's catechism I received from the pamphlet collection at Duke University Library does not list the publishing date anywhere on it; however, Duke reports the catechism's publishing date as "193?" on their electronic library listing. For more on the dating of this text, see Appendix I: Critical Editions.

significance of these catechisms first requires an examination of the history and evolution of the catechism genre itself.

A Brief History of the Catechism Genre

To begin a historical account of the catechism genre, it is best to first define “catechism.” Perhaps bookseller and noted bibliographer George E. Littlefield defined it best as “a book containing a summary of principles reduced to the form of question and answer, and when we speak of a catechism, from its universal employment by the Christian Church, we are understood to refer to a religious catechism” (106). While the religious catechism is the most common, Littlefield quickly pointed out that, “there are many others, such as legal, medical, geographical, and botanical catechisms” (106).⁴⁰ The religious catechism did not originally start out as a “book containing a summary of principles”:

The story of the catechism as we have come to know it begins in the late Middle Ages. Before it became enshrined in the pages of a book, the

⁴⁰ The similarities between the catechetical method and the Socratic method—in that they are both based on asking a series of questions to get at the “truth” of a subject—are indeed evident; as Littlefield pointed out, “to catechize is to sound a thing into one’s ears, to impress it upon one by word of mouth. Teaching by catechizing is certainly as old as the Greek philosophers of Athens, for Socrates is said to have introduced a catechetical method of arguing” (106). For instance, teaching by catechizing is evident Plato’s dialogues and in Cicero’s *De Partitione Oratoria*, which is “a brief but detailed essay on the art of oratory, designed for the instruction of Cicero’s son Marcus Tullius. It is based on the system of rhetoric of the Middle Academy, and it takes the form of a dialogue, in which the questions of young Cicero are answered by his father” (306). At the beginning of the dialogue, young Cicero asked his father, “Well then, are you agreeable to my adopting your method, and putting to you a series of question in Latin about the same subjects as you examine me upon in Greek” (311)? Cicero responded, “By all means, if you like, as that procedure will enable me to see that you have remembered your previous lesson, and you will be able to obtain information on the points you raise *seriatim*” (311).

catechism was a series of oral instructions, usually in some form of sermon, given at set times in the liturgical year.⁴¹ By the thirteenth century the basic outline of the catechism was well established: the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the twofold precept of love of God and neighbor, the seven deadly sins, the seven principal virtues (faith, hope, charity, justice, prudence, temperance, fortitude), and the seven sacraments. (Marthaler 9)

It was in 1357 that “catechism” came to mean “a book of instruction” rather than oral instruction when John Thoresby, the Archbishop of Canterbury, commissioned John de Taystek, a monk of York, to write *The Lay Folks’ Catechism*. Taystek’s catechism was largely intended “for use by the clergy in instructing the faithful,” which was not the case in the early 1500s, when humanists such as Erasmus and Colet wrote catechisms for use “by the laity for their own instruction and edification” (18). In all of these cases, from the Middle Ages through the Enlightenment, catechisms remained religious texts.

The question-answer and “small catechism” formats in which the UDC wrote their own catechisms were innovations of the genre dating back to the sixteenth century, when “reforming zeal and the printing press combined to shape the catechism and make it an instrument of [religious] reform” (Marthaler 21). The most notable contributor to the catechism genre at the time was Martin Luther.

⁴¹ These oral instructions can be traced back even further to the first centuries of the Church when “catechesis was institutionalized in the catechumenate, a protracted period during which time candidates for baptism had their lifestyle scrutinized, memorized the Creed, and learned the Lord’s Prayer” (Marthaler 9). Further, Marthaler found that “catechumenal practices are found in the instructions and homilies of Ambrose of Milan (d. 396) and Augustine of Hippo (d. 430)” (10).

Luther wrote his 1529 catechisms in two forms—the “large catechism” and the “small catechism”—which were emulated by Protestant and Catholic reformers for centuries to come.⁴² His greatest contribution to the genre may have been arranging his catechisms in question-answer format. Sister Mary Coke pointed out that, “A major turning-point came in the sixteenth century with Luther and the Reformation. Although not the first person to write a catechism he was probably the first to produce one specifically in question and answer form to be learnt by heart” (37). By the time John Calvin wrote his Geneva Catechism in 1541, the question-answer format had become the standard.

The rhetorical significance of the question-answer format, in small catechisms especially, was that it encouraged readers to memorize the catechisms’ contents “by heart.” Speaking on the topic of memorization in Luther’s time, Coke found that, “children would be made to repeat the catechism until they were word perfect and it became so firmly imprinted on their memories that it could still be repeated twenty or even fifty years later” (37).

By the time the Daughters wrote their catechisms in the early 1900s, memorization of schoolbooks, not just catechisms, was common practice in the United States. As Elson discovered in her research on nineteenth century education practices, “The classroom method of the period made the textbook peculiarly

⁴² Large catechisms “served as theological resources for pastors, preachers, and teachers” whereas the small catechisms “served as manuals of instruction in the hands of clergy, schoolmasters, and parents” (Marthaler 21). For more on the use of Luther’s small catechism in the United States, see Arthur C. Repp’s book, *Luther’s Catechism Comes to America: Theological Effects on the Issues of the Small Catechism Prepared In or For America Prior to 1850*.

important in the school. Because teachers were relatively untrained, letter-perfect memorization without particular attention to meaning was the basic method of common, or public, school education” (8). Choosing to write their catechisms in question-answer format and having the Children memorize their contents were certainly well-suited strategies for “imprinting” a collective memory onto young minds.

The UDC catechisms included other significant catechetical inventions dating back to the seventeenth century, which was an important era for the genre. One seventeenth century innovation was the inclusion of narratives in the catechisms. The reason for including narratives in the catechisms was the belief that “there is no better way to teach than by storytelling. Everyone can understand and enjoy a good story. Facts essential to the narrative, because they engage the senses and excite the imagination, are easily remembered,” especially by children (Marthaler 67). Another way catechisms “excited the imaginations” of children in the seventeenth century was “by illustrating the biblical stories with pictures” (Marthaler 68). While printing the illustrations was not always possible or affordable, it was an invention embraced by many catechism writers of the time. In at least two of the UDC catechisms, Allison’s and West’s, the authors included illustrations in the form of photographs to enhance their historical narratives and “arouse the imaginations” of the Children.

It was under the influence of the religious catechism genre, as well as the secular catechisms that followed, that the UDC wrote their texts for children.⁴³ The evolution of the secular catechism in the United States began in early New England. Littlefield found that “the first book used in New England in the education of children, even before the establishment of the common school, was the Catechism” (105). Even after the first common or public school was established in Boston in 1635, the catechism was still employed to teach religion.⁴⁴ Besides using separate catechisms in the public schools to educate the children on religion, many of the earliest American school textbooks included religious catechisms within their pages; for example, the *New England Primer*, which was likely first published in 1683, was reportedly based on the *Protestant Tutor*, a school primer first published in 1607, London (Carpenter 23-24).⁴⁵ Outside of

⁴³ The catechism genre influenced not only the UDC catechism writers, but other members of the UDC as well. Mildred Lewis Rutherford, the UDC Historian-General from 1911 to 1916 and one of the UDC’s most prolific writers, wrote a catechism entitled, “A Scripture Catechism for Baptist Sunday-Schools” in 1898, and she often chose elements from the catechism genre in her public addresses. For instance, in her speeches, “Wrongs of History Righted,” “Georgia: The Empire State of the South,” and “The Civilization of the Old South: What Made It: What Destroyed It: What Has Replaced It,” Rutherford wove questions and answers about the South and its history throughout the texts. In her monthly programs in the *Confederate Veteran*, Rutherford instructed children to read these three and other speeches of hers to find the answers to her monthly questions about Southern history.

⁴⁴ For instance, at the Dorchester public school in Massachusetts founded in 1639, the “rules and orders” of the school included a provision that, “every sixth day in the week at two of the clock in the afternoon [the school master] shall catechize his scholars in the principles of Christian religion, either in some Catechism which the wardens shall provide and present, or in defect thereof in some other” (Littlefield 84).

⁴⁵ The *Protestant Tutor*, Carpenter found, “was strongly anti-Catholic, and had more religious than secular matter in it; but many of the elementary schoolbooks of the time contained hymns, the catechism, the Lord’s Prayer, and related matter, and could

New England, “the Southern colonies and states never used the *New England Primer* as did those of the North,” but the South, especially in the Confederate era, did use primers of similar format (Carpenter 33). As Carpenter argued, “the Confederate primers, aside from the regional touches, were in a general way similar in text outline to those of the North,” which meant that the Southern primers likely contained catechisms just as the Northern primers did (56).

But even the secular textbooks in the nineteenth century that did not include catechisms within their pages still retained a religious tone. As Elson pointed out, “Although religious emphases change during the century, none of these books is secular; a sense of God permeates all books as surely as a sense of nationalism....Just as God appears to be the final cause in nature, so He is also the final cause in human history” (41). The secular school textbooks of early America and into the nineteenth century, then, maintained a “quasi-religious” tone, regardless of whether they included catechisms within their pages.

By the time the UDC began writing their catechisms, teaching history in schools and authoring history textbooks were still relatively new practices. Reporting on the place of history in the early school curriculum, Elson explained, “the history of the United States appeared as a separate subject in some schools by the 1830s, but it was not generally a required subject until after the Civil War”

equally well be designated as religious texts” (23). A primer, incidentally, was a reading and spelling book that included a catechism within its pages. Primers were used primarily in England and in the early American elementary schools.

(5).⁴⁶ Any history that did appear in the early nineteenth century schoolbooks “was found in the reading lessons of the spellers, grammars, and readers” (Littlefield 294). It was in 1820 that the first “really comprehensive and ably written American school history” was penned by Joseph Emerson Worcester entitled, *Element of History* (Carpenter 199). Soon after, schoolbook publisher Kay and Biddle began printing “a number of small educational texts, almost pamphlets, known as ‘Catechisms’,” written by William Pinnock, who wrote histories of other countries such as England and France (Carpenter 200). Many of the books in the nineteenth century “were written wholly in the catechism form,” including the histories, so we may conclude that the history catechism was existent and in use by the time the Daughters penned their historical catechisms for the Children of the Confederacy (Elson 10).

The UDC’s catechisms—which the women wrote in Luther’s easily-accessible “small catechism” style, utilizing his question-answer format to facilitate memorization, including narratives and illustrations to “arouse the imaginations” of children, and mostly on the subject of history, a newly required discipline for schools—carried the full rhetorical force of the catechism genre. The UDC’s catechisms also retained the religious quality that most secular textbooks did at the time, and the fact that the Christian Church still used catechisms to teach religion

⁴⁶ Carpenter found that, “until the nineteenth century history was little valued as a school subject” (196). Littlefield agreed, that in the first centuries in America, “Geography and History had an insignificant place in the curriculum of the common schools” (294).

when the Daughters penned theirs only further solidified the religious authority of the UDC's catechisms.⁴⁷

Furthermore, while the Daughters rhetorically constructed themselves as authorities of collective memory to the public and to the Children (which we will see in chapter two), the catechism format hinted that the ultimate authority on memory and “truth” was God. Quoting from Claude Fleury, a lawyer and “Church historian” in the seventeenth century, Marthaler stated, “The catechism ‘is the word of God,’ and should not contain anything that cannot stand public scrutiny and is unbecoming ‘the majesty of religion’” (68). In this way, not only did the “correct” answers come from the “truth-telling” Chapter leaders, but more importantly, they came straight from God Himself. As such, those who learned catechisms could have seen themselves as speaking God’s word: as Mathaler observed, “A catechism...is not a scholarly work but an instrument of evangelization. Even the word *catechism* (*kata*, again + *echein*, to resound), implies a proclamation of the

⁴⁷ While authors in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries continued to work with different innovations and experiment with the content, order, and language of the Christian catechisms, by the middle of the nineteenth century, the First Vatican Council called for a uniform catechism, which was a sentiment echoed by bishops across other Christian nations, including the United States. The first national catechism in the United States—called the “Baltimore Catechism”—was published in 1885; and as was typical of catechism-writing since the Middle Ages, the Baltimore Catechism was a compilation of previous catechisms. Marthaler found that it was commissioned by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore and “consisted of 421 questions, distributed in 37 chapters, that ran to 72 pages. Compared question by question with other works, only 49 are not found in either the Butler-Maynooth, Verot’s, McCaffrey’s, or David’s catechism,” but “despite the fact that the Baltimore Catechism derived almost all of its content from other works, its organization was original” (Marthaler 116). And despite dissatisfactions with the Baltimore Catechism, it gained acceptance in most dioceses across the country and it was revised in 1941 for continued use in the States (although by Vatican II in 1962, “it had already been displaced by textbooks in many parishes”) (Marthaler 119).

Christian message that echoes over the centuries to people of today” (146).⁴⁸ In many ways, then, the Southern experience became a religion by way of the UDC’s catechisms.

A Brief History of the UDC’s Catechisms

The historical information available on the UDC’s catechisms is not nearly as copious and detailed as the information on the catechism genre as a whole. In fact, besides the occasional mention of the catechisms in the UDC’s General meeting minutes from 1894 to 1955 and the passing references to the catechisms in the *Confederate Veteran* magazine from 1899 to 1935, little has been reported on the early catechisms.⁴⁹ It is for this reason that I have conducted my own historical

⁴⁸ The catechism genre is what most infused the UDC’s texts with the “quasi-religious” element that we so often see in the Lost Cause myth; but there are a few instances (surprising only a few) where the content of the catechisms embraced a quasi-religious tone. Such quasi-religious allusions functioned to persuade the Children that their collective past was in some way divine and they were learning the word of God. For instance, Allison asked the question, “Some say if our cause was right, why did the ‘God of battles’ let us fail,” expecting the responding child to proclaim, “God does not always permit His children to have their way, and God is the vindicator. (Shakespeare says: ‘Triumphal marches are beat, not for successful persons only, but also for the conquered and slain.’)” (7-8). Further evidence of quasi-religious rhetoric may be found in West’s catechism when she provided lyrics to the song, “Our Southland,” which was sung to the tune of “America.” The last stanza of the song went, “We lift our voice to thee, Author of Land and Sea, Creator All. Still guide our steps, O God! In paths our Fathers trod, Thou wert their King, their God! Be Thou our All” (35)!

⁴⁹ I have personally skimmed through the hard copies of these meeting minutes, read through Poppenheim et al.’s book on the *History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy*, which also reports on the UDC’s meeting minutes, and skimmed the *Confederate Veteran* magazines only to find brief and uninformative mentions of the catechisms; in other words, I have found no information on the number of catechisms printed, the authors, the different versions, where the catechisms were placed beyond the C. of C. chapters, or the contents of the books. For example, in the years 1930 and 1931, it was reported in the General meeting minutes that the South Carolina Division of the C. of

investigation, including visits to the UDC headquarters in Richmond, Virginia. The headquarters houses the Caroline Meriwether Goodlett Library, which contains “books relating to Southern history, diaries, letters, and other archival materials suitable for research on the War Between the States” (UDC *Home Page*). It is here that I searched their collection for reports of the catechisms. This is also where I worked closely with Brenda Latham, leader of the Skylark chapter of the Children of the Confederacy in Richmond, Virginia.⁵⁰ While Ms. Latham was not able to answer most of my questions regarding the authors of the catechisms, the numbers of texts printed, and versions of the texts, she was able to explain the catechism ritual to me and put me in contact with other UDC members, especially Kathy Smith Brewer, the Third Vice President General of the UDC and Director of the Children of the Confederacy in 2003.⁵¹

C. paid for 300 catechisms—which catechism, who wrote it, and any other essential details are completely absent (Poppenheim et al. 368).

⁵⁰ Ms. Latham gave me a copy of the UDC’s most current version of the catechism: *Catechism on the History of the Confederate States of America: 1861-1865*, last revised in 1996 and printed in 1999. I do not include this catechism in my project, however, because it was not written during the height of the Lost Cause as were the other five texts.

⁵¹ According Ms. Latham, the Chapter leader of today reads aloud a question from the catechism allowing the Children fifteen seconds to answer from memory. When a Child knows the answer to a question, they must stand up to be recognized by the Chapter leader. If the Child can recite the correct answer to the question, they receive three points (paraphrased answers are accepted). If no one has an answer after fifteen seconds, the leader calls “Books,” which Ms. Latham explained is when the Chapter leader announces, “On God, open your books.” The Children then open their catechisms to search for the correct answer, and according to the C. of C. Minutes of 2002, “the first person to answer the question correctly using their Catechism receives one point. The responding Child must not only read the answer in its entirety but give the page number as well” (20). In the case of two Children standing at the same time to answer a question, “a tie will be declared, the question will be discarded and another question will be asked. No points will

What I have learned by doing my historical research with these resources is that the five catechisms in this dissertation are Division or Chapter catechisms, not General catechisms. Kathy Smith Brewer informed me that, “The [catechisms] you have pre-date the CofC General Organization and are most likely Division ones. I do not recognize any of these names, but would think that they would have been Division or General historians who may have written them” (“Catechisms” 24 Feb). Supporting Brewer’s conjecture is this statement on the first page of the 1999 C. of C. catechism: “At the request of Mrs. Glenn Long, UDC President General, 1951-1953, this catechism was initially compiled. Its purpose was to teach the truths of our Confederate history, and to convey the objectives of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Children of the Confederacy to the reader” (1). The statement went on to explain that,

The concept of a Catechism on the History of the Confederate States of America was approved at the UDC Annual General Convention, Washington, D. C. in November 1953. After much research and consultation with noted authors, historians and educators, it was compiled by Mrs. Harry Davis Allen of Memphis, Tennessee in 1954 and first printed

be awarded” (*C. of C. Minutes* 20). The Children today practice their catechism quizzes in Chapter meetings in preparation for the General Convention Catechism Quizzes, where Kathy Smith Brewer explained to me, “the competition is stiff” (“Catechisms” 24 Feb). Even though these are contemporary documents and resources explaining today’s catechism ritual, given the UDC’s loyal adherence to tradition, it may be deduced that the rituals of today are in many ways similar to those of the early 1900s when Stone, Fore, Allison, Lawton et al., and West wrote their catechisms.

in October of that year. After reprints over the past forty years, the material has been updated to speak to the reader of today. (1)

Since the catechisms I analyze in this dissertation pre-date the first General catechism of 1954, it would appear that they are, in fact, Division or even Chapter catechisms.

There is a difficulty, however, in accepting that the 1953 version of the C. of C. catechism was the UDC's initial conception of the catechism at the General level. The first difficulty lies with Poppenheim et al.'s report that at the 1952 UDC General meeting, it was recommended and approved that "a catechism for Southern Children be prepared;" that "a similar creed for small children be prepared;" and that "a book of instructions be turned over to the Third Vice-President-General when she is elected" (381). Further difficulty lies with Decca Lamar West's 1934 catechism and the "Statement Regarding Preparation of Manuscript" at the beginning of her catechism. The Statement explained that, "This catechism was written in competition for the Orren Randolph Smith Medal offered by Miss Jessica Smith of North Carolina and Washington, D. C., in honor of her father, Captain Orren Randolph Smith, who designed the first Confederate flag" (2).⁵² What is perhaps most telling in the Statement is the assertion that, as a condition of the award, "the catechism winning the medal would be officially adopted by the General U. D. C. (1926)" (2). The catechism was not, however, adopted by the

⁵² The UDC meeting minutes in 1926 confirm West's win: "The Orrin Randolph Smith medal, [was awarded] to Miss Decca Lamar West, of Texas; accepted by Miss West" (106).

UDC at that time, as the Statement explained: “As the General Association did not publish the manuscript as stated in Miss Smith’s offer of the medal, the Texas Division decided to do so, permitting the author to copyright under her own name” (West 2). Thus far, I have not discovered why West’s catechism was not published and officially adopted by the General UDC in 1926. What is clear, though, is that the idea of a C. of C. catechism at the General level was not first conceived in 1952 or 1953. The idea was at least considered in 1926 when Decca Lamar West won the Orren Randolph Smith Medal.

As Division catechisms, the books were used in C. of C. meetings within their respective states: Fore’s and Allison’s were used in North Carolina, Stone’s and West’s in Texas, and Lawton et al.’s in South Carolina. But the catechisms did apparently reach much broader audiences. Allison’s catechism, originally “presented to the United Daughters of the Confederacy, North Carolina Division, at the twelfth annual convention...was adopted and used throughout the South in all the various chapters” (12). Stone’s catechism was republished in 1912 by the J.E.B. Stuart Chapter No. 10, U.D.C in Staunton, Virginia for the benefit of the Stonewall Jackson Camp C.V. No. 25, U.C.V No. 469, which was likely a United Confederate Veterans chapter in Virginia (or perhaps Texas). And in the forward material of West’s catechism, Hope Harrison Turner, President of the Texas Division, UDC wrote,

Because it is accurate, true and concise we recommend it most highly to all State Text Book Boards and to all teachers in all schools as supplementary

material in the study of the history of America. We commend this Catechism to every Chapter Historian as most helpful in interesting the member who had not the time to devote to research. (7)

Additionally, Kathy Smith Brewer informed me that although the catechisms “are used primarily in CofC meetings....Some have been placed in public libraries” (“Catechisms” 24 Feb.). When pressed on which libraries the women have donated catechisms to and how many, Brewer stated, “I am sorry that there is no way I can tell you how many have been placed in libraries....We do have an award for most books placed in libraries but it doesn’t distinguish Catechisms from other books so researching that would not give you an accurate count” (“Catechisms” 25 Feb.). At the very least, it is probable that the catechisms have reached C. of C. members as well as non-Children of the Confederacy members across the South for decades.⁵³

Method and Analysis

Having now discussed my historical research on the UDC catechisms and catechisms genre, as well as having laid out how the theories of collective memory and constitutive rhetoric have shaped the backbone of my critical perspective, I find it necessary to also discuss the general assumptions that inform my methodological paradigm; namely, contextualism.⁵⁴ Rhetorical critics today do not hold as tightly

⁵³ See Appendix I: Critical Editions for more textual history on each of the catechisms and the catechism genre.

⁵⁴ Ford and Klumpp labeled this perspective “systematic pluralism” because it operates on the “meta-level” of criticism. As such, “the resulting attitude is a respect for

to one method of analysis as did the early neo-Aristotelian critics. Because of this trend, critics have become more pluralistic in crafting their perspectives. As such, I have found the vocabulary and assumptions of contextualism to offer the most flexibility in articulating my own methods and analysis questions.

Contextualism

A contextualist paradigm, or “world hypothesis” as Stephen C. Pepper called it, offers the rhetorical critic a pliable vocabulary with which to talk about methods.⁵⁵ The basic unit or “root metaphor” of contextualism is the historic event: “What we ordinarily mean by history...is an attempt to *re-present* events, to make them in some way alive again” (Pepper 232). The sets of categories associated with contextualism are change, or the existence of non-permanent structures in an historic event; novelty, which refers to the features of an event that are not universal; quality, the total meaning of an historic event; and texture, or the details and relations that constitute a quality. The contextualist critic is interested, then, in re-presenting a historic event, paying particular attention to its dynamic nature, its

methods at the level of their systematic integrity and an evaluative attitude in defining and comparing the limits and potentialities of the methods” (Ford and Klumpp 411).

⁵⁵ Pepper defined world hypotheses as theories which, “purport to inform us about the structure of the world” (74). He went on to discuss four theoretical paradigms in his book, *World Hypotheses: A Study in Evidence*: those are formism, mechanism, contextualism, and organicism. In his discussion of the four world hypotheses, Pepper identified their corresponding philosophies and philosophers, their root metaphors, and whether they are analytical or synthetic hypotheses. Pepper contended that the four hypotheses are “relatively adequate,” which means, “they are capable of presenting credible interpretations of any facts whatever in terms of their several sets of categories” (99).

distinctive elements, the total meaning of the event, and the individual parts that comprise the meaning of an event.

The two features of a historic event that a contextual critic may examine to achieve such an analysis are context and strands. A historic event is always tied to its context or surroundings by way of strands: strands are the details which compose the texture and quality of an event. In his discussion of context and strands, Pepper stated, “A texture, through its strands, is constantly involved in its context, and the two together are so complex and so constantly changing that the nature of a total texture could hardly be expected ever to be duplicated” (257). As such, the contextual critic may choose between many strands to trace back and forth between the context and texture of a historic event in order to capture or “re-present” its quality. The contextual critic understands, though, that their interpretation of an historic event is never total because the historic event is dynamic and the texture of the event is comprised of more strands than a critic could even count, forget analyze.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ By way of stranding, a contextualist critic may choose to highlight one or more general type, or “reference,” of strand; those being linear, convergent, blocking, and/or instrumental. The linear reference has a starting point, a transitive direction, and meets its end or “satisfaction;” a convergent reference is “a complex linear reference in which there are either several initiations converging upon one satisfaction or several satisfactions derived from one initiation. This is the contextualists’ description of the common experience of similarity;” blocking is the breaking of a reference, or what happens when linear or convergent references do not meet their ends; which leads to instrumental references, or action that is taken “as a means to a desired end and as a result of some obstacle that intervenes between the beginning of the action and its end or satisfaction” (Pepper 252-260).

Numerous rhetorical scholars speak with a contextualist vocabulary in their discussions of method, especially when they argue that the rhetorical criticism of American public address should look at the place where text and context intersect, or in contextualist terms, where the strands of a historic event weave together with its context.⁵⁷ For example, in his article, “The Schism in Rhetorical Scholarship,” Stephen E. Lucas argued, “to explicate satisfactorily what a rhetorical text [historic event] means or how it functions, we need to comprehend the very identity of that text [texture] as inextricably interwoven with its world [context]” (90). In another article, Lucas asserted that the rhetorical critic’s purpose is not to simply retell the speech in their own words, “but to apprehend it fully from the inside out—to break down its rhetorical elements [strands] so completely as to determine how they function individually and to explain how they interact to shape the text [historic

⁵⁷ Such basic assumptions of contextualism are present, although not always explicitly stated, in the literature on rhetoric and public address. Perhaps the most detailed explanation of contextualism in the literature may be found in Brock, Scott, and Chesebro’s discussion of experientialism. Experientialism, they argued, was born after the 1940s and 1950s when people were decrying the constraining methods of rhetorical criticism, particularly neo-Aristotelianism. As a result of this “breakdown in faith in the paradigm,” rhetorical critics developed a number of new and varied “perspectives” (Brock et al. 86-87). The experiential perspective is marked by two strains: eclectic and epistemic, both of which are more “critic” oriented than “speaker” oriented (Brock et al. 88). Brock, Scott, and Chesebro argued, however, that “it seems possible that a critic could become objective by giving his or her allegiance to a method and thus become a neutral manipulator of instruments,” especially by following Brockriede’s charge that critics must construct arguments (89). The primary assumptions of the experiential perspective include, 1) viewing society as being in a continual state of process or change, 2) a belief in the availability of an infinite number of concepts, strategies, and perspectives for the study of the rhetorical act (Pepper would support this tenet with his statement, “there are many equally revealing ways of analyzing an event, depending simply on what strands you follow from the event into its context,” 250), 3) an understanding of rhetoric and criticism as being interpretations of phenomena, and 4) an obligation that the critic be eclectic, or pluralistic, in method. The assumptions Brock, Scott, and Chesebro attributed to experientialism are also contextualist assumptions.

event] as a strategic, artistic response to the exigencies of a particular situation [context]” (“The Renaissance” 253). In both cases, Lucas expressed the contextualist perspective and laid out the general method that should be employed by public address scholars and rhetorical critics in their scholarship.⁵⁸

Also speaking with a contextualist vocabulary is Waldo W. Braden in his article, “Myths in a Rhetorical Context.” According to Braden, what is most important for a rhetorical critic to consider when analyzing myths from a contextualist approach is studying both the rhetorical and physical elements of a context. On analyzing the rhetorical context of a myth, Braden warned, “the myth draws together minor themes or sub-myths, and it often overlaps and is intertwined with related concepts” (“Myths” 124). According to Braden, then, a critic who wishes to study a “mythical” strand may learn that it is actually “intertwined” with other “mythical” strands; for example, a critic may find that a Lost Cause strand features elements from the Old South, the New South, the Solid South, or other such myths. Besides analyzing the rhetorical context of a myth, the critic must consider the material context surrounding a myth as well: “in his pursuit of his subject, the critic must evaluate the influence of context or atmosphere—the

⁵⁸ For more on text and context, also see Kathleen Turner’s edited volume, *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, for essays by noted rhetorical scholars on assumptions and methods of rhetorical analysis, text and context, and the differences between rhetorical history, rhetorical criticism, and theory. Turner herself argued that rhetorical criticism seeks to understand the message in context whereas rhetorical history seeks to understand the context through messages that reflect and construct that context. Also see Michael C. Leff and Fred J. Kauffeld, eds. *Texts in Context: Critical Dialogues on Significant Episodes in American Political Rhetoric*, and Thomas W. Benson, ed. *American Rhetoric: Context and Criticism*.

setting, the time, and the staging—as well as physical symbols—banners, flags, uniforms...and ritual” (Braden “Myths” 125). By examining both the rhetorical and material contexts of a myth, the critic may more fully understand a “mythical” strand than a critic who does not heed this advice.

The underlying method I employ in this dissertation, then, is informed by contextualism, which means I trace out the strands of the texts into their contexts, and back again, so as to capture the texture and quality of the historic event.⁵⁹ For my project, the UDC’s catechisms were the historic events I attempted to re-present in terms of change, or their evolution over time and the differences that exist between them; their novelty, or unique rhetorical qualities; the total meaning of the catechisms, including purposes and goals; and the specific details that comprise their total meaning. The strands I trace into the historical and rhetorical contexts of the catechisms are the mythical collective memory and rhetorical subjectivity strands.

Analysis Questions and Contributions

The ideas and vocabulary of contextualism have allowed me to articulate not only my methodological assumptions, but also my research questions about the UDC’s catechisms. What I offer in this section are the research questions that have

⁵⁹ When I say I “trace out the strands” of this historic event, I mean that I describe, interpret, and evaluate the details that constituted the event. Furthermore, as a contextualist, I understand that there are even more strands that weave themselves through the historic event of the catechisms and that therefore, the perspective I have chosen leaves my interpretation open to further interpretation in the future.

guided my analysis and informed the contribution I hope to make with this dissertation.

First, I ask the question: What is the context within which the UDC wrote their catechisms? Because contexts inform the content of rhetorical texts and then in turn, those texts influence their contexts, I study the historical and mythical contexts of the post-bellum era. Analyzing the historical context of the catechisms is important because it allows us to see what events, people, and attitudes influenced the construction of texts, which I study in chapter two. Studying a text's rhetorical context teaches us how rhetors within the historical context were talking and what they were talking about. In the case of the catechisms, the rhetorical context of the time was mythical as rhetors responded to the South's defeat with mythical rhetoric, which is the topic of chapter four.

The second question I pose is: How have other researchers studied the Southern response to defeat in these historical and rhetorical contexts? With my analysis of the literature on Southern oratory, the Lost Cause, and the UDC's involvement with the Lost Cause in chapter three, I have been able to see where other researchers have succeeded in their work and places that may benefit from further research. Answering this question sets the research context for my entire project.

The third and final question I address is: How did the catechism authors draw from the contexts of the time to construct their texts? Answering such a question helps the critic explain the choices rhetors made in their texts and what

impact those choices may have had on their historical and rhetorical contexts. In the UDC's catechisms, the women drew from the resources of their contexts in order to construct Southern collective memories for the Children of the Confederacy, which we will see in chapter five. The contexts also helped the catechism authors constitute the Children as the next generation of "Southern people," as we will see in chapter six.

I believe that by answering these questions, my project contributes to the study of collective memory, especially to the discussion of how memories are made. I also believe that the answers to these questions contribute to the study of constitutive rhetoric, particularly to the idea of interpellating individuals into rhetorical subjectivity and the specific strategies that constitute a "people." Finally, it is my hope that this project will add to our understanding, appreciation, and preservation of Southern women's rhetoric, particularly the rhetoric of the United Daughters of the Confederacy

Organization of the Study

In all, this study develops my thesis—that the UDC constituted the Children of the Confederacy as the next generation of "Southern people"—in six chapters. The present introductory chapter has explored several of the key theories, literatures, and questions that have informed my analytical perspective and it will now describe the organization and purpose of the remaining chapters.

The next three chapters describe the various historical, research, and mythical contexts for the UDC's catechisms. Chapter two, *The Crisis of the Post-War South*, establishes the historical context for the study. With a focused narrative of the post-bellum era in the South, I describe white ex-Confederates' reactions to the events they endured—losing the war, emancipation, and Radical Reconstruction—as bitter, resentful, and humiliated. Into that narrative I place the United Daughters of the Confederacy to describe how the post-bellum era of defeat informed their reactions; specifically, I contend that the women's rhetoric positioned them as “authorities” of public memory. I conclude with a look at the Children of the Confederacy as an important site of the women's memory work.

With the historical context of the study in place, chapter three, *Studies of the Era: Interpretations of the Post-bellum South*, describes previous research on the rhetorical responses to defeat in the South. I review three areas of research: Southern oratory, the Lost Cause myth, and the UDC's involvement with the Lost Cause. I examine the approaches taken and issues addressed as that literature developed, situate my study within that literature, and identify the contribution of my study.

Chapter four, *The Myths of the Post-War South*, is the final context chapter in which I examine the mythical context of the post-bellum rhetoric. Here I identify the four tangled myths with which the Southerners responded to defeat: the Solid South, the New South, the Old South, and the Lost Cause. I illustrate each of the myths in action as they soothed the bruised egos of Southerners and preserved

memories after the war. I argue that the UDC preferred the Old South and Lost Cause myths, both of which could be evoked in discourse to remember the South in favorable ways.

Having set up the historical, research, and mythical contexts of the study, the dissertation turns to analysis of the catechisms. I devote the next two chapters entirely to the texts, looking at how the authors constructed their catechisms for children. In chapter five, *Mythical Memories of the South*, my focus is the construction of collective memory. I trace the authors' construction of four narratives—of slavery, secession, the “War Between the States,” and Radical Reconstruction—that together rhetorically fixed the Lost Cause and Old South myths through the questions and answers of the catechisms. Then, I examine the strategies for constructing those narratives and molding collective memory. Those memories “kept alive” the Southern past in the present as the Children recalled them in their own public discourses.

In the last chapter of the dissertation, chapter six, ‘The People’ of the South, I argue that the catechisms drew from contexts and memories to constitute the Children of the Confederacy as the next “generation” of “Southern people.” To make this claim, I identify four requirements of the collectivization process in which a “people” is formed—identity, history, nation, and action—and focus on the process of “interpellation” as a key component in the Children “coming-to-be” “Southern people.” The chapter concludes with a consideration of rhetorical

subjectivity; specifically, what resources were available to the Children and all “Southern people” as they sought to perpetuate Southern culture into the future.

Finally, in a brief Afterword, I make some suggestions about where we may find evidence of the constituted “Southern people” in public discourse after the post-bellum era.

My goal is to capture the United Daughters of the Confederacy’s employment of the rhetorical rituals of their Children of the Confederacy group to construct their specific memories of the South, and with those memories, to provide rhetorical subjectivity for a Southern “people” once again in control of their lives. In the process of this specific study, I seek to illuminate the rhetorical processes involved in responding to crises, constructing collective memories, and constituting a generation of “people.” I further hope that we may learn how each of these processes is informed by the other, and in the end, appreciate the complex rhetorical undertaking the Daughters accomplished with their catechisms for children.

Chapter Two: The Crisis of the Post-War South

There is much discussion today about the Confederacy and its place in today's world. I do hope that you view these as they are intended—as an educational aid to teach facts that may be left out of current history books.

—Kathy Smith Brewer, Third Vice President General of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 24 February 2003.

The “educational aids” Kathy Smith Brewer made reference to in the above quotation were the United Daughters of the Confederacy’s catechisms for children. I had contacted Ms. Brewer to ask if she had any information on the five catechisms I analyze in this dissertation, such as how many were printed, if they were local or national catechisms, and if they had been used in Southern schools. After answering most of my questions, Ms. Brewer concluded her Email with the statement above which prompted me to think not only about the “place of the Confederacy in today’s world,” but also about the place of the UDC catechisms within their historical context. As any public address student would, I thought about how the events and attitudes of the post-war era informed the content of the catechisms, and about how the catechisms themselves fit into that context. In order to answer these questions and properly contextualize the UDC catechisms, I devote this chapter to the historical context of the post-Civil War era in the South. In addition to contextualizing the catechisms, this chapter also provides the context of the defeated Southerners’ rhetorical responses, which are the subjects of chapters three and four.

There are numerous historical narratives one may tell about the South after the Civil War. For example, one may follow the freed slaves through their civic struggles, walk in the shoes of the poor white farmers, observe the political battles in the new state legislatures, or recount the economic trials and tribulations that kept the South on its toes.¹ The narrative I construct in this chapter focuses on how most white ex-Confederates responded with humiliation, bitterness, and resentment to major events in the decades following the Civil War (1865 to 1930), and how their feelings contrasted with their refusal to remember and identify themselves as a defeated people.² I include in this narrative an examination of women's memorial associations, particularly the United Daughters of the Confederacy, for their place in rebuilding memory and rhetorical agency in the post-war South. Because the UDC's narrative necessarily includes the Children of the Confederacy—the organization for whom the UDC wrote their catechisms and whom they believed could perpetuate their versions of memory and Southern culture into the future—I write them into this chapter as well. While the historical narrative in this chapter

¹ Also in my narrative I withhold judgment on historical controversies debated in the scholarly literature. For example, some scholars have debated whether Radical Reconstruction was successful or not; specifically, if the decade of Reconstruction should be shamed as a “tragic era,” or if it should be lauded for its “revolutionary aspects.” Others have argued that the embittered post-war South brought much of its hardship upon itself (for example, historian Forrest G. Wood). Whether Reconstruction was a success or not, whether white ex-Confederates brought hardship onto themselves, or whether they were even justified in feeling bitter and resentful are not the immediate concerns of this dissertation.

² Of course, it must be mentioned that some Southerners were not bitter at all; instead, they were optimistic and “determined to work and, if necessary, fight to preserve what was left” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 4-5). The rhetoric that emerged from these optimistic and future-oriented Southerners formed the backbone of the New South myth.

may seem narrow and limited, I offer historian Staughton Lynd's philosophy on history-writing to explain my motivation: "To study history...is to strive simultaneously for a clear, selective focus and for an integrated, over-all view" (vii). It is my hope that the focused historical narrative I construct in these pages will also give the reader a general sense of the post-war era in the South.

The Defeated South

The story of the UDC catechisms begins with the Civil War itself. From December 20, 1860 to February 1, 1861, seven Southern states seceded from the United States of America. The seceded states were fearful that the newly elected president and known opponent of slavery, Abraham Lincoln, would disrupt or abolish their way of life. In February of 1861, the seceded states formed their own nation—the Confederate States of America—and by May of 1861, four more states joined the Confederacy.³ By the time secession was complete, most Northerners believed that the Southern states had no constitutional right to secede and therefore

³ The eleven states of the Confederacy consisted of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas. The "border states," or slave states that stayed with the Union, were Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, and Delaware. Defining the "South" has been a topic of discussion with historians such as Richard N. Current concluding that "the South, after all, is not so much a place as it is an idea," and John S. Ezell agreeing, "One must therefore be content with the conclusion that history and not geography made the South, that it is a 'state of mind' rather than a geographical or genealogical development" (Current *Northernizing* 12; Ezell *The South* 6). Also see the first three essays in David M. Potter's book, *The South and the Sectional Conflict*, for his conceptions of the South, as well as Monroe L. Billington's edited collection, *The South: A Central Theme?*, for essays by historians who sought to define the South by "the presence of the Negro" and white supremacy, "the presence of aristocracy," militancy, "the agrarian tradition," and a "cultural and intellectual tradition."

considered the Confederacy “states in rebellion.” President Abraham Lincoln reportedly had little interest in answering the question of whether the Confederate States were still in the Union or had lost their legal lives by secession. As such, Lincoln insisted on waging war with the Confederate States under the assumption that “it was a rebellion of citizens rather than a revolt of states” (Ezell 60). The Confederate States argued that the Constitution did allow for secession, and because they were no longer part of the United States, they were about to fight a legitimate war, not a “rebellion.”

The Civil War began on April 12, 1861, when Confederate forces attacked Fort Sumter, South Carolina. The causes of the Civil War have been fiercely debated by historians, some citing such causes as “economic differences, constitutional conflict, conspiracy theories, bungling generations, cultural clash, and various other factors” (Wood 64).⁴ But as historian Forrest G. Wood has argued, historians do not much debate the causes of the Civil War any more, because after the smoke cleared, “the slavery issue still loomed as the greatest single antecedent of the sectional conflict” (64). While Wood’s assessment is accurate, the slavery issue alone does not fully explain why Southerners without slaves supported and participated in the war. Historian John S. Ezell has addressed this dilemma, arguing that while slavery may be viewed as the primary cause, the Civil War was not fought only to retain slavery: “Southerners had come to believe that their beloved Southern way of life was something they could not keep if they

⁴ For a review of the secondary literature on the causes of the Civil War, see especially chapter four, *The Literature on the Background of the Civil War*, of David M. Potter’s book, *The South and the Sectional Conflict*.

remained in the Union. And to them all—the planter, the yeoman, the poor white—it was a way of life worth dying for” (22). Fighting to protect slavery and their way of life, Confederate men across social and economic classes fought the war until April 9, 1865, when the leader of the most important Confederate army, General Robert E. Lee, surrendered that army to General Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox, Virginia. Casualties during the war were incredibly high, “with over 600,000 men in two armies losing their lives at a time when the total population barely exceeded thirty million” (Reid 485). Hundreds of thousands more were left physically or mentally maimed (Connelly *Marble* 91).

Most of the South’s citizens, not just its veterans, were left “mentally maimed” after the war as they struggled to understand how the North defeated them.⁵ The typical reactions to their defeat were humiliation, bitterness, and resentment which many white Southerners had already experienced in the antebellum years in response to “Northern interference” by abolitionists, politicians, and other “Yankees.” In the post-bellum years, the defeated ex-Confederates clung even tighter to those sentiments: “the war only intensified the anti-Yankee bitterness of Southerners and made them, on the whole, less willing

⁵ In *The Waning of the Old South Civilization, 1860-1880s*, historian Clement Eaton argued that “A profound mood of discouragement and pessimism affected the Southerners as a whole after the conclusion of the war...For many months after the fall of the Confederacy, the Southern people tried to explain to themselves why the tragic event had occurred” (112-113). Historian John S. Ezell also spoke of the “mental maiming” of defeated Southerners when he observed, “no one even bothered to compile accurate records of those who were wounded or to count the cost in lives shattered by material loss and the demoralization of defeat” (25).

than ever to accept and adopt Northern ways” (Current *Northernizing* 57).⁶ Discussing the psychology of a defeated people, historian Paul H. Buck explained, “[t]he defeated tend as readily to resent the implied inferiority of their humiliating position,” which acutely defined the feelings and “mental maims” of most white ex-Confederates after the war (vii). Agreeing with such a position, historians Thomas D. Clark and Albert D. Kirwan have argued that when the dust settled after the war, the people of the South were left “groping in a decade of defeat” (2).

The material wounds the South needed to mend after the war took the form of defunct state governments, devastated economies, and destroyed landscapes. Most Southerners despaired knowing that rebuilding was all but impossible with their limited resources, especially because two billion dollars worth of human capital—the slaves—were released (Franklin *Reconstruction* 3). The South still had its land, which could be cultivated again,⁷ but the South’s need for capital,

⁶ Agreeing that antebellum sentiments remained strong as Southerners faced Reconstruction was Charles W. Ramsdell who argued, “Defeat, poverty, frustration, the wearying sense of being eternally on the defensive had their inevitable depressing effects upon social and cultural conditions. The tone of southern life was lower than before the war” (86). Also see rhetorical critic W. Stuart Towns’ claim that, “The decades of bitterness from the 1830s to the end of the War were nourished by the real as well as the perceived wrongs perpetuated upon the South by the Reconstruction governments....For years after the guns had cooled, many white southerners felt no interest nor desire to be reconciled to the victorious North...They limped away from the devastation bitter, uncertain, and unreconciled to their conqueror” (“Ceremonial” 121).

⁷ For primary sources on how the South revived its agriculture, specifically how it moved away from a one-crop system, diversified its crops, and how tenancy farming and sharecropping became the norm, see Thomas D. Clark’s edited book of essays, *The South Since Reconstruction*, pages 61-130, and for a secondary account, see chapter four: Farmers on the Land in Clark and Kirwan’s book, *The South Since Appomattox: A Century of Regional Change*. For more on challenges to farming, production costs, and crop yields, see John S. Ezell’s chapter seven, *Southern Agriculture, 1865-1930*. Also see Charles W. Ramsdell’s argument that agriculture defined the South in his essay, “Preoccupation with

specifically Northern capital, eventually became all-consuming. Commenting on Southern attitudes towards the need for Northern capital, Buck asserted, “at no time in the postwar period did Southern morale reach so low a level as when the yearning to escape the dire circumstances of defeat led many to expect salvation from the North” (150).⁸ The need for Northern capital after the war only added insult to injury for many ex-Confederates already feeling bitter and resentful towards the North.

With their heads hung low, the people of the South opened their doors to Northern capital and the “Yankee investor,” who quickly fueled Southern resentments and became a most hated “villain.” While many ex-Confederates acknowledged the necessity of Northern investors bailing the South out of debt, historian Eric Foner explained that, “what most annoyed Southern whites was the newcomers’ sublime confidence that they knew better than former slaveowners how to supervise free black labor” (137-138). Despite the fact that Northern investments greatly helped the Southern farmers and economies get back on their

Agriculture,” as well as Frank L. Owsley and John C. Ransom’s essay, “The Ideal of an Agrarian Society,” for their discussion of the agrarian vs. industrial conflict in the South after the war (both essays are available in Monroe L. Billington’s edited book, *The South: A Central Theme?*).

⁸ Ezell explained the need for Northern capital perhaps most succinctly: “Hope, and with it revival, had to lie in the future, whose chief architect would be the North” (40). For more on the South’s need for Northern capital, see *The First New South, 1865-1920* by Howard N. Rabinowitz, especially pages 31-48. In those pages, he argued that the South needed capital for industrialization (especially for railroads) and agriculture. For more on the advances in Southern industrialization, see Ezell’s chapter eight, Southern Industrialization Before 1930.

feet, most white Southerners were “annoyed” by what they perceived as Yankee investors trying to control businesses and “Northernize” the South.⁹

Besides the Yankee investor, the “carpetbagger” was another villain from the North also accused of “Northernizing” and “Africanizing” the South. Foner explained the myth of the carpetbaggers and why they were maligned by the Southern residents: “Able to pack ‘all his early belongings’ in his carpetbag, he supposedly journeyed south after the passage of the Reconstruction Act ‘to fatten on our misfortunes,’ in the process of poisoning the allegedly harmonious race relations of 1865-67” (294). Believing that carpetbaggers possessed nothing but sinister intentions, the people of the South often described the villains as “grasping, ignorant, unconscionable, filthy, and totally lacking in refinement or any other civilized quality” (Wood 55). Southerners developed and expressed deep-seated resentments for the “unrefined” Northern carpetbaggers whose primary goal, they believed, was “poisoning” and taking advantage of the South.

The “scalawag” was yet another villain in the South. This derisive term was applied to any “‘traitorous’ white southerners who supported the Republican ‘invaders’,” or in other words, did not support secession or the war (Rabinowitz 76). Embittered ex-Confederates believed that these “traitors” were “motivated not only by the chance for private gain...but also by spite. Here was their chance to get

⁹ See Richard N. Current’s book, *Northernizing the South*, for his discussion of how some Northerners did, in fact, want the South to look like the North. Current examined how the idea of Northernization was crafted in the minds of some Northerners decades before the Civil War began (which, he argued, contributed to Southern secession in the first place), and how ideas of “Northernizing” the South carried through and after the war.

even with the haughty plantation overlords who had been toppled by the war” (Wood 55). Like their beliefs about the carpetbaggers, the ex-Confederates who applied this term believed wholly in the devious and vengeful intentions of scalawags. While historians have argued that most carpetbaggers and scalawags were well-intentioned individuals who were largely misunderstood,¹⁰ it is most important to keep in mind Southerners’ perceptions of these people as outsiders and even enemies whose sole purpose was “Northernizing,” “Africanizing,” and even “poisoning” the South.

Besides the “villains,” a major source of resentment for the ex-Confederates facing Reconstruction was the Northern occupying army: “Nothing offended the warriors of the Lost Cause more than the presence in their towns and villages of companies and regiments of the victorious army—including Negroes, many of them former slaves—to remind them of their humiliation” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 35).¹¹ Responding to the occupying armies with bitterness, Ezell found, was almost

¹⁰ For more on the misconceptions of carpetbaggers, see especially Richard N. Current’s essay, “Carpetbaggers Reconsidered,” or his more recent book, *Those Terrible Carpetbaggers: A Reinterpretation*, John H. Franklin’s *Reconstruction After the Civil War*, pages 93-103, and Forrest G. Wood’s *The Era of Reconstruction, 1863-1877*, pages 55-60. Also see Jack B. Scroggs’ essay, “Carpetbagger Constitutional Reform in the South Atlantic States, 1867-1868,” for his argument that the South actually needed more carpetbaggers during Reconstruction.

For more on the misconceptions of the scalawags, see Allen Trelease’s, “Who Were the Scalawags,” Otto H. Olsen’s “Reconsidering the Scalawags,” and James A. Baggett’s *The Scalawags: Southern Dissenters in the Civil War and Reconstruction*.

¹¹ Explaining this resentment further is historian Clement Eaton: “Southerners bitterly resented the use by the North of Negro troops, many of whom were slaves recruited from Kentucky and the occupied regions of the South. There was something ignoble they thought in the eagerness of Northern states to recruit Negroes from the South, even using brokers, to fill out their quotas in the draft and thus to avoid conscripting some of their white men” (114).

sport: “Another canker was the snubbing of ‘Yankees’ on the streets by Southerners and the refusal to meet them socially, especially by ‘women who consider it essential to salvation to snub or insult Union officers and soldiers at every possible opportunity’” (32). The responsibilities of the military in the South were to organize new state governments according to the congressional plan, administer oaths of loyalty, and register as many qualified voters, including former slaves, as possible. Ezell pointed out that some military occupiers were “reckless with their power, suppressing Confederate veteran organizations, parades, and other symbols of the lost cause,” but that most were essentially “good men doing a distasteful job” (82). Again, while historians have argued that “the strength and influence of the military forces in the South between 1867 and 1877 have frequently been exaggerated,”¹² what is most important to understand is the Southern perception of being invaded and controlled by an intrusive force (Franklin *Reconstruction* 119). This was a perception that only fueled their feelings of resentment for years to follow.

Another source of agitation for Southerners was the “Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands,” or more commonly known as the “Freedmen’s Bureau.” Congress created the military-run Freedmen’s Bureau in March of 1865

¹² John H. Franklin, in *Reconstruction After the Civil War*, argued that the numbers and influence of the occupying army have been exaggerated (see especially pages 35-36, 119-121). John S. Ezell did not make a judgment about whether or not perceptions of the occupying army have been exaggerated, but he did inform his readers that the occupying army throughout Reconstruction numbered 20,000 troops, distributed in ten states at 134 army posts (82).

to “aid refugees and freedmen by furnishing supplies and medical services, establishing schools, supervising contracts between freedmen and their employers, and managing confiscated or abandoned lands” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 37-37). While the Bureau was created to assist both blacks and whites after the war, many poor whites simply refused the assistance: “asking the Freedmen’s Bureau for help now would have been, in their minds, tantamount to admitting social equality with blacks” (Wood 26). The Freedmen’s Bureau is credited with helping thousands of refugees and freedmen after the war,¹³ yet most white Southerners, including President Johnson, viewed it as just another source of outsider aggression and intrusion: “Since it stood in the way of states’ rights and self-government, they were resolved that it should be resisted. Thus, to former Confederates the Bureau was a symbol of outside interference that every self-respecting Southerner could be expected to oppose” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 39). Those who were opposed to the Bureau expressed their opposition by refusing assistance—which, incidentally, may be read as an example of Southerners bringing hardship upon themselves—by blocking legislation to extend its tenure¹⁴ and some even turned to violence by burning down schools where Bureau workers taught black students. However they

¹³ The Freedmen’s Bureau’s accomplishments were indeed substantial: “Within four years the Bureau had issued twenty-one million rations to white refugees and Negro freedmen. It established more than forty hospitals and spent more than two million dollars in treating 450,000 cases of illness. It assisted in the settlement of some thirty thousand persons who had been displaced by the war. It restored, at the insistence of President Johnson, most of the abandoned lands to pardoned rebels” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 37). For more on the Freedmen’s Bureau, see Foner 142-170 and Ezell 51-55.

¹⁴ In 1866, President Johnson vetoed a bill to extend and enlarge the Freedman’s Bureau, but months later, Congress passed another Freedman’s Bureau Act over the president’s veto thereby extending the life and functions of the Bureau.

chose to resist, it was clear that most white Southerners resented the Freedmen's Bureau.

A major cause of tension for white Southerners immediately after the war was "the Negro question." Abraham Lincoln had declared freedom for all slaves in the "rebellion states" (not the Union or border states) with his Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863. While the slaves were not actually freed at that time because the Confederate States rejected the Proclamation (after all, they considered themselves a separate nation and not obliged to obey another nation's orders), the Thirteenth Amendment eventually abolished slavery across the United States and brought freedom to four million slaves in December 1865. Unsatisfied with the Thirteenth Amendment, Northern reformers advocated for full citizenship and suffrage rights for the former slaves, some even pushing for suffrage as a prerequisite for re-entrance by the Confederate states into the Union. Most Southern whites outright opposed the idea: "For Southern whites such a proposition was absurd. They held that Negroes were not only unprepared for politics but, because of their innate inferiority, were unfit" (Franklin *Reconstruction* 43).

The thing white Southerners feared most was "Negro rule," or the idea that former slaves would take control of their state governments. The apprehension of "Negro rule" included a fear that freedmen would outvote the white men, and that votes by former slaves would be protected to insure a majority while at the same

time white men were systematically disfranchised.¹⁵ Regardless of whether or not their fears were founded, white Southerners argued “stolidly and unyieldingly for control over a problem they insisted was domestic in nature,” and that the “Negro question” required “home rule” (Buck 283).¹⁶

One manifestation of whites’ attitudes towards ex-slaves, their fear of “Negro rule,” and their insistence on dealing with the question themselves was the passage of Black Codes by Southern legislatures in 1865. The Black Codes varied from state to state but most were consistent in denying ex-slaves such freedoms as the right to bear arms, the right to buy or possess alcoholic beverages, the right to leave their houses after ten o’clock at night, or the right to hold special meetings after sunset without permission. To reformers in the North, the Black Codes confirmed their worst fears: “that leaders of the Confederacy were determined to

¹⁵ Historians have examined “Negro rule” in the South, mostly as a gross exaggeration by Southern whites. For example, John H. Franklin argued that, “Negroes were not in control of the state governments at any time anywhere in the South” (*Reconstruction* 133). For more by Franklin, see his book *Reconstruction: After the Civil War*, especially pages 133-138 and page 102 where Franklin provided a quantitative comparison of blacks and whites in state conventions, 1867-1868. Also see Forrest G. Wood who argued, “there was never much real evidence to support the charge that the freedmen were taking over, and, in particular, that southern whites had been disfranchised to guarantee a black majority” (68). Finally, see Rabinowitz’s argument that “Africanization” was an exaggeration in pages 75-76 of *The First New South: 1865-1920*.

But on the voting front, see Clark and Kirwan who have argued that by the time the First Reconstruction Act was fulfilled, “a total of 703,000 Negroes and 627,000 whites were enrolled in the five districts. Registered Negroes outnumbered whites in Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina, despite the fact that only in the last two states were Negroes a majority of the population” (34). Of course, the number of registered voters at this time was much larger than the number of people who actually voted, especially among the black voters who were kept from voting in the South by way of Jim Crow laws, terrorism by the KKK, and other forms of intimidation.

¹⁶ Historian Eric Foner has argued that “home rule” was a euphemism for “white supremacy” (xix-xx).

restore as nearly as possible the conditions of the ante-bellum South....to restore the old condition of slavery under a new name” (Clark and Kirwan 28, 29).¹⁷ To white Southerners, besides wanting to keep the former slaves from “ruling,” enacting the Black Codes was a way to exert some control over their own territory. Perhaps Franklin explained it best when he argued, “the spirit that lay behind the black codes and other reconstruction measures of the former Confederates was a disquieting feature of ‘home rule’” (*Reconstruction* 51).¹⁸ The Black Codes were suspended in 1866 by federal officers, but an organization called the Ku Klux Klan was already forming and deciding to assert “home rule” across the South in yet another way.

Undoubtedly the most violent expressions of bitterness and resentment for the freedmen came from the Ku Klux Klan.¹⁹ The KKK, or the “Invisible Empire

¹⁷ It is important to remember that the North had their own “anti-Negro” laws as well; such as “vagrancy laws, suffrage restrictions, and laws against intermarriage” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 50). As a matter of fact, Eaton argued that the Black Codes “were derived from the apprenticeship and vagrancy laws applying to whites in the North as well as in the South, the customs of slavery times, the ante-bellum laws relating to free Negroes, British West Indies legislation for ex-slaves, and regulations of the Union Army and the Freedmen’s Bureau” (128).

¹⁸ Or in Eaton’s words, “The Black Codes expressed accurately the mood and opinions of the Southerners as they faced the colossal problem of establishing a stable social order and of adjusting the former slave to the conditions of a free society. Many Northerners, especially radical politicians, saw in these codes an attempt to continue the practice of virtual enslavement of the Negro” (129).

¹⁹ Other white supremacy groups in the South during Reconstruction were the Knights of the White Camellia in Louisiana, the Knights of the Rising Sun in Texas, the White Line in Mississippi. Others across the South included the Constitutional Union Guards, the Pale Faces, the White Brotherhood, the White League, the Council of Safety, and the ’76 Associations. For more on the KKK, see Allen Trelease’s *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction*.

of the South,” was organized in December of 1865 by a group of young white men in Pulaski, Tennessee.²⁰ The white sons of the Confederacy who joined the Klan vowed to protect white supremacy in the South, especially the purity of white womanhood, and to protect ex-Confederates against the dreaded “Negro retaliation.” The Klan considered not only black men and women their enemies, but also the Freedmen’s Bureau, Northerners, carpetbaggers, scalawags, the black militias, those who supported Radical Reconstruction, or those who even associated with former slaves as equals. Klan members “protected” white supremacy with such tactics as whipping, maiming, mutilating, beating, burning, hanging, and generally intimidating and terrorizing those who challenged white dominance in the South. While it was only a small minority of Southerners who actually participated in the KKK, it is the wide-spread support they received throughout the South that is most significant: “it is...a commentary on the attitude of a majority of whites that they not only tolerated the terrorists, but, in many instances, welcomed and encouraged them....And to much of the white population, these men were the saviors of the South” (Wood 80, 81).²¹ The KKK and its supporters were very much active by the time Radical Reconstruction began in 1867.

²⁰ To read about white women’s participation in the Ku Klux Klan, read Kathleen M. Blee’s book, *Women of the Klan: Racism and Gender in the 1920s*.

²¹ Ezell agreed: “At first many of the best Southerners supported the Klan, but it quickly grew out of control” (95). The Klan was eventually pushed underground by way of the Third Enforcement Act or “Ku Klux Act,” which became law on April 20, 1871. The Enforcement Acts of 1870 and 1871, passed by Congress to stop the KKK by enforcing the Fifteenth Amendment, proved wholly inadequate (the Fifteenth Amendment was ratified on February 3, 1870 and granted citizens the right to vote regardless of “race, color, or previous condition of servitude”). Blee found that even before the 1871 Act, though, the

The political struggle over Reconstruction planning began before the Civil War even ended, and most former Confederates found themselves on the sidelines as helpless and anxious observers rather than active participants.²² The major bone of political contention was that the Constitution, which contained no provision for disunion and reunion, did not specify which branch of government should be in control of Reconstruction: the executive or legislative. As such, both branches began constructing their post-war plans for the South and debating them bitterly. Having effectively won the struggle over Reconstruction, the Radical Republican-controlled Congress began crafting their plans for Reconstruction with the Fourteenth Amendment.²³ Based on the Civil Rights Act of 1866, the Fourteenth

Grand Wizard of the KKK in 1870 ordered the dissolution of the organization, “insisting that atrocities blamed on the Klan were in fact committed by opportunistic nonmembers” and as such, “the local remnants of the first Ku Klux Klan disintegrated during the mid-1870s” (16).

²² For more on the political struggle over Reconstruction—including the struggles between President Lincoln and Congress over their plans for reconstruction, the Civil Rights Acts, the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments, the struggles between President Johnson and Congress, and the four Radical Reconstruction Acts—see chapter one: Reconstruction and War (especially the sections entitled “The President Acts” and “The Congress Reacts”), and chapter two: “Congressional Reconstruction” in Forrest G. Wood’s book, *The Era of Reconstruction, 1863-1877*, and Clark and Kirwan’s chapter two, Political Reconstruction in their book, *The South Since Appomattox: A Century of Regional Change*. Also see chapter four, Radicalism vs. Conservatism and chapter five, The Radical Triumph, in Ezell’s book, *The South Since 1865*.

²³ It is interesting to note that the Radical Republicans ruled Congress only in influence, not in numbers. Wood succinctly explained the control Radicals enjoyed in Congress at the time: “An aggressive minority faction had demanded fundamental changes that conservatives resisted. When moderates grew disenchanted over the president’s unwillingness to consider even the most reasonable reconstruction proposals, they joined the radicals in overruling him and attempting to overthrow him” (92). Clark and Kirwan explained that “the radicals owed much of their victory to Johnson, whose unyielding attitude had recruited moderates to their cause, so that the early radical minority was not turned into a majority” (32).

Amendment defined citizenship as “All persons born or naturalized in the United States” and as such, “no state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property” (Cornell Law). The Fourteenth Amendment passed both houses in June of 1866 to the delight of Radical Republicans and to the chagrin of most ex-Confederates. White Southerners perceived the Amendment as yet another unfair punishment, another outside interference, and another encroachment on home rule. As such, most Southern states refused to ratify the Amendment, but the Radical Republicans would not be deterred as they pushed through Congress the First Reconstruction Act in March of 1867.²⁴

The decade of Radical Reconstruction from 1867 to 1877 brought new sources of hope to the South—such as the election of Ulysses S. Grant in 1868, relaxed military control in the South during elections, reviving state economies, and rebounds in agriculture—but it also introduced new reasons for low morale, such as inflation and debt that plagued the Southern states, as well as corruption and graft

²⁴ The Second Reconstruction Act was passed later in the month explaining how the military commanders were to carry out reconstruction in the South: “This involved the registration of voters who could take an ‘ironclad oath,’ the election of delegates, the assembling of conventions, and the adoption of state constitutions” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 72). The Third Reconstruction Act was passed over Johnson’s veto months later, in July 1867, and it empowered registration boards “to deny registration to anyone they thought had not taken the oath in good faith, a provision that invited abuse because a board could disfranchise someone with only a tissue of evidence” (Wood 45). Then in March of 1868, a Fourth Reconstruction Act was passed because “Alabamans defeated their proposed constitution by registering and then not voting on the constitution one way or the other” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 72). The Fourth Act made it so that “a majority of the votes actually cast would be sufficient to put a new constitution into effect, even if a large number of registered voters stayed away from the polls when the constitution was up for consideration” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 73).

which was widespread across the nation. Also, the state governments in the South strained under the weight of new government plans which included improving public education, building railroads and new roads, and reorganizing the penal systems. And while taxation and borrowing were the South's primary strategies for meeting their new needs and challenges, many Southerners accused the new governments—which, in their minds, were being run by carpetbaggers and scalawags anyway—of “stealing” money from them through taxation.²⁵

In the decades after Reconstruction ended, the political, social, and economic situations in the South changed very little, which may in part explain why many ex-Confederates still clung tightly to their grudges: “They felt that they were badly treated by reconstruction and were bitterly resentful,” Ezell argued (87). Furthermore, these feelings of bitter resentment “did not die out with the return of home rule to the section and became one of the factors which account for the continuance of a ‘self-conscious’ South long after the last federal troops had been withdrawn” (Ezell 87).

And still, the people who bore the brunt of the white Southerners' bitterness were the former slaves, and again, a main front was voting and political participation. For example, to keep black men from voting, polling places were changed at the last minute, ballots were made long and complicated, and literacy tests were required before one could vote. Still more ways of disqualifying or discouraging the freedmen's votes were frequent gerrymandering, setting time

²⁵ As a matter of fact, Ezell argued, “considering their financial bankruptcy, Southerners became the most heavily taxed people in United States history” (85).

limits on how long a voter could spend in the voting booth, setting up registrations and elections in areas far from black settlements, and imposing poll taxes and property requirements that the freedmen and poor whites could not afford (Ezell 178).²⁶ As a result, most black men simply stopped voting, and significantly, “Effective political power therefore remained where it had been before the war—with an oligarchy, a small ruling clique, which wielded power far out of proportion to its numerical strength” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 219).²⁷ In other words, despite the war and a decade of Reconstruction efforts, the post-Reconstruction era in the South looked in many ways identical to its antebellum era, resentments and all.²⁸

²⁶ See also Rabinowitz, especially pages 113-114 where he discussed the “grandfather clause” and the “good character clause” as two more methods of disenfranchisement, as well as Thomas D. Clark’s *The South Since Reconstruction* for primary documents such as the 1890 “Mississippi Plan” that contained the literacy provision, poll taxes, and other forms of disenfranchisement (pages 149-151), and “The Grandfather Clause” as it appeared in Louisiana’s state Constitution in 1898 (pages 152-154). For even more on the ex-slave’s struggle to vote and participate in politics, see Ezell’s chapter ten, *The Southern Negro, 1877-1930*.

²⁷ Historian Howard N. Rabinowitz has argued similarly, that “by 1920, the South, despite often momentous instances of change, was more as it had been in 1865 (or even 1860) and less like the North than New South spokesmen had hoped it would be or claimed it had become” (4).

²⁸ In arguing for Reconstruction’s success, Paul H. Buck highlighted “the accomplished fact of Southern restoration to full political rights within the Union” (169); John H. Franklin deemed “the most revolutionary aspect of the reconstruction program” the fact that roughly 700,000 former slaves were enfranchised and entered the “political arena” (*Reconstruction* 86); and Eric Foner argued that Reconstruction was successful because of the political ground gained by ex-slaves (xxv).

Yet, historians have also argued that Radical Reconstruction was a “tragic era” (as so deemed by Claude G. Bowers in his 1929 book *The Tragic Era: The Revolution After Lincoln*) and a “failure,” mainly because it “did not go far enough” (Wood 92). Historian Staughton Lynd argued that Reconstruction failed because of “the futility of trying to coerce deep-seated attitudes by legal or military force,” because “it did not give the freedman land of his own,” and Reconstruction “stopped too soon” (4, 8, 5). Clark and Kirwan argued that while it may celebrate successes, Reconstruction also must admit its

On the social front, white Southerners continued to hold grudges against emancipation by segregating blacks from whites in public institutions, especially in churches and schools. In 1896, the Supreme Court ruled in *Plessy v. Ferguson* that it was legal to separate the races in public as long as accommodations were equal, a victory for many Southerners.²⁹ The “separate but equal” mantra became the law of the land, especially in the South, where Jim Crow laws were passed to keep the races separate in all public capacities. Jim Crow laws closely resembled the Black Codes of 1865-1866. For example, it was illegal for whites and blacks to attend the same schools; in some states it was illegal for a black barber to cut a white woman’s or child’s hair; for a restaurant to serve both blacks and whites; for a hospital to require a white nurse to work in wards where black men were admitted; and like the Black Codes, it was illegal in most states for blacks and whites to intermarry. Again, these laws were largely motivated by white fear of “Negro rule,” miscegenation, economic competition, as well as the desire many whites had for racial supremacy. But this time, because they were sanctioned by a Supreme Court ruling, the Jim Crow laws lasted well into the 1960s.

Another unfortunate but perhaps predictable feature of the post-Reconstruction era was the violence visited upon those who made any gesture of

failures, the most significant of which was “produc[ing] a trauma in the southern psyche from which its people would not soon recover” (50).

²⁹ To read the *Plessy v. Ferguson* Supreme Court decision, see pages 155-167 of Clark’s edited book, *The South Since Reconstruction*. Also see Clark’s pages 237-243 for the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision which declared *Plessy v. Ferguson* unconstitutional in public schools.

equality.³⁰ The years between the end of Reconstruction in 1877 and the beginning of the Great Depression in 1930 is often referred to as the “lynching era.” Historians Stewart E. Tolnay and E. M. Beck found that, “During these years we may estimate that there were 2,018 separate incidents of lynching in which at least 2,462 African-American men, women and children met their deaths in the grasp of southern mobs, comprised mostly of whites” (17).³¹ Black men, women, and children were hanged, burned, dismembered, and beaten—tactics similar to the KKK’s during the Reconstruction era—and as a matter of fact, lynch mobs were often joined or roused into action by the KKK themselves who reemerged in 1915. The reasons that warranted lynching in the minds of some white Southerners included acting suspiciously, gambling, adultery, being improper with a white woman, arguing with a white man, incest, resisting a mob, slander, being obnoxious, injuring livestock, spreading disease, insulting a white man, throwing stones, trying to colonize blacks, demanding respect, trying to vote, unpopularity, acting uppity, vagrancy, peeping tom, voting for wrong party, frightening a white

³⁰ Read John H. Franklin’s essay, “The Militant South,” in Monroe L. Billington’s edited collection, *The South: A Central Theme?*, for his argument that violent tendencies were part of the South’s defining features: “Experience in everyday life had made the Southerner a kind of fighter unique in his world. His ordinary amusement was the chase, and as a hunter, horseman, and rifleman, he was almost naturally trained to war” (63). Also see Frank E. Vandiver’s essay, “The Southerner as Extremist,” in the same collection for a similar argument about the South’s violent tendencies: “Land, climate, and blood will make them in future [sic] as hot-tempered and quick to resentment as ever” (76).

³¹ Tolnay and Beck found that the reasons why whites lynched blacks were similar to their reasons for passing the Jim Crow laws: “In addition to the punishment of specific criminal offenders, lynching in the American South had three entwined functions: *first*, to maintain social order over the black population through terrorism; *second*, to suppress or eliminate black competitors for economic, political, or social rewards; *third*, to stabilize the white class structure and preserve the privileged status of the white aristocracy” (18-19).

woman, and poisoning a well (Tolnay and Beck). The fear of “Negro rule” and the desire for total white supremacy in the South were arguably as strong in 1930 as they were in 1865.³²

Behind the enactment of the Black Codes, resistance to the Freedman’s Bureau, resentment of the occupying armies, objections against “unfair taxation,” the brutality of the KKK, refusal to amend the Fourteenth Amendment or support Radical Reconstruction, the creation of Jim Crow laws, the lynching era, and animosity for the Yankee investors, carpetbaggers, and scalawags, stood a humiliated people embittered by their defeat, resentful of outside interference, and determined to regain home rule.³³ Complicating these feelings even more was the fact that most ex-Confederates refused to accept that they were a defeated people,

³² For more on segregation, Jim Crow laws, *Plessy vs. Ferguson*, and the lynching era, see Howard N. Rabinowitz, pages 133-157. Also within those pages are discussions of reformers such as Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. Du Bois and their efforts to reform racist policies at the time. For primary documents by such reformers, see Clark’s *The South Since Reconstruction*, especially pages 263-287 for George Washington Cable’s 1882 speech “The Freedman’s Case in Equity,” pages 323-342 for W. E. B. Du Bois’s 1901 speech, “Relations of the Negroes with the Whites,” and Booker T. Washington’s 1895 “Cast Down Your Buckets” speech on pages 510-515. Also see Staughton Lynd’s book *Reconstruction* where he reprinted speeches and essays from W. E. B. Du Bois, James F. Rhodes, and William A. Dunning on the topic of “Negro Suffrage, Pro and Con,” pages 24-81.

³³ Even more reasons for white ex-Confederates’ resentments existed at the time; for example, see pages 51-54 of Paul H. Buck’s book, *The Road to Reunion, 1865-1900*, for his argument that Southerners were even “further irritated by the arrest and imprisonment of Jefferson Davis,” as well as the “martyrdom” of Lincoln by Northerners. Clement Eaton also argued that, “Another source of keeping alive hatred of the victorious North was the humiliating treatment of Jefferson Davis while he was a prisoner at Fort Monroe” (119). Additionally, “Most Southern people were especially resentful of the Yankee “nigger teachers” who invaded their communities to uplift the freedmen” (Eaton 118).

and they loathed the thought of being remembered in history as such.³⁴ Describing these complex tensions, historian Forrest G. Wood explained, “The war had brought defeat and humiliation to a proud people” and “since defeat and humiliation were not the stuff traditions were made of, the white Southerner found it necessary to read back and glorify an earlier era in order to find his tradition” (61).³⁵ To put it simply, the defeated people of the South were faced with crises in memory, identity, and rhetorical subjectivity.

Southern Women Respond

Finding the era in which they lived from 1865 to 1930 so humiliating to them, most bitter and resentful ex-Confederates chose instead to remember a better time in Southern history. Specifically, they chose to remember the romanticized antebellum era, which we will see in chapter four, became the basis of the Old South myth. In addition to reviving their memories of the antebellum years, white Southerners who despaired in the post-war era also chose to remember the Confederacy, the Civil War, and themselves in glorified terms, and these remembrances, (as we will see in chapters three and four), became the backbone of

³⁴ Historian Gaines M. Foster has deftly pointed out that, “Most white southerners, despite their alleged heedless romanticism and obsessive love of the past, were far too realistic to let bitter memories get in the way of rebuilding their society” (5).

³⁵ Paul H. Buck has talked about “Southern pride,” finding that, “Whatever the cause, whether it was the reflex of Southern provincialism, the defense reaction of a slave society in a world of freedom, or inherent justification, the South did firmly believe in its own superiority. Few people have carried self-respect and self-pride to so sensitive a degree” (28-29).

Lost Cause myth.³⁶ And because what constitutes a “people” is grounded in memories, ex-Confederates chose to remember a glorified, romantic, and overall “mythical” past in order to reconstitute themselves in a similar light. As C. Vann Woodward explained it, “With the crumbling of so many defenses in the present, the South had tended to substitute myths about the past. Every self-conscious group of any size fabricates myths about its past” (“The Heritage” 104). Building their collective memories and reconstituting themselves as a “people” in the wake of defeat and in the midst of humiliation, bitterness, and resentment were perhaps the South’s greatest challenges. These were the challenges met head-on by the women of the South.

In response to these rhetorical exigencies, new voluntary memorial associations took shape in the South.³⁷ These memorial associations devoted themselves to honoring the men who fought in the war with commemorative activities such as monument building, awarding Crosses of Honor to Confederate veterans, recording the stories of wartime experiences, holding banquets for the veterans, orchestrating parades and pageants, sponsoring public programs to mark

³⁶ Buck has made a similar claim in *The Road to Reunion, 1865-1900*: “Memory, indeed, was the only solace in ‘these days of public shame, in this conquered land.’ If in some it sealed the heart to reconciliation, to many it was the one thing that made life bearable....Productive of the greatest grief was the necessity of interring the Lost Cause” (33).

³⁷ Voluntary associations refer to reform organizations, memorial associations, and clubs. Reform organizations strive to better society with causes such as temperance, abolition, and suffrage. Memorial associations strive to commemorate war and the men and women who fought in wars. Clubs are philanthropic organizations that strive to raise funds, educate about God, and contribute to charity. For further discussion on the “club movement,” see Jane C. Croly’s book, *The History of the Woman’s Club Movement in America*.

the birthdays of famous men and the anniversaries of notable historic events, and even decorating the graves of soldiers who died in the war (Sims 131-132). Behind each of these activities was a desire to remember the South and its people in the most favorable way possible. It was not long after the “boom” in voluntary associations in that late nineteenth century that men gave women complete control over these organizations.³⁸

Until the time when women’s associations were left solely in their own care, women’s participation in public organizations met resistance from men and women, especially in the South. Historian Anastasia Sims discussed the hesitation some Southern women faced when considering membership in voluntary associations: “perhaps North Carolina women’s discretion grew out of their awareness of widespread hostility toward women who openly defied convention. Feminism, an offspring of the abolition movement, was as unpopular in North Carolina as it was in the rest of the South” (11).³⁹ As such, the women who joined

³⁸ The earliest organizations were run primarily by men, while women served as members only. Even some women’s organizations in the early nineteenth century were managed by men. Historian LeeAnn Whites has noted that women in the early organizations, such as the Ladies Memorial Associations, “gave over conventionally ‘male’ aspects of public organizational activities—public speech making, managing the construction finances for monuments, reordering graveyards, and negotiating with building contractors—to prominent men” (141).

³⁹ Historian Anne F. Scott argued that, “the South was slow to develop an organized suffrage movement,” although suffrage organizations did eventually form (*Southern* 170-173). For more on women’s suffrage organizations in the South, see Aileen S. Kraditor’s book, *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920*, especially chapter seven, ‘Southern Question.’ Some memorial associations did work openly for suffrage, such as the Northern-based Daughters of the American Revolution, but the UDC was not one of them (Scott *Southern* 180). Gaines M. Foster argued that within the group, no clear consensus on women’s issues emerged: “some members supported careers for women outside the home; others did not. Some advocated women’s suffrage; other

voluntary associations in the South faced the rhetorical challenges of convincing Southern men that they were not trying to defy convention and that they were instead the most qualified authorities for such commemorative work. For the most part, the middle to upper-class white women who joined the United Daughters of the Confederacy did not intend to overthrow patriarchy or advance feminist agendas.⁴⁰ As a matter of fact, they worked hard to reassure men that their intentions were still consistent with “feminine” ideal roles.

The United Daughters of the Confederacy

The earliest development of the United Daughters of the Confederacy may be traced back to 1890. At that time, a number of unrelated memorial associations across the South began forming and calling themselves “Daughters of the Confederacy” (DOC) in honor of Jefferson Davis’s daughter—“the Daughter of the

opposed it” (174). As an organization, the United Daughters of the Confederacy was not interested in endorsing suffrage.

⁴⁰ Foster argued that “although membership records are unavailable, literary evidence indicates that the UDC also had a primarily upper- and middle-class membership” (171). Some nineteenth-century Americans argued that upper-class women *should* devote their time, energy, and resources to voluntary associations, and to educational work. For example, well-known education reformer and teacher Catharine Beecher argued that, “upper-class women...should do whatever they could to contribute to the ‘proper education’ of American children. Whether by teaching themselves, or by raising funds, or by supervising schools in their community, all well-to-do women could do some productive labor for education” (Sklar 143). According to historian Fred A. Bailey, the upper-class, elite women of the UDC openly accepted this assumption: “The United Daughters of the Confederacy gladly embraced this assignment . . . affluent and unfettered by domestic duties, UDC women had both the time and the commitment to review textbooks, lobby school boards, and write literature” (“Mildred” 516). Historian Karen L. Cox argued that women were attracted to the UDC “because of its social status” as an “elite” organization (*Women* 52).

Confederacy par excellence”—Varina Anne (Winnie) Davis (Poppenheim, et al. 3). The DOC organizations were open to “the widows, wives, mothers, sisters, or lineal descendants of the men who served honorably in the army, or navy, of the Confederate States” (Poppenheim, et al. 22).⁴¹ In 1894, Anna Davenport Raines, who was a member of the Savannah DOC group, and Caroline Meriwether Goodlett, the president of the DOC Nashville group, decided that these separate groups should meet and perhaps form one organization.

Raines and Goodlett succeeded in organizing the DOC groups at a meeting in Nashville, Tennessee, on September 10, 1894. It was there that the women passed a constitution listing the name of their organization—“National Association of the Daughters of the Confederacy”—as well as their objectives, officers, finance, monuments, representation, powers, insignia/seals, badges, and certificates of membership. The United Daughters of the Confederacy, which was so named at the 1895 annual convention, continued to grow rapidly year after year. Historian Karen L. Cox discovered that within a year of its founding, “twenty UDC chapters were chartered representing women in Tennessee, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Texas, Kentucky, and Washington, D.C.” (48). Within two years of its founding, “eighty-nine chapters had been chartered. By the third year, one hundred and thirty-eight UDC chapters were active. The UDC had grown large enough within its first few years to receive discounted railroad rates

⁴¹ The minutes went on to state that membership was also open to women “who served in the civil service of the Confederate States, or, one of the Southern States; or, who gave personal service to the Confederate cause; or, those who wherever living, gave aid or comfort to the Confederate States during the war” (Poppenheim, et al. 22).

for travel to its conventions” (Cox *Women* 48). By the turn-of-the-century the UDC was, in Sims’ words, “by far the most popular patriotic group among white southern women” (32).⁴²

The UDC’s objectives, as outlined at their first General meeting in 1894, were: 1) social: “to cultivate ties of friendship among our women whose fathers, brothers, sons (and in numberless case) mothers shared common dangers, sufferings and privations;” 2) memorial: “to perpetuate honor, integrity, valor and other noble attributes to true Southern character,” or in other words, to positively rebuild the “Southern people;” 3) historical: “to perpetuate a truthful record of the noble and chivalric achievements of [our] ancestors,” which fulfilled their desire to proudly remember their past; and 4) educational: “to instruct and instill into the descendents of the people of the South a proper respect for and pride in the glorious war history, with a veneration and love for the deeds of their forefathers, which have created such a monument of military renown” (UDC *Minutes* 2). Consistent with these objectives, the women devoted themselves to activities such as fund-raising for monuments and memorial markers, providing care for aging Confederate veterans and widows, collecting artifacts for the Confederate Museum in Richmond, Virginia, placing “true” accounts of the Confederacy and the “War Between the States” in public libraries, awarding scholarships to Southern children, and forming textbook committees to decide which books were the most

⁴² Within the first decade of their existence, the UDC attracted nearly thirty thousand women, and by the end of World War I, the organization claimed a membership of nearly 100,000 women (Cox *Women* 48-49).

sympathetic to the Southern perspective and therefore acceptable for use in the public schools.

The Daughters were able to pursue these activities with little resistance from Southern men; in part, no doubt, because of the widely held assumption that women were “natural memorializers” who reigned in the “realm of sentiment.”⁴³ But beyond that, I maintain that the Daughters were left to pursue their memorial activities because they crafted a rhetoric that fashioned themselves as authorities of collective memory. In chapter one, I extracted from the literature on collective memory two important questions regarding the politics of public memory: 1) Who and what gets remembered, and 2) Which individuals or groups have the “authority” to construct memory for a collective (see pages 13-16)? After reading much of the UDC’s public discourse, I conclude that the Daughters constructed their authority as public memorializers by asserting their non-political (and non-feminist) interests, insisting they were “called” to public service, explaining that they only chose activities that were consistent with their “feminine” positions, and

⁴³ Many men agreed that women were the natural leaders of memorial associations after the war because of the assumption that women’s “sentimental” and “virtuous” natures made them better memorializers (undoubtedly a perceived outgrowth of their roles as mothers). Historian Gaines M. Foster found that Southern males “believed that memorial projects belonged to the realm of sentiment in which women had innate abilities and over which they had primary responsibility. Men therefore helped organize the societies and donated money to them but left the leadership of the groups and most of the work to women” (38). Historian Fred A. Bailey argued that the Sons of Confederate Veterans especially believed that “the preservation of tradition and the teaching of children was a more appropriate calling for females” (“Mildred” 516).

affirming that they were wholly dedicated to preserving Southern manhood.⁴⁴ The UDC's rhetoric not only served to reassure uneasy men that they were not trying to overthrow patriarchy, but it also authorized their roles as public memorializers.⁴⁵

The first rhetorical strategy the Daughters employed to secure their positions as public memorializers was insisting that they were not political. As historian Elna Green argued, "while the work of the UDC had a decidedly political agenda (the defense of the Confederate rebellion), it carefully maintained its non-political facade. The organization insisted that the non-political role was the only proper public role available to women" (71). Written into their constitution at the first UDC meeting in 1894 was the explicit declaration, "The objects and purposes of the federation shall be social, literary, historical, monumental, benevolent and honorable in every degree, without any political signification whatever" (UDC *Minutes* 2). Even to this day, the Daughters still maintain that they are a "non-

⁴⁴ Three of the acceptable "feminine ideals" for white women in the nineteenth (and other) centuries have been labeled by contemporary researchers as Republican Motherhood, Cult of True Womanhood, and Southern Lady. For more on Republican Motherhood, see footnote 46 of this chapter. For more on the Cult of True Womanhood, which defined "the home" as a white woman's proper sphere and her four cardinal virtues as "piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity," see Barbara Welter's article, "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860" and Mary Beth Norton's book, *Liberty's Daughters: The Revolutionary Experience of American Women, 1750-1800*. Also see Foner who pointed out that the Cult of True Womanhood did not apply to black women at the time (85). For more on the Southern Lady role, see Anne F. Scott's book, *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930*.

⁴⁵ This approach has been articulated by rhetorical critics who study the women's suffrage movement: it is typically called the "womanhood" or "expediency" argument because it celebrates "womanhood" as the reason for allowing women to vote (or in this case, allowing them to publicly commemorate). See especially Bonnie J. Dow's article, "The 'Womanhood' Rationale in the Woman Suffrage Rhetoric of Frances E. Willard" and Amy R. Slagell's article, "The Rhetorical Structure of Frances E. Willard's Campaign for Woman Suffrage, 1876-1896."

political” organization. For example, in a talk given by the President-General in 2000, June Murray Wells told her audience, “I am often asked why the U.D.C. is not heard from more often in debates and arguments, why we are not seen in marches and protests. The rules set by our founders and still in effect today require us to be non-political” (2). By declaring themselves “non-political,” the Daughters intoned that they were “not feminists,” and that their authority to commemorate was in no way politically-motivated or biased.

A second way the Daughters justified their membership in this public organization was referring to themselves as ordinary women who were “called” to do the official work of commemorating the war. As I mentioned earlier, it was generally assumed in the post-war South that women were natural commemorators. According to Foster, “southern males believed that memorial projects belonged to the realm of sentiment in which women had innate abilities and over which they had primary responsibility” (38). Many women also felt that they were the natural choice for joining and leading memorial associations and often expressed a patriotic “calling” and “duty” to commemorate the war. For example, in a speech delivered to the fourth annual UDC meeting in 1897, Mrs. D. Giraud Wright spoke of the “calling” with her comment, “across the waste of years the voices of our loved ones call to us. They have called you together here on this mission of love and duty, and in response, you come...in answer to this resistless appeal” (UDC *Minutes* 4). Wright’s quotation not only illustrates the “calling” the Daughters

heard to act, but it also shows how these women believed it was their duty or “mission” to preserve memory.

A third way the UDC constructed their public authority was by dedicating themselves to “feminine” and “motherly” issues. Historian Gaines M. Foster has argued, “In general...the Daughters seemed able—and content—to harmonize their expanded activities with the traditional ideal of femininity” (174). Besides memorializing, some of the other issues the UDC devoted themselves to, which were also consistent with traditional “feminine” roles, were children’s education and textbook reform. In their *History of the UDC*, Poppenheim et al. stated their interest in reforming Southern textbooks:

the importance of having correct, fair, and unbiased history taught in the Southern schools has impressed itself upon the members of this organization from its earliest incipency, this being one of the objects laid down in the constitution...at each succeeding convention the voice of the members was raised in protest against the use in Southern schools of ‘improper, unfair, and sectional histories. (135)

One Daughter, Mildred Lewis Rutherford, justified her participation in the UDC for the sake of Southern children’s education by stating, “Patriotic organizations are needed to keep alive the spirit of patriotism in the hearts of the young people in the land. We must teach them loyalty to our government, and to our country’s flag, to

our State and our State flag, to our city and all that pertains to civic righteousness” (“The Civilization” 43).⁴⁶

A fourth strategy the Daughters employed to justify their public roles was overtly devoting their efforts to the preservation of Southern manhood. George C. Rable explained that although women’s participation in voluntary associations may be viewed as undermining Southern manhood—because they were entering the public sphere in record numbers and building political consciousnesses—that was not the case with women’s associations such as the UDC: “women in effect reassured uneasy men that their strength would buttress rather than undermine the social order and that their energies would flow in perfectly safe channels” (238).⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Historian Karen L. Cox would likely agree that Rutherford’s comments also illustrate the UDC’s “Lost Cause Motherhood” role: “Women were considered especially suited for that task [teaching Southern children how to be good, patriotic Southerners], and the Daughters’ actions as Lost Cause educators was considered an extension of their role as mothers” (*Women* 186). Cox’s idea of Lost Cause Motherhood is grounded in the research on Republican Motherhood. Republican Motherhood is a “feminine” ideal that defined women’s roles in the United States from Revolutionary times through the nineteenth century. Linda Kerber has argued that “the Republican Mother was a device which attempted to integrate domesticity and politics....[the Republican Mother’s] political task was accomplished within the confines of her family...[her] life was dedicated to the service of civic virtue; she educated her sons for it; she condemned and corrected her husband’s lapses from it” (“The Republican” 202-203). Historian Marilyn Blackwell’s essay, “The Republican Vision of Mary Palmer Tyler” in *Mothers and Motherhood: Readings in American History*, identified some basic qualities and virtues that Republican Mothers were encouraged to instill in their children: “focusing attention on their sons and encouraging industry, frugality, temperance, and self-control, republican mothers would nurture virtuous citizens who served their communities; by educating their daughters, mothers would ensure the virtue of future generations” (31). See Linda Kerber’s book, *Women of the Republic*, for more on the duties and characteristics of “good” Republican Mothers, as well as articles by Ruth H. Bloch, Amelia H. Kritzer, Karen List, and Margaret Nash. Also see Kathryn Michel’s master’s thesis, “Republican Motherhood in the South?: An Examination of the Roles of Elite White Women in North Carolina and Virginia, 1784-1830.”

⁴⁷ Two dominant perspectives have emerged in the literature on the voluntary associations in the post-war South. Some historians view the voluntary associations as

Women needed to assure men that they were not trying to break the mold of the “gentile Southern lady”;⁴⁸ instead, that they were only in public to serve their men and preserve their heroic memories. Take for example Cornelia Branch Stone’s answer to the question, “For what purpose did they [UDC] organize,” in her 1912 catechism: “To preserve the true history of the Confederacy and keep in sacred memory the brave deeds of the men of the South, their devotion to their country and to the cause of right, with no bitterness toward the government of the United States, under which we now live” (11-12). It is interesting to note how Stone frankly asserted that the South did not feel bitterness nor would they teach bitterness to their children, although as we have seen, many Southerners *did* still

“training grounds” for women’s political participation. Scott, for one, argued that, “within this network women learned how to conduct business, carry on meetings, speak in public, manage money. Experiences in small-scale voluntary associations (‘our little republic,’ one woman called hers) prepared women for politics, broadly defined” (*Natural* 2). Historian Anastasia Sims agreed, adding that, “women who joined voluntary associations proudly described themselves as trailblazers, exploring new frontiers for women and articulating altered definitions of woman’s place” (1).

Conversely, some historians have argued that women’s voluntary associations served a hegemonic function; that the memorial associations not only rebuilt Southern masculinity, but they also reinforced traditional women’s roles. Historian LeeAnn Whites contended, “whereas historians of women have been inclined to view women’s voluntary associations as a basis for women’s struggle for independence, they can just as easily be viewed as an extension of women’s ‘dependent’ domestic role as mothers of men” (137). Speaking of the UDC specifically, Gaines M. Foster has argued, “Too much could easily be made of the way the UDC expanded the female role, however...Traditional social affairs and gentility persisted alongside the new activities” (173).

⁴⁸ The traditional “Southern lady” role required women to be gentle, obedient, guardians of the home, and “trained to the ideals of perfection and submission” (Scott *Southern* 7). Again, see Anne F. Scott’s book, *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930*, for more on this “feminine ideal.”

harbor feelings of bitterness and resentment at this time.⁴⁹ Decca Lamar West echoed Stone's sentiment regarding Southern manhood in her 1934 catechism when she asked,

Q. After their benevolent work, what does the United Daughters of the Confederacy consider next in importance? A. To teach their children from generation to generation that there was no stain upon the action of their forefathers in the War Between the States; and the women of the South; who nobly sustained them in that struggle will ever feel that their deathless deeds of valor are a precious heritage to be treasured for all time to come” (29).

As these quotations illustrate, the Daughters expressed reverence and highest regard for the men who fought in the “War Between the States” by always referring to them as “brave,” “devoted to their country,” and/or “valorous.” The women also indicated the importance of the men's actions, that their actions comprised “a precious heritage,” which was worthy of being commemorated, or in West's words, “treasured for all time to come.”

⁴⁹ As a matter of fact, Gaines M. Foster has argued that women were actually the most bitter members of Southern society after the war: “Women who right after the war had displayed greater hatred than men for the Yankees who had exposed their vulnerability and denied them respect apparently not only continued to harbor their resentments but passed them on to their daughters” (172). Some of those daughters, Foster argued, joined the UDC: “Women who still hated the Yankees for killing fathers, husbands, and sons and for violating the protections of the traditional female role found a forum in which to vent their persisting hostilities and to voice their continuing admiration for the men of the Confederacy” (174).

The strategies the Daughters relied upon to construct their authority as public memorializers were insisting that they were “non-political,” declaring that they were “called” to do the patriotic yet “feminine” work of commemoration, dedicating themselves to traditionally “feminine” areas (i.e., working with children and “sentimentalizing”), and reassuring Southern men that preserving Southern manhood was at the heart of all their public work. After all, who better to craft collective memories than those who are not influenced by politics, those who were asked by others (or even a higher power) to do the job, those who were “naturally” suited for tasks such as educating the young, and those who were devoted to honoring Southern manhood and patriarchy? In the 1897 edition of the *Confederate Veteran*, UDC co-founder Anna Raines employed these four strategies in one potent remark: “We are not a body of discontented suffragists thirsting for oratorical honors, but a sisterhood of earnest, womanly women, striving to fulfill the teaching of God’s word in honor of our fathers” (Cox *Women* 54). It is fair to conclude that the women of the UDC strategically kept “one foot in the domestic sphere and one in the public sphere” as they built their authority as collective memorializers amidst an era of defeat (Cox *Women* 67).

The Children of the Confederacy

One of the ways the UDC fulfilled its “feminine” and “motherly” educational objective—as well as perpetuated “true Southern character” and “a

truthful historical record”—was by organizing the Children of the Confederacy.⁵⁰ The first branch of the Children of the Confederacy was organized on April 18, 1896, by Mrs. D. H. Appich, a member of the Mary Custis Lee Chapter of Alexandria, Virginia. The Mary Custis Lee Chapter reported having “over a hundred little girls and boys” in their organization, all interested in taking part in the commemorative activities “similar to the adult organization” (Cox *Women* 206). Shortly thereafter, at the UDC’s fourth annual convention in 1897, Mrs. E. G. McCabe of Atlanta, Georgia, requested “that there be children’s chapters formed at each domicile of a chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy” (Poppenheim, et al. 181).⁵¹ The “Committee on Organization of Children” was then formed, comprised of seven Daughters, who named the Mary Custis Lee

⁵⁰ Sims argued that “The Daughters carried out their mission of vindication within their own homes and among the members of the UDC’s juvenile auxiliary, the Children of the Confederacy; they made sure that their offspring learned the history of ‘the war between the states’ from the southern perspective” (147).

⁵¹ According to the 1999 version of the *Catechism on the History of the Confederate States of America, 1861-1865*, “A children’s organization begun [sic] as an auxiliary to the UDC. It was suggested by Miss Bunnie Love at a Georgia Division UDC Convention on October 14, 1897, and a Resolution was presented that the organization be created” (25). I take this to mean that Miss Bunnie Love heard about Mrs. Appich’s C. of C. organization in Virginia and suggested at the Division meeting that Georgia also create C. of C. Chapters. It is also reported in the 1999 catechism that “the resolution [proposed by Miss Love] was passed and Mrs. McDowell Wolff was named the Founder of the C of C” (25). Since I find no mention of Mrs. Wolff in Poppenheim et al.’s history of the UDC, I assume Mrs. Wolff to be a member of the Georgia Division who organized or recognized the first C. of C. Chapter in that state. It then appears that Mrs. McCabe, also from Georgia, took Miss Love’s suggestion of organizing Children’s Chapters at the Division meeting and proposed at the General meeting that all Divisions organize children’s Chapters.

Chapter in Alexandria the headquarters for the C. of C.⁵² The Committee also wrote the constitution and by-laws for the Children of the Confederacy, which established such things as the organization's object, officers, fee, seal, and badges. The 1897 convention decided that the Children of the Confederacy would not have representation in the General conventions, that their representation would instead be confined to Division conventions.⁵³

The UDC's interest in the Children of the Confederacy continued to grow in the years that followed with many Daughters arguing that their involvement with the C. of C. must increase.⁵⁴ Poppenheim et al. reported that after 1904, "for the next several conventions, the minutes show a continued enlargement of the children's work, as reported by Division presidents" (186). Interest in the C. of C. was shown not just within the ranks of the UDC, but also by young folks across the

⁵² As the C. of C. headquarters, the Mary Custis Lee Chapter was responsible for selling charters for \$1.00 each to the UDC Chapters who formed C. of C. divisions (the money from the charters would then be donated to such causes as the Winnie Davis Monument Fund).

⁵³ The increasing size and significance of the Children of the Confederacy organization eventually led to its recognition as a national organization. Poppenheim et al. stated, "History was made," on June 10, 1954, "when an all-day Conference was held by the Third Vice-President and delegates from the four States...to discuss plans for a General C. of C. Organization and Convention" (382). That discussion became a reality on August 26 and 27, 1955, when the first General Organization of the C. of C.—with its "full quota of officers"—met at its first annual Convention at the Cox-Carlton Hotel in Atlanta, Georgia (Poppenheim, et al. 383). The individual C. of C. Chapters, like their foremother in 1894, finally came together in 1955 as a nationally recognized organization in the South.

⁵⁴ For example, at the 1909 annual convention in Houston, then President-General Mrs. Cornelia Branch Stone stated, "Greater activity in the organization of C of C cannot be too strongly urged upon the chapters. For upon the training of these our boys and girls, our citizens and patriots of the future—depends the perpetuity of the organization" (Poppenheim, et al. 186).

South. Southern children joined the C. of C., or were signed up by their mothers or grandmothers, at a steady rate.⁵⁵ The first report on the size of the C. of C. was not made until 1920 at the General convention in Asheville. Mrs. R. P. Holt, then Third Vice-President General,⁵⁶ reported that there were 1,314 children holding registration cards from fourteen Divisions of the C. of C. The following year in St. Louis, Mrs. Holt reported a registration of 3,470 members, and by 1929—five years before Decca Lamar West published her catechism—Mrs. J. T. Burney reported to the convention at Biloxi that the C. of C. had a total enrollment of 22,507 (Poppenheim, et al. 189). The Children of the Confederacy’s most active members were between the ages of six and eighteen—the children who reached the age of eighteen then usually joined the UDC or the Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV).

When Children of the Confederacy joined the UDC, they most likely felt right at home because they performed many of the UDC’s rituals in the C. of C.

⁵⁵ Most of the C. of C. members were children and grandchildren of UDC members: “Boys as well as girls were eligible to join the C. of C. Membership sometimes began as early as the day a child was born since UDC members were quick to enroll their children and grandchildren” (Cox *Women* 207).

⁵⁶ At the twenty-third convention in 1915, the UDC amended their constitution to read that the third Vice-President-General “have under her consideration the uniting of the C. of C. and bringing them into closer association with the UDC,” a tradition that has carried through into today (which is why I have corresponded with Kathy Smith Brewer, the most recent Third Vice President General, regarding the catechisms) (Poppenheim, et al. 186). One of the responsibilities of the Third Vice-President General/Director of the C. of C. was to issue a booklet each year “which contained full information on all phases of the work, material for programs, and list of awards. The Yearbooks were sent to the Division Directors to be distributed to Chapter Leaders and Officers” (Poppenheim, et al. 366). The intention of the yearly booklet was to provide a “background and guide for C. of C. workers;” in other words, it helped maintain consistency in instruction across the C. of C. Chapters.

monthly Chapter meetings. For example, “Like the UDC, children began their meetings with prayer and an opening ritual in which they pledged themselves to honor Veterans and study and teach the ‘truths’ of history” (Cox *Women* 208). In the Pledge itself, the Children recited in unison the words, “we desire to perpetuate in love and honor the heroic deeds of those who enlisted in the Confederate Army and upheld its flag through four years of war,” a promise that fell directly in line with the UDC’s devotion to Southern manhood (Poppenheim, et al. 366). The Pledge also declared the C. of C.’s overall goals, which again, closely resembled the UDC’s objectives to remember and identify themselves with pride:

to preserve pure ideals; to honor our Veterans; to study and teach the truths of history (one of the most important of which is, that the War Between the States was not a REBELLION nor was its underlying cause to sustain slavery); and always to act in a manner that will reflect honor upon our noble and patriotic ancestors. (Poppenheim, et al. 366)⁵⁷

After the Children recited their opening prayer and the C. of C. Pledge, the Children and their leader would then discuss business. For example, they might talk about how much money they raised thus far for a local, regional, or national monument; figure out how to raise money for a C. of C. scholarship fund; or

⁵⁷ The minutes of the Children of the Confederacy’s 2002 General meeting inform us that the wording of the C. of C. Pledge (now the C. of C. Creed) has been amended twice: in 1965, the words “to honor our Veterans” was changed to “to honor the memory of our beloved veterans,” because there were no longer any Confederate veterans still alive to “honor;” and then the phrase “those who enlisted in the Confederate Army” was revised to “those who enlisted in the Confederate service” to allow for broader recognition of those who aided the Confederate cause (15-16).

discuss which veterans and/or widows' homes to visit next (Cox *Women* 207). The Children also engaged in such activities as “[writing] essays, and [singing] favorite Confederate songs such as ‘Dixie’ and ‘The Bonnie Blue Flag’” (Cox *Women* 207-208).

The centerpiece of the C. of C. meetings, however, was learning Confederate history from their Chapter leader. The Chapter leaders were members of the UDC, and according to Cox, they were the “key to the success of the children’s chapters...They were Daughters who were the most zealous about instilling children with a reverence for Confederate men and women, as well as the sacred principles of states’ rights” (*Women* 208). The subjects the Chapter leaders taught included the “War Between the States,” the antebellum South, slavery, and Reconstruction. Cox found that Chapter leaders taught these subjects with the assistance of a monthly program developed by the Historian-General,⁵⁸ and a Confederate catechism, which was written in “a call and response format in which

⁵⁸ At the 1915 convention, Mrs. S. E. F. Rose of Mississippi was elected Historian-General. In that capacity, Rose took it upon herself when later compiling the Historical Yearbook for 1917 to include monthly historical programs for the Children of the Confederacy. Poppenheim et al. commented that, “The value of these programs was recognized at once, and each succeeding Historian-General has continued their preparation and publication” (187). The historical programs for children were printed in the *Confederate Veteran*, a monthly magazine which became the “official organ of all Confederate organizations—United Confederate Veterans, Sons of Confederate Veterans, Southern Confederate Memorial Association, and the United Daughters of the Confederacy” (Poppenheim, et al. 174).

leaders asked questions to which children responded with the ‘correct’ (i.e. pro-Southern) answer” (*Women* 209).⁵⁹

The catechisms written for the Children of the Confederacy—and perhaps placed in some local schools and libraries across the South as well—were significant educational artifacts.⁶⁰ Cox argued that “Children’s learned responses to the questions from the catechism was a key ingredient in their indoctrination” (*Women* 211). Furthermore, the lessons the Children learned from the catechisms in their C. of C. meetings often made lasting impressions on them, and “combined with information children learned at school and at home, provided lessons that remained with them through adulthood” (Cox *Women* 211).⁶¹ The rhetorical strategies UDC members employed to make those impressions will be analyzed throughout the next chapters.

⁵⁹ See Appendix I for the critical editions of the UDC’s catechisms and more in-depth discussion of the texts.

⁶⁰ I have not been able to find out how many or which catechisms have been placed in which public schools and libraries. Kathy Smith Brewer was not able to locate information on the catechisms placed in public schools and libraries either: “They are used primarily in CofC meetings—I don’t know of any used in schools, but that does not mean that they aren’t, especially with children today who are home-schooled. Some have been placed in public libraries” (“Catechisms” 24 Feb.). In a follow-up correspondence, Ms. Brewer informed me, “I am sorry that there is no way I can tell you how many have been placed in libraries, but I will check with the 2nd Vice President CofC to see if he has any history in his records. The officers pass the files around, but it is possible that a lot of the info has been previously “filed” away....We do have an award for most books placed in libraries but it doesn’t distinguish Catechisms from other books so researching that would not give you an accurate count” (“Catechisms” 25 Feb.).

⁶¹ For example, in 1990, Cox interviewed Helen Foster—a former C. of C. member in South Carolina, born in 1911, and educated about the Civil War at school and in the children’s chapters—about what caused the Civil War. Foster responded, “I still think they were fightin’ for states’ rights” (*Women* 212).

Conclusion

From this chapter, we can see that the historical context of the UDC catechisms actually starts with the birth of the Confederacy in 1861. After seceding from the Union, forming their own nation, and then losing a devastating war, most white people of the South were left mentally “maimed.” In other words, a traditionally proud people experienced humiliation, bitterness, and resentment while struggling to comprehend their defeat. As if these feelings were not causing enough tension for them, most ex-Confederates refused to define themselves as a defeated people and objected to being remembered in history as such. Instead, they insisted on remembering a romanticized antebellum era and commemorating a glorified Confederacy and Civil War, all the while feeling anxious to expel “outside interference” and determined to regain “home rule.”

Within this historical context, we see the Southern women who joined memorial associations, especially the UDC, devoting themselves to the South’s crises in memory, identity, and rhetorical subjectivity. Choosing to work with the future generations of the South to help mend these crises, the Daughters formed the C. of C. and educated the Children on Southern history, mostly with their self-authored catechisms. The content and tone of the catechisms were influenced by this historical context just as they were informed by the rhetorical context of the era. It is imperative, then, that we study the rhetorical context of the catechisms as well, starting with an examination of how other researchers have studied the rhetorical responses to the era of defeat.

Chapter Three: Studies of the Era: Interpretations of the Post-bellum South

Far more catastrophic than any physical losses was the destruction of the southerner's view of himself. Shattered dreams, ideals, sentiments, beliefs, and life-styles were not easily recovered or replaced.

—Waldo W. Braden, *Oratory in the New South*, 10.

Since I am not the first or only person to study this “catastrophic” era of Southern crisis or how defeated white ex-Confederates responded to their “shattered life-styles,” it is necessary for me to review the appropriate literature in order to identify how others have approached this subject, situate my study within that body of scholarship, and identify what my perspective will add. In this chapter, then, I review the research on 1) Southern oratory, 2) the myth of the Lost Cause, and 3) the United Daughters of the Confederacy's involvement with the Lost Cause. By the end of the chapter, I argue that because researchers have already studied issues of identity in the post-war era, my examination of rhetorical collectivity and subjectivity in chapter six adds a new and important perspective to the literature. Also, I contend that my project, especially chapter five, adds to the existing scholarship on the Lost Cause as a public memory and to our understanding of how collective memories themselves are made. Finally, it is my hope that this dissertation contributes to our recognition and appreciation of the

UDC as a powerful rhetorical force in the era of Southern defeat, especially their work with children.

Southern Oratory Literature

To begin a conversation on how ex-Confederates rhetorically responded to their crises in the post-Civil War era, one must turn to the literature on Southern oratory, which has not always been considered a respectable or worthy topic of study.¹ For instance, we find Southern oratory being treated as a “flamboyant, ornate, spread-eagle type of oratory, superfluous in verbiage and all but barren of thought; even the warmest defenders of Southern life must admit that it was widespread and generally very terrible” (Gaines 6).² Merle E. Curti similarly characterized Southern oratory as an “embroidered oratorical rhetoric,” which Waldo W. Braden explained, “implies high flown and grandiloquent style, a bombastic voice, and impassioned and fiery delivery” (“The Emergence” 174).³

¹ Actually defining “Southern oratory” had been an issue in the literature. In his definition, John D. Saxon explained, “Neither style nor delivery characterizes it, nor do place of birth or presentation. What emerges is the indication that at least during one period of Southern history, Southern oratory had a thematic unity of devotion to the Southern region and Southern causes” (266-267).

² Dallas C. Dickey is one scholar who found little difference between Southern oratory and oratory elsewhere. See Dickey’s 1949 article, “Were They Ephemeral and Florid?”

³ Waldo W. Braden has done much work on the myth and image of Southern oratory before and after the war. In his 1961 article, “The Emergence of the Concept of Southern Oratory,” Braden found that the image of Southern oratory as “florid” and “high flown” originated in the school readers given to children in the antebellum South. These readers featured “brief eloquent passages from ceremonial speeches” to teach the children how to write and speak in that same “flowery” and “mellifluous” style (Braden “The

For decades, the image of Southern oratory as “high flown” and “florid” remained largely unchallenged in the academic literature.

The image of Southern oratory as “embroidered,” and subsequently unworthy of serious academic pursuit, was eventually problematized. Decades after researchers such as Gaines and Curti made their cases against Southern oratory, rhetorical analysts like Waldo W. Braden argued that it had not been given fair consideration, especially post-war Southern oratory: “historians, literature teachers, and rhetorical critics are likely to dismiss this genre as excessive, sterile, and ephemeral, but these speakers filled their speeches with what southern listeners craved” (*Oratory* 4).⁴ Braden admitted that post-bellum Southern orators

Emergence” 182-183). In his 1975 article, “Myths in a Rhetorical Context,” Braden suggested that the presence of Southern myths in post-bellum ceremonial oratory was what may have led to Southern oratory’s “high flown” quality: “the ceremonial speech provides an excellent vehicle for utilizing the myth...it is quite possible that from this mode the southern speaker has gained his reputation of grandiloquent style and impassioned delivery” (123). Braden made a similar claim in 1979 in the companion piece to that article, “Repining over an Irrevocable Past: The Ceremonial Orator in a Defeated Society, 1865-1900,” published in his book, *Oratory in the New South*. And finally, in his 1983 book, *The Oral Tradition in the South*, Braden argued that “the so-called demagogues of the twentieth century changed southern speaking in that they departed from the grandiloquence and expansive manner of nineteenth-century southerners,” although they did not stop employing Southern myths as well (xi).

⁴ Some rhetorical critics have argued that Southern oratory is itself a “concept,” an “image,” or even a “myth” (Braden “The Concept” 141). In his 1961 article, “The Emergence of the Concept of Southern Oratory,” Braden provided a literature review, not of what Southern oratory was, “but what others have said it was” (i.e., “florid,” “high flown,” etc) (173). The concept of Southern oratory, Braden concluded, has been “heavily myth-encrusted” by historians and rhetoricians, and thereby devoted his article to separating the myth of Southern oratory from the “real oratory of the South” (“The Emergence” 173).

Then in 1975, John D. Saxon reviewed the literature of rhetorical analysts, such as Braden, who “debunk the myths surrounding the concept of Southern oratory” in order to “formulate the discernible characteristics which distinguish traditional Southern oratory into a framework against which one aspect of contemporary Southern oratory can be examined” (263).

“indulg[ed] in what is known as spread-eagle or high-flown oratory,” but argued that Southern orators, especially in the new South, served an important function: “they soothed their listeners, encouraging them to remain in the euphoria of a romantic past” (*Oratory* 36). Braden essentially made the case for post-war Southern oratory as a viable area of academic research despite its “high-flown” qualities.⁵

Finding the scholarly treatments of post-war Southern oratory insufficient and insincere, Braden edited *Oratory in the New South* in 1979.⁶ In the Introduction, Braden articulated what he considered to be the biggest problem in Southern oratory research at the time: there did not exist yet an extensive examination of post-bellum Southern rhetoric and orators because again, the subject was not considered significant or substantive by scholars. As a matter of fact, when a colleague of Braden’s heard about the project he asked, “Tell me, what is there to talk about besides Booker T. Washington and Henry W. Grady” (1)? Braden also reported that Robert T. Oliver, editor of the book, *History of Public*

⁵ Braden made a similar claim regarding the importance of studying antebellum Southern oratory in 1970 in his edited book, *Oratory in the Old South, 1828-1860*. In the Introduction, Braden asserted, “it is true that some speakers on occasion soared in oratorical flights and seemed to enunciate sweeping idioms. But the elements of commonality actually developed from generally held tenets which served as the bases for many speeches—a desire to preserve state rights, slavery, and an agrarian aristocracy” (*Oratory* 17-18). Furthermore, Braden claimed that the essays in the collection on antebellum oratorical groups such as the Nullifiers, the Southern Whigs, and the Fire-Eaters, show that “the likeness in method of speaking—use of language, voice, and bodily action—failed to appear. These essays help destroy the myth of the southern orator” (*Oratory* 18).

⁶ The term “New South” in this instance refers to a “period of time,”—generally the time period between 1870 and 1910—not a “theme or movement (Braden *Oratory* 1).

Speaking in America (1965), was “equally selective and chose to discuss only the same two men” (1).

Acting upon his insistence that Southern oratory should be taken seriously by rhetorical, historical, and literary scholars, Braden and his *Oratory* contributors decided to pursue three research questions: “Who were the other southern orators deserving of study and analysis? How did they meet the challenges of a defeated society? What does their speaking reveal about southern life?” (1). In answering the first research question, the contributors to *Oratory* discussed “other southern orators” such as W. E. B. Dubois, L. Q. C. Lamar, the United Confederate Veterans, some “southern ladies,” and others.

Rhetorical scholars outside of *Oratory* have since attempted to answer the second two research questions by identifying a “thematic unity” among Southern discourses (Saxon 272). In his search for a “thematic unity,” rhetorical analyst W. Stuart Towns argued that Southerners crafted a *defensive* oratory as a result of their defeated attitude: “Over the generations, southerners have developed a siege mentality, a paranoid and defensive outlook on life that shows itself clearly in many southern speeches. Many groups and individuals have been seen as ‘the enemy’ by passing generations of southerners” (“Ceremonial” 4). Some “enemies” who spurred Southern defensiveness in the nineteenth century included abolitionists and Northern politicians, the Northern armies during the Civil War, and “the occupying army, carpetbaggers, and Freedman’s Bureau of the reconstruction years,” all of whom we met in the previous chapter (Towns

“Ceremonial” 5). In the twentieth century, perceived enemies of the South included the “‘liberals,’ the ‘Commies,’ the ‘outside agitators,’ and even the federal government” (Towns “Ceremonial” 5).⁷

Not disagreeing with Towns’ argument, per se, other historians and rhetorical analysts have also sought to characterize Southern oratory. For example, Braden argued that Southern oratory from 1870 to 1910 featured a rhetoric of *accommodation*. Speakers in the post-war South, he asserted, encountered “many difficult problems of spirit and morale” by facing listeners “whose self concepts and political confidence had been seriously weakened” (*Oratory* 2). In other words, ex-Confederates’ attitudes of defeat led to a serious crisis in identity, and as such, “they had to comply with and cater to outside forces that could coerce, withhold capital for rebuilding, and even exert military pressure. Not free to express their deep feelings or to propose change in policy, they were forced to accommodate” (*Oratory* 2-3). Braden did not deny that the Southern residents after the war were also feeling defensive or even speaking defensively, as argued by Towns; rather, he contributed a new dimension to the conversation on Southern

⁷ Francis P. Gaines argued that Southern oratory may be characterized even more broadly, that Southern oratory “centers on the struggle for human freedom” (18). Also, John D. Saxon argued that the thematic unity of “traditional” Southern oratory was *desperate* while “contemporary” Southern oratory is *optimistic* (it is unclear to which era Saxon was referring when he talked about the Southern oratory “of the past.” Also, while it is not readily evident, it seems that “contemporary” Southern oratory to Saxon is the rhetoric of the 1970s). And similar to Saxon’s assertion about traditional rhetoric being “desperate,” Ralph T. Eubanks also characterized Southern oratory between 1830 and 1860 as “a Rhetoric of Desperation” (21).

oratory by identifying an accommodating quality in the rhetoric of some Southern orators during this difficult time.⁸

Offering yet another perspective on the “thematic unity” of Southern oratory is rhetorical analyst Howard Dorgan. In his analysis of post-1865 rhetoric, Dorgan argued that Confederate veterans developed an *apologetic* oratory: “Confederate defeat...left the South in search of an apologia which would satisfactorily explain the sharp variance between ante-bellum expectations and post-bellum realities” (“The Doctrine” 119).⁹ To support his claims, Dorgan traced the “quasi-religious” rhetoric of the Lost Cause through the oratory of the United Confederate Veterans (UCV).¹⁰ The Confederate Veterans, or “orator-apologists” as Dorgan called them, employed four “quasi-religious” rhetorical strategies in their apologies to the post-Confederate residents:

First, the orators proclaimed that the Confederate soldier had offered his life as a holy sacrifice. Second, they charged that Confederate defeat had not meant their cause was wrong. Third, they suggested that this defeat had in some way been an expression of divine will. And fourth, they reasoned that

⁸ Exemplars of this type of rhetoric include speakers such as Booker T. Washington and Henry W. Grady (Braden *Oratory* 5).

⁹ Also see Richard M. Weaver’s book, *The Southern Tradition at Bay: A History of Postbellum Thought*, for his examination of Southern apologetic works from 1865 to 1900 (see especially Part II: Writing the Apologia, pages 112-176).

¹⁰ The United Confederate Veterans was a veteran’s organization opened only to former Confederate soldiers. The UCV was formed in 1889 and held its first annual reunion July 3-4, 1890, in Chattanooga, Tennessee. The UCV was as visible as the UDC, shared many of the UDC’s goals (historical, memorial, social), and was, according to historian David W. Blight in *Race and Reunion*, one of the three entities that “took control of the Lost Cause” in the postwar years (272).

Confederate defeat held out to the nation a hope for a glorious future. (“The Doctrine” 130)

When these four arguments came together, Dorgan contended, “a theological rationale relative to Confederate defeat begins to emerge” (“The Doctrine” 130). The theological apologia of the UCV functioned, then, to repair the “southern self-image” or identity that had been “seriously scarred” by defeat.¹¹

The research on Southern oratory, while seemingly contradictory and inconclusive, actually paints a rich and multi-layered portrait of Southern rhetoric after the war. We see a defeated people approach their crises with different oratorical strategies: some chose to speak in a “florid” and “high flown” manner; some chose to defend themselves and their actions in their discourse; others chose to accommodate to outside forces; and others chose to apologize for losing the war and perhaps, for losing the Confederate identity. Still other rhetors chose to employ myths in their discourse, particularly the myth of the Lost Cause.¹²

¹¹ Also see Cal M. Logue’s article, “Coping with Defeat Rhetorically: Sherman’s March Through Georgia,” for more on how Southerners rhetorically responded to defeat. In the article, Logue looked at newspaper reactions to Sherman’s “scorched-earth march through Georgia” in 1864 to discover “how people accommodate losses discursively” (56). Logue concluded that, in this case, “rhetors rationalized losses in four interconnected processes. First, they expressed disillusionment. Second, conflict increased in the region. Third, rhetors converted to more powerful initiatives. Fourth, rhetoric represented defeat as mythical victory” (56).

¹² Waldo W. Braden argued that speaking after the war in the South was specifically “directed toward creating, promoting, and sanctifying composite social myths, namely those of the Old South, the Lost Cause, the Solid South, white supremacy, and the New South” (*Oratory* 3). These myths are discussed in greater depth in chapter three, The Myths of the Post-War South, of this dissertation.

The Lost Cause Literature

As I discussed in the Introduction to this project, much of the Lost Cause scholarship begins by establishing its terminology (see page 27). For example, some researchers have labeled the Lost Cause a “doctrine,” an “American legend,” or most popularly, a “myth” and an “ideology.” But beyond seeking the proper labels for the Lost Cause, historians, rhetorical analysts, and literary critics have also sought to define the Lost Cause by locating its origins, formation, and rhetorical components. Researchers who have studied the origins and formation of the myth seem to agree that its roots are buried in Sir Walter Scott’s legendary tales of Scotland’s lost cause.¹³ Historian James McPherson pointed out that as early as the 1850s, some Southerners were calling themselves “Southrons,” a term adopted from Scott’s writings (48). The person often credited with popularizing the Lost Cause ideology in the United States is Confederate historian and editor of the *Richmond Examiner*, Edward A. Pollard, who wrote and published *The Lost Cause* in 1866. In his book, Pollard articulated Lost Cause arguments such as “states’ rights” and “sectional animosity, not slavery” as causes of the war. Pollard’s arguments were repeated and elaborated in a variety of forms and forums by Lost Cause advocates in the South.¹⁴

¹³ For more literature on the origin of the Lost Cause, see Connelly’s and Bellows’s book, *God and General Longstreet: The Lost Cause and the Southern Mind*, William R. Taylor’s *Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and American National Character*, and Rollin G. Osterweis’s, *The Myth of the Lost Cause, 1865-1900*. Also see chapter three, The Myths of the Post-War South, for more.

¹⁴ For more on Pollard’s Lost Cause arguments and rhetorical developments of the Lost Cause myth, see chapter three, The Myths of the Post-War South, of this dissertation.

Another direction researchers have gone in defining the Lost Cause is in describing the rhetorical components of the myth. The eight general features scholars have identified in the Lost Cause myth include, 1) an argument for states' rights, 2) a claim that Confederates were not "rebels" or "traitors," 3) an assertion that slavery was not a cause of war, 4) blaming the war on the North and abolitionists, 5) insisting that the Confederate army was not beaten in battle but overwhelmed by numbers and resources, 6) glorifying and celebrating great men, 7) drawing parallels between Southern Confederates and American Revolutionaries, and 8) relying on "quasi-religious" imagery to define Southern Confederates as "chosen people."¹⁵ These eight rhetorical characteristics, many of which were found in Pollard's book, are also identifiable in public discourse all across the post-war (and recent) South.¹⁶

Whether the purpose of the scholarship has been to label the Lost Cause, trace out its origins and formation, or locate its rhetorical characteristics, what is normally present in the Lost Cause literature is an argument for its utility. For example, it has been argued that some Southern biographers after the war utilized the Lost Cause in their writings to prove Robert E. Lee a descendent of King

¹⁵ In his article, "The Doctrine of Victorious Defeat in the Rhetoric of Confederate Veterans," Howard Dorgan refers to this strain of Lost Cause argument as "quasi-religious" because the imagery is not always specific to a certain religion or religious event.

¹⁶ These are not the only rhetorical features of the Lost Cause myth. For a much more in-depth discussion of the Lost Cause and other Southern myths, see chapter three, *The Myths of the Post-War South*.

Robert the Bruce of Scotland (Connelly 101-102).¹⁷ Arguing more broadly for the utility of the Lost Cause was John A. Simpson who found, “in order to liberate the South from Northern ‘misinterpretations’ in American history, many ex-Confederates urgently sought to illuminate the positive aspects of their lost dreams and ambitions—a self-rationalization of the vanquished Confederacy” (“The Cult” 351). Contributing yet another perspective is historian Rollin G. Osterweis who argued that the Lost Cause ultimately functioned to “reshap[e] the region’s new political and social realities” and help Southerners “regain a sense of identity” (*The Myth* x). According to these well-supported arguments, it may be stated that the defeated people of the South utilized the rhetoric of the Lost Cause in a variety of ways for a variety of reasons: as a way to prove their regality, rationalize defeat, remember their past in a positive light, shape their realities, and rebuild their identities.

Organizing the Literature

One way of organizing the descriptive strain of literature is by way of David W. Blight’s claim that the Lost Cause has been studied in three distinct ways: as a “public memory, shaped by a web of organizations, institutions, and rituals,” as a “literary phenomenon,” and as a “civil religion” (“For Something” 1165). First,

¹⁷ Also see Waldo W. Braden’s 1975 article, “Myths in a Rhetorical Context.” Braden argued that myths, including the Lost Cause, serve “to confirm, intensify, and amplify sentiments and attitudes. It acts upon beliefs already possessed. For those who cannot or do not wish to face reality, it suggests rationalizations, escapes, and fantasy” (“Myths” 122).

scholars such as W. Stuart Towns have asserted that the Lost Cause—as well as ideas and events such as the Old South, the Confederacy, Jim Crow laws, and Reconstruction—constituted a “cultural memory” in the South (Towns “Ceremonial” 5). In other words, the Lost Cause formed a “web” of ideas, events, organizations, and rituals that people may evoke in recalling the South’s past. Blight seemed to agree with this characterization when he argued, “On the broadest level, [the Lost Cause] came to represent a mood, or an attitude toward the past. It took hold in specific arguments, organizations, and rituals” (*Race* 258).

As a cultural or public memory, historians and critics have considered how the Lost Cause was kept alive, even into today, with monuments, memorial days, partisan histories, and other rituals (Blight “For Something” 1166).¹⁸ For example, Osterweis found that the myth,

has flourished longer than any other regional legend; its symbols continue to be visible in all the media by which myths are communicated—on monuments and memorial battlefields, in the celebration of the Centennial of the Civil War, in literature, art, music, and drama, in the ubiquitous use of the Confederate battle flag and battle hymn. (*The Myth* xi)

¹⁸ Gaines M. Foster is one historian who argued that the Lost Cause myth has not endured. He maintained, “In the New South of the twentieth century, the Confederate tradition did not serve as a basis of social identity because it had lost much of its specificity and power to shape behavior...the Confederate tradition played a limited role in modern southern culture” (8). Howard N. Rabinowitz is another historian who argued that “by at least the late teens, interest in the Lost Cause had declined to the point where it had become a hollow shell of its initial self” (181). It appears that Rabinowitz made that conclusion based on Foster’s work.

Gallagher and Nolan also argued for the longevity of the Lost Cause in their 2000 edited book, *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History*. The book is a collection of essays that discusses “the degree to which Lost Cause arguments continue to influence modern writers and, by extension, the large lay audience interested in the Civil War” (4). In his independent work, Gary W. Gallagher also argued convincingly for the endurance of the Lost Cause myth and how it “remains vigorous today” by providing specific examples: “Winston Groom’s *Shrouds of Glory: From Atlanta to Nashville, The Last Campaign of the Civil War* illustrates that Lost Cause arguments remain current in 1995,” and “[Lost Cause] arguments also run through Ken Burns’s ‘The Civil War,’ the 11-hour documentary that reached an unprecedented Public Television audience in 1990” (*Jubal* 6, 27, 36).¹⁹ The “public memory” perspective, then, has established two ideas about the Lost Cause: 1) the Lost Cause is a “web” of rituals, events, ideas, and organizations of the South’s past, and 2) the arguments of the Lost Cause are identifiable in public discourses from the late nineteenth century into today.

Second, as a literary phenomenon, scholars have studied how the Lost Cause was shaped by journalists and fiction writers, “from the die-hard

¹⁹ For more discussions of how the Lost Cause has endured throughout the twentieth century, see David W. Blight’s article “‘For Something Beyond the Battlefield’: Frederick Douglass and the Struggle for the Memory of the Civil War.” Blight explored how the Lost Cause has been kept alive with monuments, memorial days, partisan histories, and other rituals (1166). Also see Connelly and Bellows, who argued in *God and General Longstreet: The Lost Cause and the Southern Mind* that, “the escapist image of a happy, luxuriant antebellum South permeated American popular culture during the depression years of the 1930s,” pointing specifically to such cultural artifacts as the 1939 screen version of Margaret Mitchell’s *Gone With the Wind* (127). They even argued that the Lost Cause was evident in the discourse of the early 1970s in reference to such events as Vietnam and Watergate (139).

Confederate apologists of the immediate postwar years through the gentle romanticism of the ‘local color’ writers of the 1880s to the legion of more mature novelists of the 1890s and early twentieth century who appealed to a national audience eager for reconciliation” (Blight “For Something” 1165). A prime example of this kind of research is Osterweis’ book, *The Myth of the Lost Cause, 1865-1900*, wherein he considered the Lost Cause a literary phenomenon; for example, a few of his chapters studied “Literature as the Battleground,” “The Lost Cause is Found by National Periodicals, 1870-1882,” and “The War Refought with the Pen” (vii). Osterweis’s argument in these chapters was that the Lost Cause spread throughout the South, and the North, by way of popular literature.

As a literary phenomenon, some scholars have also suggested the possibility of two Lost Cause rhetorics. Connelly and Bellows, for one, argued that the Lost Cause is divisible into two separate types: the National Lost Cause and the Inner Lost Cause. The National Lost Cause, they reasoned, was a literary endeavor most popular from the 1880s to World War I. The National rhetoric was also “bidimensional” in that it “attempt[ed] to explain the meaning of the Confederate experience to outsiders as well as to southerners” (59). The Inner Lost Cause, on the other hand, “describes a mentality that arose from the ashes of defeat, fought for three decades in print and oratory, and dwindled in the shadow of the First World War” (Connelly and Bellows 5). The people in charge of the Inner Lost Cause were members of the veterans’ organizations, former Confederate generals, and memorial associations who spoke and wrote “more to appease their own

frustrations and fears than to convert a national audience” (Connelly and Bellows 6). Essentially, the National Lost Cause was directed at the national reading public and the Inner Lost Cause was constructed for residents of the defeated South.²⁰

Important to note at this point is that the literary perspective on the Lost Cause has placed the myth into a specific time frame. In other words, literary scholars who have analyzed the Lost Cause typically maintain that the myth was most evident in Southern literature from 1865 to the beginning of World War I in 1914. After World War I, however, the themes of the Lost Cause became more and more difficult to find in novels, literary magazines, and periodicals. Scholarship on the public memory of the Lost Cause, on the other hand, has established that the Lost Cause is still alive in places such as monuments, movies, art, and music. I would even argue that Lost Cause themes are still evident in recent UDC catechisms which are still revised and republished every few years by the UDC for use in their Children of the Confederacy meetings. The point to be made here is

²⁰ The “absolute heart” of the Inner Lost Cause was the assertion of Confederate moral superiority, or the “better man” concept (Connelly and Bellows 22). The rhetoric of the better man argued that the war had been a “grand epic fought by a chivalrous South,” and that no matter what had happened, “southerners were still the *better men*” (Connelly and Bellows 23, 22). According to Connelly and Bellows, advocates of the better-men concept maintained that the South possessed political morality by adhering to the virtues of the Revolutionary generation and the Constitution (23). Osborne elaborated on the better man concept in his discussion of Jubal Early and his followers by stating, “The core of their doctrine was a declaration that the Confederate soldier was a better fighter—and a better man—than his Union adversary; the Northern enemy was often a foreigner, a member of a mongrel race—seen by one Southern writer as a breed mingling ‘Yankees, negroes, Germans and Irish’” (432). See also Thomas L. Connelly, *The Marble Man: Robert E. Lee and His Image in American Society*, for his discussion of how Lee has been constructed as “superior” and as a “better man” than Northern generals (especially pages 94-95).

that the Lost Cause has enjoyed a more lasting appearance in our public memory than in our literary outlets.

The third perspective in the Lost Cause scholarship has considered the myth a “dimension of southern and American civil religion.” Blight argued that some historians analyzed the Lost Cause as “rooted in churches and sacred rhetoric as well as secular institutions and thought” (“For Something” 1165). For example, Connelly and Bellows, in their book *God and General Longstreet*, examined the relationship and “lasting bond between Confederate memory and southern piety” (38).²¹ The most complete analysis of the Lost Cause as civil religion, however, must be Charles R. Wilson’s book, *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920*. The *American Historical Review* was quoted on the back cover of Wilson’s book: “What makes this volume significant is both the demonstrated usefulness of the theory of civil religion in the hands of a historian and the fresh substantive contribution to the history of the South’s tragic experience.” Although a historian, Wilson discussed how rhetoric formed the Lost Cause myth. For example, he looked at how the “Yankee monster” and Jefferson Davis as “Christian martyr” were constructed with religious rhetoric, and how the Southern jeremiad “served to nurture a southern identity” (40, 50, 98).

While each of these three perspectives adds greatly to our understanding of the Lost Cause, I find myself most persuaded by the argument that the Lost Cause

²¹ Also see Charles C. Osborne’s book, *Jubal: The Life and Times of General Jubal A. Early, CSA, Defender of the Lost Cause*, for a treatment of the Lost Cause as a “civil religion.”

has functioned as a public memory. As such, I tend to think of the “literary” and “civil religion” phenomena of the Lost Cause as components of its “public memory.” In other words, Lost Cause literature and civil religion are two of the many strands that make up the “web” of public memory. Speaking with a similar vocabulary about the structure of public memory is rhetorical analyst Roseann M. Mandziuk who argued, “Critical attention to public memory entails examination of complex webs of interrelated rhetorical forces wherein multiple layers of discourse are examined. In such studies the ‘text’ is comprised of the processes and rituals of commemoration, not just the product” (273). The Lost Cause, then, may be considered a “text” and “web” of rhetorical forces, processes, and rituals, not just a “product” of commemoration. As such, the Lost Cause is still “called up” and “shaped into useful public memories” today as a way of keeping its ideology alive.

Issues in the Literature

So far in the literature, we have seen researchers label, define, describe, and organize the Lost Cause. There exists, though, a strain of analytical research in the Lost Cause literature as well.²² Some researchers, for instance, have tried to

²² There also exists Lost Cause literature that does not seem to fit anywhere. For example, Robert H. Gudmestad’s 1998 article, “Baseball, the Lost Cause, and the New South in Richmond, Virginia, 1883-1890.” Granted, this article does not specifically attempt to elaborate or analyze the Lost Cause, but Gudmestad did state that “baseball in the former capital of the Confederacy fit neatly with romantic conceptions of war that began to emerge with the mythology of the Lost Cause” (268). For example, Gudmestad argued, “all of the rituals employed by the Virginia Base-Ball Association strengthened the feelings of social solidarity, deference to leadership, and homage to the common soldier. Confederate veterans controlled the team and used it as a vehicle to promote the memory of the war and the celebration of veterans’ sacrifices” (277-278).

separate the “myth” of the Lost Cause from the “facts” of the Civil War in order to better focus their analyses. Alan T. Nolan argued, “In the popular mind, the Lost Cause represents the national memory of the Civil War; it has been substituted for the *history* of the war” (12). Nolan’s mission was to establish what “actually” happened in the war—the “facts”—instead of the stories and myths people remembered about the war—the “fictions.” Also, Wilbur J. Cash in his 1941 book, *The Mind of the South*, attempted to separate the myths of the Cavalier and Yankee from the reality of those caricatures.²³ Cash explained that the typical Southerner was not a member of the Southern aristocracy, as the Cavalier image may have led us to believe. In fact, Cash argued, the Cavalier was “rare” and the “true” Southerner was a “simple, rustic figure,” a farmer (3, 31).²⁴ With this approach, researchers believed they could better present the “facts” of the Civil War and the South without the “distortions, falsehoods, and romantic sentimentality of the Myth of the Lost Cause” getting in the way (Nolan 29).

Conversely, some researchers have not been immediately concerned with the “facts” of the Civil War and have wished instead to analyze one or more of the eight Lost Cause themes I identified earlier in this chapter. A fitting example is Thomas L. Connelly’s book, *The Marble Man: Robert E. Lee and His Image in*

²³ Also see William C. Davis’ book, *The Cause Lost: Myths and Realities of the Confederacy*, for more sorting out the “facts” of the Civil War from the “fictions.”

²⁴ Also see William R. Taylor’s 1957 book, *Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and American National Character*, for more on the literary formation of these images (as well as images of the North and South, and the “national character”). Taylor’s study focused especially on the years between the 1820s-1850s.

American Society. Connelly focused on the constructions of Lee as “Christ-like” and “god-like” in post-war rhetoric, which expands our knowledge of how Lost Cause crusaders glorified and celebrated great men.²⁵ For example, Connelly explained, “Lee’s character was almost deified as he became a Christ symbol. If Christ had his Gethsemane, Lee had his Appomattox. Writers turned to Lee as an example of the better man who could lose, and honed his character to perfection” (95). Connelly argued for the significance of these “deified” constructions by explaining, “the exaggerated image of Lee which [Lost Cause writers] constructed provided needed rationales for a defeated South” (91). Connelly not only analyzed the Lost Cause myth of great men and argued for its rhetorical significance, but also claimed that the great men theme—specifically, the “Lee” theme—may be found at the heart of all other Lost Cause themes: “the ultimate rationale of this pure nation was the character of Lee. The Lost Cause argument stated that any society which produced a man of such splendid character must be right” (95).

Connelly has also contributed to our understanding of the Lost Cause by identifying a line of argument not normally mentioned in discussions of the Lost Cause: Virginia as the “showpiece of the Confederacy” (96). He argued that the “Virginia Pattern” was constructed by Lost Cause writers in the 1880s—writers who denied the Social Darwinian theory that “the stronger institution invariably survives” (Connelly xiii, 102). Such writers instead relied on the Darwinian

²⁵ Connelly’s argument shows how Lost Cause themes may overlap and borrow from each other; in other words, what we see here is “quasi-religious” rhetoric—normally employed to construct Southern Confederates as the “chosen people”—now also being used to construct Lee as a “great man.”

concept “man is shaped by his environment” to explain that the South “had fought to protect its environment, to defend a finer society” (Connelly 102). Virginia became the centerpiece of that “finer society,” as Connelly explained: “Virginia came to epitomize in secession a society that fought for finer virtues. In defeat, Virginia only taught that a finer civilization could lose” (103). In Lost Cause terms, the connection between Virginia and Robert E. Lee was then perfectly logical: “once there was a superior culture [Virginia], and it produced men of better values [Robert E. Lee]” (Connelly 104). Connelly’s analysis of the “Virginia Pattern” and the “Lee Theme” elaborate and extend our knowledge of Lost Cause rhetoric.

Another researcher who followed the analytical line of research is Gary W. Gallagher in his study of Jubal A. Early’s discourse. Early was a Confederate general who fought under Robert E. Lee and wrote Civil War history after the war. Gallagher pointed out that, “several talented historians,” such as Connelly in *The Marble Man*, Foster in *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, and Connelly and Bellows in *God and General Longstreet*, already explored Early’s role as a “leading Lost Cause warrior” (*Jubal* 6). The problem Gallagher found was that their interpretations of Early as “resolutely unreconstructed” were insufficient because they did not acknowledge Early’s “long-term impact on the ways in which Americans have understood the Civil War” (*Jubal* 6). To make his case for Early’s rhetorical significance, Gallagher found five Lost Cause themes in Early’s

discourse—all of which built on the “glorification of great men” theme²⁶ as well as Connelly’s “Virginia Pattern:”

1) Robert E. Lee was the best and most admirable general of the war, 2) Confederate armies faced overwhelming odds and mounted a gallant resistance, 3) Ulysses S. Grant paled in comparison to Lee as a soldier, 4) Stonewall Jackson deserved a place immediately behind Lee in the Confederate pantheon, and 5) Virginia was the most important arena of combat. (*Jubal* 16)

Arguing that previous work on Jubal Early underestimated the extent of his rhetorical significance, then, Gallagher analyzed Early’s rhetoric to illustrate his importance. Along the way, he also elaborated on a major Lost Cause theme by breaking it down into more specific components.²⁷

²⁶ Elaborating on the argument for great men seems to be the most popular subject in this strand of Lost Cause literature. John A. Simpson, in his 1975 article, “The Cult of the ‘Lost Cause’,” argued that the myth of the Lost Cause was centered on the constructions of “chivalric Southern soldiers” and the “noble Confederate leadership embodied in Jefferson Davis” (351). Also contributing to this theme is H. E. Gulley who argued that the memorials and monuments erected across the South by the UDC “conveys important themes used to recognize and maintain Confederate traditions in the Deep South...[for example] noble southern men fought and died to maintain basic principles” (133).

²⁷ It should be noted that, with the exception of Nolan’s work on separating the Lost Cause myth from the “facts” of the war, the literature reviewed in this section seldom situates the Lost Cause myth as the centerpiece of the scholarship. For example, Gallagher’s main purpose in analyzing Jubal A. Early’s discourse was to illuminate the rhetoric of Jubal A. Early, not to illuminate new arguments of the Lost Cause. The same may be said of Connelly’s work in *The Marble Man*: his central purpose was to explore the image of Robert E. Lee, not to complicate the myth of the Lost Cause. The conclusions drawn in this research are almost incidental.

The Lost Cause literature reviewed here reveals the many different approaches researchers have taken. Some defined and labeled the Lost Cause, some located its origins and formation, some identified its rhetorical characteristics, while others argued for its utility as a rhetorical strategy. Still some scholars sought to organize the Lost Cause into manageable areas of research by considering it a public memory, a literary phenomenon, or as a civil religion, and still others separated the myth from the “facts” in order to study either one more efficiently. Often in the process of dividing the myth from the “facts,” scholars were able to elaborate on and extend already existing knowledge of the Lost Cause themes. While the Lost Cause literature is perhaps the most informative to my project, there still exists one more strand of literature that must also be considered. This next body of literature has examined the relationship between the Lost Cause and women’s memorial organizations; specifically, the Lost Cause and the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

The Lost Cause and the UDC Literature

In their quests to illuminate the rhetoric of the Lost Cause, many researchers have analyzed the activities and discourses of prominent men, such as Jefferson Davis, Jubal Early, and General Longstreet.²⁸ Some researchers, however, have

²⁸ For more on men’s contributions to the Lost Cause myth, see Gary W. Gallagher’s work, *Jubal A. Early, the Lost Cause, and Civil War History: A Persistent Legacy*, Thomas L. Connelly’s and Barbara L. Bellows’ book, *God and General Longstreet: The Lost Cause and the Southern Mind*, and *Judah P. Benjamin, Statesman of the Lost Cause* by Rollin G. Osterweis. Also consult W. Stuart Towns’ book, *Oratory and Rhetoric in the Nineteenth-Century South: A Rhetoric of Defense*, to read about John

studied in-depth the role of women and women's memorial associations as "guardians" or "keepers" of the Lost Cause. Speaking on the impact of women's memorial associations and veteran's organizations on Southern culture, historian Gaines M. Foster declared, "more southerners formed an understanding of their past through the ceremonial activities or rituals conducted by these groups than through anything else" (5).²⁹ As the largest memorial association, the UDC has often been referenced and even highlighted in discussions of the Lost Cause. One historian has convincingly established that during the 1890s, "three entities took control of the Lost Cause," one of which was the United Daughters of the Confederacy (Blight *Race* 272).³⁰

Brown Gordon and Charles Colcock Jones, Jr.'s contributions to the Lost Cause ideology. See also Howard W. Dorgan's chapter, "Rhetoric of the United Confederate Veterans: A Lost Cause Mythology in the Making," as well as his article, "The Doctrine of Victorious Defeat in the Rhetoric of Confederate Veterans," for a discussion of men's contributions to Lost Cause rhetoric. Finally, see Osterweis' chapter, "The Confederate Veteran and His Daughters," in his book, *The Myth of the Lost Cause, 1865-1900*, where he discusses the *Confederate Veteran* magazine. While he devoted about four pages of his chapter to the UDC and provided brief quotations from three UDC members, he instead highlighted extended examples from Confederate men—namely, Alexander Helper, Father Abram Ryan, Paul Hamilton Payne, Henry Timrod, Sidney Lanier, and J. N. Ogden—as major contributors to the magazine.

²⁹ For more on women's memorial associations, see Jane C. Croly's *The History of the Woman's Club Movement in America* and Anne F. Scott's, *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History*. For more on Southern women's memorial work, see especially Anastasia Sims, *The Power of Femininity in the New South: Women's Organizations and Politics in North Carolina, 1880-1930* and LeeAnn Whites' chapter, "'Stand By Your Man': The Ladies Memorial Association and the Reconstruction of Southern White Manhood," in Christie A. Farnham's edited book, *Women of the American South*.

³⁰ The other two "entities" that "took control of the Lost Cause" in the South were the United Confederate Veterans (UCV) and the *Confederate Veteran* magazine.

The literature that examines the UDC's involvement with the Lost Cause comes primarily from the field of history and tends to focus on the women's activities, not their rhetoric. Historian David W. Blight, for one, discussed the UDC's activities in his book, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. He mentioned that the Daughters "delivered public speeches, wrote in the popular press, and lobbied Congressmen," and he discussed the UDC's campaign to reform history textbooks in the Southern schools (*Race* 278). In numerous places, Blight even insisted on the importance of the UDC's rhetoric on the South, but his primary focus was on their activities, not their rhetoric.³¹

Another historian who has studied the UDC and the Lost Cause is Karen L. Cox. In her dissertation entitled, "Women, The Lost Cause, and the New South: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Transmission of Confederate Culture, 1894-1919," Cox examined the activities of the UDC; particularly, monument building, caring for veterans, and forming textbook committees. Cox concluded that by way of these activities, the Daughters directly contributed to the terms by which the North and the South finally reconciled. Cox even examined the UDC's educational activities, such as textbook and curriculum reform, and found the women's efforts to be more significant than those of their male counterparts—

³¹ Patricia Faye Climer is another historian who proclaimed that the UDC "has aided in the perpetuation of the idea of the Lost Cause," but her analysis is also of the UDC's activities, not their rhetorical strategies (7). Also see H. E. Gulley's article, "Women and the Lost Cause: Preserving a Confederate Identity in the American Deep South." Gulley demonstrated how the activities of the UDC and women of the Confederacy have been honored in monuments across the South. Gulley analyzed the monuments' inscriptions to argue the UDC and Southern women were held in high esteem for their role in maintaining the Lost Cause with their activities.

the UCV and Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV)—in teaching the Lost Cause to children:

Men may have felt a responsibility to teach children the ‘truth’ of history but their activity rarely extended to social guardianship of the region’s white youth. Women were considered especially suited for that task, and the Daughters’ action as Lost Cause educators was considered an extension of their role as mothers. (186)

In light of their involvement with the Southern youth, Cox was able to conclude that the UDC fulfilled a “Lost Cause motherhood” role with their educational programs and activities for children.³²

Historian Fred A. Bailey has also worked extensively with the activities of the UDC, as well as with their public discourse. Bailey’s article, “The Textbooks of the ‘Lost Cause’: Censorship and the Creation of Southern State Histories,” focused on the textbook reform campaign waged by three post-bellum memorial associations: the UCV, SCV, and the UDC. Bailey looked specifically at the efforts these groups made to remove textbooks from Southern schools that did not glorify the “patrician” and “aristocratic” class. He even examined some of the state history books written by UCV and SCV members (and one text written by a UDC

³² Similar to Republican Motherhood, the UDC engaged in Lost Cause motherhood by teaching traditional and patriotic values to Southern children. Cox explained, “Though their ancestors’ attempts to form a separate nation had failed, the Daughters were determined to keep alive the values of the Old South and the Confederacy, and hold off the intrusion of Northern values. UDC members served as public guardians of the Confederacy’s sacred principles and imparted the same to southern white children” (185). For more on Republican Motherhood, see footnote 46 of chapter two.

member) to illustrate the authors' constructions of the antebellum elite class. He did not, however, mention the UDC catechisms or discuss specific rhetorical strategies.³³

One historian actually mentioned the UDC catechisms directly in his work on the Lost Cause. In his book, *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920*, Charles R. Wilson spent a few pages discussing the UDC's efforts to reform textbooks. He pointed to Cornelia Branch Stone's 1912 textbook, "U.D.C. Catechism for Children," as an example of how the Daughters approached textbook reform. Without providing specifics, Wilson argued that the catechism included "historical facts" about the war and Reconstruction arranged in a "dogmatic" question-answer form (140). Furthermore, he found that "the historical interpretation was belligerently pro-Southern" (140). Far from a rhetorical analysis, Wilson's mention of Stone's catechism is still informative to the researcher who wishes to locate UDC catechisms and gain a preview of their contents.

I have found only one piece of scholarship on the subject of the UDC and the Lost Cause *not* written by an historian. The book is entitled, *Edith D. Pope and her Nashville Friends: Guardians of the Lost Cause in the 'Confederate Veteran'*,

³³ In another article, "Mildred Lewis Rutherford and the Patrician Cult of the Old South," Bailey analyzed the rhetoric of this prolific UDC member. He examined Rutherford's discourse, especially her rhetoric on textbook reform, to argue, "Historical truth as crafted by Mildred Lewis Rutherford and the Confederate societies insured that white southerners would retain cultural values ultimately detrimental to the progress of their own native land" (Bailey 535). In both of these articles, Bailey analyzed the texts in terms of class, not collective memory or rhetorical subjectivity.

written by rhetorical analyst John A. Simpson. One of Simpson's research questions sought to answer how Pope, who was a prominent UDC member, maintained the goals of the *Confederate Veteran* after she took it over as editor.³⁴ Simpson argued that Pope upheld the Lost Cause goals of the magazine by encouraging contributors to avoid "devil words" such as "Civil War," "New South," "rebel," and "traitor" (*Edith* 47). She also printed articles that advanced the argument for states' rights, white supremacy, and,

published articles that glorified the Confederate past as well as related stories that remained popular in Southern white society; the plantation legend (and that of the faithful slave); the constitutional rationale for Southern independence; the cult of pure Southern womanhood; and the hero worship of specific Confederate leaders. Pope also continued to publicize key memorials and fought for 'proper histories' in Southern textbooks.

(Simpson *Edith* 40)

Simpson stands alone in this literature because he focused on the rhetorical contributions of a UDC member to the myth of the Lost Cause, not her activities.³⁵

³⁴ The *Confederate Veteran* was the official magazine of the United Confederate Veterans, UDC, Sons of Veterans, Confederated Southern Memorial Association, and other Southern memorial associations.

³⁵ One other piece of UDC research from the field of communication is Mary Jennifer Hunter's 1982 master's thesis, "A Rhetorical Analysis of the Speeches of Mildred L. Rutherford, Historian General, United Daughters of the Confederacy." Her analysis is very traditional in that she examined the invention, style, and arrangement of the speeches, the major premises, minor premises, and conclusions of Rutherford's major arguments, and the pathos and logos Rutherford constructed in her discourse. Hunter's thesis did not discuss the UDC's involvement with the Lost Cause.

Research Goals

The issues that have emerged from the literature on Southern oratory, the Lost Cause myth, and the UDC's involvement with the Lost Cause have informed my own research path. First to review, the literature on Southern oratory has established that ex-Confederates struggled to "soothe their bruised egos" and with oratorical strategies as numerous and varied as their emotions. With most white Southerners feeling depressed, defeated, and hopelessly uncertain, some chose to defend themselves, others chose to accommodate to outside forces, and still others chose to apologize. Second, it is clear from the literature on Southern oratory that some rhetors chose to evoke myths in their discourse, particularly the myth of the Lost Cause, to address their rhetorical crises. As a myth, the Lost Cause supplied Southerners with a reservoir of arguments and language from which to draw, especially when remembering the South's past and rebuilding their identities. Third, from the literature on the UDC and their relationship with the Lost Cause, it is certain that the United Daughters of the Confederacy were thoroughly entrenched in and dedicated to the Lost Cause. The women's memorial projects were all, for the most part, geared towards teaching and perpetuating the myth of the Lost Cause.

The literature I reviewed in this chapter revealed areas that have already been well-researched by skilled and discerning scholars, which helps me articulate my own research goals. For one, researchers have fully documented the origins and creation of the Lost Cause myth, attributing its earliest beginnings to the

writings of Sir Walter Scott, and then in the United States with Edward A. Pollard's book, *The Lost Cause*. As such, I do not address this area in my project. Also, historians especially have quite completely and accurately discussed the UDC's activities in the South, so this is another area I do not pursue in this dissertation. Finally, I do not attempt to separate the "facts" of the war from the "fictions" because it is the rhetoric of this era I am most interested in studying, not the events, per se.

Another area that has been much researched in the literature is the response to the South's identity crisis. As we have seen in this chapter, researchers have correctly argued that it was oratory, rhetoric, and myths that rebuilt Southerners' sense of themselves in the post-bellum years, especially as white ex-Confederates were feeling defeated and grasping to figure out "who they were."³⁶ To examine this phenomenon further, some researchers have looked at how ex-Confederates named themselves in discourse, such as Braden who argued that the identity of the post-war era was "Southern," not "Confederate" or "American." He explained, "in contrast to the antebellum years when persons often identified more closely with their states, thinking of themselves as Virginians, Georgians, or Texans, now [1865-1900] increasing numbers regardless of class or locality spoke of themselves as southerners" (*Oratory* 16). Some have found that people in the South after the war identified themselves as "Americans." For instance, Henry Grady was faced

³⁶ C. Vann Woodward claimed that the South was of a "divided mind" in the postwar South: one half of the Southern mind identified with the romanticism of the Old South whereas the other half was focused on the progress of the New South.

with a distinct oratorical challenge of identity: “to make the traditions of the Old South compatible with the beliefs of the New South, while suggesting a primary identification as an American rather than as a southerner” (Mixon 98). Taking a position between Braden and Mixon, historian David M. Potter argued that a lasting feature of the South is the “obsessive impulse” of its residents to be both “Southerners and *Americans*” (30-31).

Because the topic of identity has already been well-covered in the literature, I focus my analysis on rhetorical collectivity and subjectivity. In other words, I am ultimately less concerned with how white Southern residents identified themselves as I am with the efforts to reconstitute ex-Confederates into a “people” with rhetorical resources, motives, and actions. Put differently, it is one thing to call oneself a Southerner and yet another to act as a “Southern people,” which I believe is a richer and more complex rhetorical accomplishment. By analyzing the strategies with which the UDC constituted the “Southern people,” as I do in chapter six, I hope to contribute a significant perspective to the study of post-war Southern rhetoric as well as to the study of constitutive rhetoric.

Another research area I explore is the Lost Cause as a public memory and as a reservoir of rhetoric that may be “called up” and “shaped into useful public memories” for persuasive purposes. Actually, many of the scholars included in this chapter talked about collective memory in their work without explicitly calling it such. For example, in *The Marble Man*, Connelly talked about the collective memory of Robert E. Lee, especially about how the memory of Lee was

perpetuated in discussions of Civil War history. Also, Blight argued in *Race and Reunion* that the public memory of the Civil War and Southern history helped maintain white supremacy across the United States in the post-war decades. But where such discussions of rhetoric and Southern collective memory have stopped short is at looking at how those memories are constructed, which I hope this dissertation, especially chapter five, will contribute to our understanding of how Southern collective memories were constructed in the post-war era and in general.

Finally, I hope to convince readers of this dissertation that the United Daughters of the Confederacy were more than “keepers” of the Lost Cause with their activities. Instead, they were significant contributors to the Lost Cause, Southern memory, and the “Southern people” with their rhetoric, especially with the rhetoric of their catechisms for children. Children, not coincidentally, have been largely overlooked in all three areas of literature so hopefully this project will help fill that void as well. In all, it is my hope that the UDC will be recognized as a significant rhetorical force in the post-bellum years as they created mythical collective memories and constituted a new “generation” of “Southern people” with their catechisms for children.

Conclusion

The literature I reviewed in this chapter shows that researchers have studied the rhetorical responses to defeat in the post-bellum era from a variety of perspectives, made many well-informed conclusions, and illuminated areas that

may benefit from further analysis. Therefore, this chapter has established the research context for my study. With the historical and research contexts of my project now set, it is necessary to examine the rhetorical context of the catechisms. Such an examination requires a critical look at how rhetors in the post-war era crafted their discourse in response to the South's rhetorical crises. As such, in the next chapter, I analyze the four myths Southern rhetors created to deal with defeat. I also identify which of those myths the UDC organization preferred and thereby drew upon most when writing their catechisms.

Chapter Four: The Myths of the Post-War South

Those happy days are no more—gone, never to return, and the civilization as our grandmothers’ lived it went with it. Happy are those whose memory holds these days in remembrance! My heartfelt sympathy goes out to those who shall never know of them! Veterans, didn’t we have a good time when hog killing time came! Weren’t the pig tails and the crackling bread fine? Don’t we feel sorry for those young people who never ate a roasted pig tail, or never spent Christmas on the old plantation? (15)

—From Mildred Lewis Rutherford’s address, “The Civilization of the Old South: What Made It: What Destroyed It: What Has Replaced It,” delivered in Municipal Hall in Dallas, Texas, 9 November 1916.

When Mildred Lewis Rutherford, Historian General of the United Daughters of the Confederacy from 1911 to 1916, crafted her final address to the UDC annual convention in Dallas, Texas, she employed rhetoric from two popular Southern myths of the time: the Old South and the Lost Cause. Speaking with the rhetoric of the Old South, Rutherford constructed vivid “rhetorical depictions” for her audience as she shared her personal memories of growing up on a plantation in the antebellum years. Rutherford’s remembrances included the smell of “sweet grass and mimosa blooms,” a kitchen table in the “Big House” that “groaned with good things to eat,” and joyful holidays and decadent weddings (“The Civilization” 8).¹ Also present in her memories of the old South were the “happy and loyal”

¹ In Herbert W. Simons’ and Aram A. Aghazarian’s edited book, *Form, Genre, and the Study of Political Discourse*, Michael Osborn described rhetorical depictions as “lenses that can color what we see and make our reactions smolder,” and that rhetorical depictions may cause audiences to “get caught up in some dramatic narrative that interprets for them the reality of their time” (86). Osborn spent the rest of the chapter detailing the five instrumental functions of rhetorical depictions, which are presentation, intensification,

slaves who lived on the Rutherford plantation—actually, Rutherford insisted that they were called “servants, part of our very home,” not “slaves” (“The Civilization” 6). Rutherford also spoke to her audience with the rhetoric of the Lost Cause. Even while denying that such a cause existed, Rutherford reinforced its central message: “No, the cause for which the Confederate soldier fought was in no sense a ‘Lost Cause,’ but a great VICTORY which will go sounding down the ages” (“The Civilization” 45). The idea of a victorious South despite military defeat formed the very backbone of the Lost Cause myth: that even though it lost the war, the South did not lose its honor, dignity, or moral righteousness.

The Old South and Lost Cause myths were perhaps predictable rhetorical responses to the Southern crises that followed the Civil War. As we saw in chapter two, after the war ended, the physical, psychological, and material landscapes of the South were left “maimed” as a traditionally proud people struggled to comprehend their defeat, rebuild their environments, adjust to Reconstruction and emancipation, preserve their memories, and restore their identity. Struggling to cope with their physical and “mental maims,” the humiliated, bitter, and resentful white ex-Confederates crafted four “myths” known to contemporary scholars as the

identification, implementation, and reaffirmation. The reaffirmation function is most applicable to Rutherford’s rhetoric—and the UDC’s—because the rhetorical depiction means to “reaffirm identity, often in ceremonies during which heroes, martyrs, villains, and the role of the people are recalled in common appreciation” (95). Furthermore, reaffirmative depiction “attempts to maintain the structures of society against the ravages of time, the erosion of memory, and the decay of commitment” (95). Given the UDC’s role in memory and “people” construction, Osborn’s reaffirmation function helps to explain the purpose of such vivid utterances such as Rutherford’s.

Solid South, the New South, the Old South, and the Lost Cause.² Historian William C. Davis has argued that, given their position as a defeated people, it was natural for the ex-Confederates to craft mythical responses to handle their crises: “Out of any conflict, the losers create more myths than the winners. It is hardly a surprise. After all, winners have little to explain to themselves. They won” (175). Davis explained further that, for the losers of a conflict, “coping with defeat, dealing with it personally and explaining to others, places enormous strains on the ego, self-respect, and sense of self-worth of the defeated” (175). Given the “strain” on their identity, it is almost expected that the “losers” of any conflict will respond to their defeat with mythical rhetoric, and as I will illustrate in this chapter, the ex-Confederates were no exception.

Throughout the remainder of this chapter, I argue that the defeated ex-Confederates created a “mythical” rhetorical context in the post-bellum years: a context from which the United Daughters of the Confederacy drew when writing their catechisms.³ As I re-create the mythical context of the time, I illustrate how

² As a reminder, rhetorical critic Waldo W. Braden defined “myth” most succinctly: “Myth draws upon memory and imagination; that it results from a collective effort over a considerable period of time; that it represents an oversimplification of events, persons, and relationships; that it is more emotional than logical in its substance; and that it combines both reality and fiction. In other words, it is the product of considerable abstracting on the part of many people” (*Oral* 68). A Southern myth, then, is a shared narrative that draws upon the memories and imaginations of the Southern collective (although, it should be noted that Northerners also contributed to Southern myths with their own ideas of the South). A Southern myth is also an emotional rather than logical oversimplification of Southern events, persons, and relationships that draws upon both Southern reality and Southern fiction.

³ For the purposes of this study, a rhetorical context refers to the rhetoric that triggers the construction of a message; the rhetoric employed in building that message; the subsequent rhetoric that serves as a response to that message (if any); and the larger

the Solid South, New South, Old South, and Lost Cause myths were distinct yet interconnected rhetorical strategies employed by defeated Southerners to help preserve their antebellum memories and soothe the “strain” on their battered identities.⁴ In order to illustrate how the four myths worked in public discourse to address the era of Southern defeat, I provide examples from various public orators, including the UDC who predominantly utilized the rhetoric of the Old South and the Lost Cause in their public discourse. I begin the chapter now by examining the rhetorical responses that helped Southerners manage their feelings of defeat and humiliation in the post-war era and that comprised the mythical context from which the Daughters would draw when writing their catechisms for children.

rhetorics that surround all three. For example, a President constructs a message asking Congress for permission to declare war on a “rogue nation.” Congress responds by debating the merits and shortcomings of such a move. Here we have a rhetorical message delivered by the President and the rhetorical response debated by Congress. Surrounding such discussions are larger rhetorics—which may include local, national, or even global discourses—that may inform the original message and/or the subsequent messages. The press, for example, may take a position in favor of the war by way of a patriotic rhetoric, or anti-war protest groups may vocalize their objections with a rhetoric of humanity. Of course, the rhetorical context may also include the rhetoric that led to the President’s message in the first place; for instance, the messages from the “rogue nation” may have been antagonistic or in some way asking for war. For more on rhetorical context, see Lloyd F. Bitzer’s article on “The Rhetorical Situation” for his argument that a rhetorical situation means that rhetorical discourse comes into existence as a response to a situation; a discourse is given significance by the situation; a rhetorical situation is necessary to the discourse; and a rhetorical situation invites a fitting response.

⁴ For scholarly treatments of the “mythical South,” see especially David W. Blight, Waldo W. Braden, Thomas L. Connelly and Barbara L. Bellows, Karen L. Cox, William C. Davis, Howard Dorgan, Gaines M. Foster, Gary W. Gallagher, Paul M. Gaston, Rollin G. Osterweis, Stuart W. Towns, and Charles R. Wilson; or, for a synopsis of their work, revisit my literature reviews in chapters one and three.

The “Mythical” South

After the war ended, white Southern residents no longer had their country—the Confederate States of America—to help them feel united within a national identity (i.e., as Confederates), and while they were in many ways “united in their defeat,” most proud Southerners were unwilling to accept that condition. As a result, some ex-Confederates created the Solid South myth—otherwise referred to as “white supremacy”—with their rhetoric. At the heart of the Solid South myth was an encouragement to white Southerners to stand united or “solid” against internal and external threats. Expectedly, then, Solid South rhetoric featured an “us versus them” rhetorical strategy. As I argued in chapter two (pages 63-69), the perceived external threats in the post-war era included Yankee investors, the Freedmen’s Bureau, carpetbaggers, and military occupation while internal threats included scalawags and the fear of “Negro rule.”⁵ It was ultimately the white Southerners’ belief in “home-rule,” their steadfast resistance to “outside interference,” and their desire to feel united that informed the rhetoric of the Solid South.

One well-known rhetor in the post-bellum years who incorporated Solid South rhetoric into his discourse was Tom Watson, a successful criminal lawyer, Georgia legislator, and controversial orator. In an 1892 article published in the

⁵ This argument is consistent with W. Stuart Towns’ assertion that the oratory of the South following the Civil War was defensive against perceived agitators from the North and from the South: “Southerners often have practiced a defensive rhetorical stand: defending their way of life, culture, and very existence against those from the ‘outside’ who they felt would destroy what they held dear” (5). Revisit the *Southern Oratory Literature* section of chapter three for more on this literature.

Arena entitled, “The Negro Question in the South,” Watson articulated his Solid South stance against perceived threats such as Northern politicians, Yankee investors, unfair taxation, and of course, “Negro rule.” Watson’s thesis was essentially that “We have...a solid South as opposed to a solid North; and in the South itself, a solid black vote against the solid white” (para. 11). Watson explained his Solid South stance further:

Northern Democrats have ruled the South with a rod of iron for twenty years. We have had to acquiesce when the time-honored principles we loved were sent to the rear and new doctrines and policies we despised were engrafted on our platform. All this we have had to do to obtain the assistance of Northern Democrats to prevent what was called ‘Negro supremacy’...Let the South ask relief from Wall Street; let it plead for equal and just laws on finance; let it beg for mercy against crushing taxation, and Northern Democracy, with all the coldness, cruelty, and subtlety of Mephistopheles, would hint ‘Negro rule!’ and the white farmer and laborer of the South had to choke down his grievance and march under Tammany’s orders. (para. 7)

Watson’s strategy here was to portray the South, or “us,” as a victim of Northern politics, economics, and social policies. Speaking directly about the Northern Democrats who “ruled the South with a rod of iron,” forced the South to “acquiesce” their “time-honored principles” (which likely meant “home-rule”), and had the South “choke down their grievances,” Watson made the South’s enemy, or

“them,” quite clear. The way Southerners were to deal with the Northern Democrats, Watson proposed, was to stand solid while “asking for relief from Wall Street,” “pleading for equal and just laws on finance,” and “begging for mercy against crushing taxation.” By constructing Northern Democrats as enemies or “outsiders,” Watson’s rhetoric gave bitter ex-Confederates a new common enemy, and as the theorizing on rhetorical scapegoating will tell us, creating a common enemy is a powerful device for unifying a collective.⁶

The New South

Not all ex-Confederates employed the Solid South myth to “soothe their bruised egos” and restore a sense of unity. Some ex-Confederates looked to the future of the South and wished to build alliances with Northerners as allies (and economic investors), not enemies. Fernald J. Bryan explained in his book, *Henry Grady or Tom Watson? The Rhetorical Struggle for the New South, 1880-1890*, that “Military Reconstruction left most Southerners in need of new ways of talking about the South, in need of dialogue about the future of the South” (10). The rhetoric that formed the New South myth gave the less-bitter and less-resentful former Confederates that “new way” of talking about the South.

Three principal themes of this future-tensed and optimistic myth included reconciliation, progress, and Southerners as a chosen people. In terms of reconciliation, the goal of New South advocates was to reunite the North and South

⁶ See especially Kenneth Burke’s work on scapegoating, sacrifice, and victimage in his books *The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology*, *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*, and *A Grammar of Motives*.

as well as reconcile the races. To accomplish this goal, New South rhetors “stress[ed] that war had settled the issues of slavery and disunion, that there were no longer Cavaliers and Puritans, only Americans, that Abraham Lincoln was a typical American, and that harmony prevailed in the South” (Braden *Oratory* 30). The rhetoric of progress, which historian James M. McPherson argued was based on the Yankee example of economic modernization, was also a significant aspect of the New South because “it gave the politicians who came forward after 1885 a means to persuade the Yankee industrialist and banker to risk investments in the South. Furthermore, it served as a means to stir hope of the new generation who had no direct experience with the war” (McPherson 609; Braden *Oratory* 27). And in terms of Southerners as chosen people, New South orators suggested that they were superior to their Northern counterparts and, “it was not long until orators actually [began] telling their listeners how fortunate they were to have faced adversity because it had forced them to change” (Braden *Oratory* 34-35).⁷

Henry Grady, a popular journalist of the Atlanta *Constitution* and skilled orator, was perhaps the most recognized advocate of the New South in the post-war era. Grady often expressed his belief that the Old South was dead and that the Southern people needed to embrace the future with optimism.⁸ In his speech, “The

⁷ Braden has argued that the New South myth was, like Southern oratory in general, a rhetoric of accommodation (*Oratory* 27). For more on the parameters and functions of the New South, see especially Paul M. Gaston’s book, *The New South Creed: A Study in Mythmaking*, and J. Louis Campbell’s article, “In Search of the New South,” *Southern Speech Communication Journal* 47 (1982): 361-388.

⁸ Henry Grady’s rhetoric has been studied by countless historians and rhetorical critics. In his book, *Henry Grady or Tom Watson? The Rhetorical Struggle for the New*

New South” to an audience of potential Northern investors, Grady began by quoting the words of Benjamin H. Hill at Tammany Hall in 1866: “‘There was a South of slavery and secession—that South is dead. There is a South of union and freedom—that South, thank God, is living, breathing, growing every hour.’ These words...true then, and truer now, I shall make my text to-night” (para. 1). After declaring the old South “dead” and the New South “alive,” Grady went on to describe what he envisioned for the New South:

The New South is enamored of her new work. Her soul is stirred with the breath of a new life. The light of a grander day is falling fair on her face. She is thrilling with the consciousness of growing power and prosperity. As she stands upright, full-statured and equal among the people of the earth, breathing the keen air and looking out upon the expanding horizon, she understands that her emancipation came because in the inscrutable wisdom

South, 1880-1890, rhetorical critic Ferald J. Bryan argued that Grady, “regarded himself as a prophet” whose goal was to uplift and rebuild the South (2). Harold Mixon, another rhetorical critic, argued in his essay, “Henry Grady as a Persuasive Strategist,” that Grady’s New South speeches developed three basic themes: economic and industrial diversification, race relations, and nationalism, which were designed for the purpose of encouraging Southerners to think optimistically about their new future (76). C. Vann Woodward summed up Grady “as an orator of national fame [who] advertised opportunities for investment in his region, celebrated the self-made man, and preached ‘reconciliation’ with the Northeast” (*Origins* 147). Also see W. Stuart Towns’ discussion of Henry Grady’s “optimistic” New South rhetoric in relation to the otherwise “bitter” rhetoric of the South. Towns argued that while much of the rhetoric and oratory after the war remained defensive, “There were some, however, who did try to create and enhance national reconciliation; Lucius Q. C. Lamar and Henry W. Grady were recognized in both North and South as leading contributors to reunification...While the bitterness continued and the South looked back to the past to forge the myths of the Lost Cause and of White Supremacy, the era did have the optimism and positive outlook of the New South spokesmen. Their vision was of the future, which was the most positive approach the South had so far seen in its history and was not to see again until the 1970s and 1980s” (7).

of God her honest purpose was crossed and her brave armies were beaten.

(para. 16)

Grady featured this rhetoric of a “new life,” “growing power and prosperity,” and “expanding horizon” in a majority of his discourse as he optimistically described the future of the New South.⁹ Perhaps Grady’s personification here of the New South as a “living, breathing, growing” person who “stands upright” and “understands” with “consciousness” encouraged his listeners to believe that by investing in the New South they were investing in people, maybe even children. Besides the Northern investors, Southerners were also listening to Grady and perhaps allowed themselves to feel “enamored” with their “new work,” their “souls stirred” with the “breath of new life,” and the “light of a grander day...falling fair” on their faces, which would have promoted a much more optimistic and comforting identity than “defeated.” Grady’s belief that God had a hand in the South’s defeat was also evident here: that God wisely chose “her” for “emancipation.” As we will see in the Lost Cause myth, quasi-religious rhetoric and the insistence that Southerners were the chosen people were recurring themes in the rhetoric of the defeated ex-Confederates, likely because identifying with “God’s cause” could mend battered egos better than losing wars could.

⁹ According to W. Stuart Towns, however, the New South envisioned by Henry Grady and other New South advocates did not materialize as planned: “Instead, the darker side of man’s nature prevailed and Jim Crow, lynch laws, and the Ku Klux Klan dominated the section. The South remained defensive and suffered from a continuing crisis of self-confidence” (7).

The Old South

The Old South myth may be traced back to the antebellum years when white Southerners who had access to public discourse began crafting their regional identity as chivalrous, romantic, and aristocratic (although it must be noted that the myth's popularity grew most rapidly after the war ended).¹⁰ Old South rhetors in the post-bellum years preferred to remember the South with the “cult of chivalry” image because it focused on “manners, woman, military affairs, the ideal of the Greek democracy, and romantic oratory,” and because it went hand-in-hand with Southern romanticism, a rhetorical theme that was largely present in popular literature in the South (Osterweis *Romanticism* 87). The romantic theme in Old South rhetoric featured “a kaleidoscopic composite of plantation life, a romantic fantasy dear to southerners: the white-columned mansion, acres of snowy cotton, the coquettish belle, the genteel master, the crooning mammy, singing field hands, reckless young gallants, and a native chivalry” (Braden *Oral* 70). The scene of the Old South was set mainly on the plantation—with the plantation house serving as the ultimate symbol of Southern aristocracy—and the plantation's foremost characters were the white slaveholder and the black slave. The black slave was

¹⁰ For more on the origin of the Old South myth, see especially Wilbur J. Cash's volume, *The Mind of the South*. Here Cash argued that the South was of “one mind” which was born in the Old South. He argued that the term “New South,” for example, was a misnomer because there was only one South—that which was formed by the values and traditions in the Old South. He went on for the rest of the volume to trace the Old South Southern mind through the nineteenth century and into the twentieth. C. Vann Woodward, however, argued that the Old South ideology was actually invented in the years after the war, around 1880, when the South was of a “divided mind” between the Old and New South ideologies (*Origins* 155).

often constructed as a happy and loyal servant: “It was the uniform contention of Southern spokesmen—the press, the clergy, and the politicians—that the slaves liked their status” (Nolan 16).¹¹ The white plantation masters and mistresses were represented in Old South discourse as superior to the slaves, but also as humane, caring, and loving “parents” to their “servants.” Because identity is grounded in memory, many white Southerners in the post-bellum era chose to remember a glorified, romantic, and mythical past with these potent cultural symbols in order to identify themselves in a similar light.

In her speech, “The Civilization of the Old South,” Mildred Lewis Rutherford invoked the aristocracy of the Old South to articulate what she saw as its most recent problem: “Aristocracy then was gauged by manners and morals and not by the size of the bank account, as I fear is too much the case today. Far more time was spent in cultivating the graces and charms of life than in amassing fortunes” (11). For Rutherford, the “graces and charms” of chivalry were what defined Southern aristocracy in the antebellum years, which were the qualities missing from the aristocracy of the day. Rutherford also included a romantic vision of plantation life in her speech as she talked about how “the plantation was the center of social life in the old system and the ‘Big House’ was the center of

¹¹ William R. Taylor found that there were two conflicting representations of slaves in antebellum literature: “The first is concerned with portraying the Negro as a child-dependent, while the other, which has almost exactly the reverse effect, is directed at dehumanizing the Negro by dwelling on his physical characteristics and stressing his animality” (304). Negative and dehumanizing representations of black slaves are largely absent in Old South rhetoric: those images are normally (although not exclusively) evoked in Solid South rhetoric.

plantation life,” as well as her reminiscences of the happy and loyal “servants” on the Rutherford plantation: “How they sang! How they danced! How they laughed! How they shouted! How they bowed and scraped and complimented! So free, so happy!” (8, 7).¹² Rutherford even included a romanticized vision of the familial relationship between the plantation owners and their “servants:” “There was something in the economic system of the Old South that forged bonds of personal interest and affection between the master’s family and their servants—a pride that was taken the one in the other” (6). By evoking familiar cultural symbols of the white, elite, slave-holding families in the antebellum and post-bellum eras—such as the plantation house and the happy “servants”—Rutherford and other Old South rhetors reminded their listeners that it was the aristocracy, romanticism, and chivalry of the “good old days”—not the defeat, humiliation, or bitterness of their current moment—that defined them.

The Lost Cause

Taking a different approach to defeat were the Lost Cause advocates who declared the South’s innocence in relation to the war and Reconstruction, and who insisted on the Confederacy’s moral and righteous victory against aggressive outside sources despite their military defeat.¹³ The major strategies Lost Cause

¹² This is a direct quotation from William Makepeace Thackeray’s lecture, “Roundabout Papers.” Rutherford thought it accurately matched her memories of slave life on the plantation in the Old South.

¹³ As I discussed in chapter three, the Lost Cause ideology formed immediately after Appomattox as a response to Confederate defeat; but again, as numerous scholars

advocates employed to build the memories of the Lost Cause included, 1) an argument for states' rights, 2) a claim that Confederates were not "rebels" or "traitors," 3) an assertion that slavery was not a cause of war, 4) placing blame for the war at the feet of Northerners and abolitionists, 5) an insistence that the South was not beaten in battle but overwhelmed by numbers and resources, 6) a celebration of great military and political men, and 7) drawing parallels between the plight of Southern Confederates with the plight of early Americans before and during the Revolutionary War, and 8) relying on "quasi-religious" imagery to explain how the Confederates were a chosen people and how their cause was not really "lost."¹⁴ Each of these arguments functioned in different ways yet for the

have persuasively argued, the Lost Cause is still identifiable in public discourse beyond the post-bellum decades and throughout the rest of the twentieth century. The origin of the phrase "Lost Cause" has been traced back to the literary romanticism of the early nineteenth century; specifically, to Sir Walter Scott's legendary tales of Scotland's lost cause. Connelly and Bellows explained the parallels commonly drawn between Scotland's and the Confederacy's struggles for independence: "An antebellum South embroiled in a power struggle with the 'churlish Saxons' of Yankeedom could identify with a heroic Ivanhoes. Small wonder it was that the Rebel battleflag adopted the design of the Scottish St. Andrew's cross, or that Dixie writers during the Reconstruction era attempted to link the ancestry of Robert E. Lee with that of Robert the Bruce" (2). See Connelly's *The Marble Man* for more on how Robert E. Lee biographers attempted to prove that Lee was a descendent of King Robert the Bruce of Scotland and of "Norman blood" (101-102).

¹⁴ The first person often credited with naming the Confederate Lost Cause in the United States is Edward A. Pollard, a Confederate historian and editor of the *Richmond Examiner* who wrote and published a book entitled *The Lost Cause* in 1866. Pollard's rhetoric was emulated shortly thereafter by a host of influential people and organizations across the country. Ex-Confederate president Jefferson Davis, for one, played a significant role in shaping the Lost Cause with his writings. In the time from his prison release in 1867 to his death in 1889, Davis fueled the fire of the "diehard era" (1860-late 1880s) with his rhetoric of "Southern honor," particularly with his two-volume memoir entitled, *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government* (Blight *Race* 258-260). Another major proponent of the Lost Cause was Jubal A. Early, a former Confederate general who fought under Robert E. Lee and whose extensive writings served to glorify military history and the Lost Cause: "Early understood almost immediately after Appomattox that there would be a struggle to control the public memory of the war, worked hard to help shape that memory,

same purpose as the Old South myth: to make white ex-Confederates feel better about themselves by creating favorable memories of their collective past.

As perhaps the most basic rhetorical feature of the Lost Cause, the “states’ rights” argument functioned to justify the cause for which Southerners fought as legal, honorable, and even patriotically American. The basic logic of the states’ rights contention was that the Confederacy, and its individual states, possessed a Constitutional right to secede from the Union. As one historian pointed out, “The premise of this contention was that because the Constitution was silent on the issue, withdrawal from the Union was permitted. It was argued that the states had entered into a compact from which they had the right to withdraw” (Nolan 18). Confederates before, during, and especially after the war held tightly to the belief that they were well within their rights as defined by the Constitution and by their sovereignty as states to secede from the Union and enter the war.¹⁵

The states’ rights argument was often accompanied by an overt denial that those who supported the states right doctrine bore the guilt of rebellion. The logic went that because secession was perfectly legal and Constitutional, “those

and ultimately enjoyed more success than he probably imagined possible” (Gallagher *Early* 6). Early’s most famous writing, *A Memoir of the Last Year of the War*, “stands as a classic Lost Cause tract” (Gallagher *Early* 16). While Pollard, Davis, and Early were not the only three individuals to shape the rhetoric of the Confederate Lost Cause in the post-war era, they were certainly among its most influential contributors.

¹⁵ For an example of the states’ rights argument in action, see especially Edward A. Pollard’s book, *The Lost Cause*, where he argued: “It could not be otherwise, looking to the different political schools of the two sections. In the North, the doctrine of State Rights was generally rejected for the prevalent notion that America was a single democracy...In the South the Union was differently regarded. State Rights was the most marked peculiarity of the politics of the Southern people; and it was this doctrine that gave the Union its moral dignity” (52).

supporting it were not rebels or traitors; there had not been a rebellion or revolution” (Nolan 18). In the controversy over how to name the war between 1861-1865, for example, many Southerners evoked this argument to declare the title, “War of Rebellion,” inaccurate: “Since co-equal, independent states cannot rebel against each other and since the seceding states did not declare war, but fought for the right to set up a government of their own, ‘War of Rebellion’ is totally unacceptable” (Climer 54-55). This kind of rhetoric also served to defend the South’s involvement with the war as patriotic, not rebellious, and it also offered a “corrective” to the North’s version of the war that painted the Confederates as “rebels” and “traitors” (two most unwelcome labels in the South).¹⁶

In order to further justify Confederate involvement in the Civil War, to correct the “false” history being perpetuated by the North, and to comfort those Southerners who felt guilty about the war, some defeated ex-Confederates argued that the South did not fight the war to preserve slavery. Often slavery was minimized in discussions of the war in favor of more “political” and “legal” reasons. In his research, Nolan found that, “Slavery was trivialized as the cause of the war in favor of such things as tariff disputes, control of investment banking and the means of wealth, cultural differences, and conflict between industrial and agricultural societies. In all events, the South had *not* seceded to protect slavery!” (15). Lost Cause advocates also argued that the South would have eventually abandoned slavery on its own, that it was only a matter of time: “If the war was

¹⁶ Even though he was a New South advocate, Henry Grady argued in his 1886 speech, “The New South,” that the war was not a “rebellion” on the part of the South, rather an “honest” and legitimate war (see especially paragraph 17).

about slavery, it was unnecessary to the elimination of slavery because it would have died a natural death. From this premise, it is claimed that the war was foolish, a vain thing on the part of the North” (Nolan 6). Historian Charles C. Osborne explained that Lost Cause proponents were able to evade their feelings of guilt about slavery by “loudly denying that the Confederacy had ever fought for that institution...What better proof of that, they asked, than that the Confederate government had contemplated abolishing slavery on its own and recruiting the freedmen as black soldiers in a last-ditch effort to win the war and preserve independence” (430).¹⁷

Seemingly content with their position that slavery was not a cause of war, that Confederates were not rebels, and that animosity over states’ rights was the “real” cause of war, Lost Cause advocates relieved any lingering guilt by blaming Northerners in general and abolitionists in particular for causing the war. As a matter of fact, Lost Cause crusaders rhetorically constructed the abolitionists as “troublemakers and provocateurs—virtually manufacturing a disagreement between the sections that was of little or no interest to the people and had little substance” (Nolan 16). These unfavorable characterizations of the abolitionists and

¹⁷ Again, for a good example, see Pollard for his stance on slavery as a “non-cause” of war: “The slavery question is not to be taken as an independent controversy in American politics . . . It was the mere incident of a sectional animosity, the causes of which lay far beyond the domain of morals. Slavery furnished a convenient line of battle between the disputants; it was the most prominent ground of distinction between the two sections; it was, therefore, naturally seized upon as a subject of controversy, became the dominant theatre of hostilities, and was at last so conspicuous and violent, that occasion was mistaken for cause, and what was merely an incident came to be regarded as the main subject of controversy” (47).

Northerners were prominent in the antebellum years but did not much change after the war. As I explained in chapter two (pages 63-64), the Northern investors and so-called carpetbaggers still remained much maligned characters in the eyes of Southerners. This scapegoating strategy of blaming the abolitionists—along with the claim that slavery was not a cause of war—helped the defeated ex-Confederates remove the responsibility and guilt for secession and the war from their shoulders and place it squarely at the feet of the North.¹⁸

Besides needing a way to relieve themselves of any feelings of guilt and responsibility for the war and slavery, the people of the South also needed a way to cope with the reality of military defeat and their resultant feelings of humiliation. To achieve this relief, Lost Cause supporters asserted that the Confederate soldiers were never actually beaten in battle; instead, they were overwhelmed by numbers and resources. Otherwise stated, “Might had simply overcome right” (Osborne 429). Osborne explained the logic of this Lost Cause contention further: “The North (the argument ran) could only win with the crushing advantage of superior numbers based on its population, which was so much larger than that of the South” (432). As such, Osborne concluded, “The Union hordes were backed up...by

¹⁸ Jefferson Davis blamed Northerners and abolitionists for starting the war in his book, *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government*. Davis maintained that abolitionists took control of the Republican party, which in turn, railroaded the Congress and the nation into accepting its agenda: “A few zealots in the North afterward created much agitation by demands for the abolition of slavery within the states by federal intervention, and by their activity and perseverance finally became a recognized party which, holding the balance of power between the two contending organizations in that section, gradually obtained the control of one, and to no small degree corrupted the other. The dominant idea, however, at least of the absorbed party, was sectional aggrandizement, looking to absolute control, and theirs is the responsibility for the war that resulted” (3).

overwhelming industrial and technological might that the South, with its more civilized agrarian tradition, could not match” (432). Often to accompany this kind of argument was a suggestion that “the North’s superior resources constituted Yankee trickery and unfairness” (Nolan 17). In addition, Lost Cause arguers often explained that, given the South’s “unfair” material disadvantages, defeat was inevitable from the beginning. The consequent logic was that if the Confederacy could not have won, then somehow it did not lose (Nolan 17).¹⁹

Regardless of whether the Confederacy won or lost the war, advocates of the Lost Cause myth assured the Southern residents that they had the strongest and smartest military leaders fighting for their cause, leaders with whom any Southerner could be proud to be associated. The most popular military men of the Confederacy included Jefferson Davis, Major General Robert E. Lee, and Lieutenant General Thomas J. “Stonewall” Jackson. In his discussion of how such men have been constructed in the Lost Cause ideology, Nolan stated, “These men,

¹⁹ Perhaps one of the first places the “overwhelmed” argument made its appearance was in Edward A. Pollard’s *Lost Cause* within which he enumerated the enormous material advantages the North possessed over the South in terms of manpower, money, and munitions: “Of population, of internal improvements, of manufactures, and of all artificial wealth the North held much the larger share. She had a population of twenty-three millions against eight millions in the South. The North had manufacturing establishments for all the requirements of peace and war. She had the advantages of an unrestrained commerce with foreign nations. She had all the ports of the world open to her ships; she had furnaces, foundries, and workshops; her manufacturing resources compared with those of the South were as five hundred to one; the great marts of Europe were open to her for supplies of arms and stores; there was nothing of material resource, nothing of the apparatus of conquest that was not within her reach; and she had the whole world wherein to find mercenary soldiers and a market for recruits” (131). Historians have found that the North did, in fact, enjoy greater material advantages over the South, but this rhetoric was meant to soothe the bruised egos of a defeated people, not necessarily establish historical fact.

at least the successful ones, are not evaluated simply in terms of their military and leadership skills and combat effectiveness. Although they are surely given such credit, they are also presented as remarkable and saintly creatures, supermen” (18). As a matter of fact, Lee has often been constructed as “Christ-like” or “God-like” in Lost Cause rhetoric, and according to Karen L. Cox, Jefferson Davis had achieved a “cult-like” status among Lost Cause supporters. Besides “the great men,” the individual Confederate soldiers as well as the Confederate army as a whole were also glorified in Lost Cause rhetoric: the Confederate soldier “was invariably heroic, indefatigable, gallant, and law-abiding” and the Confederate army was unmatched in courage and valor (Nolan 17).²⁰

Adding to the recollection of the Confederate people as courageous and valorous, Lost Cause rhetors often justified their mission by comparing themselves to their Revolutionary ancestors. With this strategy, it was argued that the Confederates in 1861 were in the same position as Americans in 1775 at the start of

²⁰ For more on the image of Robert E. Lee, see especially Thomas L. Connelly’s book, *The Marble Man: Robert E. Lee and His Image in American Society*, where he argued that Lee became “a god figure for Virginians, a saint for the white Protestant South, and a hero for the nation...To the postwar South, he was the rationale of the Lost Cause, the proof of the argument that the righteous do not always prevail” (3). Also Thomas L. Connelly’s and Barbara L. Bellows’ work, *God and General Longstreet: The Lost Cause and the Southern Mind*. Connelly and Bellows argued that Robert E. Lee emerged as the “*invincible* military leader” by way of an “enthusiastic cult of followers,” especially in Virginia (26). They also discussed the metaphor that compared Robert E. Lee to Christ (29), and how the defeat at Gettysburg was essentially blamed on General Longstreet (not Lee) so as to preserve Lee’s status as “*invincible*” (34). Charles Osborne, in *Jubal: The Life and Times of General Jubal A. Early, CSA, Defender of the Lost Cause*, also discussed “the shining symbol of this triumph—and the basis of the campaign’s second front—was Robert E. Lee. Early and his supporters, in their writings, speeches, and discourse with other Southerners, and the world, worked indefatigably to elevate Lee to the status of a demi-god” (431-433).

the Revolutionary war: “the cause, they said, had been Southern independence, which they had sought in the same spirit as that of the Revolutionary War for American independence” (Osborne 430). Both narratives portrayed the CSA and the USA as suffering from oppression, seceding from their parent nations, organizing independent governments, adopting constitutions, electing presidents, adopting flags and seals, fighting a war, and glorifying their founders and heroes. Wilson discussed this similarity in *Baptized in Blood*:

Ministers of the Lost Cause identified the Confederate crusade with the virtuous American Revolution...stressed blood ties, real or fantasized, between Confederate and Revolutionary heroes, and they noted that in both wars the virtuous had been invaded and had fought defensively. (40)

By employing Revolutionary rhetoric, establishing that the South was not beaten, only overwhelmed by the North’s strength and numbers, and glorifying “great men,” the Lost Cause crusaders were again defending their cause while building favorable memories of the war.²¹

A final feature of the Lost Cause myth was a reliance on “quasi-religious” rhetoric that gave divine purpose to the war and the Confederate people. In his

²¹ In his book, *The Marble Man*, Thomas L. Connelly further explained that, “the attempt to connect secession with the forefathers of the Revolutionary War was not new...In his inaugural address as President, Davis’s words foreshadowed an idea that sprang up after the war—that the causes were comparable. He spoke of how the Revolutionary fathers had designed a government based on the principle of a compact of states, with the inherent right to withdraw if the government violated the compact. The South had been true to the Constitution, while the North had violated it by attacks upon the expansion of slavery and other issues” (96). Another occasional feature of Revolutionary rhetoric was that Virginia, a Southern state, won the Revolutionary War and established American government (96).

article, “The Doctrine of Victorious Defeat in the Rhetoric of Confederate Veterans,” Howard Dorgan argued that the Confederate veterans constructed an apologetic oratory in the post-war era to “satisfactorily explain the sharp variance between ante-bellum expectations and post-bellum realities” (119). Specifically, Dorgan found that the Confederate veterans employed a “quasi-religious rhetoric of sacrifice, immolation, and regeneration” to help them explain “the Southern defeat in terms of a divine will which envisioned an eventual dominance of Confederate principles” (“The Doctrine” 123). Wilson made similar observations about “Southerners try[ing] to come to terms with defeat, giving rise to the Lost Cause” via religious rhetoric in his book, *Baptized in Blood*. Wilson went even further than Dorgan and argued that, “Religion was at the heart of [the South’s] dream, and the history of the attitude known as the Lost Cause was the story of the use of the past as the basis for a Southern religious-moral identity, an identity as a chosen people” (1). The quasi-religious rhetoric of the Lost Cause, then, helped former Confederates define their defeat as a moral, God-given victory and themselves as chosen people (recall, the rhetoric of Southerners as chosen people was a comforting feature of the New South myth as well).²²

²² In making his case, Dorgan found that Richard Henry Lee, in a statement at a monument dedication in Clark County, Virginia, explained with quasi-religious rhetoric how the outcome of the war was not a moral judgment on the Confederacy: “The cause we loved was lost. My friends, it was not lost because our quarrel was not just; not because our leaders were not skillful and our soldiers brave; but because he [sic] who rules above deemed it best it should fail...God is in all history; was in our history during our war” (Lee 205 qtd. in Dorgan “The Doctrine” 128). Dorgan argued that Lee’s statement implied that “the deity might have acted to thwart immediate justice in order to establish some greater good;” that God “controlled” and “designed” how the Confederacy would go down in history, a plan that was not yet observable (“The Doctrine” 128). The cause, then, for

Speaking about secession and the war with quasi-religious rhetoric served many similar functions as the previous seven Lost Cause strategies: it justified the Southerners' involvement in the war, because God wanted them to prove themselves worthy of being chosen; it relieved them of any guilt or responsibility for starting the war, because that was God's doing; and it also gave them a cause or divine plan to believe in. Quasi-religious rhetoric also functioned to glorify the Confederate army, soldiers, and leaders as "God-like" and "Christ-like." Even when Lost Cause advocates made the argument that Confederates fought to protect their states' rights and not to protect slavery, it could be reasoned that these were God's ways of testing His chosen ones. Such divine memories of the South's past were infinitely more agreeable than memories of defeat and loss, and defining themselves as "patriotic" and "chosen people" rather than as "traitors" and "losers" helped bitter and resentful white Southerners feel better about themselves and their cause.

The fact that Lost Cause crusaders sometimes invoked quasi-religious rhetoric when expressing the other seven areas of the myth—or even across myths, such as often the case with the New South myth—is illustrative of the fact that the four Southern myths all borrowed from each other and were interconnected in various ways. For example, critics may find evidence of rhetors evoking images from the Old South myth in their constructions of the Solid South, or in the rhetoric of the New South, a critic may find traces of the Lost Cause. Waldo W. Braden

which the Confederacy suffered defeat was planned by God and therefore more sanctified than only the war.

explained the tendency of these four particular myths to overlap and borrow from each other:

Having a tangled genealogy, the four myths are sometimes difficult to isolate because they seldom appeared alone or in a simple or pure form. They were activated by common terminology...appealed to common states of readiness and drew support from revered events and sentiments. Because they shared common sub-myths, they were multidimensional, overlapping, and intertwined. (*Oratory* 35)

In addition to the propensity of myths to share each other's rhetoric, the myths may also appear in incomplete forms. In fact, because all eight of the Lost Cause arguments are rarely present in a single message, a Lost Cause message may only draw upon a few of the arguments presented in this chapter, for example, or a message of the New South may only focus on reconciliation and not progress or Southerners as chosen people.

To elucidate the point of "tangled genealogy" and to see the Lost Cause myth in action, it is useful to examine some primary discourse. For instance, Fanny Downing, a noted Southern poet, wrote in 1868 that General Lee was seen by Southerners as "bathed in the white light which falls directly upon him from the smile of an approving and sustaining God," and in 1875, Robert Stiles, a soldier in Lee's army, remembered Lee as, "The grandest thing in all the world to us...when he loved us like a father and led us like a king, when we trusted him like a providence and obeyed him like a god" (Downing 194-195; Stiles 42). These

statements by loyal ex-Confederates were clearly quasi-religious in content—God “smiled” on General Lee and his soldiers trusted him like a divine “providence”—while at the same time they glorified the “great men” of the Lost Cause. The larger function of these rhetorical strategies was to build a flattering and even “divine” memory of the Confederacy. In this case, that goal was attempted with two Lost Cause strategies rather than one.

An example that shows how the myths intersected across one another, not just within, is Henry Grady’s 1886 speech, “The New South.” Although Grady largely advanced an optimistic New South ideology, Grady also addressed the Lost Cause issue of “war not rebellion” in his speech. He explained to his audience, “The South has nothing for which to apologize. She believes that the late struggle between the States was war and not rebellion, revolution and not conspiracy, and that her convictions were as honest as yours...The South has nothing to take back” (para. 17). Grady’s primary goal was to reunite the sections so that the North would invest in the “up-and-coming” South, and while his statement here may seem defiant, he was actually attempting to build identification between Southerners and Northerners by showing how Confederates believed they were fighting a legitimate and “honest” war to defend their “convictions,” just as the Northerners believed they were doing the same. In other words, Grady didn’t want his Northern audiences to think they were dealing with a bunch of “rebels” and “traitors,” but a legion of honest and loyal “patriots.”

The “Mythical” Context of the UDC

Given the “tangled genealogy” of myths and the United Daughters of the Confederacy’s penchant for mythical rhetoric, all four of the Southern myths appeared at some point in the UDC’s discourse, but by examining their overall rhetoric, it is evident that the Daughters most explicitly utilized the Old South and Lost Cause myths.²³ Taking into account that the UDC was organized to remember and honor those who fought in the war and the South’s collective past, these rhetorical choices are hardly surprising. The Old South myth gave the women the rhetorical material they needed to build positive memories of the antebellum era whereas the rhetoric of the Lost Cause allowed the Daughters to build “correct” histories of the South, the Civil War, and Reconstruction by justifying the Southern position and declaring its innocence.²⁴

²³ The *Confederate Veteran*, the UDC’s most prominent public forum, encouraged contributors to omit the terms “New South” and “Lost Cause” from their submissions. J. W. Sandell, in a letter to the December 1912 edition of the *Confederate Veteran*, sought to remind contributors that, “The ideas conveyed by these terms are contradicted by facts, for there is no New South in this Southland....No, we want no word, new or old, to separate us from the South of our fathers....The ‘Lost Cause’ is an expression of despair that is inconsistent with the spirit of the Southern people. It is especially so of the real cause—peace—which was the leading principle of the Confederacy” (573). Even though the terms were discouraged in the *Confederate Veteran*, the ideas of those myths were not; although admittedly, while the Lost Cause myth saturated the *Confederate Veteran* and the UDC’s discourse in general, any ideas of the New South are difficult to find.

²⁴ Many of the white, conservative, elite women who flocked to the UDC and employed the imagery of the Old South were raised on plantations and could personally identify with that memory, and as Cox argued, “Certainly, the images of plantations and faithful slaves held more appeal to them than the ‘dark days’ of Reconstruction in which they grew to maturity. Likewise, the Old South was more palatable than the industrial filth and mammonism that accompanied the ‘New South’—an expletive in their vocabulary” (59-60).

What follows in this section, then, is an examination of the UDC's rhetoric as an organization. This treatment shows the UDC themselves as part of the rhetorical context for the catechism authors; in other words, the authors not only pulled from the historical and mythical contexts of the time, they also followed the lead of their organization and used the same rhetorical resources. Therefore, this section will lay the groundwork for the following two chapters in which I examine the collective memory-making strategies and moves to constitute a "Southern people" in their catechisms for children.

When constructing their recollections of the South's past, many UDC members incorporated the chivalry, aristocracy, and romanticism of the Old South myth into their public discourses. For example, in a speech to the UDC annual convention in 1897, Mrs. D. Giraud Wright mused that when looking back on the South's past, "We see, as in a vision, what was surely the fairest land that ever held a people's love—a land crowned with stately homes radiant with a gracious hospitality; men, brave, gentle, and courteous, the models for all time of a dauntless chivalry" (4). Wright unmistakably valued the aristocracy and chivalry of the Old South when she described how the Southland was "crowned" in royal fashion with "stately homes" of "gracious hospitality," and was inhabited by "courteous" and "gentle" men. Those men of high honor were the same men who rebuilt Southern cities such as Atlanta, Georgia, after the war, as Cornelia Branch Stone reminded her audience in 1908:

This has been largely wrought by the same men and their descendents who, in ante-bellum days, were the refined and cultured gentlemen of leisure...Men of chivalry and honor, like the knights of old, with a devotion and protecting reference [sic] for woman, that ennobled and adorned their high character. ("Mrs. Stone's" 20)

Clearly unwilling to let the old South die, what Stone asked was for her audience to believe that the chivalric, "refined," and "high character" of the old South was still alive and well in their Southern "knights."

Believing that chivalry and aristocracy formed the core of their "character," the Daughters layered on romantic images of plantation life and slavery to fill out their remembrances of the antebellum South. In her 1912 essay, "Vivid Reminiscences of the Old Plantation," Cornelia Branch Stone declared, "Ring out, memory bells, and carry me back to the golden days of childhood and life on the old plantation, where my mother and father presided over their children in the 'great house' and their large family of darkies in the quarters" (568). By evoking her fond memories of childhood in the "great house" through the romantic sound of "memory bells," Stone reminisced further: "I fancy I hear again the soft, sweet melody of the banjo as the pickaninnies danced in front of the cabin door by the light of the moon, or when fair Luna's face was turned away by the lightwood torch burning so brightly on the high scaffold" ("Vivid" 568). The romantic imagery here can hardly be missed: Stone's rhetorical depiction of plantation life invited her Southern audience to visualize happy slave children who were considered part of

the “family” as they danced along to a banjo sounding out its harmonious tune outside the “great house” amidst the glow of moonlight. Even if Stone’s audience did not grow up on a plantation, these memories were far more pleasant than the “dark days” of war and Reconstruction, and likely more desirable for all defeated Southerners struggling to redefine themselves.

Of course, Stone’s romantic recollection of the antebellum South would not have been complete without the memories of the “happy and loyal” slaves who lived on the plantations. Ann E. Snyder, in her 1890 history book entitled, *The Civil War from a Southern Stand-Point*,²⁵ informed her readers that, “the great body of slaves were kindly treated, and they were a healthy, contented, and prolific race, noted for their muscular development, musical genius, and jolly good humor” (306). Stone explained to her readers, “In the cabin or in the field their hearts and voices were full of song, and in looking back they seemed to me to have been the happiest people I have ever known, free of all responsibility or care” (“Vivid” 569). Stone seemed to prefer musical metaphors and imagery in her discourse—“voices full of song,” “ring out memory bells,” “soft, sweet melody of the banjo”—possibly suggesting that a “harmony” existed between the slaves and the slave-owners. Perhaps more significantly, though, is that such highly romanticized visions of the slaves functioned rhetorically to refute the Northern and abolitionist argument that slavery was a “cruel” system of human bondage. Instead, in the Old South vision

²⁵ This book (which also goes by the title, *History of the Civil War*) was endorsed by the UDC as a “supplemental reader in the schools” at the 1894 annual convention (Poppenheim et al. 135).

of slavery, the “servants” were happy and enjoying life on the plantation, almost as much as the plantation owners themselves.

In case there was any doubt to their audiences that slavery was a humane system within which the “happy and loyal servants” thrived, some Daughters reported on a familial relationship between the plantation owners and “their large family of darkies in the quarters” (Stone “Vivid” 568). Sarah Price Thomas argued in an essay entitled, “Was ‘Ole Mis’ Lazy,” that the plantation mistresses took care of the “servants” as they would their own families:

they were present at all the births and most of the deaths, superintended the preparation of the body for burial, and more than often read prayers over the grave. Here, again, a large part of their work is touched upon, the spiritual responsibility for the slaves. (351)

In Thomas’s view, the slaves were treated as family members by the plantation family out of “spiritual responsibility,” whereas to Cornelia Branch Stone, the slaves were treated well out of “caste” responsibility:

My father was a typical gentleman of the old school, cultured and refined, with that high sense of honor which would have scorned to abuse the authority that he possessed as lord of the manor; hence his servants and dependents were always kindly and justly treated, and he taught his children that was an evidence of bad breeding to be otherwise than polite and respectful to the servants and considerate to all who were less fortunately placed in life than themselves....Public sentiment in the South was opposed

to any cruel treatment of the negroes, and a planter who was not kind to his slaves lost caste and the respect of his neighbors; and even if humanity had not so prompted, it was to the interest of the planter to give the best care to his slaves. (“Vivid” 569)

For the Stone family, kind treatment of their slaves was essentially a status symbol: they treated their “servants” well so as to uphold their aristocratic and chivalric values, not because of a “spiritual responsibility.” If they treated their slaves badly, the Stone family would have lost clout in their aristocratic neighborhood, an embarrassment evidently not welcomed by any family of “good breeding” in the antebellum South. But again, the function of such a construction was to refute the argument that slavery was a cruel and inhumane system and to give the defeated ex-Confederates a pleasant memory to embrace as they dealt with defeat.

The Lost Cause arguments for states’ and Constitutional rights and Confederates as “not rebels” appeared often in the UDC’s historical discourses as the women sought to justify the South’s involvement in the war and paint the Southern people as innocent patriots and chosen people. Historian Karen L. Cox argued that refuting claims of rebellion actually became a major objective of the UDC: “Indeed, the Daughters made it their mission to reverse the trend of vilification to one of vindication. No longer would southerners be painted as ‘traitors’ or ‘rebels,’ but heroes and defenders of the United States Constitution” (144). In 1899, Miss Kate Mason Rowland proposed a resolution that passed unanimously by the UDC General Convention to strike the phrase “War of

Rebellion” from Southern histories. In her plea to the Daughters, Rowland argued, “I need not remind the Daughters of the Confederacy that the ‘foul, dishonoring’ term of ‘rebellion’ can have no application to the action of sovereign States in withdrawing from the compact to which they were parties through the Constitution of 1787” (73). Rowland’s statement simultaneously addressed two Lost Cause arguments in one message: that the Confederates could not be labeled “rebels” because they were only exercising their Constitutional rights as “sovereign States” to secede from the Union.

To further release the South from any guilt over slavery and the war, the Daughters drew repeatedly on the Lost Cause arguments that slavery was not the cause of war and that actually it was the North and abolitionists who started the war. Mildred Lewis Rutherford asserted such sentiments in her 1916 speech, “The Civilization of the Old South:”

Had the South prevailed, the Union would have been preserved and that too by the Constitution. Our negroes would have long ago been freed by gradual emancipation, as Southern slave-holders had already done,...and, had no interference come from the abolitionists, there would be now no race problem to adjust. (17)

So according to Rutherford, not only was slavery not a cause of war—because the South was already “gradually emancipating” its slaves—but the North and abolitionists were actually to blame for fueling the fire that eventually caused the “unnecessary” war between the sections. Additionally, the bitter attitude many

Southerners had towards civil rights or the abolitionist-created “race problem,” as Rutherford called it, was clearly evident here.

The UDC also employed Lost Cause rhetoric to cast the South as being “overwhelmed” in battle rather than “beaten,” the Confederate armies as “wearing themselves out beating the Yankees,” and concluding that since the South was destined to lose from the beginning, they were never truly defeated. In *A Narrative of the Civil War*, Ann E. Snyder wrote in her concluding chapter that, “the North was rich in men and resources, and her armies stretched in an almost unbroken line from the Potomac to the Rio Grande. What could a Confederate victory avail against such a power, with the whole world for a recruiting ground” (182)? Given the North’s superior material advantages, Snyder remarked that, “The South had worn herself literally out with the victories won from the Federals,” but went even a step further to ponder, “with a depleted army and an exhausted commissary, one only wonders in admiration that divine courage could so triumph over the weakness of human physical nature as to enable those veterans of the Army of Virginia and the Army of Tennessee to resist so long and so bravely” (182).

But Snyder did not stop at just declaring a material win for the North and glorifying the unusual courage of the Confederate troops. She also made abundantly clear to her readers that the South was destined to lose from the beginning, which only proved the soldiers’ courage in fighting a “lost cause” even more:

The South, though she had gained victory after victory, never had a force adequate to consummate the war in a complete victory for the Confederacy. Therefore, from the beginning it was merely a question of time when those very first victories themselves, as paradoxical as it may seem, hastened defeat. (182)

Giving the people of the South courageous and patriotic heroes with whom to identify, the UDC glorified the Confederate army and its “god-like” military leaders with their rhetoric. At the fourth annual UDC convention held in Maryland, the president of the Baltimore chapter, Mrs. D. Giraud Wright, opened the meeting with these words: “Thirty-six years ago the State of Maryland sent twenty thousand of her sons to battle for the South. They were the flower of chivalry, the bravest knights in the noblest quest that ever fired the heart of cavalier” (3). What is remarkable about this statement is that Wright engaged the language of the Old South myth to justify a Lost Cause belief: that the brave soldiers of the Confederate army were also “chivalric” and “noble” cavaliers. But also notice the reference to the soldiers as “knights,” which rings of Sir Walter Scott’s lost cause narratives. Shortly after Wright’s welcoming address, Mrs. J. D. Beale of Alabama presented the convention with a gift: “I have the honor of presenting to you this gavel, inlaid with memories of our cherished martyr President [Jefferson Davis], together with admiration of his statesmanship and virtues of Christian manhood” (5). Such discourse indicates that the Daughters were just as proud of their “brave” and “chivalrous” army as they were of their “martyred” president. The reliance on

quasi-religious rhetoric to describe the “god-like” and “martyred” men was typical in these constructions, as was the mention of Old South chivalry.

As the Daughters worked to justify the Confederate cause and establish their innocence in their public memories, they wove Revolutionary rhetoric into their discourse as well. Historian Patricia F. Climer explained the UDC’s penchant for this kind of rhetoric:

The Daughters believe that the Revolutionary War and the War Between the States were both the result of that same cause: the right of local self-government. By claiming this, they have been able to draw a parallel between the thirteen colonies fighting to overthrow an unjust government and establish one that more nearly met the needs of the majority of the people and the Confederate States of America fighting for the right to interpret the constitution according to their views. (59-60)

In her 1899 address to the UDC, Miss Kate Mason Rowland drew a parallel between the meaning of the term “rebel” in Civil War times and its meaning in Revolutionary times: “it was with Washington and our heroes of the Revolution as it was with the Confederates. The terms ‘rebel’ and ‘rebellion’ were used by their enemies only, and these epithets of reproach were indignantly repudiated by the patriots of 1776, just as they were by the patriots of 1861” (74). Again, notice that Rowland answered one Lost Cause concern (Confederates as “rebels”) with another Lost Cause strategy (Revolutionary rhetoric), which not only served to defend the South’s position in the war, but also rebutted the argument that Confederates were

“rebels” and “traitors.” In another example, Ann E. Snyder argued that, “After four days’ deliberation this body [of provisional Confederate delegates] adopted a Constitution for the Confederate States of America, which differed very little from the Constitution of the United States of America” (*A Narrative* 14). By aligning themselves with the fore-founders and one of their sacred documents—the Constitution—Snyder’s readers were invited to believe that what the Confederacy did to assert its freedom from the United States was similar—and therefore, justified—to the actions America took against England.

Religion played a major role in the UDC organization. From awarding bronze “crosses” of honor to Confederate veterans who fought in the “holy” war, to the prayers they recited at the beginning of their meetings, and even right down to the “catechisms” they wrote for Southern children, the UDC’s work was saturated with quasi-religious symbolism and rhetoric. One Daughter even declared that the UDC’s work was sanctioned by God Himself. In her speech, “Work and Spirit of the United Daughters,” Mrs. W. B. Prichard announced, “Where the heart and mind are full of good, evil finds no room; and under God the U. D. C. has done more to encourage good feeling than any other agency” (17).

In the UDC’s rhetoric, God was not only on the women’s side, but also on the side of the Confederacy. On more than one occasion, the UDC recalled the Confederate defeat as a God-given victory and Confederates as a chosen people, especially in the UDC’s Prayer recited at the beginning of the annual convention in 1929:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we adore Thy love and Providence, in the history of our country, and especially we thank Thee for our Confederate history. We thank Thee for its pure record of virtue, valor and sacrifice; and for the inspiring reflection that, despite its bitter disappointments and sorrows, it proclaims for us, to all the world, that we came through its years of trial and struggle with our battered shields pure, our character as a patriotic and courageous people untarnished, and nothing to regret in our defense of the rights and the honor of our Southland. (UDC Program 32)

In this prayer, the white Confederates were the chosen people because they remained “untarnished” after God tested them with “trial and struggle.” The Prayer also implied that the Confederacy truly won the war between 1861 and 1865 because their “shields” remained “pure,” even after facing “bitter disappointments and sorrows.” What is also worth noting is how the Daughters thanked God for their history: that they have God to thank for proving to “the world” that they really were the most “virtuous” by way of their Godly “sacrifice.” Mrs. J. Jefferson Thomas made a similar contention in a speech delivered to the UDC annual convention in 1896: “A country is never really grand until it has had its baptism of sorrow, its pathetic legends and its historic fame” (5).

In case there remained any doubt that the Confederate cause was just, that the Confederate people fought a holy war sanctioned by God, and that the Confederacy emerged as the true victor, one only needed to listen to Mrs. Thos. B.

Pugh's speech delivered to the 1902 general convention. Pugh informed her audience that "Louisiana is the only State which gave a bishop of the church to the great Southern army of martyrs" (6). She went on to detail this holy man's part in the war: "When Bishop Polk laid aside the robes of the church militant that wages war against 'the world, the flesh and the devil,' and donned his country's gray to wage a holy war against invaders and oppressors, he was as faithful a soldier under the Southern cross as he had been under the cross of Christ" (6-7). The fact that a bishop fought in the Confederacy's "holy war" under the "Southern cross" only helped the UDC and other Lost Cause crusaders make their case that the "War Between the States" was a just war fought for a just cause.

What this examination of the UDC's discourse shows is that the Daughters relied on the rhetoric of the Old South and Lost Cause myths to serve numerous and various purposes as they addressed the South's rhetorical crises. The Old South myth helped the UDC craft romantic, chivalric, and aristocratic memories of the South for bitter ex-Confederates, even for those Southerners who did not live on plantations, own slaves, or belong to elite castes. Such a pleasant recollection of the South's past ultimately functioned to soothe the "maimed" egos of the defeated ex-Confederates. The women also relied on the Lost Cause myth, which provided the Daughters with a rhetoric to justify the South's participation in slavery, secession, and the war, to craft the Southern people as patriotic chosen people, not traitors, and to comfort the defeated South by relieving it of any guilt or responsibility. And even though the myths of the New South and the Solid South

were not as outwardly prominent in the Daughters' discourse, given the tangled genealogy of the four Southern myths, one may certainly find traces of their rhetorics, as we will see in the next two chapters.

Conclusion

The United Daughters of the Confederacy's rhetorical choices of the Old South and Lost Cause myths made sense given the historical context within which they organized and worked. In the years between 1865 and 1930, in addition to physically rebuilding the South, the former Confederates, including the UDC, struggled to preserve their memories and restore identity in ways that relieved feelings of defeat, humiliation, and bitterness. Rhetorical myths helped them do just that. The women's choices of rhetoric also made sense considering the rhetorical context of the era, because as we have seen in this chapter, mythical responses to the South's crises were common at that time.

Now with the historical and rhetorical contexts of the catechisms established, we may examine the texts themselves to see how the authors drew from these contexts to construct their catechisms for children. The next chapter looks at the women's strategies in building mythic collective memories of the South's past. These memories not only helped the UDC address the South's memory crisis at the time, they also formed a collective history that the women would also draw upon to constitute the Children as the next generation of "Southern people."

Chapter Five: Mythical Memories of the South

It seems to me that our error lies in embalming, as it were, historic truths and putting them away in the tomb of the Confederacy—making them as devoid of energizing influence as an Egyptian mummy—instead of bringing them and keeping them ever before us in the vital, living present. Memory is not a passivity, but an ever active faculty....History should be made to serve its true purpose by bringing its lessons into the present and using them as a guide to the future. (11)

—From Adelia A. Dunovant’s speech, “Principles in Their Relation to Human Action.” United Daughters of the Confederacy General Meeting. Wilmington, NC. 13 November 1901.

Immediately after the Civil War ended, as we have seen, a rhetorical situation took shape that signaled the need for memory as the Southern people mourned the death of their Confederate nation and the men who fought and died to preserve it. Memorial organizations formed in response to this exigency, and it was the women’s memorial associations organized after Reconstruction, especially the United Daughters of the Confederacy, that became the most successful in commemorating the War and the Southern past. In this chapter’s epigraph, Adelia A. Dunovant positioned herself as an “authority” of collective memory.¹ Like Dunovant, the women of the UDC devoted their organization to keeping the

¹ Recall that in chapter two (page 85-92), I argued that the Southern women who joined the United Daughters of the Confederacy justified their involvement in public organizations and constructed themselves as authorities of collective memory by insisting that they were “non-political,” declaring that they were “called” to do the patriotic yet “feminine” work of commemoration, dedicating themselves to traditionally “feminine” areas (i.e., working with children and “sentimentalizing”), and reassuring Southern men that preserving Southern manhood was at the heart of all their public work.

South's past "vital" and "living" in the present for the purpose of "guiding the future." It was a mission the Daughters accepted whole-heartedly, particularly those who authored catechisms for children.

With their catechisms in hand, the Children of the Confederacy members would arrive at their Chapter meetings having read, studied, and memorized the contents of their books: these Children were ready for the catechism ritual. After saluting the Confederate flag, reciting the C. of C. Creed, and discussing which historical project to pursue next, the catechism ritual would begin. Depending on the Chapter, the leader would ask roughly fifteen questions from the catechisms. After each question was asked, the Children who knew the answer would stand to be recognized, each hoping to be the first one up. The Chapter leader recognized the first Child and asked them to recite the answer to the question. If that Child answered correctly, he or she received three points; otherwise, the next Child up could attempt to answer. If no one could answer, the leader would call "Books" and allow the Children to scan their catechisms for the right answer. The Child answering from the catechism only received one point, though, so it behooved the Children to memorize their catechisms so as to earn the most points and be the winner of the catechism quiz.²

² Because I cannot locate any first-hand accounts of the catechism rituals in UDC meeting minutes, books, or in any of the materials at the Caroline Meriwether Goodlett Library in Richmond, Virginia, I have pieced together what a typical meeting may have been like from my interview with Brenda Latham, Chapter leader of the Skylark Chapter of the C. of C. in Richmond, from the C. of C. General meeting minutes from 2002, and the 1999 *Catechism on the History of the Confederate States of America: 1861-1865*. Seeing as how the UDC closely honors and adheres to tradition, I can assume that the ritual has not changed much since its early days.

In this chapter, I analyze how the UDC drew from the rhetorical context of the time to make mythical collective memories with the Children's catechisms. While the literature on collective memory tends to consider how memories function in public discourse, I focus instead on how those memories themselves were constructed.³ The women's memory-construction involved crafting four historical narratives of the South's past. These narratives served to engender mythical collective memories of the South's past; therefore, I analyze the strategies the women employed to transform those narratives into collective memories for their readers.⁴ The collective memories the women constructed would begin to fill the storehouse of rhetorical resources available to the Children as Southern rhetorical subjects as well as form the historical backbone of the "Southern people."

³ In chapter one (pages 7-17), I reviewed the collective memory literature and cited such scholars as Maurice Halbwachs, John Bodnar, and Bruce E. Gronbeck as being instrumental to my definition of collective memory. I defined collective memory as a group's or an individual's strategic, rhetorical construction of the past in order to influence the present or future conditions of the public. These scholars have also convinced me that collective memories are strategically constructed as narratives or stories about a public's past and may function in multiple ways; to build an individual's or group's subjectivity, for instance. Revisit chapter one for my complete literature review on collective memory studies.

⁴ In this chapter, I attempt to contribute to the study of Southern memory because as historian Fitzhugh W. Brundage has argued, "To date...surprisingly little work has been done on the historical memory of the South" (3). Brundage also argued for the significance of such a line of study: "If characterizations of southern memory are to be meaningful, attention should be given to what kind of history southerners have valued, what in their past they have chosen to remember and forget, how they have disseminated the past they have recalled, and to what uses those memories have been put. We need, in short, a social history of remembering the South" (3). By the end of this chapter, I believe I address each of Brundage's points.

Making Mythical Narratives

The UDC catechism authors exploited the “tangled genealogy” of the Southern myths, particularly the Old South and Lost Cause myths,⁵ to construct four narratives of the South’s past. First, in their slavery narrative, the women told of a peaceful Old South wherein the chivalrous and aristocratic slave owners lived in harmony with their “happy and loyal” slaves. In this narrative, the slave owners treated their “servants” with respect while the slaves loyally “protected” their masters. The authors immediately followed this narrative with a secession narrative in which the unfair and hypocritical abolitionist-led North invaded the peaceful Old South by violating their Constitutional guarantee to states’ rights, leaving the South with no choice but to secede from the United States of America. Following the secession narrative with the Civil War or “War Between the States” narrative, the authors built a story of the Confederacy being “tricked” and “forced” into an unwanted and “unprovoked” war by the North. Yet despite their reluctance to fight, the “great men” of the Confederacy rose to the occasion and fought the Northern bully until the Confederates were eventually “overwhelmed” on the

⁵ In chapter four we learned that the Old South myth described the antebellum South with romantic, aristocratic, and chivalrous rhetoric (this last type of rhetoric also known as the “cult of chivalry”). Also from chapter four we saw that the major rhetorical features of the Lost Cause myth included, 1) an argument for states’ rights, 2) a claim that Confederates were not “rebels” or “traitors,” 3) an assertion that slavery was not a cause of war, 4) placing blame for the war at the feet of Northerners and abolitionists, 5) an insistence that the South was not beaten in battle but overwhelmed by numbers and resources, 6) a celebration of great military and political men, and 7) drawing parallels between the plight of Southern Confederates with the plight of early Americans before and during the Revolutionary War, and 8) relying on “quasi-religious” imagery to explain how the Confederates were a “chosen people” and how their cause was not really “lost.”

battlefield. Finally, in their Radical Reconstruction narrative, the catechism authors painted the portrait of a “Negro ruled,” “military dominated,” poverty-stricken, and corrupt South where outsiders such as the carpetbaggers feasted on the South’s devastation. All four of these narratives portrayed the South as an innocent victim allowing the women, and thereby the Children as Southern rhetorical subjects, to justify slavery, secession, the War, and even the KKK with their rhetoric. It was these four mythical narratives that the women would transform into collective memories with their inventive and creative rhetorical strategies.

The Slavery Narrative

In their slavery narrative, the catechism authors constructed the slave system as benevolent and civilized, a move that would help the women justify slavery to the Children and establish the South’s innocence in the subsequent three narratives. The women relied heavily upon the Old South myth when designing this narrative, particularly when building the slave characters, because the Old South myth typically talked about the slaves as “happy and loyal” members of the plantation families, as children, or as property. The catechism authors did not explicitly portray the slaves as family members in their narrative, although they did construct a benevolent relationship between the slaves and plantation families, even while describing the slaves as property. The basic plotline of the slavery narrative was stative as the women described a mutually beneficial and peaceful coexistence between the slaves and their owners. Consistent with the perspective of that

plotline, the actions of these main characters were simple expressions of loyalty and care. Surprisingly, the typical Old South setting that featured the majestic plantation house and the snowy fields of cotton did not make an appearance in the catechisms, perhaps because that Old South image had already been so firmly established enthymematically in the public consciousness.⁶ Even without the setting, the catechism authors vividly depicted their narrative of antebellum slavery.

At the center of their slavery narrative, the women characterized the slaves as happy and loyal, which helped the authors tell their story of a peaceful Old South in which slavery was a mutually beneficial arrangement. Take for instance Cornelia Branch Stone and Decca Lamar West as they answered the question, “What was the feeling of the slaves toward their masters?” with the reply, “They were faithful and devoted and were always ready and willing to serve them” (Stone 5; West 12). The adjectives “faithful” and “devoted” cast the slaves as loyal friends or family acquaintances, not as unpaid, forced laborers. With such descriptions of the slaves in place, the actions the women gave them were consistent:

How did [the slaves] behave during the war? They nobly protected and cared for the wives of soldiers in the field, and widows without protectors; though often prompted by the enemies of the South to burn and plunder the homes of their masters, they were always true and loyal. (Stone 5; West 12)

⁶ One only needs to think about Margaret Mitchell’s Pulitzer Prize winning novel, *Gone with the Wind*, published in 1936 and the movie adaptation in 1939 to realize the popular image of the Old South, plantations, and slave relations.

The actions of “protecting” and “caring” were consistent with the temperament of the slaves as “true” and “loyal,” not to mention that such portrayals of the slaves answered any Northern charges of forced servitude or even rebellion on the part of the slaves. Even the adverb “nobly” hinted that the slaves were as chivalrous as their owners and part of a respectable system. Taken together, these sentimentalized Old South characterizations and actions triggered the impression that slavery was a benevolent and even voluntary institution. Such a perspective “forgot,” of course, the reports of slaves of cruel and inhumane treatment.

Adding another layer and more support to the slavery narrative, the catechisms cast Southern slave owners into the role of kind gentlemen, largely with “cult of chivalry” rhetoric. With a question-answer set that simultaneously characterized the Southern slave owners as gentleman and their actions as chivalrous, West asked and had the Children answer:

Q. How were the slaves treated? A. With great kindness and care in nearly all cases, a cruel master being rare, and lost the respect of his neighbors if he treated his slaves badly. Self-interest would have prompted good treatment if a higher feeling of humanity had not. (11-12)

According to this mini-narrative, the vast majority of slave owners acted with “kindness and care” toward their slaves because of their “higher feeling of humanity,” a response that functioned as a “corrective” to the abolitionists’ charge that slavery was an inhumane and cruel institution. In this case, reputation in the aristocratic Old South was evidence that poor treatment of the slaves was

unacceptable and even impossible. As such, the Children could rest assured by this narrative that slavery was a respectable, family institution wherein the “happy and loyal” slaves were “kindly treated” by benevolent “masters.” The Children could thus see charges of slavery as an inhumane institution as one of those untruths launched by Northern abolitionists and ex-slaves.

As we can see, the basic plotline of the slavery narrative was simple: chivalrous, aristocratic slave owners treated their slaves with kindness, and in return, the happy and loyal slaves protected and cared for their owners. It was a storyline that “forgot” to mention the involuntary, unpaid labor that defined slavery. And while the women characterized slavery as benevolent with their characters and actions, the authors went even further to characterize slavery itself as a respectable arrangement. For example, the women asked and answered:

Did slavery exist among other civilized nations? Yes, in most all; and our mother country, England, did not emancipate her slaves until 1843, when Parliament paid \$200,000,000 to the owners. (Stone 3; West 9)

The adjective “civilized” described slavery as the women wished it to be remembered, even using England as evidence of another “civilized nation” with slavery.

Portraying the slaves as property in this narrative helped the catechism authors establish the legality of slavery and thereby define it as a Constitutional right. Such a characterization of slavery was of utmost importance in this narrative because it would serve as the justification for secession and war in the subsequent

narratives. Stone and West portrayed the lawful nature of slavery when they asked, “Did the people of the South believe that slavery was right” (Stone 4; West 11)?

The “correct” response had the Children declare:

No, not as a principle; and the colonies of Virginia and Georgia had strongly opposed its first introduction, but after the Constitution of the United States had recognized the slaves as property, and the wealth of the South was largely invested in negroes, they did not feel it was just to submit to wholesale robbery. (Stone 4; West 11)

This question-answer set was layered with rhetorical motives: to prove that slavery was not the South’s fault; to show that the South did not think slavery was “right” and had originally opposed it; and to argue that the Constitution, that most revered American document, had “recognized” slavery as perfectly legal. With this favorable perspective of slavery established, the women were able to frame the fight for slavery as a legal issue, a property right, and most importantly, a fight for the Constitution.

The Narrative of Secession

The authors’ depictions of the slaves as property and slavery as a Constitutional right foreshadowed the secession narrative and prepared the Children to accept the South’s reasons for leaving the Union. To help them build their secession narrative, the catechism authors introduced a new character: the North as law-breaking and hypocritical villain. With their various depictions of the

North and its people as tricky bullies, the women developed the problem of “Yankee interference.” The hero to solve this problem was, not surprisingly, the innocent South as Constitutional crusader. Given the unfavorable character of the North and some of its people, it was easy for the women to explain and justify Southern secession to their young readers.

To set up the “Yankee interference” plotline that would justify Southern secession, the catechism authors had to trigger a conclusion in their readers that the North was an unfair, unlawful, and even tricky villain: the “overwhelmed” argument of the Lost Cause myth helped the women do just that. Take for instance Mrs. James A. Fore’s question and answer in her catechism: “Ques. What caused a further difference between the sections? Ans. The North had a larger representation in Congress, and wanted to force the South to abolish slavery” (1). Recall here Nolan’s observation on page 150 that the “overwhelmed” strategy intonated that the North’s superior material advantages in battle constituted “Yankee trickery and unfairness” (17). While in this example Fore was not referring to being overwhelmed on the battlefield, her statement embodied the very essence of that argument: that the South was never defeated, it was only outnumbered and overpowered. This time, however, the South was overwhelmed by the North’s “larger representation” in Congress, not by their numbers on the battlefield. In either case, the North came across as the unfair bully who wanted to interfere in the South’s business and the South as the innocent, threatened victim.

Adding even more texture to the North's villainous character, the authors oversimplified the North's actions to portray them as hypocritical. For instance, West asked, "Q. After the first introduction of slavery into the colonies, how was the African slave trade kept up" (9)? Clearly establishing the North's guilt and the South's innocence, West replied, "A. Chiefly by enterprising ship owners of New England, who imported the slaves from Africa and secretly sold their cargoes along the coast, after the States of the North had abolished slavery" (9). Not only did this simplified question-answer set absolve the South from enabling slavery, it also constituted the North as an unlawful and hypocritical character. Fore held the North accountable for the very same charge in her catechism:

Ques. Who had a monopoly of the slave trade up to 1808? Ans. New England, until Congress passed a law forbidding it; but New England traders smuggled slaves in frequently after the law passed. (1)

While many of the authors' answers were factually correct, what is important to remember is that the women asked these questions in order to demonize the North as well as debunk the charge that the South started and spread slavery.⁷

Besides demonizing the North as a whole, the authors added even more threat to the South by casting groups of Northerners as antagonists; namely, the abolitionists. By conflating the North in general with the abolitionists in particular,

⁷ As Zelizer has pointed out, "Memory's congruence with the events that it represents becomes secondary to the larger issue of making sense of the public's relationship with those representations" (229). In other words, what is most important in this example is not who "really" started and perpetuated slavery but the relationship Southerners had with this common belief.

the catechism authors escalated the threat to the Old South way of life.⁸ For instance, consider this question-answer set in Stone's and West's catechisms:

When the Northern States had sold their slaves to the South, what did they then do? They organized a party to oppose slavery, called the 'Abolition Party,' which advocated all means to abolish slavery, with no intention of paying the people of the South for their property. (Stone 4; West 10)

The "Abolition Party" here referred to the Radical Republicans who, by many historical accounts, constituted the ruling party in Congress just before, throughout, and after the Civil War. An answer like this, however, oversimplified and perhaps even overestimated the Radicals' influence in Congress before the War.⁹ Either way, with this set, the women conflated the North with all abolitionists by stating that it was the entire "Northern States" who "organized a party to oppose slavery," not individual or groups of abolitionists. Such an oversimplification of the North's actions triggered the assumption that all people in the North opposed slavery, which historians have established, was not the case. Perhaps more significantly, the women in this question-answer set blatantly accused the "abolitionist North" of

⁸ This "conflating" strategy is similar in theory to Barbie Zelizer's idea of "collapsing commemoration" in which "commemorative dates or holidays are used to remember more than one event at the same time" (222-223). As an example, Zelizer cited "the erection of tombs to the unknown soldier, which were set in place following the First World War. As John Gillis (1994, p. 11) has pointed out, these tombs offered a way to remember everyone 'by remembering no one in particular'" (223). Similarly, the way the catechism authors talked about the North and the abolitionists invited their readers to remember them both in the same derogatory way.

⁹ For more on the Radical Republicans and their influence in Congress before the Civil War, see especially *The Radical Republicans: Lincoln's Vanguard for Racial Justice* by Hans L. Trefousse.

deliberate trickery. By their account, the North sold their slaves to the South so that they could make a profit on their “property,” and then with the South’s money safely in their hands, they moved to abolish slavery without even one thought of reimbursing the South, which the Children learned in the previous set, is exactly what England did. With this question and answer, the Children could at least deduce beyond the “correct” answer that the abolitionists who “ruled” the North were a threat to the Old South way of life and that they were to blame for pushing the South into secession with their trickery.¹⁰

Focusing their attention even more narrowly beyond the North and abolitionists, the catechism authors transformed specific Northern heroes, namely Ulysses S. Grant and Abraham Lincoln, into hypocritical and unlawful crooks. Take for instance this set on Grant:

What great leader in the Northern army owned slaves? Gen. U. S. Grant, who continued to live on their hire and service until the close of the war, and after the emancipation proclamation had been published, while he was leading armies to free the slaves of the South. (Stone 4; West 10)

President Abraham Lincoln was another favorite target for the women in their secession narrative. For example, in her catechism, Fore asked and answered, “Ques. What effect did Lincoln’s election have? Ans. It forced secession from the Union by the Southern States, because they knew the party that elected Lincoln would break up slavery at any cost” (2). The assumption here was that because the

¹⁰ As a side-note, none of the catechism authors differentiated between abolitionists and the antislavery advocates who just wanted to stop slavery from spreading, not abolishing it entirely.

abolitionists (or the “Northern States,” as far as the UDC was concerned) supported Lincoln’s election, Lincoln would in turn owe them something; specifically, the abolition of slavery in the Southern states. Having already cashed in on their “investments” by selling their slaves to the South, the Lincoln-led, abolitionist North would only further violate the South and its rights.

Of course, most narratives have a protagonist—the heroic character who will confront and potentially overcome the threat—and not surprisingly, the women cast the South into that role by inviting their readers to contrast the South’s “genuine” actions with those of the North. Take for instance these question-answer sets in West’s catechism:

Q. What effort was made by leading statesmen of the South to arbitrate peacefully? A. Senator Jefferson Davis and others urged President Lincoln immediately after his election to call a National Constitutional convention.

Q. What did they hope to gain by this? A. They believed that if the Northern and Southern leaders would get together and talk matters over calmly, war might be avoided.

Q. Did Mr. Lincoln call such convention [sic]? A. No; he refused, and instead called for 75,000 volunteers to ‘put down the insurrection in the South.’

Q. Why was this unwise and unjust? A. It was unjust because the States had a perfect legal right to withdraw from the Union when the original

compact had been broken, and unwise because it precipitated a horrible war of bloodshed that might have been avoided. (20)

Given that each of the questions in this series referenced the previous—such as asking “What did *they* hope to gain by *this*?” and “Why was *this* unwise and unjust?”—we may deduce that the Chapter leaders asked these four questions one right after the other. By the end of the series, the Children could at least conclude that Lincoln played a key role in causing secession and starting the Civil War. In comparison to Lincoln—who “refused” to call a “National Constitutional convention,” who “called to put down the Southern insurrection,” and who thereby caused an “unjust,” and “horrible war of bloodshed” because of his “unwise” refusal—the women led their readers to remember the South as a peaceful and innocent character, the hero who hoped to “arbitrate peacefully” and “talk matters over calmly.” These damning actions and adjectives, such as “unwise” and “unjust,” only further helped the women demonize Lincoln in particular and the North in general.

The catechism authors not only cast the Southern protagonists as innocent and peaceful victims of Northern aggression in this narrative, they also characterized them as righteous characters who defended the principle of states’ rights. To do this, the women first explained states’ rights to their readers, usually in relation to the Constitution: “XVI. What is meant here by constitutional rights? Ans. The right of Self government called States rights, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States” (Allison 5). Often in their definitions of states’

rights the women claimed that the Constitution protected slavery, such as West who asked and answered, “Q. What were [states’] rights? A. The right to regulate their own affairs, one of which was to hold slaves as property” (9). Notice here again the strategic characterization of slaves as “property.” After establishing their interpretation of the Constitution and its states’ rights doctrine, the women triggered with their questions an understanding of how secession was not their fault: “Ques. Did the States have a right to secede, according to the Constitution? Ans. Yes; the Union was a compact between the States, which could be broken if the State’s rights were invaded” (Fore 2). Mrs. John P. Allison pointed her readers to a similar conclusion about the South’s “right to secede” when amidst a series of questions on states’ rights she asked and answered, “XVI. Was it right for the Confederate States to secede? Ans. Yes, they could not do otherwise, under the circumstances” (5). With the states’ rights argument of the Lost Cause myth, the catechism authors could explain secession as perfectly legal and justified. In this light, the South became the protagonist who stood up to “Yankee threat” to preserve their principles and their way of life.

The War Between the States Narrative

In the women’s next narrative, the War Between the States narrative, the authors developed the Southern protagonist’s actions after secession, starting with the formation of the Confederate States of America as a self-governing nation.¹¹

¹¹ On the issue of collective memory at the national level, Gillis has argued, “National memory is shared by people who have never seen or heard of one another, yet

Establishing the Confederacy as a sovereign nation allowed the women to argue for the legality of war; to justify the South's involvement in it, which the secession narrative already set up; and to portray the Confederate soldiers as patriots rather than as rebels or traitors. Also in this narrative, the women introduced the Children to the "great men" who fought for the Confederacy and concluded their tale with an account of the War, maintaining that the South only lost the war on a technicality and because they "gave up" the fight. Throughout the narrative, the readers learned that the South did the "right" thing by going to war and that they were the victors, despite military defeat; in other words, their cause was not really lost.

The first important move the women needed to make in their War narrative was to establish the Confederacy as a separate, sovereign nation and thereby a "legitimate" place of action. Describing the South's transformation after secession into a nation, Stone asked and prompted the Children to answer:

What was the first step taken by the seceded States? They proceeded to organize a government, by uniting themselves under the name of the Confederate States of America, and adopted a Constitution for their guidance. (7)

Employing here the Revolutionary rhetoric of the Lost Cause myth to parallel the Confederacy's and the United States' early formations, Stone triggered a memory of the Confederacy as its own official entity. Even beyond forming a government, naming themselves, and adopting a Constitution, the women told of more nation-

who regard themselves as having a common history. They are bound together as much by forgetting as by remembering" (7).

building actions; for example, with questions that asked, “Did the Confederacy have a flag,” “Who did Mr. Davis select for his cabinet,” and “Where and when was the capital moved” (Stone 8). With an “official” name, government, Constitution, capital, and flag, the catechism authors legitimized the Confederacy as its own sovereign nation, an important construction for Southern subjects wishing to rationalize and justify Southern decisions, actions, and people in their public discourse, especially regarding the War.

Having legitimized the Confederacy as its own nation, the catechism authors rationalized their nation’s war involvement just as they defended the South’s involvement with secession. With the Lost Cause rhetoric of states’ rights, Allison asked and expected her readers reply:

XIII. What did the North and the South fight about? Ans. The North would not grant us constitutional rights, nor would they let us alone, the South could no longer submit to the tyranny and oppression of the North, and was obliged to fight. (5)

With just this one answer, Allison utilized Lost Cause reasoning with three strategies to justify their entrance into the War: an argument for states’ and Constitutional rights; placing blame for the War entirely on the North; and relying on Revolutionary rhetoric, such as “tyranny” and “oppression,” to parallel their plight with that of the early Americans. One could also hear in this answer the “disquieting feature of home-rule” as the Child announced that the North “would [not] let us alone” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 51). Even beyond that, one could hear

the bitterness and resentment of a people “obliged” to fight a war, yet also a justification for why that war needed to be fought. What was further significant about the states’ rights position in the War narrative was that it often portrayed the Confederates as patriotic Americans and Constitutional crusaders, because when it came right down to it, according to questions and answers such as Allison’s, the people of the South were only exercising their rights as set forth by the American Constitution.

Besides remembering the War as legal, justified, and not their fault, the women emphasized that protecting states’ rights was the only reason the Confederacy fought the North. In other words, slavery was *not* a cause of war. By the time the Children encountered this part of the War narrative, they already learned the slavery narrative, which treated slavery as both a benevolent and financial arrangement. With the slavery narrative already in their minds, the Children memorized questions like Allison’s: “XVIII. Was Slavery the cause of the war” (6)? As we consider the response Allison gave the Children, keep in mind that most contemporary historians have agreed that slavery was the main cause of war in 1861: “Ans. It was one of the issues, but the matter of ‘States Rights’ was the cause of the war” (6).¹² Consistent with the Lost Cause myth and in-line with their previous narrative on slavery, the women subsumed slavery under the principle of states’ rights so that white Southerners could declare their ancestors’

¹² Recall from page 60 of chapter two, *The Crisis of the Post-War South*, that historians such as Forrest G. Wood have argued that, after the smoke cleared, “the slavery issue still loomed as the greatest single antecedent of the sectional conflict,” with historians like John S. Ezell and David M. Potter in agreement (64).

innocence with the War, and by association, their own innocence. By remembering the cause of the “War Between the States” in this way, the Children were encouraged to “forget” that slavery was the main reason for the “War Between the States.”

To support their plotline of the Confederacy fighting to preserve states’ rights, and to reinforce their construction of the Confederacy as a sovereign nation, the catechism authors insisted that the War should be called the “War Between the States,” not the “Civil War.” Allison addressed this point in her catechism when she asked and the Children answered: “IX. What was this great war called? Ans. The war between the States” (4). Explaining the “correct” moniker of this historical event, Allison wrote:

X. Is it incorrect to call it the ‘Civil War’ as some do? Ans. Yes—A civil war is a war between subjects of the same government, and this was a war between two separate governments, and therefore was not a civil war. (4)

Allison’s response served to “correct” a “falsity” of the War while arming the Children with a response to those “some” (i.e., Northerners) who “incorrectly” named the war the “Civil War.” Such an answer also provided the Children with a Lost Cause response to the charge that their Confederate ancestors were “rebels” and “traitors.” After all, how could the Confederates have been “rebels” or “traitors” if they were no longer citizens of the United States and were faithfully fighting a war for their “separate government” on behalf of Constitutional states’ rights? With this mini-narrative on hand, the Children could defend their

Confederate ancestors' actions to anyone accusing them of rebellion and treason and "correct" anyone with an opposing interpretation.

The catechism authors glorified the Confederate men who fought to preserve their nation's states' rights. In establishing the character of the Confederate men as "great," the Daughters talked about them as patriots, not as "rebels or traitors," and as defenders of the Constitution. This was the same move the women made to explain secession, to defend their war involvement, and to relieve their guilt over slavery. For example, West asked her readers, "Q. Was it disloyal for General Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, J. E. B. Stuart and others to resign from the United States Army" (11)? After responding "No" and then immediately following up with the question, "Why not?," West offered abruptly, "A. Because the Constitution of the United States provided for a Union of Independent and self-governed states, and a citizen's first duty was to his state. Secession was a legal right" (11). The first thing to notice here is that, according to the authors, the leaders of the Confederate Army "resigned," they did not abandon their country or act in a "disloyal" or rebellious manner. Second, the women's appeal to the Constitution fortified their position already established in the secession narrative: that leaving the Union was a "legal right" of the states. And third, because the "first duty" of every "citizen" of the United States was "to his state," the reader could conclude beyond the "correct" answer that Lee, Jackson,

Stuart, and the “others” (i.e., all Confederates) were acting with patriotism and loyalty to the Constitution when they seceded and joined the Confederate Army.¹³

In addition to arguing that their Confederate men were not rebels or traitors, the catechism authors added even more depth to their hero characters by exaggerating certain traits and actions. For instance, Stone and West explained that the Southern army was well-regarded,

For its great commanders—great as soldiers and great as men of stainless character—and for the loyalty of the men in the ranks, who were dauntless in courage, ‘the bravest of the brave,’ ever ready to rush into the ‘jaws of death’ at the command of their great leaders. (Stone 12; West 23)¹⁴

¹³ This “great men” of the Lost Cause strategy may also be explained with Zelizer’s theory of “collapsing commemoration” in which multiple events and/or people are celebrated and remembered on the same day; in this case, the Confederate soldiers were meant to stand in for all Confederates. Also consider here Stephen H. Browne’s argument that “In being made exemplary [Crispus Attucks] came to stand for all Americans with specific reference to none” (“Remembering” 184). So just as the civic leaders in 1887-1888 turned Crispus Attucks into a “universalized American,” the catechism authors turned the soldiers into “universalized Confederates” (Browne “Remembering” 170).

¹⁴ Robert E. Lee was a favorite “great man” of the Lost Cause for the catechism authors. Employing hyperbolic language to describe their hero, Stone described Lee as “the best beloved and honored of all of the Confederate veterans” (*U.D.C.* 10). Allison had nothing but praise for Lee in her catechism when she announced that he was “one of the greatest [generals] the world ever saw” (11). And in 1934, West answered that the South should observe January 19th “Because it is the birthday of General Robert E. Lee, one of the greatest military leaders of all time, and a man revered and beloved the world over” (32).

Besides Lee, the catechism authors lionized other “great” leaders of the Confederate Army with similar language. For example, West praised Stonewall Jackson as “one of the military geniuses of the world” and said of General George Edward Pickett, “like Generals Lee, Jackson, Stuart and others he resigned from the United States Army, to become an officer in the Confederate Army, where he became noted as one of the most daring and brilliant commanders of all time” (23, 18).

Clearly fond of hyperbole and colorful descriptors when glorifying their “great” and “brave” heroes of the Lost Cause, Stone and West again asked and had the Children answer, “How many years did the war last? Four years; and there is no record, in all the world’s history of an army that endured more privations with greater fortitude, or fought more bravely than the soldiers of the Confederacy” (Stone 10; West 18). Such amplified depictions of the Confederate Army—as being the bravest and most fortuitous “in all the world’s history—only added further force to the underlying conclusion of the War narrative, that the South’s “great” soldiers and leaders were the heroes of the War.

Perhaps the “greatest” hero in the War narrative was Confederate President Jefferson Davis whom the women glorified for his Old South chivalry and military prowess. Helping to build Davis’s chivalrous character, Stone asked, “Whom did [the Confederate States of America] elect as their President?,” and penned the reply:

Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi, senator from that State in the Congress of the United States, when Mississippi seceded, and already distinguished as a soldier and statesman, having gallantly served in the Mexican war, and as secretary of war under President Pierce, and member of both houses of Congress. (7)

Davis’s “distinguished” character as a “soldier and statesman” who already served “gallantly” in a United States-led war, in the U.S. Congress, and for one of the Presidents of the United States not only erased any ideas of Jefferson Davis as a

traitor, but such colorful adjectives and adverbs also characterized him as a “great,” chivalric, Southern gentleman.

The most note-worthy characteristic the women gave to Davis was that of a martyr for the Lost Cause.¹⁵ Relying on “quasi-religious” rhetoric to describe Davis’s Christ-like sacrifice for the Confederate people and Old South rhetoric to describe his “character,” Stone and West both asked and answered:

Why do the people of the South honor [Jefferson Davis] so greatly? First, for his integrity of character as a man and patriot, and because he suffered the greater martyrdom for their cause. (Stone 11; West 19)

West took her portrayal of Davis as a patriot and a martyr even further when she asked, “Q. Why should we observe: (c) June 3rd” (32)? Relying again on “quasi-religious” and “cult of chivalry” rhetoric to glorify this “great man,” West declared:

A. Because it is the natal day of Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States of America, the vicarious sufferer of the whole South. A man among men, a soldier, statesman and gentleman—a great American whose name we should demand be acclaimed leader of one side of the greatest epoch in American history. (32)

The comparison to Jesus Christ could hardly have been overlooked as West depicted Davis as the “vicarious sufferer of the whole South,” nor could the Old South characterization of Davis as a “soldier, statesman and gentleman” be easily ignored. This depiction of Davis as Christ-like leader of the Confederate people

¹⁵ Regarding memory and martyrdom in the case of Crispus Attucks, Browne observed that, “martyrs are not celebrated alone for blood spilt; they need to be understood as having effected the course of events to which they are then irrevocably identified” (182).

also acted as a foil to the characterizations of Lincoln as the villainous leader of the bullying, abolitionist North. Given the high esteem in which the Southern people and the UDC held Davis, it is no surprise to read Allison's take on the importance of remembering him: "XLVI. Should we love and honor [Jefferson Davis's] name and memory? Ans. Yes. Always" (10).

By the end of their War narrative, the authors crafted their version of the War itself, fixating on how the Confederacy never really lost. Exploiting the "overwhelmed" argument of the Lost Cause, Allison asked her readers, "XXVII. If our cause was right why did we not succeed in gaining our independence?" (7). Trying here to explain the South's loss as a simple technicality, Allison replied, "Ans. The North overpowered us at last, with larger numbers, they had all the world to aid them, we had no one, we fought the world" (7). Choosing here to amplify the North's advantage by insinuating that they had the "world" on their side, readers could easily have concluded beyond the answer that the North only won because they fought an unfair fight, which of course was consistent with their character developed in the previous narrative.¹⁶ Some authors chose instead to amplify the South's disadvantages rather than the North's advantages, such as Stone and West who asked and answered:

Under what disadvantages did the Confederate army fight? Not only did the Confederates have greatly inferior numbers, but they were poorly

¹⁶ As a side note, notice that Allison mentioned nothing in her response about the Confederate "cause" not being "right;" she only provided "unfair" numbers as the reason for the Confederacy's "overpowering" defeat.

armed, often scarce of ammunition, and scantily fed and clothed. (Stone 10; West 19)

Regardless of how they were “overwhelmed” in battle, by Northern advantages or Southern disadvantages, the catechism authors insisted that the Confederacy was never defeated: “XXV. What reason did one Confederate soldier give for giving up? Ans. He said, ‘we wore ourselves out whipping the Yankees’” (Allison 7). For the women to tell their story of the Confederate nation as “technically defeated” or as “giving up,” the women chose appropriately diminutive adjectives and adverbs: “disadvantages,” “exhausted,” “inferior,” “poorly,” “scarce,” and “scantily.” In this way, the South could justify their loss as a technicality and as the result of unfair material advantages by the always tricky Northern villain.¹⁷

The Narrative of Radical Reconstruction

While in the previous three narratives the authors focused on crafting the characters, plotlines, and actions of the South’s past, in the Radical Reconstruction narrative they concentrated on setting. Perhaps the women made this move because Reconstruction was the era ending just prior to their writing the catechisms and its scene was still most vivid in their memories, or perhaps it was a way of even further demonizing the North as an intrusive, aggressive crook who would

¹⁷ The authors filled their catechisms with questions and answers regarding military history, such as Stone who asked, “When was the first shot fired in the war between the States,” and Fore’s questions, “Who was the first soldier killed in battle” and “What was the first great battle, and which side was victorious” (Stone 9; Fore 4). Military history questions cast the Confederacy and its army in the best light possible, but it was the “overwhelmed” Lost Cause arguments that did the most work for the authors.

always bring devastation to the South. In many ways, the Reconstruction narrative acted as a conclusion to the overall Southern narrative the women built in the catechisms while garnering sympathy and support from the Children for their Southland.

Setting the scene in the Reconstruction narrative, the catechism authors told a tale of a devastated and unequal South. Mrs. St. John Alison Lawton et al., for instance, asked and led the Children to respond, “According to the Constitution of 1868, who could vote? Every negro man had the right to vote, while whites who aided the Confederacy were barred” (13). Undoubtedly referring here to the Fourteenth Amendment¹⁸ which was ratified in 1868 and subsequent Reconstruction policies,¹⁹ the responding Children were triggered to conclude that

¹⁸ Based on the Civil Rights Act of 1866, the Fourteenth Amendment defined citizenship as “All [male] persons born or naturalized in the United States” and as such, “no state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property” (Cornell Law). The parts of the Fourteenth Amendment that likely upset Southerners the most were the second and third sections. The second section declared that any state who denied male citizens the right to vote in any election would have their state representation reduced in Congress, and section three asserted that no person may serve in Congress, the Electoral College, or other federal offices who previously took an oath to serve in the federal government yet participated in “insurrection or rebellion” (Cornell Law). In their minds, the Fourteenth Amendment simultaneously enfranchised the former slaves and disfranchised the former white Confederates. For more on the politics of the Fourteenth Amendment, see Foner pages 251-261.

¹⁹ Winning more House and Senate seats in the 1866 Congressional elections, and with the Fourteenth Amendment tucked safely under their belts, Radical Republicans pushed through Congress the First Reconstruction Act in March of 1867. The Act divided the former Confederate states into five military districts, each of which was to be commanded by an officer whose rank met or exceeded brigadier general. The officer in command was expected to supervise the election of delegates to state conventions where the delegates would write new constitutions and set up new governments for their states. Each of the five districts was also to be equipped with military force authorized to help keep the peace and enforce laws. The First Reconstruction Act also guaranteed black

the white, post-war South was “ruled” by the former slaves. Fore expressed similar resentments towards the former slaves while creating the setting of a depressed South: “Ques. Were the sufferings of the South ended by the surrender? Ans. No; they suffered from poverty, negro rule, and military domination,” an answer that made evident the women’s lingering bitterness towards the former slaves and military occupation while creating an unpleasant setting (9). What is most significant to notice here is how the women turned the slaves, who they cast as heroes or as property in their antebellum narrative, into “Negro” villains in the Reconstruction era. In other words, as slaves, the African-American people were

men—those who were not disfranchised because they participated in the rebellion, that is—the right to vote for state convention delegates. The delegates, in turn, were required to write such a provision for black male suffrage into their state constitutions. Then after meeting those requirements, “When a majority of persons qualified as electors had ratified a constitution, when Congress had approved it, and when the state had ratified the Fourteenth Amendment, the state could be admitted to the Union and its representatives and senators seated in Congress (Franklin *Reconstruction* 70). Reportedly outraged by the idea of a reconstruction plan being placed under the exclusive control of Congress, and arguing that the plan favored state prerogatives, President Johnson vetoed the Act, but Johnson’s veto was overridden by both houses and the first of four Reconstruction Acts was passed.

The Second Reconstruction Act was passed later in the month explaining how the military commanders were to carry out reconstruction in the South: “This involved the registration of voters who could take an ‘ironclad oath,’ the election of delegates, the assembling of conventions, and the adoption of state constitutions” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 72). The “iron-clad oath” was first proposed under the Wade-Davis bill and it required each former Confederate to swear, “that he had never borne arms against the United States or aided the rebellion,” a move that would have disfranchised a substantial portion of Southerners (Wood 17). The Third Reconstruction Act was passed over Johnson’s veto months later, in July 1867, and it empowered registration boards “to deny registration to anyone they thought had not taken the oath in good faith, a provision that invited abuse because a board could disfranchise someone with only a tissue of evidence” (Wood 45). Then in March of 1868, a Fourth Reconstruction Act was passed because “Alabamans defeated their proposed constitution by registering and then not voting on the constitution one way or the other” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 72). The Fourth Act made it so that “a majority of the votes actually cast would be sufficient to put a new constitution into effect, even if a large number of registered voters stayed away from the polls when the constitution was up for consideration” (Franklin *Reconstruction* 73).

friends of the family, but as ex-slaves, they were seen as “Negro” enemies of the South. And as if a “poverty-stricken,” “suffering,” and socially unequal Reconstruction-era South was not enough to convince the Children that the North brought nothing but destruction to the South, authors like Lawton et al. only reinforced the idea: “What was the financial policy of the [South Carolina] State Government during the Reconstruction period? Fraudulent collection of taxes, issuing of bonds, personal graft” (13). In this narrative, the Daughters exploited the Reconstruction policies in descriptive ways to paint the South as a place continually devastated by the North.

Into their Reconstruction narrative of a still-depressed South dominated by former slaves, the women introduced a new character with villainous actions: the carpetbagger. Not surprisingly, the authors cast this Northern character as they did the abolitionists, Lincoln, Grant, and all other Northerners: as enterprising, tricky, and exploitative of the South. For example, when building her narrative of Radical Reconstruction, Stone posed the question and response:

Were the people of the South punished for engaging in the war? Yes; by losing nearly all that they possessed, and further by having a horde of men called ‘carpetbaggers’ sent down South to rule over them and rob them of the little left to them by the ruins of war. (11)

Stone’s response reflected the resentment and bitterness many white ex-Confederates felt in the post-war era as she represented the South as continually “punished” by the North for “engaging” in a war it did not start and did not want.

And because the carpetbagger, like the abolitionist, often stood in for “all Northerners” in Southern rhetoric, the indictment of a “punishing” carpetbagger—or an “outsider who exploited the South for personal gain and preferment,” as Lawton et al. called the carpetbaggers in their 1919 catechism—was equally a charge against the entire North (13).

Of the four narratives, the Reconstruction narrative was the shortest and most inconsistently placed. In some cases, the Reconstruction narrative served as the conclusion to the catechisms, such as in Lawton et al.’s and Fore’s catechisms—Fore choosing to end on a question about how the Ku Klux Klan “protected whites from negro rule” during Reconstruction (9). Such a conclusion indicated to the Children where to pick up the overarching Southern narrative: protecting the South from “negro rule” and all other outsiders. In other catechisms, such as in Stone’s, the Reconstruction narrative immediately preceded questions about the UDC, perhaps instructing the Children to join the women in continuing the Southern narrative beyond that dark period in their shared past. And in at least one catechism, Allison’s, the Reconstruction narrative did not appear at all, perhaps attempting to “forget” that era all together.

The catechism authors built these four narratives of the South’s shared past by drawing upon the mythical, rhetorical context of the time in which they wrote. Relying most heavily on the Old South and Lost Cause myths, the women told stories in which, among other things, the South and its people were heroes and the North and its people were villains. The authors not only constructed these

narratives as handy ways of educating the Children about the South's past: they transformed their narratives into collective memories for their readers. As collective memories with mythical content and narrative form, the women gave the Children as Southern rhetorical subjects some recollections of the South's past to be evoked in public discourse to influence the present or future of the South. Furthermore, these memories would become resources for the women in their constitution of a "Southern people."

Mythical Narratives into Mythical Memories

The narratives the women constructed were not meant to lay dormant or become "embalmed" in the catechisms, as Dunovant indicated in the epigraph of this chapter: they were meant to be "kept before" the ex-Confederates in the "vital, living present" to "guide the future" of the South (11). Most importantly, as we will see in chapter six, the women needed these mythical narratives to constitute the Children as a generation of "Southern people." It was imperative, then, that the catechism authors find a way of keeping the four mythical narratives "present" in the collective discourse and as rhetorical resources available to Southern subjects; in other words, the women needed to engineer the rhetoric of their catechisms in a way that made collective memories. Therefore, with seven creative, interdependent rhetorical strategies, the UDC catechism authors transformed their mythical narratives of the South into mythical collective memories for Southerners.

Creating the Memories

The first rhetorical move the catechism authors made was leading the Children to remember complex historical and political events in oversimplified ways. Because recollections of the past are typically partial, excluding specific and elaborate details, and because memories are often recalled as incomplete impressions rather than full narratives, the women kept their memory-narratives short and simple to recreate the South's shared past in incomplete ways.²⁰ Such a move was strategic in the women's memory-making because complicated past events could be evoked more easily than elaborate narratives and perhaps more readily understood by the Southern collective.

Creating oversimplified memories of complex historical events served the women well when remembering such events as military battles, for example, which typically involve various leaders, military maneuvers, numbers of troops, dates of action, available ammunitions, gains and losses, etc. With the women's mythical memory-narratives of military events, rhetors could recall and narrate the basic elements of such events for strategic, rhetorical purposes: to reinforce the winning

²⁰ Memories, like myths, are partial: "No single memory contains all that we know, or could know, about any given event, personality, or issue. Rather, memories are often pieced together like a mosaic" (Zelizer 224). Recall here Waldo W. Braden's definition of myth, that it "draws upon memory and imagination; that it results from a collective effort over a considerable period of time; that it represents an oversimplification of events, persons, and relationships; that it is more emotional than logical in its substance; and that it combines both reality and fiction. In other words, it is the product of considerable abstracting [like piecing together a mosaic] on the part of many people" (*Oral* 68). Braden's definition of myth largely influenced my own moves in this section on memory-making.

spirit and resolve of the Confederacy and its people, perhaps. In her memory of the Battle of Chancellorsville, for instance, Fore asked and answered:

59. In what battle was Stonewall Jackson wounded, while winning a great victory? Ans. The Battle of Chancellorsville. He died from his wounds, to the great grief of the Confederacy. (7)

Here Fore took an extremely complex and significant battle and reduced it to three easily recalled sentences, the answer or conclusion to which could be evoked by rhetorical subjects in public discourse to celebrate the fortitude of the Confederacy and its military heroes, and by association, the “Southern people” as well.

The women also oversimplified the complexities of political events, such as Reconstruction laws and policies, to capture the essential memory of those events for rhetorical purposes. In an example we examined earlier in this chapter, Lawton et al. asked and answered, “What was the financial policy of the [South Carolina] State Government during the Reconstruction period? Fraudulent collection of taxes, issuing of bonds, personal graft” (13). While the majority of white ex-Confederates in South Carolina likely experienced the policies of the state government in this way, especially given what we know of their bitter and humiliated states of mind at the time, it was not an entirely accurate representation of South Carolina’s actual financial policies.²¹ What is significant about this memory is that such an oversimplification constructed an incomplete narrative of that experience and became a readily accessible resource for Southern rhetorical

²¹ To read about the South’s financial policies at the time, see especially John S. Ezell’s book, *The South Since 1865*, and Eric Foner’s book, *Reconstruction: America’s Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877*.

subjects. It also encouraged a “forgetting” of the full details of the event, which we will explore later in this section.

The second strategy the catechism authors employed to make their Southern collective memories worked closely with the first: here the question-answer format of the catechism genre allowed the women to create “enthymematic triggers” of memory. Because an actual narrative is not commonly recalled when one remembers—again, it is an abstract conclusion or impression that is recalled instead—the catechism authors led the Children to abstract conclusions about past events with the enthymematic structure of their question and answer sets. Within this structure, the questions and answers served as the claims or specific observations of the enthymeme while the conclusions or more general observations were left unstated. By answering the women’s questions, the Children were “triggered” into recalling the unstated, larger, and more abstract conclusions of the narratives, not so much the complete answers.

Employing the question-answer format of the catechism genre, the Daughters “triggered” the Children into remembering abstract and impartial conclusions about all areas of the South’s collective past. In the question and answer set about Stonewall Jackson and the Battle of Chancellorsville, the authors not only prompted the “correct” answer from the Children, but also triggered a vague and oversimplified memory of Stonewall Jackson and the battle. Put differently, even if the Children could not recall the specific details about the battle or its leader, they might have at least remembered the battle as a victory and

Jackson as a martyr who died for the cause. Such abstract conclusion-making captured the very nature of memories and offered a powerful appeal to Southern audiences.

With a third rhetorical move, the catechism authors guaranteed the Children that the oversimplified narratives triggered in their memories were “correct.” Because of the fallible and unreliable nature of memory, the women gave the Children assurances that their memories of the Southern past were accurate. To do this, the women employed a rhetoric of “correcting false histories.” With this rhetoric, the women not only provided Southern rhetorical subjects with the confidence of “correct” memories about their past, but also with refutations or counter-narratives to the North’s “incorrect” interpretations. Put another way, if ever faced with opposing interpretations of past events, such as the war, Southern subjects could claim that they possessed the “correct” version of the matter.²² Further, by “correcting false history,” the women discredited those who made the “false histories” in the first place (i.e., Northerners).

We already witnessed the women’s “correcting” rhetoric when they insisted that the Civil War be called the “War Between the States”—a move to “correct” the name of that conflict and relieve the South of any lingering “rebellion” guilt—but some of the women went even further and employed ad hominem attacks to make their memories “correct.” For instance, after a series of questions and answers about the Mason and Dixon line, West asked the Children, “Q. Do any people

²² See especially Mildred Lewis Rutherford’s 1914 speech, “Wrongs of History Righted,” in which her central strategy is “correcting” or “righting the wrongs” of history.

believe the name [Mason and Dixon line] came into use because of the War of Secession, as some historians call the War Between the States” (26). Notice here West’s use of the “proper” moniker for the “War” as she prompted the Children to respond, “A. Only those who are ignorant of the history of the United States” (26). The purpose of this question and answer was to point out the “ignorance” of “some historians,” likely Northern historians, who did not accept the “true” historical facts about the Mason and Dixon line, not so much to “correct” that ignorance. In other words, it was not enough for West to arm Southern subjects with the “right” history of the Mason and Dixon line; instead, she admonished and discredited those who remembered the Southern past “incorrectly.” In a similar instance, West informed the Children that a certain historical fact regarding the Confederate Seal was “wrong” but did not provide the “right” answer: “Q. Has there been any dispute about [the Confederate Seal]? A. Yes, many erroneous statements concerning it have been published” (25). Neither the “erroneous statements” nor the “correct” statements about the Seal were ever provided by West in her catechism because her purpose in this case was to expose the ignorance of others, not only to “correct” an historical inaccuracy.

While remembering is clearly a significant part of memory-making, so is forgetting, an idea that informed the women’s fourth rhetorical strategy. Forgetting allows collectives to deny or feel better about their past, especially regarding controversial issues such as slavery. At the same time, forgetting the unpleasant details of a collective’s past allows rhetors to fill in their memories with even more

favorable impressions of their shared past.²³ It is important to note that rhetors need not forget entire events with their memories (although they may). Instead, rhetorical subjects may only forget parts of the collective's past in strategic places.

By strategically forgetting certain aspects of their collective past, Southern subjects could more easily deny charges against them and relieve any remaining guilt they may have experienced. For example, by forgetting the experiences of slaves who reported slavery as a cruel and inhumane establishment, the Southern people could deny that slavery was anything less than a civil, familial, and even respectable arrangement for everyone involved. We only need to think here of the women's slavery narrative and their depictions of the slaves as "loyal," "faithful,"

²³ As Brundage has observed, "Campaigns to remember the past by forgetting parts of it have occurred in many times and places" (6). On the topic of forgetting or "collective amnesia," as Benedict Anderson called it, Zelizer observed that, "how memories are erased, forgotten, or willed absent has come to be seen as equally important to the ways in which memories are set in place" (220). Furthermore, forgetting "is considered not as a defect of deficit practice but a valued activity that is as strategic and central a practice as remembering itself. Forgetting reflects a choice to put aside, for whatever reason, what no longer matters" (220). The choice to "forget" slavery in the catechisms was certainly strategic as the women desired to construct favorable memories of the antebellum South for their young readers. As Brundage has claimed, "This idealization of slave life and glorification of the loving and faithful black slave, especially the mammy, sought to conceal alternative memories of violence, exploitation, and cruelty. Slave auctions, beatings, and uprisings, much less more mundane hardships, had no place in this white historical memory" (7). Connecting this amnesia with identity, Gillis argued that, "Post-Civil War American identity was forged by forgetting the contributions of African Americans to the military effort, forgetting even what the struggle had been about" (10).

For an analysis of how a "forgotten" person employed "forgotten" memories of the Lost Cause to construct a competing narrative of the Civil War, see David W. Blight's article, "'For Something Beyond the Battlefield': Frederick Douglass and the Struggle for the Memory of the Civil War." See especially Blight's focus on Douglass's "fourth source of argument," a "conviction that the country had been seduced into 'national forgetfulness,' a peculiar American condition of historical amnesia" (1171). According to Blight's analysis, Douglass "again and again...pleaded with his audience not to believe the arguments of the Lost Cause advocates, however alluring their 'disguises' might seem. He insisted that slavery had caused the war, that Americans should never forget that the South fought 'to bind with chains millions of the human race'" (1178).

and “noble,” and their characterizations of the slave owners as “kind” to see how the women forgot rival interpretations of slavery. In the slavery narrative, the catechism authors “forgot” that the South fought to keep their slaves, not only by portraying slavery as a mutually beneficial arrangement, but also by evoking the Lost Cause myth’s argument for states’ rights. By forgetting perspectives and events such as these, the Southern rhetorical subjects could deny counter-narratives against them and relieve themselves of guilt regarding controversial topics.

A fifth and equally important dimension in the UDC’s formation of collective memories was their strategy of glorification. Glorifying a collective’s past enables individuals and especially a collective to amplify exceptional events and people of the past while, of course, forgetting the ordinary or the not-so-flattering. The catechism authors cast Southern heroes into memory by amplifying the qualities and accomplishments of those folks, often into positions larger and more memorable than may have been the case: a move that simultaneously “forgot” any failures or short-comings. With this move, the South’s shared heroes became even more memorable in the Southern collective memory, because after all, we tend to recall large and exceptional narratives over those not as remarkable.

To amplify and celebrate the achievements of their heroes and build memories of a good South, the women sometimes crafted their recollections with hyperbole, typically with rhetoric such as “most” and “best.” One only needs to consider this question and answer set from Fore’s catechism to understand the women’s glorification tactics: “Ques. Who was the most brilliant Southern

Admiral, and what vessel did he command? Ans. Admiral Raphael Semmes. He commanded the Alabama” (8). This hyperbolic statement—that Semmes was the “most brilliant” Southern admiral—not only exaggerated this Southern hero’s intelligence, but also amplified his success as commander of his ship. What we also see in this memory-narrative is a remembering of Semmes’ most note-worthy accomplishment while simultaneously forgetting his other achievements, and perhaps more importantly, forgetting his failures or shortcomings. Even further, this heroic memory certainly oversimplified Semmes’ contributions, but the conclusion triggered from this prompt—about the greatness of Southern military heroes—was even larger and perhaps more important than the “correct” answer.

In addition to hyperbole, the women exploited the strategic functions of adjectives, adverbs, and pathetic appeals to glorify the admirable traits and actions of their Southern heroes. The catechism authors celebrated their memories of the South’s heroes by applying colorful adjectives such as “devoted” to characterize the slaves, adverbial phrases such as “with great kindness and care” to describe the slave owners, and pathetic appeals like “ever ready to rush into the ‘jaws of death’ at the command of their great leaders” to portray the Confederate soldiers. By glorifying the South’s friends and enemies with these tactics, the women made the memory of a good South for the Children.

Remembering the Memories

With their four historical narratives and creative rhetorical tactics, the catechism authors constructed Southern memories for the Children of the Confederacy to remember as if they were their own and to call upon when needing to generate rhetoric about the South and its actions. But would the Children accept those memories and how? Two more rhetorical moves worked in concert with each other to impress those memory-narratives onto the Children. First, the authors inserted the UDC as “truth-tellers” into their catechisms to convince the Children that they were learning the “truth” about the South. Second, they allowed the catechism genre and ritual to exert their rhetorical forces, especially with the quasi-religious tone and format designed expressly for memorization and repetition.

Just as the women employed a rhetoric of “correcting false history” to give Southern subjects confidence about their memories, the catechism authors similarly engaged a rhetoric of “truth.” Beyond explaining why “other” interpretations of Southern history were “incorrect,” attempting to “fix” them, and attacking those who made “false” interpretations, this rhetorical move asked the Children to put their trust in their leaders, Confederate organizations, and in the catechisms themselves. With this rhetoric in place, the Children learned that they were not only studying Southern history with its numbers, facts, and figures; more importantly, they were acquiring truth.

Looking to the texts, we see that the catechism authors employed the god term “truth” to cast the UDC and the C. of C. Chapter leaders into the role of

“truth-tellers” and their memories as “truth.”²⁴ Allison asked and answered in her catechism:

XXXV. Are you taught to hate anyone? Ans. No.

XXXVI. What does your leader teach you? Ans. The truth, and Confederate History.

XXXVII. Is [it] wrong to tell the truth in all things? Ans. No.

XXXVIII. Then isn't it right for your leader to teach you the truth in these matters? Ans. Yes. (9)

With this one syllogism—which featured the god term “truth” in nearly all parts—Allison led the Children to accept their Chapter leaders as honest, unbiased, and non-hateful authorities on “Confederate history.” After all, how could the Children refuse the tutelage of their leaders who did the “right” thing by teaching them about their collective past? In another question-answer set, Allison asked the Children how they were “going to get true history,” again evoking the god term “truth.” The

²⁴ Zelizer argued that, “Ultimately, collective memories can be tested most effectively against other memories, and less effectively against any absolutist past” (224). In the case of my criticism, I study how the memories in the catechisms “tested” against the already established mythical context, not against what “really” happened. Furthermore, considering Zelizer’s observation in the case of the catechisms, it was strategic for the authors to employ the Southern myths because the memories they built could have been “tested” against the already established and accepted memories of the Old South and Lost Cause (in other words, perhaps the Children would have believed the catechisms because they were “true” to what they already knew about Southern history—in Fisher’s words, the memories had fidelity).

On this topic, Brundage argued that, “in order for a historical narrative to acquire cultural authority, it must appear believable to its audience. Precisely because groups care whether their historical narrative is ‘true’ or ‘false,’ they strive to distinguish it from fiction by affirming its authenticity. They consequently establish standards of credibility against which they test their narratives” (5). Simply put, “Memories that deviate too much from convention are unlikely to be meaningful to large audiences or to be spread successfully” (Brundage 9).

question prompted the Children to declare, “By having histories taught in our schools, written by just people, by joining Confederate organizations and listening to what our leaders tell us” (9). The “just leaders” undoubtedly referred to the Chapter leaders of the Children of the Confederacy and the “Confederate organizations” likely referred to the United Daughters of the Confederacy, the Children of the Confederacy, and perhaps even the men’s organizations, such as the Sons of Confederate Veterans. Such a response constructed the Chapter leaders and the memorial organizations as authorities of truth and memory while at the same time, reassured the Children that the memories they were receiving were “true.”

Along with their portrayals of the UDC as “truthful” memory-makers and their narratives as “truth,” the women relied on the catechism genre itself to infuse the books with a “divine” authority. As I detailed in chapter one of this dissertation (pages 30-46), the religious catechism genre was born in the late Middle Ages, first as an oral lesson and then as a “book of instruction” for the Christian Church, including such elements as the Creed, Ten Commandments, and the seven sacraments. While the catechism format appeared in secular texts by the time the UDC penned theirs, catechisms still retained their religious quality, especially because the Christian Church still used catechisms to teach religion when the Daughters wrote theirs. The secular catechisms, then, such as the UDC’s, connoted that the ultimate authority and source of its contents was God. Put differently, to the Children memorizing the UDC’s catechisms, not only did the “correct” answers

come from the “truth-telling” Chapter leaders, but more importantly, they came straight from God Himself. As such, perhaps the Children who practiced learning and reciting the UDC’s “truthful” memories thought of themselves as speaking God’s word.

The question-answer format of the catechisms also added rhetorical force to the UDC’s books, teaching the Children how to recall and recite the UDC’s mythical memory-narratives of the South. The question-answer format was introduced to the catechism genre in the sixteenth century by Martin Luther and it was a format that encouraged readers to memorize the contents of the books “by heart.” Speaking on the topic of memorization in Luther’s time, Sister Mary Coke found that, “children would be made to repeat the catechism until they were word perfect and it became so firmly imprinted on their memories that it could still be repeated twenty or even fifty years later” (37).²⁵ From what we know of the UDC catechism ritual—that the Children were to memorize the catechisms so that when prompted in their Chapter meetings, they could stand and provide the answers to questions—we may conclude that choosing to write their catechisms in question-answer format was a well-suited strategy for “imprinting” a collective memory onto young minds. Furthermore, the repetitive nature of the catechism ritual itself was

²⁵ While collective memory scholars such as Zelizer have argued that, “Memory exists in the world rather in a person’s head, and so is embodied in different cultural forms,” it is hard to ignore the “in the head” factor in the case of the catechisms, as “actual” human beings memorized those narratives (232). Accepting as I have that, “We find memory in objects, narratives about the past, even the routines by which we structure our day,” I also want to acknowledge that the UDC’s material memories also existed “in the heads” of the C. of C.

significant to the Children's learning of the UDC's memories, as Brundage has observed, "The repetition of these observances, like all ritualized expressions of historical memory, established continuity with the past....Such routinized performances are essential to the diffusion and enduring cultural authority of historical memory" (9). By memorizing and repeating the "divine" "truth" of the catechisms, the Children of the Confederacy surely remembered the mythical memories the UDC made for them.

Conclusion

Being able to identify the strategies involved in making collective memories not only lets us appreciate the UDC as a significant rhetorical force, but it also adds to our understanding of rhetoric. In other words, it allows us to take pause and understand the choices and moves that must take place before memories can be employed in public discourse for strategic purposes.

To wit, we see in this chapter that by employing the "tangled genealogy" of the Southern myths, the catechism authors built mythical collective memories of the South for the Children of the Confederacy. With strategies of oversimplifying, triggering, forgetting, "correcting," and glorifying, the catechism authors turned their narratives into memories that could be employed by rhetorical subjects to guide the present and future of the South. Of course, none of these rhetorical memories would have meant anything if they were unaccepted by the Children, so the women inserted the UDC as truth-tellers into their narratives and let the

catechism genre and ritual to do that work for them. Once memorized, these narratives equipped the Children with the “truth” when discoursing on the Southern nation and its people.

Perhaps the most powerful utility the women had for these mythical memories in their discourse was for constituting the Children as the next generation of “Southern people.” In this way, the authors not only drew from the historical and mythical contexts of the time, they also exploited their own collective memories to construct rhetorical subjectivity for the next generation of “Southern people.” This is a rhetorical accomplishment I explore in the next chapter.

Chapter Six: “The People” of the South

Today we stand, and desire to stand, a reunited people, all sections prosperous, happy, at peace and united. Yes, united in energies, in common interests, in resources, in courage and in patriotism, dependent the one upon the other. (35)

—From Mildred L. Rutherford’s speech, “Wrongs of History Righted.” United Daughters of the Confederacy General Meeting. Savannah, GA. 13 November 1914.

Even in light of the South’s significant memory crisis after the Civil War, perhaps no struggle was as intense for white ex-Confederates as dealing with their loss of rhetorical subjectivity. Simply put, when the war ended, the “Confederate people” ceased to exist as a rhetorical complex. Recalling Michael C. McGee’s conception of “the people,” we understand that “‘the people’ are not objectively real in the sense that they exist as a collective entity in nature” (240). Rather, as McGee explained, “they are a fiction dreamed by an advocate and infused with an artificial, rhetorical reality by the agreement of an audience to participate in a collective fantasy” (240). It is when an “audience” accepts and “participates” in the “collective fantasy” of “the people” that individuals become rhetorical subjects. As rhetorical subjects, individuals sense that they belong to a larger collective, or public, and can generate discourse from “the people’s” storehouse of rhetorical resources. Being a “people,” then, means that individuals have rhetorical agency, which is exactly what white ex-Confederates lost after the war.

The extinction of the “Confederate people” resulted from three major events: losing the government that officially named them “Confederates;” the emergence of a new class of citizens, the ex-slaves; and losing the Civil War or “War Between the States.” Because of these events, Southern residents no longer controlled their own government with its forum dominated by Confederate themes and argumentative positions. They could no longer define themselves and their lifestyle in relation to slavery, and therefore the authority structures and value narratives inherent in their rhetorical culture were lost. They also could no longer speak of their shared Confederate cause and exert their rhetorical powers towards its characteristic goals and purposes. In sum, because the people of the South lost their ability to generate rhetoric as Confederate subjects, they found themselves with diminished political power, social unity, and rhetorical confidence: losses as devastating to their public life as any physical “wounds” they may have suffered in the era of defeat.

As we learned in earlier chapters, these significant losses resulted in feelings of bitterness, resentment, and humiliation among white ex-Confederates. But furthermore, the presence of new villains seemed to trigger an anxiety in the South, especially among the UDC, that the South and its people could be forgotten or misrepresented, their class could be ejected from their positions of power, and they could be dominated by outside forces. Given the continued state of crisis in the post-war South and the anxiety of its white residents, the South concentrated their rhetorical power in the next “generation” of “Southern people.” For the

Daughters, the Children of the Confederacy were their best hope for the South's next "generation" of rhetorical subjects.

The leaders of the UDC, like Mildred Lewis Rutherford in this chapter's epigraph, perceived the urgency of regaining rhetorical agency as a "people" in the post-war era.¹ In the process of making a "people," McGee observed a cycle: "'the people' are...conjured into objective reality, remain so long as the rhetoric which defined them has force, and in the end wilt away, becoming once again merely a collection of individuals" (242). Finding themselves at the end of McGee's cycle after the Civil War—as "merely a collection of individuals" experiencing bitterness and defeat—Southern rhetors "conjured" into existence over the subsequent decades a new "Southern people" to which they could make appeals for unified action. Like the "Confederate people," the "Southern people" had developed rhetorical agency, social unity, and were gaining political power by the time the UDC wrote their catechisms. The women's role at that point was to perpetuate the existence of the "Southern people" with their rhetoric, which they did by constituting the Children of the Confederacy as the next "generation" of "Southern people."² In this way, the Daughters were "giving force" to the rhetoric that

¹ When talking about "the people" in the present chapter, I place quotation marks around the terms "Confederate people" and "Southern people" because McGee does so in his writing about "the people." The term "Southerners" I leave outside of quotations, for writing-aesthetic purposes, although I use it interchangeably with the "Southern people."

² On the idea of "generations" of "the people," McGee argued that, "A rhetorical analyst might suggest further that, regardless of their biological age, all who accept the same system of myths constitute a 'generation' of 'the people.' As myths change, 'generations' change, and with the new 'generation' comes a new 'people,' defined not by circumstances or behavior, but by their collective faith in a rhetorical vision" (245-246). In

“defined” the “Southern people,” ensuring that the next generation, like the generation before, would not “wilt away.”

There are four inter-related rhetorical requirements in the collectivization process, or the constitution of a “people.” First, a “people” require a collective identity, a sense of who they are, what they share in common, and how they differ from others. Collective identity, or what Charland called the “collective subject,” is a mapping of “people,” of similarity and difference, of friend and enemy, of “their kind” and “the other.”³ This conception of identity is not only what we examined in previous chapters where we looked at the thoughts and feelings of ex-Confederate “individuals” and how they defined themselves in discourse; identity here manifests in discourse as the rhetorical character of “the people.” Drawing upon their mythical collective memories, the UDC infused the identity of “Southern people” with the common principles of home-rule, constitutional rights, and peace, thus defining the fundamental themes of their discourse. The women also positioned the “Southern people” as united against their common enemies: the North and ex-slaves, thereby orienting the definitions of “us” and “the other” that would mark their rhetoric. Consequently, not only did these moves fortify the

this way, the “Southern people” constituted a “generation” of “people,” just like the “Confederate people” or the “American people.”

³ Charland has argued that a constituted subject or persona exists as a series of “narrative ideological effects” (139). According to Charland, the first narrative ideological effect is “constituting a collective subject,” which tells the story of “the protagonist of the historical drama, who experiences, suffers, and acts” (139).

identity of the “Southern people,” they also helped fill a “repertory of convictions” for Southern rhetorical subjects.⁴

A collective identity functions rhetorically as a source of ethos or credibility for rhetorical subjects. In other words, the rhetor who addressed an audience of “Southern people” speaking as “one of them” was likely perceived as more believable and trustworthy than the rhetor who did not. Furthermore, appealing to a collective identity allows a rhetorical subject to deploy a theme of difference between “their kind” and others. In this way, the Southern subject could distinguish Southerners from their common enemies by explaining how they are *not* Yankees or *not* African American Southerners. Thus, the Southern identity could be drawn upon to define these boundaries, structure authority, and provide crucial themes for rhetorical exchange.

A second rhetorical requirement to constitute a “people” is a common history. Identity is framed within history. Maurice Charland argued, “It is within the formal structure of a narrative history that it is possible to conceive of a set of individuals as if they were but one,” and further that “histories of peoples in general, offer a ‘consubstantiality,’ to use Burke’s expression, between the dead and the living” (140). A rhetorical “people,” then, needs a common history to bind

⁴ In McGee’s view, rhetorical theorists “should be able to document the existence of themes, movements, or rhythms in a way that historicists such as Marx and Ortega could not” (249). Those “themes,” “movements,” and beliefs are what Jose Ortega y Gasset has called a “repertory of convictions” or rhetorically constructed commonplaces, propositions, maxims, beliefs, and “truths” of the people (McGee 248-49). These convictions not only define the people, but they also become rhetorical resources available to rhetorical subjects long after encountering the texts that constructed them.

them together. This rhetorical accomplishment I described in previous chapters as Southern rhetors constructed myths to remember the South's past (see chapter five especially). The UDC then drew upon those same myths to construct collective memories of a shared Southern past. The women's memories not only served to reinforce the "Southern people's" common history, but that common history helped them construct a common identity and the other two requirements of "the people."

Outside of constituting "the people," a common history functions as a resource for rhetorical subjects. As rhetorical subjects, the "Southern people" had a common history to draw upon when celebrating their values, identifying their heroes, and establishing continuity in the larger Southern story. This is exactly what the "Southern people's" common history gave to Southern subjects. In the Children's case, the catechisms gave them mythical collective memories with which to recall their common Southern history. And as we saw in the previous chapter on pages 210-212, the catechism authors meant for the Children to have the "truest" common history at their disposal.

Third, a rhetorical "people" needs a home, a geographic continuity. Of course, such a place provides a common location for the ongoing exchanges that support rhetorical subjectivity. There could be no better example than the Children of the Confederacy meetings where the catechisms were recited and taught. But, in addition, place rhetorically provides "the people" a location all their own to occupy, to take pride in, and to defend. For the "Southern people," that place was a

Southern nation.⁵ Put another way, “the people” cannot exist as a disorganized collection of individuals; rather, a sense of localized organization is needed to structure, support, and identify them. Evoking their collective memories, especially their memories of the Confederacy, the catechism authors showed the Children that the Southern nation was the “Southern people’s” home, it was the place that housed and structured them, and it became the place Southerners needed to defend and preserve with their actions into the future.

As a rhetorical “conviction,” the Southern nation allowed Southern subjects to provide boundaries for their audiences. For example, when a Southern rhetor spoke of the “South” or of “our dear Southland,” the audience knew exactly where he or she was referring. To the rhetor themselves, the Southern nation gave them a place from which to confidently generate their rhetoric. In other words, having an established framework from which to ground one’s rhetoric gives assurance and legitimacy to a subject and their rhetoric. Also, having a collective nation provides a place of action. So when the Daughters taught the Children to “stand up for the South” and “perpetuate the South into the future,” they could rest assured that the Children knew where to perform those actions.

⁵ Many have agreed with the idea that Southern nationalism thrived after the Civil War ended; for example, geographer John P. Radford argued that, “The full flowering of a national identity followed the Southern defeat” (94). Also see historian Anne S. Rubin who stated, “The Southern state may have ceased to exist, but the Southern ‘nation’ or people, lived on,” and historian Michael O’Brien who similarly asserted, “The idea of the South was strengthened, ironically, by the destruction of its political expression, the Confederacy” (Rubin 400; O’Brien 5).

The fourth requirement of constituting “the people” is a field of unified action. Charland explained this as the third ideological effect of constitutive rhetoric: “the constitution in action of a motivated subject, that orients those addressed towards particular future acts” (143). In this way, a rhetorical “people” is motivated by the pursuit of common purposes, commitments, and goals. The actions of “the people” must also correspond to the elements that constituted them. For instance, actions such as surrendering to outside forces would not have been consistent with the “Southern people’s” identity, history, and nation. The actions of the “Southern people,” at least according to the UDC, were perpetuating Southern memories and defending the South. These actions were “inherent” and portrayed as necessary if the “Southern people” wished to maintain their culture in the years to follow.

Actions also become sources of appeal and motivation for rhetorical subjects. In the case of the South, when the “Confederate people” ceased to exist, white Southern individuals found themselves no longer united by common commitments and actions, no longer managing slaves, and no longer governing their own “official” democratic nation. And as we saw, without common and “future acts” to work toward together and without accompanying rhetoric, the “Confederate people” “wilted away” into a collection of de-motivated individuals. Therefore, the people in the South needed renewed motivation towards new actions in order to feel reunited as a “people” and to become Southerners.

While these four moves are fundamental in the constitution of a “people,” especially in the “coming-to-be” phase of the collectivization process, there is also a performative dimension that Charland described as “interpellation” and McGee acknowledged in his discussion of “dual realities.”⁶ A “people” do not exist if individuals do not accept and perform (or “embody,” as Charland called it) the “social reality” of “the people” (Charland 137; McGee 240). In the UDC’s case, the Children of the Confederacy who recited the catechisms “became” the next generation of “Southern people” through a process of interpellation, or as Charland explained, “the process of inscribing subjects into ideology” (138). With pathetic appeals and by having the Children publicly perform the catechism ritual, the catechism authors encouraged the Children’s identification with the “Southern people” and allowed them to practice their Southern subjectivity. Put differently, by learning and rehearsing the rhetoric of the “Southern people” and by actually performing the actions required of them, the Children “became” the “Southern people.”

With these four requirements of the rhetorical collectivization process in mind, I argue in this chapter that the UDC equipped the Children of the Confederacy with the rhetorical resources of the “Southern people,” especially a

⁶ Discussing the “dual reality” of “the people,” McGee argued that, “An alternative to collecting the votes of ‘persons,’ therefore, may be to conceive ‘people’ as an essential rhetorical fiction with both a ‘social’ and an ‘objective’ reality....Contrary to the law of identity, the assertion is explicit that ‘the people’ are both real and a fiction simultaneously” (240). Therefore, the “Southern people” existed as both a collection of individuals who accepted themselves as “Southerners” and as a rhetorical “fiction” constituted by individuals and groups like the UDC.

shared identity, a common history via their own mythical collective memories, a shadow nation, and the commitments and purposes that guided common public action. Perhaps the UDC's greatest achievement, though, was "interpellating" the Children into the "Southern people" by having them publicly perform the catechism ritual, because at the end of this process, the Children "became" the UDC's next generation of "Southern people."⁷ In the remainder of this chapter I examine the strategies through which the women of the UDC accomplished these goals.

Constituting the "Southern People"

Drawing from the rhetorical context of the time and from their mythical collective memories of the "Southern people's" common history, the UDC catechisms constituted a new generation of "Southern people." First, the Children reciting and memorizing their catechisms learned their collective identity as principled and "who they were" by identifying their common enemies. By creating

⁷ In the process of constituting a "people," according to McGee, there are four different kinds of rhetoric "that defin[e] 'the people' at each stage in a collectivization process' of coming-to-be, being, and ceasing-to-be an objective real entity" (242-243). It is the process of "coming-to-be" that I study in this chapter and the line of thinking I hope to contribute to with my argument for "nation" as a requirement of "the people." Further, I hope that by analyzing the "interpellation" process of the catechisms I can fill out McGee's idea about "the people" responding to political myths; as he explained, "A third kind of rhetoric emerges when masses of personas begin to respond to a myth, not only by exhibiting collective behavior, but also by publicly ratifying the transaction wherein they give up control over their individual destinies for sake of a dream" (243). Analyzing the rhetoric that "defines" "the people" in the collectivization process and "the people's" "responses" to those rhetorics, then, are the two goals and hopeful contributions of this chapter.

a historical link between the Southerners of yesterday and “today”—in other words, by keeping the Southern-Confederate past “alive” in the present with their mythical collective memories—the catechisms presented the “Southern people” as believing in the principle of home-rule, valuing constitutional rights, and advocating peace.⁸ Employing a similar strategy and reflecting the overall tone of the post-war era in the South, the UDC named the North and ex-slaves as enemies of the “Southern people.” Molding these ideas about the “Southern people’s” collective identity into catechism form, the women told the Children with whom the “Southern people” should befriend while at the same time, defining who the “Southern people” were and who they were not.

Who Are the “Southern People?”

The principle of home-rule, according to popular Southern interpretation, was what most distinguished the “Southern people” from other Americans. Cornelia Branch Stone and Decca Lamar West, in their respective catechisms, evoked the Lost Cause memory of home-rule and constitutional rights when they asked, “What were the principles of the Southern people” (Stone 5; West 12)? The response to this question did not change one word from 1912 to 1934 as the Children answered:

They believed that each State should regulate her own affairs, according to its best interests, with no meddling with the management of other States,

⁸ By “today,” “present,” or “current,” I mean the time at which the Children were learning their catechisms.

and that each State should loyally support the Constitution of the United States. (Stone 5; West 12)

According to this response, the principle of home-rule, or the belief in “regulating her own affairs,” was guaranteed to the “Southern people” by the Constitution of the United States. Therefore, not only were the Southern states who “loyally supported” the Constitution perfectly justified in past actions—actions such as those recounted in the UDC’s memory-narratives—but they were also more “American” than the “other States” who “meddled” in the business of others. Those “other States” were likely those of the North who, in the women’s memories, violated the Constitution by “meddling” with the South’s states’ rights and home-rule.

Exploiting their mythical memories of the Confederacy as an innocent victim of unlawful, outsider aggression, the catechisms also constituted the Children with the principle of peace. For instance, in her catechism, West asked and prompted the Children answer, “Q. Did the Confederate States have any army or navy at their command at first, or any preparations for war? A. None; they had hoped to ‘depart in peace’” (19-20). In another example, Mrs. James A. Fore asked and had the Children answer, “Ques. Did the seceding States have any thought of war? Ans. No, they only wished to set up a separate Government, and manage their own affairs peaceably” (2). The claim that the seceded states “only wished” to set up a “separate Government” and handle “their own affairs” meant that the South was acting upon its principle of “home-rule,” and that they wanted to do it

“peaceably” positioned the “Confederate people” and their Southern descendents as peaceful beings as well. Also evident in these kinds of question-answer sets was the Lost Cause memory of “blaming the North” which only further established the South’s innocence regarding secession while providing a peaceful ancestry for the “Southern people.” With this reasoning, all Southerners could be considered a peaceful people because they, including the Children, descended from the “Confederate people.”⁹

It must always be kept in mind that these were young children, usually ranging in ages from six to eighteen, learning the contents of the UDC’s catechisms and that questions and answers like these positioned them within the larger Southern story. In other words, by creating a link between the “Confederate people” and their ancestors, the catechisms prepared the Children to not only see themselves as peaceful, but also as victims of Northern aggression like their fore-parents. As such, resisting the Yankees and not letting them destroy the “Southern people” as they did the “Confederate people” became an inter-generational responsibility of the “Southern people” and thus, of the Children. We see this same phenomenon in the following examples.

⁹ This strategy of conflating time in order to define “the people” may be explained by Charland’s “second ideological effect,” or the “positing a transhistorical subject” (140). As Charland explained it, “Time is collapsed as narrative identification occurs; today’s Quebec residents constitute a *peuple* and have a right to their own state because members of their community have discovered, claimed, and occupied the land” (140). With the catechisms, the authors “collapsed time” so as to align the Children and Southerners with the Confederate nation and the Confederate people, thereby infusing “today’s residents” with the same qualities as their ancestors.

The catechisms further constituted the identity of the “Southern people” by contrasting them with their common enemies. With this move, the catechisms named the Northern Yankees and former slaves as enemies of the “Southern people” while rhetorically positioning them as what Southerners were not. In her catechism, Mrs. John P. Allison asked and signaled the Children to answer:

XXVIII. Were our Confederate Soldiers and our relatives who fought in the Confederate army traitors? Ans. No! No! No!

XXIX. Who says so? Ans. The Yankees say so, and teach it in their schools, and want it taught to Southern children. (8)

The Lost Cause memory of the “Confederate people”—and by association, the “Southern people”—as “not traitors” obviously saturated these responses as Allison strengthened her case against the Yankee villains. What the first question and answer did was set up a contrast between “good and evil;” in other words, the first question established the “Southern people” as “good” (at the least, “not traitors”), and the second positioned the Yankees as “evil” liars. The response to the second question acted as a “conviction” for Southerners: to hate “the Yankees” because they were the ones who “falsified” the memory of the Confederate soldiers as “traitors,” corrupted the minds of Northern children, and wished to do the same to Southern children. Here again we see the Southern children as direct victims of Northern aggression. Questions and answers such as these taught the Children their position as Southerners in the United States in contrast to their Northern counterparts while at the same time perpetuating the “Yankee threat” to the

Southern culture. As we will see, standing up to that and any threat became a necessary action for the “Southern people,” especially this generation.

The catechisms further crafted the shared identity of Southerners as different from and united against another group of people: the former slaves. As we may recall from chapter two (pages 68-71), the ex-slaves were at the heart of what white Southerners typically called “the Negro problem.” The South’s “home” remedy to this “problem” had always been supporting organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan, support that was almost certain to continue with the UDC’s rhetorical assistance. For example, Mrs. St. John Alison Lawton et al. stated in a response that, “The Ku-Klux in its operations” was the “secret society [that] made it possible for white people to reside in the state” (13). In South Carolina, the KKK was not the only solution, as Lawton et al. posed the question-answer set: “How was the State redeemed in 1876 for home rule? By Wade Hampton and an organization of native whites. This was commonly known as the Red Shirt Movement” (13).¹⁰ Fore also praised the KKK for their efforts to restore home-rule to the South: “Ques. What organization was formed, to protect the whites from negro rule? Ans. The Ku-Klux Klan, organized by Gen. N. B. Forrest” (9). The catechisms celebrated the KKK and similar organizations for their efforts to “protect” the people of the South from the former slaves. These “home” organizations, the catechisms maintained, “protected” Southerners and built what many white

¹⁰ To read more about Wade Hampton and the Red Shirt Movement in South Carolina, see *Wade Hampton: Confederate Warrior, Conservative Statesman*, by Walter B. Cisco, and *Hampton and His Red Shirts; South Carolina's Deliverance in 1876*, by Alfred B. Williams.

Southern residents at the time wanted: a white supremacy culture, or in mythical terms, a Solid South.

By the end of the catechisms, the young readers learned that the “Southern people” lived by the time-honored principles of home-rule, constitutional rights, and peace just as they always had. They also learned that Southerners were superior over the “meddling” Northerners and the ex-slaves, both of whom posed threats to the South and to its people: whether that threat was “Negro rule,” teaching Northern children that the Confederates were “traitors,” or trying to poison the minds of the Southern children. These were important moves to make because the Children as Southern subjects could then appeal to these “convictions” when motivating the “Southern people” towards action, especially the act of defending their Southern home.

A New Southern Nation

The principle of “home-rule” and the act of standing up for the South would not have been salient if the “Southern people” did not have a home to rule or defend, so to address this rhetorical dilemma, the strategy of “presenting the past” helped the catechism authors constitute the “Southern people” into a new nation.¹¹

¹¹ Much of the theorizing on nations, nationalism, and national identity maintains that a nation forms when “ordinary people” or audiences “imagine” themselves as belonging to a larger community of people, which is an idea born of and perpetuated in rhetoric. Benedict Anderson, for one, theorized that nations are mental constructs or “imagined political communities” rather than objective, material realities (6). Building on Anderson’s theory of nations as “imagined communities,” DeCillia et al. explained, “Members of even the smallest nations do not know the majority of their fellow-citizens, do not meet, do not hear from one another. And yet they are convinced that they belong to

In many ways, with their questions and answers, the catechisms worked to show how the Confederacy—or at least a shadow of that nation—still existed as a safe, distinct, and “official” place for the “Southern people.” To do this, the women again pulled from the rhetorical context of the time to celebrate the South’s differences from the rest of the country, decorate their nation with Confederate emblems, and populate their new nation with “great men.” These three moves allowed the Daughters to give the “Southern people” a national home and a place from which Southern subjects could draw rhetorical confidence and legitimacy.¹²

a unique national community” (154). Adding her perspective to this “imagined” conception of nation is historian Anne S. Rubin who stated, “A nation...is an emotional, ideological, and frequently sentimentalized construct, created by individuals who self-consciously share the belief that they are all united by a common culture, history, and social personality” (2). As communities of people or “audiences” imagine themselves as part of a nation, an identity with that nation is also formed: “For nationalism to do its work, ordinary people need to see themselves as the bearers of an identity centered elsewhere, imagine themselves as an abstract community” (Eley and Suny, 22). The place from which “ordinary people” get the idea that they belong to a larger “abstract community” is from discourse, as DeCillia et al. argued, “national identity—conceived as specific forms of social identities—are *discursively*, by means of language and other semiotic systems, *produced, reproduced, transformed, and destructed*” (153).

¹² For scholarship that studies nation-building, especially the rhetoric of nation-building and national identity, see James A. Mackin, Jr. who argued that Pericles’s use of antithesis and schismogenesis in his Funeral Oration, “nourished the local sense of Athenian community” (251). James R. Andrews also looked at nation-building rhetoric when he traced the tensions that have existed in American rhetoric; for example, he considered the tensions that exist between such polarities as morality and violence, and individuality and conformity, in the “national character” of American rhetoric. For even more on nation-building rhetoric, see Marjorie Ferguson for a discussion of the “ideological underpinnings of American and Canadian ‘national’ identities, and how such values and traditions express themselves in each country’s broadcasting policy, ethos, and industry responses to more diverse audiences” (43). Also, De Cillia et al. explored the ways national identities may be constructed by analyzing various discourses in Austria, while McKerrow and Bruner looked at how European nationalism is rhetorically constructed. Rhetorical analyst Lisa A. Flores analyzed the work of Chicana feminists to illustrate the ways they construct a discursive space for themselves between American and Mexican identities. She argued that an examination of this sort “allows us to witness the building of individual and community identity” (143). Also see Hariman and Lucaites’

The catechism authors built a shadow of their beloved Confederate nation with a rhetoric of difference and “official” separation. Fore’s answer about the Southern states wishing to “peaceably set up a separate government” on page 227 illustrated this point (2).¹³ Mrs. John P. Allison took a similar approach in her catechism when she asked, “IV. What do you mean by the Confederacy” (3)? The Children dutifully replied, “Ans. The Southern States which seceded from the Union and became a Separate Government” (Allison 3). This response remembered the Confederacy as an official, separate nation formed by the “Southern states,” and because those very same Southern states still existed in 1908 when Allison wrote her catechism, it could easily have been reasoned that the

article in which they claimed, “When the event shown is itself a part of national life, the public seems to see itself, and to see itself in terms of a particular conception of civic identity” (36). Their case was based on the Vietnam-era photograph, “Accidental Napalm,” and how the visual rhetoric of that photograph serves to constitute a public identity (and collective memory) for Americans. Finally, see Roy and Rowland’s article on rhetorical constructions of Hindu nationalism by way of “a narrative of mythical redefinition.”

¹³ Treating the South as a separate entity “officially” divided from the United States was not unique to the UDC: many Southern residents began doing so in the antebellum era and continued through the Civil War, Reconstruction, and well into the twentieth century. As Radford explained, “The idea that Southerners were ‘different’...was fashioned in the final antebellum decades into a full-blown mythology” (93). That “mythology” or “political myth,” as McGee would call it, helped the South “imagine” itself as a separate nation, which ultimately helped the Southern residents justify their decision to secede (similarly, the myth of a Quebec nation allowed the *people québécois* to justify “the constitution of a new state”) (Charland 134). And just as defining the South as a distinct and separate nation was not exclusive to the UDC, “division” is not an uncommon strategy of any nation trying to define itself. As DeCillia et al. have pointed out, “the discursive construction of nations and national identities always runs hand in hand with the construction of difference/distinctiveness and uniqueness” (153). Seyla Benhabib similarly argued, “Since every search for identity includes differentiating oneself from what one is not, identity politics is always and necessarily a politics of the creation of difference” (qtd. in DeCillia et al. 154). For more on antebellum Southern nationalism, see especially John McCardell’s book, *The Idea of a Southern Nation: Southern Nationalists and Southern Nationalism, 1830-1860*.

South was still a nation and even a “Separate Government.”¹⁴ Furthermore, with the “Southern people” still embodying the principles of the Confederate era and maintaining the same enemies, accepting the South as its own nation would not have been a far stretch for its people, or for the Children.

Another way the UDC constructed “the people’s” Southern nation was by making relics of the Confederacy “alive” and valid in the present: specifically, the flags of the CSA. As Stone noted in her catechism, besides the national flag, a battle flag was designed and “adopted by Congress as the flag of the Confederacy” (9). But on the topic of whether or not this flag was ever used in battle, Stone replied, “No; it was adopted just before the fall of the Confederacy, and was never used” (9). While Stone clearly admitted here that the Confederate States of America “fell” and was therefore no longer in existence, she immediately followed with a question that asked, “How are these [battle and national] flags used by the different Confederate organizations” (9)? The responding Children stood up and declared:

The Confederate Veterans have for their emblem the battle flag, and the Sons of Veterans have adopted the last flag of the Confederacy, while the

¹⁴ While Charland does not address nationalism or “place” as an ideological effect of narratives or as a requirement of “the people,” perhaps Roy and Rowland’s theory of “mythical redefinition” may help us understand how, “Via a myth of return, the perfection that was present at the beginning of the society/nation/religion can be brought to the present day” (231). With their mythical collective memories, then, the women could “return to” the “perfection” of the Confederate nation and bring it into the “present day” when constituting their new nation for this generation of “Southern people.”

Daughters of the Confederacy use the ‘stars and bars,’ the first flag adopted by the Confederate States. (9)

Seeing as how the “Confederate organizations” of “today” still used the flags to identify themselves, not to mention the fact that “Confederate” organizations even still existed, suggested that the Confederacy was still very much alive in the present. As such, these Southern relics became artifacts of the Children’s generation, not just their ancestors’, and potent symbols for Southern subjects to evoke in their public celebrations of nationalism.

The catechism authors also populated their Southern nation with the “great men” of the UDC’s mythical collective memories. In the process of nation-building, a great nation should be established and inhabited by great people: otherwise, that nation would not be worth defending, maintaining, or perpetuating. Allison asked in her catechism, “III. Who are Confederate Soldiers,” to which the Children were expected to respond, “Ans. Those Southern men, who fought for Southern rights, for the homes and firesides of our dear Southland” (3). Appealing here to the “great men” memory of the Lost Cause, Allison only mentioned “Southern men,” “Southern rights,” and the “Southland” in this question about “Confederate” soldiers. Such a rhetorical move conflated the Southern and Confederate nations while dividing the Southern nation from the North and the United States. Perhaps most significantly, though, is how Allison asked “Who *are*” not “Who *were*” the Confederate soldiers, placing those “great men” within the present Southern nation. By this wording and reasoning, the “Confederate

Soldiers,” as well as their respected convictions and principles, were still alive and well in the “dear” Southern nation that they themselves “fought for.”¹⁵ Furthermore, it suggested to the Children reading the catechism that they too could be “great men” of their generation if they fought for “Southern rights” as their forefathers had done.

The rhetorical presence of the Confederate nation in their “current” era communicated to the Children that the “Southern people” still belonged to a separate and unique collective entity: that is, to a Southern nation that closely resembled or “shadowed” its predecessor. Making the Confederacy present in the post-war South constituted Southerners as a people with an “official” structure from which to speak and act. Given the existence of the Southern nation and the “Southern people,” the actions assigned to them (and the Children) were “predetermined” and necessary for the continued existence of “the people.”

“The People” Must Act

The final requirement of a constituted “people” is action: action that is essential for the continuation of “the people” and “fixed” to their position, just as supporting sovereignty was a required action of the *peuple québécois*. Charland explained that the constituted people “must be true to the motives through which the narrative constitutes them, and thus which presents characters as freely acting

¹⁵ Here again, Charland’s “second ideological effect” may illuminate Allison’s strategy as “positing a transhistorical subject,” or aligning the “Southern people” with their ancestors thereby making them as “great” as their Confederate heroes.

towards a predetermined and fixed ending” (141). The actions of the “Southern people” were to “stand up” for their Southern nation and its people and to perpetuate Southern culture into the future by actively remembering.¹⁶ Both of these actions situated the “Southern people” as rhetorical beings accountable for sustaining Southern existence. Considering the character of the South’s shared history, identity, and nation already constructed by the catechisms, these actions and commitments were “true to the motives” of the “Southern people.”

The first rhetorical commitment inherent to this generation of “Southern people” was to defend or “stand up” for the South and its people. Consider this point in Allison’s line of questioning on Confederates as “not traitors:”

XXX. What is a traitor? Ans. One who betrays a trust, one who is unfaithful to one’s country.

XXXI. Do you like to think of your fathers, grandfathers and relatives who fought in this great war, as traitors? Ans. No.

XXXII. Then what are you going to do about it? Do you think it is right to sit in silence, and hear that our brave Southern soldiers were traitors? Ans.

No. We will deny the false charge, and prove it by history. (8-9)

¹⁶ According to Charland, the “third ideological effect” of constitutive rhetoric is the “illusion of freedom...Freedom is illusory because the narrative is already spoken or written” (141). As such, “the subject is constrained to follow through, to act so as to maintain the narrative’s consistency” (Charland 141). Applying this logic, Charland argued that in the case of the *peuple québécois*, “a subject is not ‘persuaded’ to support sovereignty. Support for sovereignty is inherent to the subject position” (134). In the case of the catechisms, the actions of Southerners only appeared as free choices because the narrative structure of each question and answer (as well as the overall narrative of the catechisms) actually made those actions “predetermined and fixed” (Charland 141).

Relying on the Lost Cause memory of Confederates as “not traitors or rebels,” Allison established that a traitor was a person unfaithful to their “country,” reasoning that because the South’s “fathers, grandfathers and relatives” belonged to their own “separate” and “official” nation, they could not possibly be traitors. Instead, according to this popular Southern interpretation, the “Southern people’s” ancestors were patriots and heroes worthy of being defended. As good Southerners, the catechisms held the Children and all “Southern people” responsible for not only “thinking” of their Confederate fore-parents as “not traitors,” but also “proving” and defending it to anyone who challenged this reality. The action of “freely choosing” to produce rhetoric to “deny false charges and prove them by history” was necessary to the “Southern people,” and by reciting the answers to the catechism questions, the Children as Southerners were practicing how to do just that.

The second rhetorical action necessary to the “Southern people” was actively remembering the South’s collective past so as to keep the South and its people alive. Recall Cornelia Branch Stone in her 1912 catechism regarding the UDC’s objectives, or Decca Lamar West’s only slightly amended version of Stone’s statement over twenty years later when she asked and answered:

Q. For what purpose did [the UDC] organize? A. To preserve the true history of the Confederacy and keep in sacred memory the brave deeds of the men of the South, with no bitterness toward the government of the United States under which we live. (West 29)

In this response, the authors portrayed the UDC as models of appropriate Southern action. After all, as “Daughters” of the Confederacy, it was a “familial” duty to carry on the memory of their Confederate “parents” into the next generation.¹⁷ It could be reasoned, then, that as “Children” of the Confederacy, Southern children shared the same commitment of “preserving true history” and keeping the Confederacy and its heroes alive “in sacred memory.” The message, then, was that carrying the South’s memory into the future was an inter-generational duty. It is also significant here to notice how the act of remembering the South’s fore-parents was to take place under “the government of the United States.” This response reveals the women’s position that the United States was not the South’s government: it was the *other* government “under which” the Southern nation must grudgingly live. Even the attitude toward governance by this “other” was indicated, perhaps ironically: “no bitterness.”

The rhetorical actions of this generation of “Southern people”—perpetuating Southern memories and defending the South—were fixed and

¹⁷ Specific actions of the UDC to perpetuate the “Southern people” were: “(a) To build homes, or through State Legislation to secure them, for the care of Confederate Veterans and their wives. (b) To secure pension laws in Southern States to help them to remain in their own homes when possible” (West 29). The “methods” the Daughters used to accomplish these goals were, “(a) Giving scholarships and prizes for historical work in high schools, colleges, and universities. (b) Collecting books historically accurate and presenting them to foreign libraries. (c) Assisting in such collections in high school, college and university libraries. (d) Giving prizes for articles written concerning the South’s part in the making of America. (e) Conferring Crosses of Service on Soldiers of the Spanish American and World War, who are descendants of Confederate Veterans” (West 29). Fundraising was a major part of the UDC’s agenda, to fund monuments and other such memorial projects: “Q. On what special work, requiring large sums of money are the United Daughters of the Confederacy now engaged? A. (a) Raising an endowment fund to promote the teaching of Southern History, to be known as the Jefferson Davis Foundation. (b) Raising fifty thousand dollars for restoration of Stratford Hall, Westmoreland County, Virginia” (30).

essential to maintaining Southern culture in the future. After all, if the Children “forgot” their shared past and “who they were,” and if they allowed the North and ex-slaves to “rule” them, then the “Southern people,” like the “Confederate people,” would “wilt away.” In McGee’s terms, what these actions did was give “force” to the rhetoric that “defined” the “Southern people.” Furthermore, what these actions did, if the “Southern people” chose to perform them, was turn individuals into rhetorical subjects who made appeals and acted as a collective. In other words, performing and even committing to perform these actions interpellated individuals, particularly the Children, into the “Southern people.”

Interpellating the “Southern People”

The Children of the Confederacy “became” the UDC’s generation of “Southern people” through a process of interpellation. Chapter one defined interpellation as the process through which individuals identify with the discourse that addressed them (see pages 24-25). As Althusser argued, “ideology ‘acts’ or ‘functions’ in such a way that it ‘recruits’ subjects among the individuals (it recruits them all), or ‘transforms’ the individuals into subjects (it transforms them all) by that precise operation which I have called *interpellation* or hailing” (Charland 138). Providing an example, Althusser explained that interpellation “can be imagined along the lines of the most commonplace everyday police (or other) hailing: ‘Hey, you there!’” (Charland 138). The UDC interpellated the Children of the

Confederacy into the next generation of “Southern people,” thereby making them rhetorical subjects, with much more complex rhetorical moves.

The UDC’s interpellation process relied on pathetic appeals and performance of the catechisms to “transform” the Children of the Confederacy into Southern subjects. Given that these were impressionable young children learning the catechisms, we may assume that the emotional appeals made to their shame, duty, and especially their need for belonging had some impact on their development as “Southern people.” Further, having these children memorize and publicly perform the contents of the catechisms gave them a chance to practice being “Southern people” in a public environment surrounded by their peers and “authorities.” This was a significant part of the collectivization process because the “Southern people” would not have come-to-be if the “political myth” of “the people” was not accepted by Southern individuals.

The emotional appeals of the catechisms facilitated the Children’s identification with the “Southern people.” Appealing to loyalty and to the Children’s sense of belonging, the catechisms encouraged their young readers to take pride in being not only Confederate Children, but also in being “Southern people.” Take for instance Allison’s catechism in which she asked and answered, “LII. Do you love your [Children of the Confederacy] chapter? Ans. Yes” (11). The immediate follow-up and final statement of the entire catechism was a declaration that read, “All who intend to be faithful to this chapter, work for the Confederate cause, and always stand up for their native South, hold up your hands”

(Allison 11). The pledge to “work for the Confederate cause” and to “stand up for their native South,” (both necessary actions, recall), devoted the Children to the Southern nation, not to the United States. But beyond that, these two responses together provided an enthymeme whose unstated conclusion was that “loving” and “being faithful” to Confederate associations, such as their very own C. of C. “chapter,” committed them to “always” perpetuating the South and its “people.” After all, feeling pride and love for the Southern nation and its people were what “Southern people” did. Put differently, pride and love were virtues of the “Southern people’s” collective identity as much as the principles of home-rule, peace, and constitutional rights.

On a performance level, by raising their hands, standing up out of their seats, and vocalizing the answers to catechism questions in front of their peers and leader, the Children were performing, practicing, and affirming their Southern subjectivity in public. Especially when the Children pledged to “always stand up for their native South,” the Children physically reinforced that action by “standing up” to make such a declaration. Perhaps the performance also encouraged the Children to identify with the emotions laid out in the catechisms, such as love and pride. The Children’s interpellation into the “Southern people” was now becoming complete.

The catechisms interpellated the Children into the “Southern people” by appealing to patriotism and even to a sense of shame. In the UDC’s historical narratives, patriotism was what the Confederate fore-parents demonstrated as they

stood up for the Constitution by seceding from the United States. Furthermore, shame was not a valid emotion for the “Southern people” as they did what was right. They did not engage in rebellion or treachery so they had nothing of which to be ashamed. With these ideas in mind, consider a series of questions and answers in Allison’s catechism:

XXXIX. What does it mean to be patriotic? Ans. To love one’s native land and to stand up for its rights.

XL. Do you want to be patriotic? Ans. Yes, I would be ashamed not to be.

XLI. Do you love your native South, then? Ans. Yes. (9-10)

First, as Southerners, the Children’s patriotism was not to be extolled to the United States of America, but to their “native land”—their “native South” land—which reinforced the idea of a shadow Confederate nation and the Children as “Southern natives.” Second, we see again in this question and answer the action of “standing up” for the South’s rights. The responding Child physically performed this Southern action by rising to their feet and vowing yet again to “stand up for the South’s rights.” Third, Allison’s shaming strategy—having the Child voice in public that they “would be ashamed to not be patriotic”—would have been a powerful motivator for any Child in a position to accept and enact Southern rhetorical subjectivity. And fourth, such appeals encouraged the Children to identify with their Southern heroes. After all, Lee was patriotic by fighting for the Southern cause, so to be “good” Southerners, this generation also needed to commit to such actions and feel that same love and devotion.

The appeals to the Children's sense of duty, legacy, and pride also worked to interpellate the Children into the "Southern people." Authors such as Allison asked, "XXXIV. Why is it so important for Southern children to learn [historical] truths" (9)? The Children's response: "Ans. Because when the older people pass away, we can take their places, and teach the truth, and be proud of our Confederate ancestry" (Allison 9). Note first that the question asked why it was important for "Southern children," not "all" or "American" children, to learn historical "truths." This positioned Southern children as different and separate from American children and from children in other regions of the country, thus constituting the identity of the "Southern people" and their nation. What united those "Southern children" with each other, according to Allison, was a "pride" for their Southern culture based on their shared "Confederate ancestry." To perform the expected Southern actions, the responding Children promised to "take the places" of the "older people" in order to perpetuate the South's mythical collective memories: again, an action chosen "freely" by the "Southern people." These pathetic appeals, coupled with the Southern actions of preserving memories and defending the South, "animated" the Children into being Southerners.

What these pathetic appeals did was further explain to the Children how to be good "Southern people" and fill out the collective identity of Southerners. Such appeals also allowed the Children to develop those emotions in their Chapter meetings as they performed the catechisms and learned how to make similar appeals to others. Furthermore, questions and answers directed to the Children's

emotions, especially to their sense of legacy and duty, made it clear that the fate of the “Southern people” relied on the present and future generations: specifically, on their actions and their emotions. In other words, it became the responsibility of this and future generations to carry on and give “force” to the “Southern people.”

As I have pointed out in these few examples, recitation and performance of the catechisms were material expressions of the Children as “Southern people.” But perhaps no rhetorical strategy interpellated the Children into subjectivity more than the recitation of their very name. Even though none of the Children were born during the time of the Confederacy and may not have had personal vested interests in actively perpetuating its memories or defending the South to outsiders, the UDC gave the Children a name that insinuated they were and did. For instance, Allison asked, “II. Why are you called children of the Confederacy,” to which the pupils dutifully replied, “Ans. Because we are the children and descendants of Confederate Soldiers and Statesmen” (3). Such a response not only brought the Confederacy into the present, but it also encouraged the Children to recognize, acknowledge, and confirm their subjectivity as Confederate Children; in this case, by their relationship with the “great men” of the Lost Cause, the “Confederate Soldiers and Statesmen.” In her theorizing on performance and identity, Judith Butler has argued that, “The statement is in some sense not only an act, but a form of conduct, a ritualistic form of speech that wields the power to *be* what it *says*” (112). In this case, the Children “ritualistically” enacted their subjectivity as “Southern people” when they “said” this “statement.” Put another way, by

answering this question, the respondents were “being” Southern Children of the Confederacy.

An important point to be made with this example is that the Children’s acceptance of their subjectivity was likely influenced by the “authority of voice” of the catechisms and the Chapter leaders who posed the questions. Based again on Althusser’s theory of interpellation, Butler explained that, “the authority of the ‘voice’ of ideology, the ‘voice’ of interpellation, is figured as a voice almost impossible to refuse” (31).¹⁸ The Children’s recognition of themselves as “Southern people,” as Children of the Confederacy, was “impossible to refuse” given the UDC’s and the catechisms’ “authority of voice” in naming the Children.¹⁹ And because there was only one “correct” answer to each of the catechism questions, and given that these were impressionable young children learning the catechisms after all, it made the “Southern people” with their history, identity, nation, and actions, virtually impossible to refuse.

¹⁸ Consider here that, “The force of interpellation in Althusser is derived from notable examples: God’s voice in the naming of Peter (and Moses) and its secularization in the postulated voice of the representative of state authority; the policeman’s voice in hailing of the wayward pedestrian with ‘Hey you there’” (Butler 31). Just as the voices of God or policemen may be “impossible to refuse,” so too were the voices of the UDC, the Chapter leaders, and the catechisms.

¹⁹ According to Althusser, though, “this naming cannot be accomplished without a certain readiness or anticipatory desire on the part of the one addressed....In this sense, as a prior and essential condition of the formation of the subject, there is a certain readiness to be compelled by the authoritative interpellation, a readiness that suggests that one is, as it were, already in a binding relation to the divine voice before one succumbs to its call. In other words, one is already claimed by the voice that calls the name, already subordinate to the authority to which one subsequently yields” (Butler 32). Butler’s observation makes sense as we think about the Children of the Confederacy’s “already binding relation” to the “divine voice” of the UDC and the catechisms; in other words, the Children’s pre-existing “readiness” to be named contributed to their “becoming” the “Southern people.”

Rhetorical Subjectivity Regained

By the early twentieth century, the UDC had helped restore to the South what it had lost: rhetorical subjectivity. Instead of being a disorganized confluence of individuals, the “Southern people” came together as a collective rhetorical force with a shared identity, collective history, Southern nation, and common commitments and actions. As such, those who identified with the “Southern people” became rhetorical subjects equipped with a storehouse of rhetorical resources to draw upon as speakers and as audiences. With those resources, Southern subjects could make appeals and motivate action with their rhetoric.

For starters, the collective identity of the “Southern people,” which defined them as principled and in opposition to their enemies, provided rhetorical resources for Southern subjects. When needing to address non-Southern audiences, for example, a Southern rhetorical subject could pull from “the people’s” repertory of convictions and explain who the “Southern people” were, who they were not, what they believed in, and what they valued. Even when speaking to Southern audiences, Southern subjects might draw from “the people’s” common identity to enhance their own ethos and build identification. Not to mention that with Southern subjects repeating and continually evoking these rhetorical constructions in their discourse, the “rhetoric which defined” the “Southern people” continued to have “force.”

I have argued that this identity was grounded in the “Southern people’s” remembered common history, which provided a broad range of rhetorical resources

for Southern discourse. Speaking as “Southern people,” especially in their catechisms for children, the Daughters evoked the South’s common history to make mythical collective memories. With those memories, the women showed the Children that they, their ancestors, and all other white Southerners were united by connections to Southern history. Having those connections made and with their history told, the women motivated the Children to act accordingly: specifically, to stand up for the South and perpetuate its memories, and more immediately, to continue their membership in Confederate memorial associations such as the UDC and SCV.

Central to the emerging Southern subjectivity was the power of place provided by their sectional identity: here, the Southern nation pulled the agency of the “Confederate people” into the “Southern people.” In other words, when the seceded states formed the Confederate States of America, the Confederate subjects were able to confidently generate nationalistic rhetoric for any number of purposes from a “legitimate” place of origin—the Confederacy.²⁰ But in 1865, when the Confederates lost that place and its “people,” rhetorical confidence was also lost and replaced with feelings of bitterness and resentment. The Southern nation

²⁰ As I discussed in chapter two on pages 59-60, the South generally considered secession a perfectly legal and Constitutional action, and the formation of the Confederate States of America a legitimate enterprise. Therefore, between 1861 and 1865, most Southern residents referred to the Southern states as “the Confederate States of America” because it was, at least in their minds, a separate nation complete with its own government, flag, Constitution, president, and other governmental faculties. The North, on the other hand, generally believed the Southern states to be “in rebellion” and acting illegally and unconstitutionally by attempting to secede and forming their own nation.

helped restore that sense of rhetorical agency to Southern subjects by giving them a “legitimate” home from which to ground their rhetoric.

Finally, the catechisms of the UDC provided fields of action that reinforced Southern identity, built motivation for actions as a “Southern people,” and interpellated Southern subjects. When the actions of actively remembering and standing up for the South were evoked in public discourse, Southern audiences might have seen themselves as having a renewed sense of purpose. For example, instead of acting to maintain slavery and secession as they did when they were “Confederate people,” the Southern residents could devote themselves to new actions, such as perpetuating the memories of their common history and standing up for their new Southern nation. In other words, the Southern residents could again feel motivated by important goals and purposes. What is remarkable to note here, too, is that by reciting the answers to the catechism questions in the Chapter meetings, the Children were actually performing these actions: they were standing up for the South and perpetuating its memory by learning the contents of the catechisms, speaking them in public, and preparing to continue such work into the future.

The pathetic appeals the Daughters employed when interpellating the Children into the “Southern people” also became available for them to use when generating their own rhetoric. As such, the Children could appeal to the pride, shame, loyalty, belonging, patriotism, duty, and legacy of their audiences in their efforts to perform the rhetorical actions “inherent” to them or perhaps to

interpellate the next generation of children into the “Southern people.” With each evocation of these rhetorical resources, the “Southern people” stayed alive by the “force” of their “defining rhetoric.”

In the end, the “Southern people” were constituted with a full storehouse of rhetorical resources to be employed in public discourse for myriad rhetorical purposes. The Southern nation could be evoked to arouse national pride in audiences and thus soothe bruised egos when recalling defeat and provide a proud Southern identity. The Confederate flag could be displayed as a historical, national unifying symbol, not just for the Confederate organizations but across the South in celebration of nationhood and national pride. The “great men” of the Southern nation could be evoked when celebrating the South, for learning lessons and values, and for giving the Southern children heroes and idols to emulate. With these resources at their disposal, especially the Southern nation, identity, history, and actions, this generation of “Southern people” could take pride in its founding and enduring residents, they could strive to become those “great” residents, and they could demarcate and celebrate their nation with symbols of the Confederacy such as their flags, organizations, and rhetoric.²¹

²¹ On the relationship between memory and nation, Kammen argued that, “an exploration of traditions in a particular cultural context may help us to determine the underlying basis of a community’s or a nation’s sense of identity,” and that, “history is an essential ingredient in defining national, group, and personal identity” (7, 10). Gillis also further discussed the link between collective memory and national identity, arguing that, “national identities are, like everything historical, constructed and reconstructed; and it is our responsibility to decode them in order to discover the relationships they create and sustain...national memory is shared by people who have never seen or heard of one another, yet who regard themselves as having a common history” (Gillis 4, 7).

Conclusion

The Children of the Confederacy's becoming the next generation of "Southern people" was as complex as the post-bellum era itself. Beginning in 1865 after the last shots were fired and the Civil War was declared over, the residents of the Southern states found themselves in an era of crisis. Physically, the Southern states experienced destroyed landscapes, defunct governments, economic ruin, and a disrupted social system. The mental "maims" equally devastated the ex-Confederates as they struggled to understand how they could have lost their righteous cause. Further, these people faced rhetorical crises as they struggled to control the South's public memory and worked to regain rhetorical agency as a collective "people." While some folks responded to defeat with optimism and determination to rebuild a "New South," most white ex-Confederates at the time responded with bitterness, resentment, and humiliation and adopted corresponding rhetorics.

In response to their defeat and crises, Southern orators chose to apologize, accommodate, or defend with their public discourses. Within those discourses, most Southern orators chose to speak with mythical rhetoric; namely, with the rhetoric of the Solid South, New South, Old South, or Lost Cause. The Lost Cause in particular became a significant rhetoric for ex-Confederates because it allowed them to remember the Confederacy as they thought it should be and it helped restore a sense of self to the defeated residents. The memorial associations in the

South that formed to meet these goals adopted mythical rhetoric, especially the Lost Cause.

The UDC became the largest and most popular women's memorial association in the South in the post-bellum years. Knowing that they faced potential hostility for their involvement in a public organization, the women represented themselves as "authorities" of public memory. With their position secured, the Daughters took on the challenges of preserving the South's memories and restoring rhetorical agency to its residents. To do that, the women drew from the mythical, rhetorical context of the time, especially the myths of the Old South and Lost Cause, and targeted the Southern children as their best hope. As such, the Daughters formed the Children of the Confederacy auxiliary group and wrote catechisms to prepare the children for their future as "Southern people."

The first move the women made was to construct collective memories for the Children with their catechisms. Drawing from the rhetorical context of the time, the women employed the Lost Cause and Old South myths to construct four narratives of the South's past. The women turned those narratives into mythical collective memories by oversimplifying, triggering, forgetting, "correcting," and glorifying, and by employing the catechism genre, which are moves that teach us something about how collective memories may be constructed before being employed in public discourse for strategic purposes. These memories not only helped the women address the South's memory crisis in the post-war years, they also formed the common history of the "Southern people."

The UDC catechism authors constituted the Children of the Confederacy as the next generation of “Southern people” by exploiting their mythical collective memories. With those memories, the women not only assembled a common history for “the people,” but they also evoked that common history to constitute the “Southern people” with a collective identity, a new nation, and necessary rhetorical actions and commitments. Then, with pathetic appeals and by having the Children perform the catechism ritual, the UDC interpellated the Children into the “Southern people” and taught them how to be Southern rhetorical subjects. In other words, by standing up out of their seats and announcing the answers to the catechism questions, the Children practiced how to speak as “Southern people” and were prepared to carry out their responsibilities of perpetuating Southern culture and its “people” into the future.

Afterword

We oppose the elimination of segregation, the repeal of miscegenation statutes, the control of private employment by Federal bureaucrats called for by the misnamed civil rights program. We favor home-rule, local self-government and a minimum interference with individual rights. (1)

—From the “Platform of the States Rights Democratic Party, Unanimously Adopted at Oklahoma City,” 1948.

In 1948, fourteen years after Decca Lamar West published her catechism for Children, the all-white members of the States Rights Democratic Party in Oklahoma met to draft their national party platform and nominate their presidential and vice-presidential candidates. The “Dixiecrat” party platform articulated the party’s stance against racial integration, as the epigraph illustrates, and thereby endorsed South Carolina Governor J. Strom Thurmond as their presidential candidate. When accepting the party’s national nomination that year, Thurmond, who had already established himself as a pro-segregation politician, did not disappoint his supporters as he announced, “And I want to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that there’s not enough troops in the Army to force the Southern people to break down segregation and admit the nigger race into our theatres, into our swimming pools, into our homes and into our churches” (NPR). What are evident here are traces of Lost Cause and Solid South rhetoric as these white Southern subjects pledged to stand “solid” against their African American “enemies” and against aggressive, outside interference in order to preserve their Southern “home.” In other words, Thurmond and the party who backed him spoke as “Southern people.”

While the “Southern people” of 1948 may not have been the exact same “generation” as the Children of the Confederacy in the post-bellum era—some of their motives or principles may have changed during that time—their rhetoric echoes a “Southern people” rhetorically prepared for another “invasion,” an invasion like the “War Between the States” and Radical Reconstruction. Evidence of a rhetorically prepared “Southern people” is perhaps most apparent in their discourse opposing racial integration. We may recall from chapter one that the “separate but equal” slogan of *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896 made it legal to separate the races in public capacities as long as accommodations were equal and remained part of American society into the 1950s. As moves were being made in the 1940s to eliminate segregation in the United States, especially by Northern politicians, the South responded with “massive resistance” (so named by U.S. Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr. of Virginia in 1956). Essentially, the “Southern people” were not going to allow outside aggressors to disrupt the peace they had established by telling them what to do, and they were ready to take that stand as “Southern people.”

Consider here the “Southern Manifesto” that was written in 1956 by members of the United States Congress who opposed racial de-segregation. Written largely in response to the 1954 *Brown vs. Board of Education* Supreme Court decision calling for the desegregation of public schools, and ultimately signed by nineteen US Senators and eighty-two US Representatives (all from the eleven former Confederate states), the document proclaimed:

Without regard to the consent of the governed, outside mediators are threatening immediate and revolutionary changes in our public school systems. If done, this is certain to destroy the system of public education in some of the States. With the gravest concern for the explosive and dangerous condition created by this decision and inflamed by outside meddlers: We reaffirm our reliance on the Constitution as the fundamental law of the land. (4459-4460)

Throughout this excerpt we see a narrative of “outside mediators” and “outside meddlers” which immediately brings to mind the “enemies” and “villains” that constituted the “Southern people’s” common identity: the Northern Yankees and African Americans. The “outside mediators” and “meddlers” in this case were the Northern politicians who supported de-segregation, who were just updated abolitionists and carpetbaggers in the eyes of Southerners. The biggest threats we see in this discourse, of course, were the African Americans who were still treated poorly across the country, especially in the South. What we also see here is the “Southern people’s” allegiance to constitutional rights as the “law of the land” (or “Southern” land).

There are many more examples that suggest the successful constitution of the “Southern people” for future researchers to examine. For example, into the 1960s we see white Southerners like Governor George Wallace also resisting de-segregation by arguing that the South was standing up to outsiders who wished to upset the South’s social order and constitutional rights: “The illegal and

unwarranted actions of the Central Government on this day, contrary to the laws, customs and traditions of this State is calculated to disturb the peace” (ADAH). Beyond that, we need only consider the controversies about displaying the Confederate flag to see how the “Southern people” refused to give up a symbol of their collective past, especially when told to do so by “outsiders.” By analyzing the rhetoric of Southerners in the mid-twentieth century decades (or even today), future rhetorical critics may be better able to determine how Southerners spoke as a “Southern people,” how their “generation” compared and contrasted with others, what their “convictions” were, and if the “Southern people’s” rhetoric ever lost its “force” and “wilted away.”

Appendix I: United Daughters of the Confederacy

Catechisms: Critical Editions and Essays

In keeping with my desire to preserve the UDC's catechisms and establish their rhetorical significance, I have gathered as many versions and instances of the texts as possible, collected primary and secondary information regarding the UDC's catechisms, and researched the history of the catechism genre. With this information, I have written individual critical editions of the texts as well as an essay on the history of the catechism genre and the UDC's catechisms in general (these two latter essays may be found in chapter one on pages 33-46). It is my hope that future rhetorical scholars studying the UDC and their texts will benefit by having "clean" catechisms available to them as well as an informative historical essay.

U.D.C. Catechism for Children Critical Edition Report

Cornelia Branch Stone served as the President-General of the United Daughters of the Confederacy from 1907 to 1909. Prior to her President-General appointment, “her first official position was that of President of the Texas Division, U. D. C., in which she served two years, honored and loved by her Division” (Gantt 210). Dedicated to education and history, Stone was a trailblazer of sorts in that she “appointed the first committee on education among the standing committees of the United Daughters of the Confederacy” in 1908 (Poppenheim et al. 95). In 1909, she set another trend in motion when, “for the first time,” a President-General “made reference in her report of the children’s work, as reported by Division presidents” (Poppenheim et al. 186). Even after her presidential position, Stone continued her work with the UDC, serving a chairperson of the Norman V. Randolph Memorial Relief Fund for Needy Confederate Women and chairperson for the Arlington Monument Fund committee (Poppenheim et al. 199). Honoring Stone and her continued commitment to education and history, the UDC created an educational scholarship and a fellowship in her name (Poppenheim et al. 110-111).

While it is not exactly clear when Stone served as President of the Texas Division of the UDC, it is probable that she wrote and published her 1904 catechism while serving in that capacity. Stone’s catechism, *U.D.C. Catechism for Children*, was likely first used in the Veuve Jefferson Chapter of the Children of

the Confederacy, as indicated on the cover page, and then perhaps in C. of C. Chapters across Texas when it was reprinted by the J.E.B. Stuart Chapter in 1912. The date 1912, incidentally, did not come from the catechism itself (as a matter of fact, the date “1904” appears on the text), but historian Charles R. Wilson established the “1912” date in his book, *Baptized in Blood*: “In 1912 the ‘U.D.C. Catechism for Children’ appeared, with historical facts about the war and Reconstruction arranged in dogmatic question-answer form” (140). Even stronger evidence of this re-publishing date came from Decca Lamar West in her “Statement Regarding Preparation of Manuscript” wherein she explained that she based her catechism on Stone’s 1912 catechism written “for use of the Children’s Auxiliary to Veuve Jefferson Davis Chapter U. D. C. (No. 17)” (2). The number of catechisms printed and where they were distributed are unknown.

A report on the variances between the versions is located at the end of the catechism. The numbers in brackets [] refer to question-answer sets and images. The places where the page numbers change are also placed in brackets with parallel lines between the page numbers [||].

Versions

- A Stone, Cornelia B. *U.D.C. Catechisms for Children*. Arranged for Veuve Jefferson Chapter U.D.C., Galveston, TX by Cornelia Branch Stone, 1904. Re-published by J.E.B. Stuart Chapter No. 10, U.D.C., 1912. Printed by Stonebruner and Prufer Printers. Acquired from the University of Virginia Library, Special Collections Department, Rare Books, Alderman Library. Copy Text.
- B Stone, Cornelia B. *U.D.C. Catechism for Children*. Arranged for Veuve Jefferson Chapter U.D.C., Galveston, TX, by Cornelia Branch Stone, 1904. Printing information unknown. Acquired from the University of Virginia Library, Special Collections Department, Rare Books, Alderman Library.

U. D. C.
CATECHISM
FOR CHILDREN

[Image 1]

ARRANGED BY
Veuve Jefferson Davis Chapter U. D. C.
GALVESTON, TEXAS
By CORNELIA BRANCH STONE, 1904

RE-PUBLISHED BY THE
J. E. B. Stuart Chapter No. 10, U. D. C.
STAUNTON, VIRGINIA. [Cover Page|1]

U. D. C.
CATECHISM
FOR CHILDREN

ARRANGED BY
Veuve Jefferson Davis Chapter U. D. C.
GALVESTON, TEXAS
By CORNELIA BRANCH STONE, 1904

RE-PUBLISHED BY THE
J. E. B. Stuart Chapter No. 10, U. D. C.
STAUNTON, VIRGINIA. [1|2]

Printed for the Benefit of

Stonewall Jackson Camp C. V. No. 25.
U. C. V. No. 469.
Stonebruner & Pruffer, Printers. [2|3]

U. D. C.
CATECHISM FOR CHILDREN.

[1] What causes led to the war between the States,
from 1861 to 1865?

The disregard, on the part of the States of the North,
for the rights of the Southern or slave-holding States.

[2] How was this shown?

By the passage of laws in the Northern States
annulling the rights of the people of the South—rights that
were given to them by the Constitution of the United States.

[3] What were these rights?

The rights to regulate their own affairs and to hold
slaves as property.

[4] Were the Southern States alone responsible for
the existence of slavery ?

No; slavery was introduced into the country in
colonial times by the political authorities of Great Britain,

Spain, France and the Dutch merchants, and in 1776—at the time of the Declaration of Independence—slavery existed in all of the thirteen colonies.

[5] How many of the colonies held slaves when the federal constitution was adopted, in 1787?

All except one.

[6] Did slavery exist among other civilized nations?

Yes, in most all; and our mother country, England, did not emancipate her slaves until 1843, when Parliament paid \$200,000,000 to the owners. [3||4]

[7] After the first introduction of slavery into the colonies, how was the African slave trade kept up?

By enterprising shipowners of New England, who imported the slaves from Africa and secretly sold their cargoes along the coast, after the States of the North had abolished slavery.

[8] Why did not slavery continue to exist in the States of New England?

Because they found it unprofitable, and they sold their slaves to the States of the South.

[9] What great leader in the Northern army owned slaves?

Gen. U. S. Grant, who continued to live on their hire and service until the close of the war, and after the emancipation proclamation had been published, while he was leading armies to free the slaves of the South.

[10] When the Northern States had sold their slaves to the South, what did they then do?

They organized a party to oppose slavery, called the “Abolition Party,” which advocated all means to abolish slavery, with no intention of paying the people of the South for their property.

[11] When did the South become alarmed?

At the election of Abraham Lincoln by this party, which was pledged to take away the slaves and offer no terms of payment to the owners.

[12] Did the people of the South believe that slavery was right?

No, not as a principle; and the colonies of Virginia and Georgia had strongly opposed its first introduction, but after the Constitution of the United States had recognized the slaves as property, and the wealth of the South was

largely invested in negroes, they did not feel it was just to submit to wholesale robbery. [4||5]

[13] How were the slaves treated?

With great kindness and care in nearly all cases, a cruel master being rare, and lost the respect of his neighbors if he treated his slaves badly. Self interest would have prompted good treatment if a higher feeling of humanity had not.

[14] What was the feeling of the slaves towards their masters?

They were faithful and devoted and were always ready and willing to serve them.

[15] How did they behave during the war?

They nobly protected and cared for the wives of soldiers in the field, and widows without protectors; though often prompted by the enemies of the South to burn and plunder the homes of their masters, they were always true and loyal.

[16] What were the principles of the Southern people?

They believed that each State should regulate her

own affairs, according to its best interests, with no meddling with the management of other States, and that each State should loyally support the Constitution of the United States.

[17] Who was most prominent in defining "States Rights?"

John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina.

[18] What steps did the Southern people take after the election of Mr. Lincoln?

They seceded from the Union, and at once took possession of the forts, arms and ammunition within their borders.

[19] Did the forts surrender without resistance?

In nearly all cases.

[20] In what order did the States secede?

South Carolina, December 20, 1860.[5||6]

Mississippi, January 9, 1861.

Florida, January 10, 1861.

Alabama, January 11, 1861.

Georgia, January 19, 1861.

Louisiana, January 26, 1861.

Texas, February 1, 1861.

Virginia, April 17, 1861.
Arkansas, May 6, 1861.
North Carolina, May 20, 1861.
Tennessee, June 24, 1861.
Missouri, October 31, 1861.
Kentucky, November 20, 1861.

[21] What other State attempted to secede?

Maryland.

[22] How was this prevented?

The Maryland Legislature was closed by the United States marshal and the secession members were sent to prison on September 18, 1861.

[23] What had happened before this in Baltimore?

Federal troops in passing through that city to invade the South, were attacked on April 19, 1861, by the citizens of Baltimore and a fight ensued in the streets, and the first blood of the war was there shed.

[24] Did Maryland take any part in the cause of the South?

Yes, most valiant part, by furnishing many regiments of men and other aid for carrying on the war, and

those who gave this aid endured persecution and imprisonment by the Federal authorities, as well as from those at home who opposed secession. Maryland was only kept in the Union by force.

[25] What honor did General Lee confer on Maryland officers?

In the last retreat of the world-famed fighting army of northern Virginia he appointed Col. H. Kyd Douglas and Col. Clement Sullivane, two staff officers, one twenty-four years of age, the other twenty-six, to command the rear guard of the two divisions of the little army on its way to Appomattox.

[26] What was the first step taken by the seceded States?

They proceeded to organize a government, by uniting themselves under the name of the Confederate States of America, and adopted a Constitution for their guidance.

[27] Whom did they elect as their President?

Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi, senator from that State in the Congress of the United States, when Mississippi seceded, and already distinguished as a soldier and statesman, having gallantly served in the Mexican war, and

as secretary of war under President Pierce, and member of both houses of Congress.

[28] Did he resign his seat in the Senate as soon as his State seceded?

No. His State seceded on January 9th, and he remained in the Senate until January 21st, pleading for some pledge from the North that would secure the interests of the people of the South.

[29] Does it appear from this that he led his people to secession?

No; like General Lee, he was led by the people of his State, obeying their call, and believing that his first duty was to his State.

[30] Who was elected Vice President?

Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, eminent in his country's history.

[31] Had the Confederate States any other President or Vice President?

No; Mr. Davis was the first and only President, and there was no other Vice President than Mr. Stephens. [7||8]

[32] Where did the first Congress of the Confederacy meet?

At Montgomery, Alabama, on February 4, 1861, and on the 9th of February Mr. Davis was unanimously elected President, and inaugurated on the 18th of February, in the Alabama State House, Montgomery was the first capital of the Confederacy.

[33] Who did Mr. Davis select for his cabinet?

Robert Toombs, of Georgia, secretary of state; Leroy P. Walker, of Alabama, secretary of war; Charles G. Memminger, of South Carolina, secretary of the treasury; Stephen H. Mallory, of Florida, secretary of the navy; Judah P. Benjamin, of Louisiana, attorney general, and John H. Reagan, of Texas, postmaster general. The last three named continued in the cabinet as long as the government lasted.

[34] Where and when was the capital moved?

To Richmond, Virginia, on May 6, 1861.

[35] Did the Confederacy have a flag?

Yes; Congress, on March 6, 1861, passed an act adopting the first flag of the Confederacy, called the "stars and bars."

[36] How many stars had this flag at this time?

Seven, as only that number of States had then seceded, but other stars were added as the other States came into the Confederacy until there were thirteen. There were three bars, two red and one white.

[37] Why was another flag adopted?

Because the “stars and bars” were mistaken, at the battle of Manassas for the flag of the United States, and it was unsafe to use it in battle.

[38] Who designed the battle flag? [8||9]

General Beauregard, after the battle of Manassas, and his design was adopted by Congress as a battle flag and used throughout the war.

[39] What was the battle flag?

The cross of St. Andrew on a field of red, the cross blue, on which was thirteen stars.

[40] What other flag was used?

This battle flag on a large field of white was adopted by Congress as the flag of the Confederacy, but it was found that so large an expanse of white might be mistaken for a

flag of truce, and Congress ordered a band of red across the end of the white field.

[41] Was this last flag ever used?

No; it was adopted just before the fall of the Confederacy, and was never used.

[42] How are these flags used by the different Confederate organizations?

The Confederate Veterans have for their emblem the battle flag, and the Sons of Veterans have adopted the last flag of the Confederacy, while the Daughters of the Confederacy use the “stars and bars,” the first flag adopted by the Confederate States.

[43] When was the first shot fired in the war between the States?

At Fort Sumter, in the harbor of Charleston, on April 12, 1861.

[44] Where did the last fight occur?

At Palmetto Ranch, near Brownsville, Texas, on May 13, 1865, between a Confederate force of 300, under Gen. James E. Slaughter, and a Federal force of 500, commanded by Col. T. F. Burrett.

[45] Where was the first battle fought? [9||10]

At Manassas, Virginia, on July 21, 1861, and it was a great victory for the Confederate army.

[46] How many were enrolled in the Federal, or Northern army?

Two million, seven hundred and seventy-eight thousand, three hundred and four (2,778,304).

[47] What number was enrolled in the Confederate army?

Six hundred thousand (600,000).

[48] How many more men were in the Northern army?

More than three times as many as the South had in the field.

[49] How many years did the war last?

Four years, and there is no record, in all the world's history of an army that endured more privations with greater fortitude, or fought more bravely than the soldiers of the Confederacy.

[50] Under what disadvantages did the Confederate army fight?

Not only did the Confederates have greatly inferior numbers, but they were poorly armed, often scarce of ammunition, and scantily fed and clothed.

[51] What was the spirit of the army?

Always ready to follow their leaders and never willing to give up the fight. "Victory or death" was their motto.

[52] Who was made commander in chief of all the Confederate forces?

Robert E. Lee, the best beloved and honored of all the Confederate generals.

[53] When did the war come to a close?

When General Lee surrendered his army, at Appomattox, Va., on April 9, 1865. [10||11]

[54] How many men did he surrender?

About 25,000.

[55] To what Northern general did he surrender?

Gen. U. S. Grant, who had 120,000 men in his army.

[56] Was the Confederate army defeated?

No; it was overpowered by numbers, and its resources exhausted.

[57] What soon followed General Lee's surrender?

The surrender of all of the Confederate forces and the capture of President Davis and his cabinet in Georgia.

[58] What were the conditions of surrender, as made by General Grant?

These conditions were liberal and generally observed, except in the case of President Davis and some others. Mr. Davis was subjected to many humiliations, even to being put in irons.

[59] Why do the people of the South honor him so greatly?

First, for his integrity of character as a man and patriot, and because he suffered the greater martyrdom for their cause.

[60] Were the people of the South punished for engaging in the war?

Yes; by losing nearly all that they possessed, and further by having a horde of men called "carpet-baggers" sent down South to rule over them and rob them of the little left to them by the ruins of war.

[61] When did the Daughters of the Confederacy organize?

On September 10, 1894, at Nashville, Tenn.

[62] For what purpose did they organize? [11||12]

To preserve the true history of the Confederacy and keep in sacred memory the brave deeds of the men of the South, their devotion to their country and to the cause of right, with no bitterness toward the government of the United States, under which we now live.

[63] What other purpose have the Daughters of the Confederacy?

To teach their children from generation to generation that there was no stain upon the action of their forefathers in the war between the States, and the women of the South, who nobly sustained them in that struggle, and will ever feel that their deathless deeds of valor are a precious heritage to be treasured for all time to come.

[64] For what was the army of the South particularly noted?

For its great commanders—great as soldiers and great as men of stainless character—and for the loyalty of the men in the ranks, who were dauntless in courage, “the bravest of the brave,” ever ready to rush into the “jaws of death” at the command of their great leaders.

Notes

The spacing, indentation, and capitalization are similar to the original. Also, I have left all of the spelling and grammar mistakes in this edition because that is how the Children learned them.

[Image 1] This image is a drawing of the Confederate Battle Flag crossed with a flag that resembles the Virginia state flag (which features the “Sic Semper Tyrannis” seal) A: Drawing of UDC insignia B.

[Cover Page] ARRANGED BY A: ARRANGED FOR B. RE-PUBLISHED BY THE J. E. B. Stuart Chapter No. 10, U. D. C. STAUNTON, VIRGINIA A. Handwritten note, [19--] B.

[|1] ARRANGED BY A: ARRANGED FOR B. RE-PUBLISHED BY THE J. E. B. Stuart Chapter No. 10, U. D. C. STAUNTON, VIRGINIA A.

[|2] Printed for the Benefit of Stonewall Jackson Camp C. V. No. 25. U. C. V. No. 469 A: MOTTO Veve Jefferson Davis Chapter No. 17, U.D.C. “With God Everything, Without God Nothing.” Chapter Flower, OLEANDER. B.

[33] continud should be spelled “continued,” as it is in B.

[47] were enrolled B.

[49] Four years; B.

[53] April 10, 1865 B. In version B, the number 10 was crossed out with a hand-written slash and the number 9 hand-written below it. There is no indication who “corrected” the date in version B.

[|12] Handwritten note on bottom of page, “Mrs. Lucy London Anderson State historian No. C. has records” B.

A Confederate Catechism for Southern Children Critical Edition Report

Mrs. John P. Allison, according to the introductory material in her catechism, “organized the Dodson Ramseur Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, Concord, N.C. March 28, 1898, and served as its first president” (1). Beyond that, Allison founded the John Phifer Young Chapter of the Children of the Confederacy on June 3, 1900 “at her home with 26 members present. She was the first leader and held this office for 25 years” (Allison 1). Additionally, as I reported in chapter one, Allison’s catechism “was adopted and used throughout the South in all the various chapters,” although in which chapters and when is unknown (Allison 12). Besides this information, I have found no other versions or instances of the text nor have I discovered any references to Allison or her catechism in the UDC’s meeting minutes, the *Confederate Veteran* magazine, or the *History of the UDC, 1894-1955*. Also, I have not found any collections of Allison’s papers in any libraries.

A report on the variances is located at the end of the catechism. The numbers in brackets [] refer to question-answer sets. The places where the page numbers change are also placed in brackets with parallel lines between the page numbers [||].

Version

- A Allison, Mrs. John P. *A Confederate Catechism for Southern Children*. Concord, NC: Kestler Brothers Printers, 1946. Originally edited and published in 1908 by Mrs. J. P. Allison, re-published in 1946 by Mrs. Charles A. Cannon and Mrs. Guy M. Beaver. Acquired from the Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County in Charlotte, North Carolina. Copy Text.

A
CONFEDERATE CATECHISM
FOR
SOUTHERN CHILDREN

By
MRS. JOHN P. ALLISON
Leader of
THE JOHN PHIFER YOUNG CHAPTER
CHILDREN OF THE CONFEDERACY [Cover||1]

[Image 1]

MRS. JOHN P. ALLISON

Organized the Dodson Ramseur Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, Concord, N. C. March 28, 1898, and served as its first president.

The John Phifer Young Chapter, Children of the Confederacy, an auxiliary of the Dodson Ramseur Chapter was organized by Mrs. Allison June 3, 1900 at her home with 26 members present. She was the first leader and held this office for 25 years. [1||2]

[Image 2]

CAPT. JOHN PHIFER YOUNG

The John Phifer Young Chapter Children of the Confederacy, Concord, N. C. was named to honor the

memory of Capt. John Phifer Young of Cabarrus County. He enlisted May 8, 1861 in Company B, 7th. Reg. N. C. Troops. Johnny Young was not quite 16 years old, being the youngest commissioned officer in the service of the Confederate Army. He was made Captain March 11, 1863, killed at Chancellorsville May 3, 1863. [2||3]

CONFEDERATE CATECHISM
FOR
YOUNG CHILDREN

[1] I. What organization is this?

Ans..... Chapter
Children of the Confederacy.

[2] II. Why are you called children of the Confederacy?

Ans. Because we are the children and grand children and descendants of Confederate Soldiers and Statesmen.

[3] III. Who are Confederate Soldiers?

Ans. Those Southern men, who fought for Southern rights, for the homes and firesides of our dear Southland.

[4] IV. What do you mean by the Confederacy?

Ans. The Southern States which seceded from the Union and became a Separate Government.

[5] V. What was this government called?

Ans. The Confederate States of America. [3||4]

[6] VI. Is this government still in existence?

Ans. No.

[7] VII. Why?

Ans. Because it was overpowered by large numbers, and forced to surrender to the United States government.

[8] VIII. Whom did the Confederate States fight?

Ans. The Northern States.

[9] IX. What was this great war called?

Ans. The war between the States.

[10] X. Is it incorrect to call it the "Civil War" as some do?

Ans. Yes—A civil war is a war between subjects

of the same government, and this was a war between two separate governments, and therefore was not a civil war.

[11] XI. How many states seceded?

Ans. Thirteen.

[12] XII. Name them.

Ans. South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas, Virginia, North Carolina, Arkan-[4||5]sas, Tennessee, Missouri, Kentucky.

[13] XIII. What did the North and the South fight about?

Ans. The North would not grant us constitutional rights, nor would they let us alone, the South could no longer submit to the tyranny and oppression of the North, and was obliged to fight (See Alexander Stevens' "War Between the States" Vol. 2, page 125.)

[14] XVI. What is meant here by constitutional rights?

Ans. The right of Self government called States rights, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

[15] XV. What is the Constitution of the United States.

Ans. The laws that govern our country—made by our forefathers, more than a hundred years ago.

[16] XVI. Was it right for the Confederate States to secede?

Ans. Yes, they could not do otherwise, under the circumstances.

[17] XVII. If the right of self-government called “State’s rights” is in accordance [5||6] with the constitution of the United States, why did the North refuse us these rights?

Ans. Because the North could not get on without us; they needed the products of our soil, our brave men for soldiers, and our wise men for counsel, and knowing that there were only 13 Southern States and 22 Northern States, they felt they could domineer over us, rule us unjustly and compel us to submit to it.

[18] XVIII. Was Slavery the cause of the war?

Ans. It was one of the issues, but the matter of “States Rights” was the cause of the war.

[19] XIX. What is meant by “States Rights?”

Ans. The right of a state to govern itself. When a state enters the Union by adopting the Federal Constitution, (as North Carolina did in 1789), it does not give up the right of self-government; hence each state elects its own Legislature to make laws for its own people.

[20] XX. Is “States Rights” now recognized by the U. S. as a part of the Constitution, and did the North not know it was, at the time it was refused the South? [6||7]

Ans. Yes, and the North always knew it was a part of the Constitution.

[21] XXI. If our cause was right why did we not succeed in gaining our independence?

Ans. The North overpowered us at last, with larger numbers, they had all the world to aid them, we had no one, we fought the world.

[22] XXII. How long did we fight the North?

Ans. Four years.

[23] XXIII. Did we kill many Yankees?

Ans. Yes, thousands and thousands of them.

[24] XXIV. Why did we at last surrender?

Ans. Because Gen. Lee thought it was wise not to shed more blood, when he saw we could not succeed.

[25] XXV. What reason did one Confederate soldier give for giving up?

Ans. He said, “we wore ourselves out whipping the Yankees.”

[26] XXVII. Some say if our cause was right, why did the “God of battles” let us fail? [7||8]

Ans. God does not always permit His children to have their way, and God is the vindicator. (Shakespeare says: “Triumphal marches are beat, not for successful persons only, but also for the conquered and slain.”)

[27] XXVIII. Were our Confederate Solders and our relatives who fought in the Confederate army traitors?

Ans. No! No! No!

[28] XXIX. Who says so?

Ans. The Yankees say so, and teach in their schools, and want it taught to Southern children.

[29] XXX. What is a traitor?

Ans. One who betrays a trust, one who is

unfaithful to one’s country.

[30] XXXI. Do you like to think of your fathers, grandfathers and relatives who fought in this great war, as traitors?

Ans. No.

[31] XXXII. Then what are you going to do about it? Do you think it is right to sit in silence, and hear that our brave Southern soldiers were traitors?

Ans. No. We will deny the false [8||9] charge and prove it by history.

[32] XXXIII. How are you got to get true history?

Ans. By having histories taught in our schools, written by just people, by joining Confederate organizations and listening to what our leaders tell us.

[33] XXXIV. Why is it so important for Southern children to learn these truths?

Ans. Because when the older people pass away, we can take their places, and teach the truth, and be proud of our Confederate ancestry.

[34] XXXV. Are you taught to hate anyone?

Ans. No.

[35] XXXVI. What does your leader teach you?

Ans. The truth, and Confederate History.

[36] XXXVII. Is it wrong to tell the truth in all things?

Ans. No.

[37] XXXVIII. Then isn't it right for your leader to teach you the truth in these matters?

Ans. Yes.

[38] XXXIX. What does it mean to be patriotic?

Ans. To love one's native land and to stand up for its rights.

[39] XL. Do you want to be patriotic?

Ans. Yes. I would be ashamed not to be.

[40] XLI. Do you love your native South, then?

Ans. Yes.

[41] XLII. Were Confederate Soldiers brave?

Ans. Yes, the bravest in the world, history says so.

[42] XLIII. Who was the first and only President of the Confederate States of America?

Ans. President Jefferson Davis.

[43] XLIV. Was he a good man?

Ans. Yes, a great, good and wise man.

[44] XLV. Who made him President?

Ans. The Southern people who said he was the right man in the right place.

[45] XLVI. Should we love and honor his name and memory?

Ans. Yes. Always. [10||11]

[46] XLVII. What was the Capital of the Confederacy?

Ans. Richmond, Va.

[47] XLVIII. Who was the Commander-in-chief of the Confederate Army?

Ans. Gen. Robert E. Lee.

[48] XLIX. Was he a great General?

Ans. Yes, one of the greatest the world ever saw.

[49] XLX. Who was called Gen. Lee's right arm?

Ans. Gen. Stonewall Jackson.

[50] LI. For whom is your chapter named?

Ans.

[51] LII. Do you love your chapter?

Ans. Yes.

[52] All who intend to be faithful to this chapter, work for the Confederate cause, and always stand up for their native South, hold up your hands. [11||12]

This Confederate Catechism was presented to the United Daughters of the Confederacy, North Carolina Division, at the twelfth annual convention which was held at Goldsboro, North Carolina October 14, 1908. It was adopted and used throughout the South in all the various chapters.

Edited and published; 1908, by Mrs. J. P.

Allison. Re-published by Mrs. Charles A. Cannon and Mrs. Guy M. Beaver, June 11, 1946, Concord, N. C.

Kestler Bros., Printers—Concord, N. C.

Notes

The spacing, indentation, and capitalization are similar to the original. Also, I have left all of the spelling and grammar mistakes in this edition because that is how the Children learned them.

[Cover Page] At the top of the page are the hand-written words “Confederate States of America” and the letters “NCR.” In the middle of the page is library stamp with the words, “Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg Count[y] Charlotte, N.C.” Across the bottom of the page is a call number sticker, possibly blocking text.

[1] At the bottom of the page are hand-written call letters and numbers, “NCR 369.17 Allison,” and the date “6/3/57.”

[14] This is supposed to be number XIV, but I am keeping the numbers as the Children learned them.

[15] The question should end with a question mark, not a period.

[26] This is supposed to be number XXVI (and consequently, all of the numbers after it are numbered incorrectly by one), but I am keeping the numbers as the Children learned them.

[36] This was supposed to read “Is it.”

UDC Catechism of South Carolina's Confederate History Critical Edition Report

Mrs. St. John Alison Lawton served as Historian-General of the UDC from 1922 until probably 1924 (the Historian-Generals typically served two-year terms). As Historian-General, Lawton raised “a fund of \$30,000.00 to provide for historical work” and expressed her commitment to the C. of C. by preparing “a yearbook with an outline of study embracing the four years of the war” (Poppenheim et al. 139). According to Poppenheim et al., Lawton’s yearbook (which I have not been able to locate) provided “outlines of the life of Jefferson Davis, the Confederate navy and Confederate cavalry....the beginning of civil government by Southern people; the question of slavery;...the causes of the war; and finally, the part played by the South in the building of the nation” (139). Incidentally, it should be noted that Lawton, along with Mrs. A.A. Campbell and Mrs. Charles R. Hyde, also wrote “Part V: Historical Work” of the *History of the UDC, 1894-1955* book edited by Poppenheim et al.

After serving as Historian-General, Lawton was elected President-General of the UDC from 1925 to 1927 during which time she stayed loyal to her historical interests and suggested that the Jefferson Davis Historical Foundation be organized, “seeking to express veneration for Mr. Davis and to perpetuate the great truths for which he and his followers so valiantly stood” (Poppenheim et al. 289). Lawton also recommended that “a loving cup, to be known as the Mildred Lewis

Rutherford Loving Cup” be awarded to Rutherford “as a testimonial of admiration of the general organization for this former Historian-General” (Poppenheim et al. 137). After Rutherford received her cup, the cup would be “bestowed annually upon the Daughter of the Confederacy writing the most meritorious criticism of history or biography dealing with the Confederate period” (Poppenheim et al. 137).

While not certain, it is highly likely that Lawton served as “Chairman” of the South Carolina Division’s history committee before becoming Historian-General. It was the South Carolina history committee, comprised of Mrs. J.R. Vandiver, Miss Zena Payne, Mrs. C.P. Murray, and Mrs. E.J. Burch, that arranged the *UDC Catechism of South Carolina’s Confederate History*. The date of this catechism is in question because it is not indicated anywhere on the text, but the University of South Carolina’s Library listed the catechism in their records as being published in 1919. Not only that, but the inside cover of the catechism acknowledged the President-General as Miss Mary B. Poppenheim, who we know served in that capacity from 1917-1919, and acknowledged Miss Grace Dell James of Bishopville as a “Prize Winner in Catechism Contest” for 1919 (which contest is not known). Therefore, it seems safe to assume that the catechism was at least written and/or first published in 1919.

A report on the variances is located at the end of the catechism. The numbers in brackets [] refer to question-answer sets. The places where the page numbers change are also placed in brackets with parallel lines between the page numbers [||].

Version

- A Lawton, Mrs. St. John Alison (Chairman of History Committee), Mrs. J. R. Vandiver (History Committee), Miss Zena Payne (History Committee), Mrs. C. P. Murray (History Committee), and Mrs. E. J. Burch (History Committee). *UDC Catechism of South Carolina's Confederate History*. Arranged by The History Committee, South Carolina Division, UDC. Charleston: J.J. Furlong, Charleston Printing House, 1919. Acquired from the University of South Carolina's Library. Copy Text.

U. D. C. CATECHISM
of
SOUTH CAROLINA'S
Confederate History
arranged by
The History Committee
SOUTH CAROLINA DIVISION, U. D. C.

MRS. St. JOHN ALISON LAWTON, Chairman,
MRS. J. R. VANDIVER,
MISS ZENA PAYNE,
MRS. C. P. MURRAY,
MRS. E. J. BURCH,
Committee. [Cover|3]

Miss Mary B. Poppenheim,
President-General,
U. D. C.

Mrs. John Cart,
President, S. C. Division,
U. D. C.

PRIZE WINNERS IN CATECHISM CONTEST:

Mrs. J. R. Vandiver,
Anderson, 1918,

Miss Grace Dell James,
Bishopville, 1919. [3|4]

—TO—
GEN. C. IRVINE WALKER,
DR. T. GRANGE SIMONS.

Most grateful acknowledgement is hereby made for the valuable assistance they so cheerfully rendered the History Committee in the preparation of this work. [4|5]

CATECHISM OF SOUTH CAROLINA'S
CONFEDERATE HISTORY.

[1] Name the South's greatest exponent of State's Rights, and give life dates.

John Caldwell Calhoun, of S. C.; 1782-1850.

[2] Mention his home, his burial place, and the chief public services of his political career.

Born in Abbeville District, March 18th, 1782. Lived at Fort Hill, Oconee County, South Carolina. Buried in St. Philips Church Yard, Charleston, S. C., 1811-1850; Member of Congress, Secretary of War, Vice-President, U. S. Senator, Secretary of State.

[3] Where did the National Democratic Convention

of 1860 meet?

Charleston, S. C., April, 1860.

[4] After the sectional split in the Party, and the election of Lincoln, which was the first state to secede, and when?

South Carolina. December 20th, 1860.

[5] By what term did it refer to the Constitution of the U. S.?

The Compact.

[6] What did it declare concerning the Union?

That it was dissolved.

[7] How many Signers were there, and how were they chosen?

One hundred and sixty-nine members of a State Convention, chosen by popular vote. [5][6]

[8] Where did the delegates convene, and where was the Ordinance signed?

The S. C. Secession Convention met in the First Baptist Church of Columbia, but owing to a small-pox epidemic, it completed its work in St. Andrews Hall, in Charleston, S. C.

[9] Where is the original Ordinance preserved, and how are the facsimile copies accounted for?

The original Ordinance is preserved in the archives of the S. C., Historical Commission in the S. C. Capitol. A copy was presented to each signer. One of these is in the Library at Winthrop College, one in the Record Room of the Lee County Court House, and others elsewhere.

[10] What part did the “Star of the West” play in precipitating the war?

The “Star of the West” was a small vessel containing troops and provisions, sent to re-inforce Maj. Anderson. She endeavored to reach Fort Sumter on January 9th, 1861, but when fired upon from Morris Island by students of the South Carolina Military Academy, she turned back. Six more states immediately seceded, and the seven Confederate states at once called for volunteers.

[11] Who was chosen as Secretary of War of the S. C. Government? and what provision was made for obtaining revenue?

D. F. Jamison, of Barnwell.

A tariff to be collected at all points of entrance into the state.

[12] Whom did the Confederate Government assign as director of South Carolina's defenses?

General G. T. Beauregard. [6||7]

[13] Where was the scene of the first struggle between the South and the U. S., and how was it precipitated?

The first combat occurred in Charleston Harbour, upon the refusal of the garrison of Fort Sumter to surrender the property there to the C. S. A., the demand being made when the rumor became current that U. S. gunboats were on their way to protect the Fort.

[14] What was the object of Beauregard's attack?

The reduction of Fort Sumter.

[15] When did the bombardment take place, and with what effect?

From 4 o'clock A. M., April 12th, 1861, for thirty-three hours, until the U. S. flag was hauled down. There was

no loss of life, except one man, who was killed by the explosion of a gun, when the salute was fired. After this, Lincoln called for 75,000 troops to coerce the seceding states, upon that call Virginia, Arkansas, North Carolina, and Tennessee seceded.

[16] Name the South Carolinians who served the Confederate Cabinet?

Charles G. Memminger, Secretary of the Treasury.
G. A. Trenholm, Secretary of the Treasury.
Lewis Cruger, Comptroller and Solicitor.

[17] What young engineer superintended the fortifications of Charleston Harbour?

Captain, later Major John Johnson; for many years after the war the beloved rector of St. Philip's Church, Charleston. A man who made valuable additions to the history of South Carolina, not only by his actual work in the formation, but in his careful and accurate written accounts. [7||8]

[18] What Confederate general afterwards became Episcopal Bishop of South Carolina?

Gen. Ellison Capers who distinguished himself as greatly during the war by his gallantry and discretion, as he did afterwards by his piety and eloquence.

[19] By what name is Gen. Richard H. Anderson known in Confederate History?

“Fighting Dick Anderson.”

[20] Who were the Confederate commanders defending Fort Sumter?

Alfred Rhett, Stephen Elliott, John Mitchell and Thomas Huguenin.

[21] Was Fort Sumter ever captured by the Federals?

Never. Neither Fort Sumter nor Charleston, though severely bombarded for over two years. They were both voluntarily evacuated at the end of the war, when the struggle was seen to be hopeless.

[22] Who bestowed the soubriquet “Stonewall” on Gen. Thomas J. Jackson, and why?

Gen. Barnard E. Bee, of South Carolina, during the first battle of Manasses, the first land battle of the war. When his brigade seemed to waver during a particularly hot encounter he pointed to Gen. Jackson, whose brigade was near by, and urging his men to rally, exclaimed: “Look there at Jackson! He is standing like a stone-wall”. The men took fresh courage and pressed on to victory, but Gen. Bee himself fell mortally wounded.

[23] What part of South Carolina territory was taken by the enemy early in the war.

Port Royall, commanded by Gen. Thomas F. Drayton, with Beaufort and the surrounding country, taken by the Federals in November, 1861. [8||9]

[24] Tell of the Battle of Secessionville James Island?

The Federal force which had captured Port Royall determined to take Charleston also, and on June 16th, 1862, they attacked with a force of six thousand men the Confederate fort at Secessionville, defended by seven hundred and fifty men, under the immediate command of Major Lamar. There was a Confederate reserve of thirteen hundred under Col. Hagood. The Federals were defeated and withdrew. This was one of the three decisive battles of the War. This was a “Colonel’s battle;” no one above the rank of Colonel being engaged. Colonel Hagood, 1st Regt., Col. Gaillard, 27th Regt., Col. C. H. Stevens and Col. Ellison Capers, 24th Regt., Col. Chas. H. Simonton, 25th Regt., being in command.

[25] Who was in command of the force defending Charleston?

Gen. R. S. Ripley.

[26] Tell of the attack and defense of Charleston Harbor.

In April, 1863 a powerful ironclad fleet attacked Fort Sumter and was driven off, after a terrific fight. Other assaults also resulted in failure to the enemy. For four years Charleston stood impregnable against all assaults from the Sea.

[27] What was the “Little David”, and what became of it?

The “Little David” was the first successful torpedo boat ever made. It was designed by Dr. St. Julien Ravenel, of Charleston, and named “Little David” because it was to attack a great Goliath, a large U. S. War ship, “Ironsides” in Charleston Harbor. It crippled the big ship and returned under Capt. Carlin to port. It was the fore-runner of the modern sea devils. [9||10]

[28] Tell of “The Hundley”.

The boat named for her designer Horace L. Hundley, was built Mobile, Ala. in 1863. She could carry a crew of 9 men, and could remain below water 30 minutes.

She was sent by rail to Charleston, S. C. Six crews were lost on her, the last being in the attack of the “Housatonic” off Charleston Harbor, February 17, 1864. The brave little boat steered straight for the big vessel, her

torpedo striking the Housatonic amidship. The big sloop-of-war sank immediately, the Hundley sinking with her. Her crew unable to open the man hole was drowned.

[29] Who were the “Immortal 600”?

They were 600 young Southern officers who were placed on Morris Island, S. C., under fire of their own guns from the forts in the harbor, enduring great hardship and with insufficient food.

Only 17 of the 600 were finally forced by their great suffering to take the oath of alligiance. The others remained faithful to the end. About a third of the original number survived.

[30] What is the approximate of the S. C. Fighting men furnished the C. S. Service?

Sixty-five thousand.

[31] Where did they serve?

In the Army of Northern Virginia; in the Trans-Miss. Department; in the Army of the West, and in Coast Defense.

[32] What was South Carolina’s loss in men in the C. S. service?

17,682 died in service. Thousands died from the effects of the war in the years immediately following.[10||11]

[33] Who were South Carolina's war governors?

Francis Pickens, December 1860-1862,
M. L. Bonham, December, 1862-1864,
A. G. Magrath, December 1864-May 1865.

[34] Name two war poets from South Carolina.

Paul H. Hayne, Henry Timrod.

[35] Give the titles of some of their calls to service.

Carolina, Charleston, a Cry to Arms, by Timrod.
My Motherland, Stonewall Jackson, by Hayne.

[36] What was the direction of Sherman's Raiders in South Carolina in 1865, and what policy did the ravages of his soldiers indicate?

From Savannah northwest to Columbia, thence north-east to Fayetteville, devastating a fifty mile belt.

Destruction of property and homes and humiliation of the people.

[37] What city was burned in February 1865 as the hot-bed of secession, and who was falsely charged by Sherman with having started the fires?

Columbia.

Its defender Wade Hampton.

[38] Who burned Columbia?

Gen. Sherman by his own confession, though at the time he declared that it was done by Hampton.

[39] In the burning of Columbia, why were the University buildings, among which was the valuable College Library, spared?

Because those buildings, and especially the library, were used as a hospital, and not even Sherman destroyed hospitals containing sick and wounded. [11||12]

[40] As the chief fighting in South Carolina was near the coast why was the state so prostrated after the war?

Because its fighting men being in other states, there was nothing to oppose Sherman's march from Atlanta to the Sea, and his army passed like a flock of locusts over a field of grain, ruthlessly destroying everything in their path.

[41] What and where were the “Wayside Hospitals”?

The “Wayside Hospitals” originated with the Women of Columbia, but soon spread to every hamlet in the State. They dispensed to sick and wounded soldiers medicine, food, bandages, clothing, and any other supplies available. The ladies had these in readiness at railroad stations, on the highroads, on the trains and elsewhere. Among the number of noble women who worked so untiringly for the soldiers may be mentioned Mrs. Sarah Rowe, of Orangeburg, Mrs. Mary Ann Buie, of Aiken, Mrs. McCord, of Charleston.

[42] Name our Reconstruction Governors.

B. F. Perry, Greenville, May 1865-November 1865, Provisional; appointed by President Andrew Johnson; J. L. Orr, Anderson, November, 1865-June, 1868, elected under Constitution framed by Convention of the people in 1865; R. K. Scott, Ohio, June, 1868-December, 1872, elected according to Constitution of 1868, following the orders issued in the Military District created by President Grant; F. J. Moses, Jr., Sumter, S. C., December, 1872-1874; D. H. Chamberlain, Massachusetts, December, 1874-March, 1877.

[43] Which Military District was the Commonwealth of South Carolina called?

District No. 2. [12||13]

[44] What did Judge A. P. Aldridge of the Superior Court say on receipt of the Federal order to dissolve the Court?

He directed the sheriff to let the court stand while justice was stifled.

[45] According to the Constitution of 1868, who could vote?

Every negro man had the right to vote, while whites who aided the Confederacy were barred.

[46] Who was the “carpet-bagger” in politics?

An outsider who exploited the South for personal gain and preferment.

[47] What was the financial policy of the State Government during the Reconstruction period?

Fraudulent collection of taxes, issuing of bonds, personal graft.

[48] What part did the negro play?

They served in Congress; half of the State Legislature were ignorant negroes; many magistrates and minor officers were negroes; but on the whole the negro was the cat’s paw

of the carpet bagger. The National Guard in South Carolina consisted of negro militia. Perhaps 40,000 were issued arms and uniforms.

[49] What secret society made it possible for white people to reside in the state?

The Ku-Klux in its operations.

[50] How was the State redeemed in 1876 for home rule?

By Wade Hampton and an organization of native whites. This was commonly known as the Red Shirt Movement. [13||14]

[51] What triumvirate was conspicuous at this time?

Wade Hampton with his advisers, Conner of Charleston and Hagood of Barnwell. They contributed largely to the redemption of the State by their council and advice.

[52] What was the uniform of the South Carolina Democrats of that year?

The red shirt.

[53] What became of the Federal garrisons stationed in South Carolina?

They were ordered withdrawn by President Hayes early in 1877, after he had recognized the Hampton regime.

[54] What became of the great seal of the Confederacy?

The day after the cabinet meeting in Abbeville, it was carried by the Davis party as they pursued their journey into Georgia, and was dropped into the Savannah River, thus as Reagan said: "dividing the waters of South Carolina from the waters of Georgia." [14||15]

GENERAL CONFEDERATE OFFICERS AND OFFICIALS FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

[55] Lieutenant-Generals

Richard H. Anderson, Army of Northern Virginia (1864).

Stephen D. Lee, Army of Tennessee (1864).

Wade Hampton, Army of Northern Virginia (1864).

James Longstreet (appointed from Alabama), Army of Northern Virginia (1862), Born in South Carolina.

Daniel H. Hill (appointed from North Carolina), Army of Northern Virginia (1862), Born in South Carolina.

[56] Major-Generals

Benjamin Huger, Army of Northern Virginia (1861).
David R. Jones (appointed from Georgia), Army of
Northern Virginia (1862).
Joseph B. Kershaw, Army of Northern Virginia (1864).
M. C. Butler, Army of Northern Virginia (1864).
P. M. B. Young (appointed from Georgia), Army of
Northern Virginia (1864).
E. M. Law (1865).
W. H. T. Walker.

[57] Brigadier Generals

Alpheus Baker (appointed from Alabama, 1864).
Barnard E. Bee (1861).
Hamilton P. Bee (appointed from Texas, 1862).
Pinckney D. Bowles (appointed from Alabama, 1865).
M. L. Bonham (1861).
John Bratton (1864).
James Cantey (appointed from Alabama, 1864).
Ellison Capers (1865).
James Chestnut (1863). [15||16]
Janes Conner (1864).
Zachariah C. Deas (appointed from Alabama, 1862).
Thomas F. Drayton (1861).
John Dunnovant (1864)
Stephen Elliott, Jr. 1864).
N. G. Evans (1861).
S. W. Ferguson (appointed from Mississippi, 1863).
M. W. Gary, Army of Northern Virginia (1864).

S. R. Gist (1862).
A. H. Gladden (appointed from Louisiana, 1861).
D. C. Govan (appointed from Arkansas, 1864).
Maxcy Gregg (1861).
Johnson Hagood (1862).
Micah Jenkins (1862).
John D. Kennedy (1864).
A. R. Lawton (appointed from Georgia, 1861).
T. M. Logan (1865).
Robert Lowry (appointed from Mississippi, 1863).
A. M. Manigault (1863).
Samuel McGowan (1863).
Lucius B. Northrop (1864).
Abner Perrin (1863).
John S. Preston (1861).
R. R. Ross (appointed from Tennessee).
John C. C. Sanders (appointed from Alabama, 1864).
C. H. Stevens (1864).
J. H. Trapier (1861).
J. B. Villepigue (1862)
W. B. Wallace (1864).
Thomas N. Waul (appointed from Texas, 1863).
L. T. Wigfall (appointed from Texas, 1861).

[58] In the Cabinet of President Davis

Christopher G. Memminger, first Secretary of Treasury.
G. A. Trenholm, second Secretary of Treasury.
Lewis Cruger, Comptroller and Solicitor. [16||17]

[59] Members of Military Staff of President Davis

James Chesnut, A. D. C.

F. R. Lubbock (appointed from Texas).

John M. Huger.

[60] War Department

A. C. Myers, first quartermaster-general.

A. R. Lawton, second quartermaster-general.

Lucius B. Northrop, first commissary-general.

T. S. Rhett, bureau of ordinance.

Samuel P. More, surgeon-general.

John S. Preston, bureau of conscription.

Notes

The spacing, indentation, and capitalization are similar to the original. Also, I am leaving all of the spelling and grammar mistakes in this edition because that is how the Children learned them.

[Cover Page] At the very bottom of the page are some smudged type-written words which appear to read, "J. J. Furlong Charleston Printing House."

[Cover||3] Pages 1 and 2 seem to be missing; perhaps they were blank opening pages.

[13] corrent should be spelled "correct," Harbour should be spelled "Harbor."

[17] Harbour should be spelled "Harbor."

[22] Manasses should be spelled "Manassas."

[23] The question should end with a question mark, not a period.

[29] alligiance should be spelled "allegiance."

[57] Stephen Elliott, Jr. (1864) should have two parentheses around the year, not one.

**A Catechism for the Children of the Confederacy of the
North Carolina Division United Daughters of the Confederacy
Critical Edition Report**

The catechism written by Mrs. James A. Fore for the North Carolina Children of the Confederacy has very little information available on it. What is known is that the catechism was a Division catechism, as indicated in the title, but we do not know for sure when it was published. The State Library of North Carolina lists their version of this text being printed in 1917 by the Observer Printing House, yet when contacted for a copy of the catechism, the Library informed me that they no longer hold a version (nor did they know where I could find another). The version of the catechism I acquired was from the Duke University Library which lists the text's publishing date as "193?" When I contacted the Library for more information on this date, librarian Heidi Madden informed me, "We checked this item in the pamphlet collection, and the item itself does not have a date on it, hence the incomplete reference (though there seems to be enough documentation to say 1930s). I have checked all our North Carolina biography resources and did not find an entry on this author" ("Reference" 23 Sept).

The only information I have found on Fore comes from the Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County which holds a manuscript collection of Fore's work (including essays, pamphlets, handwritten drafts of her historical

work, biographies, and correspondences, although apparently no versions of the catechism). The collection description explained that Fore's maiden name was Cornelia Berry, she lived from 1864 to 1946, and that "for eleven years, Fore was the historian of the Stonewall Jackson Chapter of the UDC" (PLCMC). The Library also reported that Fore "was elected to this same position with the State UDC in 1916 and served for two years" (PLCMC). Besides this source, I have not found any information on Fore or her catechism in the UDC's meeting minutes, the *Confederate Veteran* magazine, Poppenheim et al.'s book on the UDC's history, or any other secondary source on my works cited list.

A report on the variances is located at the end of the catechism. Since the question-answer sets were already numbered in this text, I will refer to those numbers when marking variances. The places where the page numbers change are placed in brackets with parallel lines between the page numbers [||].

Version

- A Fore, Mrs. James A. *A Catechism for the Children of the Confederacy of the North Carolina Division United Daughters of the Confederacy*. Prepared by Mrs. J. A. Fore. Charlotte, NC: Piedmont Printery, 193? (according to Duke University's catalog listing on the WorldCat database). Acquired from the pamphlet collection at Duke University Library. Copy Text.

A CATECHISM
FOR THE
CHILDREN OF THE CONFEDERACY
OF THE
NORTH CAROLINA DIVISION
UNITED DAUGHTERS OF
THE CONFEDERACY

Prepared by
MRS. J. A. FORE [Cover Page||1]

A Catechism for the Children of the Confederacy of
the North Carolina Division, U. D. C.

1. Ques. What were the causes that led to the War
between the States?

Ans. The difference of opinion between the North and
the South on the rights of the States, the tariff and the
slavery question.

2. Ques. Who introduced slavery in the American
Colonies?

Ans. In 1619 a Dutch man-of-war brought negroes to
Virginia, and sold them to the Colonies.

3. Ques. Who else sold slaves to the North and the
South?

Ans. The English, who controlled the slave trade until

1776.

4. Ques. Did slavery apply to negroes only?

Ans. No, white people were indented or bound out, and
sold from one owner to another, up to the Revolution.

5. Ques. Who had a monopoly of the slave trade up to
1808?

Ans. New England, until Congress passed a law
forbidding it; but New England traders smuggled slaves
in frequently after the law passed.

6. Ques. Was slave labor profitable in the North?

Ans. No, the climate was too severe; and the slaves were
sold to the Southern States, who needed them to work
the cotton fields.

7. Ques. What caused a further difference between the
sections?

Ans. The North had a larger representation in Congress,
and wanted to force the South to abolish slavery.

8. Ques. What did giving up slavery mean to the South?

Ans. It meant the loss of valuable property, and labor to
work the cotton fields. [1||2]

9. Ques. What effect did Lincoln's election have?

Ans. It forced secession from the Union by the Southern States, because they knew the party that elected Lincoln would break up slavery at any cost.

10. Ques. Did the States have a right to secede, according to the Constitution?

Ans. Yes; the Union was a compact between the States, which could be broken if the State's rights were invaded.

11. Ques. Had other States threatened to secede before?

Ans. Yes, the New England States, on several occasions; notably the war of 1812.

12. Ques. Did the seceding States have any thought of war?

Ans. No, they only wished to set up a separate Government, and manage their own affairs peaceably.

13. Ques. Which State seceded first?

Ans. South Carolina in December, 1860.

14. Ques. Where was the Confederate Government formed?

Ans. At Montgomery, Ala.

15. Ques. Who were elected President and Vice-President?

Ans. Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi, President; and Alexander Stephens, of Georgia, Vice-President.

16. Ques. Did North Carolina want to leave the Union?

Ans. No; she voted in February, 1861, against a Convention to consider Secession, but held that the States had a right to hold slaves under the Constitution.

17. Ques. What was the first act of war?

Ans. South Carolina fired on Fort Sumter, because Major Anderson refused to surrender the fort.

18. Ques. What finally decided North Carolina to go with the seceding States?

Ans. The call of the Secretary of War, on April 15, for North Carolina to furnish troops to make war on the seceded States. [2||3]

19. Ques. Did North Carolina have any doubts, after this call?

Ans. No; the State knew now that she had either to make war on her sister States, or with them.

20. Ques. When did North Carolina secede?

Ans. On the twentieth of May, 1861; and a week later was received into the Southern Confederacy.

21. Ques. Who organized the North Carolina troops?

Ans. James G. Martin, the Adjutant-General of North Carolina.

22. Ques. Was his task a hard one, and why?

Ans. Yes; because North Carolina was a farming State, and had no factories and no markets from which to buy clothing and ammunition.

23. Ques. What did Martin accomplish?

Ans. In seven months, North Carolina had turned over to the Confederacy forty thousand men, armed, drilled, and ready for service.

24. Ques. How were the soldiers equipped?

Ans. With thirty thousand old-fashioned muskets, and gun-powder from the United States Arsenal, at Fayetteville, which the State Government had seized.

25. Ques. Where were guns made?

Ans. In Wilmington, Fayetteville, and in Guilford County.

26. Ques. What steps did Martin take to clothe the troops?

Ans. He started a clothing factory, in Raleigh, and ordered the mills in the State to send every yard of cloth they could make.

27. Ques. What did women contribute?

Ans. They furnished blankets, quilts, and comforts. They cut up carpets, and lined them with cotton, for blankets, also.

28. Ques. Who were the Governors during the War?

Ans. Governor Ellis died soon after the War began, and Henry Clark served out his term. Zebulon B. Vance was elected, in 1862, while a Colonel in the Army. [3||4]

29. Ques. What was Vance called?

Ans. The great War Governor of North Carolina.

30. Ques. What was the first battle of the War?

Ans. The battle of Bethel (near Yorktown, where Cornwallis surrendered).

31. Ques. What North Carolina troops participated in this battle?

Ans. The First North Carolina Regiment, under Col. D. H. Hill, afterwards General.

32. Ques. Who was the first soldier killed in battle?

Ans. Henry Wyatt, of North Carolina, fell in the battle of Bethel.

33. Ques. What was the first great battle, and which side was victorious?

Ans. The battle of Manassas, and resulted in a great victory for the Confederates.

34. Ques. What was meant by the blockade?

Ans. The ports of the South were all blockaded by Federal ships, ready to sink any vessel going in or coming out of the port.

35. Ques. What did Governor Vance do to get supplies past the blockading fleet?

Ans. He had fast steamers built in England, to run the blockade between Wilmington, Beaufort, New Bern, and the West Indies.

36. Ques. What were these steamers called?

Ans. Blockade-runners.

37. Ques. Which was the most famous of these?

Ans. The Advance, named in honor of Governor Vance.

38. Ques. Did North Carolina get along better after this?

Ans. Yes, her troops were better clothed than those of the other States. [4||5]

39. Ques. How much did North Carolina spend for her own needs during the war?

Ans. Over twenty-six million dollars; she supported her own troops entirely.

40. Ques. What did North Carolina furnish the Confederacy?

Ans. The State received six million dollars for supplies furnished the Confederacy. With this money North Carolina bought cotton, and exchanged it for necessities. She also gave stores of great value to the Confederacy free of charge.

41. Ques. What did Major Hogg, in charge of State's stores, say?

Ans. He said he was feeding one half of Lee's army the last year of the war.

42. Ques. How many troops did North Carolina furnish?

Ans. Altogether, one hundred and twenty-five thousand soldiers—one-fifth of the whole Confederate Army.

43. Ques. What was the mosquito fleet?

Ans. Four little gunboats, owned by the State. In six weeks this little fleet had captured sixteen vessels.

44. Ques. What city was captured in March, 1862, by the Federals?

Ans. After the fall of Roanoke Island, New Bern fell into the hands of General Burnside.

45. Ques. What was the comparative size of the Confederate and Federal forces in the New Bern battle?

Ans. Gen. L. O. B. Branch commanded the Confederate force of four thousand men, against fifteen thousand men and a large fleet of vessels.

46. Ques. What other towns in North Carolina were soon occupied by the Federals?

Ans. Morehead, Beaufort, Fort Macon, and all of the towns on the coast from Beaufort to Virginia.

47. Ques. What steps were taken to hold the rest of the State?

Ans. More troops were called for, and twenty-eight regiments were formed. [5||6]

48. Ques. Who led the North Carolina troops in the battle of Seven Pines?

Ans. Generals Bryan Grimes and D. H. Hill and Colonel Pender. Colonel Pender was promoted to Brigadier-General by President Davis, who witnessed the battle.

49. Ques. When was General Lee appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Confederate Army?

Ans. During this battle, after General Johnston was wounded.

50. Ques. How did North Carolina strip itself for the Confederacy?

Ans. She gave up the fifteen thousand troops she had just organized to General Lee, to help protect Richmond.

51. Ques. How many were left in the State?

Ans. Only four regiments, stationed at Kinston.

52. Ques. Were these allowed to remain?

Ans. No; these, too, were given up when Richmond asked for more troops. Burnside, if he had known it, could have moved on Raleigh without hindrance.

53. Ques. In the Seven Days' Battle around Richmond, how many regiments took part; and of these how many were North Carolinians?

Ans. One hundred and seventy-four regiments altogether, and thirty-six were North Carolina regiments; one-fifth were North Carolinians.

54. Ques. What disease visited the Coast in 1862?

Ans. Yellow fever, at Wilmington.

55. Ques. How did Governor Vance provide for the families of the soldiers, who were becoming poorer all the time?

Ans. He established storehouses, and bought and distributed immense quantities of food, thus saving much suffering.

56. Ques. By whom was the first Confederate flag made?

Ans. By Orren Randolph Smith, of Warren County, N. C. [6||7]

57. Ques. Where was a Navy Yard in an inland city?

Ans. In Charlotte, N. C. When Norfolk was evacuated, the Confederates moved the men and machinery of the Norfolk Navy Yard to Charlotte, where ordnance and guns were manufactured for the Navy.

58. Ques. What great naval battle occurred in 1862, that changed naval warfare for all time?

Ans. The battle between the ironclads Merrimac and Monitor.

59. Ques. In what battle was Stonewall Jackson wounded, while winning a great victory?

Ans. The Battle of Chancellorsville. He died from his wounds, to the great grief of the Confederacy.

60. Ques. State North Carolina's losses in this battle.

Ans. Over one-third of those killed were North Carolinians.

61. Ques. What day marked the turning point in the fortunes of the Confederacy?

Ans. On July 4, 1863, occurred the double defeat of the Confederates, at Vicksburg and Gettysburg.

62. Ques. What effect did these defeats have?

Ans. The fall of Vicksburg closed the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico; and the double defeat prevented European powers from intervening to stop the war.

63. Ques. How was the town of Plymouth, N. C., wrested from the Federals?

Ans. By the combined attack of Generals Hoke and Robert Ransom, and the naval attack of the Confederate ram Albemarle, commanded by J. W. Cooke.

64. Ques. What city in North Carolina was plundered and burned by the Federals?

Ans. Washington.

65. Ques. What Northern General burned Atlanta and Columbia, on his "March to the Sea"?

Ans. General Sherman, who did all he could to make war what he said it was—"Hell". [7||8]

66. Ques. What towns in North Carolina did Sherman and his "bummers" pass though?

Ans. Laurinburg, Fayetteville, and Goldsboro.

67. Ques. What battle occurred in North Carolina, on March 19, 1865?

Ans. The Battle of Bentonville, between Generals Johnston and Sherman.

68. Ques. Who was the most brilliant Southern Admiral, and what vessel did he command?

Ans. Admiral Raphael Semmes. He commanded the Alabama.

69. Ques. What were the names of the three North Carolina naval officers who attained high rank in the Confederate Navy?

Ans. Capt. J. W. Cooke, Commander John N. Maffitt, and Lieut.-Commander James Iredell Waddell.

70. Ques. What vessel did Maffitt command, and what damage did he do to Federal ships?

Ans. He commanded the Florida, and captured many prizes; one of the ships was valued at one and a half million dollars.

71. Ques. What was the name of the vessel commanded by Waddell; and what can you say about it?

Ans. He commanded the Shenandoah, and sailed around the world, capturing ships and cargoes valued at five million dollars.

72. Ques. What great naval battle was fought on the coast of North Carolina, in December, 1864?

Ans. The battle of Fort Fisher, which protected the city of Wilmington.

73. Ques. What did General Grant say of the bombarding ships?

Ans. He said the fleet of war vessels was “the most formidable Armada ever collected for concentration upon a given point.” [8||9]

74. Ques. What was the effect of the Fall of Fort Fisher?

Ans. It closed the last open port through which the Confederacy could receive supplies. It was only a few months afterwards that General Lee surrendered to Grant, at Appomattox—on April 9, 1865; and Johnston to Sherman, two weeks later.

75. Ques. Where was the last meeting of the Confederate Cabinet held?

Ans. In Charlotte, N. C., where President Davis and his entire Cabinet remained for eight days, on the retreat from Richmond.

76. Ques. What great event took place at the last Cabinet meeting?

Ans. The surrender of Johnston was decided on; the terms were written, and signed. This was the last official act of the Confederate Cabinet.

77. Ques. Did the Cabinet meet again after the President left Charlotte?

Ans. No; two of the members of the Cabinet—Mr. George Davis and Mr. Trenholm—remained in Charlotte, the others leaving Mr. Davis before he reached Washington, Ga., except Mr. Reagen, who was captured with him later.

78. Ques. Where and when did the surrender of Johnston take place, and how many troops were included?

Ans. Ninety thousand troops were included in Johnston's surrender, near Durham, N. C., on April 26, 1865.

79. Ques. What is true of the North Carolina Confederate soldier?

Ans. That he “was first at Bethel, farthest at Gettysburg, and last at Appomattox.”

80. Ques. Were the sufferings of the South ended by the surrender?

Ans. No; they suffered from poverty, negro rule, and military domination.

81. Ques. What organization was formed, to protect the whites from negro rule?

Ans. The Ku-Klux Klan, organized by Gen. N. B. Forrest. [9||10]

John N. Maffitt

James Iredell Waddell

Captain J. W. Cooke

The Piedmont Printery, Charlotte, N. C.

Confederate Generals of North Carolina

General D. H. Hill	General R. D. Johnston
General R. F. Hoke	General William McRae
General Robert Ransom	General W. P. Roberts
General J. J. Pettigrew	General G. B. Anderson
General W. D. Pender	General A. C. Godwin
General Bryan Grimes	General J. R. Cook
General L. O. B. Branch	General T. L. Clingman
General W. H. C. Whiting	General Gaston Lewis
General Stephen Ramseur	General Matt Ransom
General A. M. Scales	General T. H. Holmes
General Rufus Barringer	General B. H. Robertson
General Junius Daniell	General Braxton Bragg
General J. H. Lane	General Leonidas Polk
General W. R. Cox	

Navy Commanders

Notes

The spacing, indentation, and capitalization are similar to the original. Also, I have left all of the spelling and grammar mistakes in this edition because that is how the Children learned them.

[Cover Page] On the bottom of the page is a stamp reading, "Pamphlet Collection Duke University Library." The words "James Albert" are barely discernable as a hand-written note above the stamp and beneath the printed words "Mrs. J. A. Fore." 77. Reagen should be spelled "Reagan."

[||10] Since the tenth page is not numbered, I do not know if the questions stopped on page 9 at number 81 or if there are pages missing with more questions on them before the tenth page.

Catechism on the History of the Confederate States of America Critical Edition Report

Decca Lamar West, once president of the Texas Division of the UDC, contributed in significant ways to the United Daughters of the Confederacy. In 1908, for example, West proposed an amendment to the UDC's constitution thereby creating the office of the Historian-General (Poppenheim et al. 136). In 1917, after the Chattanooga convention, "Miss Decca Lamar West, Texas, became the chairman of the Jefferson Davis Highway Committee, and visualized how much of importance to the United Daughters of the Confederacy and to the South could be accomplished by carrying out the highway project" (Poppenheim et al. 81). West served as chairman of that committee until 1923 when she officially resigned but was "elected honorary chairman" (Poppenheim et al. 81). Then at the thirty-third annual UDC General convention in 1926, the UDC presented West with the Orrin Randolph Smith medal for her catechism. Upon accepting the award, "Miss West stated the catechism was as an additional memorial to Mrs. Cornelia Branch Stone," who apparently died in 1925 (UDC "Minutes" 106; GTH Center). Because West based her catechism so heavily upon Stone's, and because I have not been able to locate any other versions of West's catechism, I compared West's catechism to Stone's in this critical edition.

A report on the variances between the versions is located at the end of the catechism. The numbers in brackets [] refer to question-answer sets and images.

The places where the page numbers change are also placed in brackets with parallel lines between the page numbers [||].

Versions

- A West, Decca L. *Catechism on the History of the Confederate States of America*. Arranged for Children of the Confederacy Chapters by Decca Lamar West. Originally written 1926. Copyright by Decca Lamar West, 1934. Published with help from the Texas Division, UDC. Printing information unknown. Acquired from the University of Texas Library, Austin, TX. Copy Text.
- B Stone, Cornelia B. *U.D.C. Catechisms for Children*. Arranged for Veuve Jefferson Chapter U.D.C., Galveston, TX by Cornelia Branch Stone, 1904. Re-published by J.E.B. Stuart Chapter No. 10, U.D.C., 1912. Printed by Stonebruner and Prufer Printers. Acquired from the University of Virginia Library, Special Collections Department, Rare Books, Alderman Library. Copy Text.

CATECHISM ON THE HISTORY
of the
CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA

Arranged for
Children of Confederacy Chapters

By
DECCA LAMAR WEST

[Image 1]

GENERAL UNITED DAUGHTERS
OF THE CONFEDERACY

MOTTO—Loyalty to the Truth of Confederate History.

FLOWER—The Rose

KEYWORD—Preparedness [Cover Page|0]

Copyright 1934

By

Decca Lamar West [0|1]

Dedication

IN HONOR AND LOVING MEMORY
of

MRS. CORNELIA BRANCH STONE

President Texas Division U. D. C.

1898-1899

President General U. D. C.

1908-1909

and

MY MOTHER

MRS. JOHN C. WEST (nee Mary E. Stark)

First Historian Texas Division U. D. C.

1896-1898 [1|2]

STATEMENT REGARDING PREPARATION
OF MANUSCRIPT

[1] This catechism was written in competition for the Orren Randolph Smith Medal offered by Miss Jessica Smith of North Carolina and Washington, D. C., in honor of her father, Captain Orren Randolph Smith, who designed the first Confederate Flag (1861). The conditions were that the catechism winning the medal would be officially adopted by the General U. D. C. (1926).

[2] The writer stated under her non de plume (used as required by rules) that her manuscript was based upon a catechism written by Mrs. Cornelia Branch Stone (1912) for use of the Children's Auxiliary to Veuve Jefferson Davis Chapter U. D. C. (No. 17), and that Mrs. Stone had suggested to the writer that she prepare a catechism of greater scope. The writer also stated in the same contest (1926) that if the manuscript won the medal it would be placed for one year in the Texas Room of the Confederate Museum in memorial honor of Mrs. Stone, and that the manuscript be still further enlarged for use of the Children of the Confederacy, as competing manuscripts are limited to

two thousand words. The author has complied with both of these suggestions.

[3] As the General Association did not publish the manuscript as stated in Miss Smith's offer of the medal, the Texas Division decided to do so, permitting the author to copyright under her own name. When the Texas Division is reimbursed for the cost of publication, any royalties which may further accrue will be used for U. D. C. enterprises at the discretion of the author. [2||3]

[Image 2] [3||4] [4||5]

Foreword

[4] There are lives so full of vision, loyalty, and truth they are like the telling of beads, each one an answer to its own prayer. Such a one is Decca Lamar West, who has written her name indelibly on Southern hearts, by vision fulfilled, loyalty enthroned and truth vindicated. After the mailed hand of war had sown the seeds of hate and prejudice and reconstruction had spent its fury on the devastated Southern states, in the home of Judge and Mrs. John C. West, Waco, Texas, their daughter Decca Lamar was taught a true history of the War between the States. The Texas Division now presents to children, Miss West's Catechism on the history of the Confederate States of America.

[5] This Catechism contains the foundation principles of Constitutional Government through Federal Union—and

State's Autonomy for which the Confederate States of America fought during the war between the states.

[6] Decca Lamar West is an outstanding Daughter of the Confederacy in local, state, and general organizations. She is an ex-president of the Texas Division, was its first poet-laureate; and is a life member of its Executive Board. She was general chairman of the Jefferson Davis National Highway Committee for several years.

[7] Through the long years, she held her vision of a national highway from Washington to San Francisco running through the southern states, and outlined the complete route, furnishing all data for the first map, published by the cartographer of the National Highway Association. She secured legislation in five states to designate certain state highways as that state's part of the Jefferson Davis Highway that will link forever the names of two of the South's greatest leaders—George Washington and Jefferson Davis.

[8] ANNIE HILL BARTHOLD (Mrs. Oscar Barthold). Regent Texas Room, Confederate Museum, Richmond, Virginia Member Executive Board, Texas Division U. D. C. World War President, Texas Division, U. D. C. [5||6]

Ex-Historian General Endorses Catechism

[9] The Catechism on History of the Confederate States, written by Miss Decca Lamar West, for the use of children, was submitted in competition for the Orren

Randolph Smith medal. All catechisms submitted were read by several people, including historians and university teachers of history. The comments were that it was easily teachable, and free from prejudice. Its statements are concise, yet cover all points. The list of references is invaluable for further study.

[10] CHARLOTTE. (Mrs. John L.) WOODBURY.
Ex-Historian General, U. D. C. [6||7]

PRESENTATION

[11] It is with a keen sense of pride and deep appreciation of its worth that we, the officers and members of Texas Division United Daughters of the Confederacy, present Miss Decca Lamar West's Catechism on the History of the Confederate States of America to children and every lover of truth, justice and facts.

[12] It has been most carefully prepared, beautifully and interestingly written and is yet so well and so simply worded that the smallest child will understand and the oldest member of the family will be benefited.

[13] Because it is accurate, true and concise we recommend it most highly to all State Text Book Boards and to all teachers in all schools as supplementary material in the study of the history of America.

[14] We commend this Catechism to every Chapter Historian as most helpful in interesting the member who has not the time to devote to research.

[15] This volume will be of untold value to every Southern mother and father for quick results when inquiring young minds ask pertinent questions that tax the memory.

[16] The truths taught in this Catechism make the history of a great nation that stood for principles as old as time and as true as the men who fought for them.

[17] HOPE HARRISON TURNER, (Mrs. W. W. Turner). President Texas Division United Daughters of the Confederacy Webster, Texas. [7||8] [8||9]

Catechism for Children of the Confederacy

[18] Q. What causes led to the war between the States, from 1861 to 1865?

A. The disregard of those in power for the rights of the Southern States.

[19] Q. How was this shown?

A. By the passage of laws annulling the rights of the people of the South.

[20] Q. How were these rights acquired?

A. They were given to every State by the Constitution of the United States.

[21] Q. What were these rights?

A. The right to regulate their own affairs, one of which was to hold slaves as property.

[22] Q. Were the Southern States responsible for the existence of slavery?

A. No; slavery was introduced into the country in colonial times by the political authorities of Great Britain,

Spain, France, and the Dutch Merchants; and in 1776, at the time of the Declaration of Independence, slavery existed in all of the thirteen colonies.

[23] Q. How many of the colonies held slaves when the federal constitution was adopted, in 1787?

A. All except one.

[24] Q. Did slavery exist among other civilized nations?

A. Yes, in nearly all. Our mother country, England, did not emancipate her slaves until 1843, when Parliament paid \$200,000,000 to the owners.

[25] Q. After the first introduction of slavery into the colonies, how was the African slave trade kept up?

A. Chiefly by enterprising ship owners of New England, who imported the slaves from Africa and secretly sold their cargoes along the coast, after the States of the North had abolished slavery. [9||10]

[26] Q. Why did not slavery continue to exist in the States of New England?

A. Because they found it unprofitable, and they sold their slaves to the States of the South.

[27] Q. What great leader in the Northern army owned slaves?

A. Gen. U. S. Grant, who continued to live on their hire and service until the close of the war, and after the emancipation proclamation had been published.

[28] Q. When the Northern States had sold their slaves to the South, what did they then do?

A. They organized a party to oppose slavery, called the "Abolition Party," which advocated all means to abolish slavery, with no intention of paying the people of the South for their property.

[29] Q. When did the South become alarmed?

A. At the election of Abraham Lincoln, chiefly by the support of this party, which was pledged to take away the slaves and offer no terms of payment to the owners.

[30] Q. Were the leading statesmen of the South opposed to the Union?

A. No, certainly not.

[31] Q. Name some of the leading men of the South who were strong Union men and did all in their power to prevent secession?

A. Jefferson Davis (Mississippi), Alexander H. Stephens (Georgia), Colonel Robert E. Lee (United States Army), Virginia, General Sam Houston (Texas), John H. Reagan (Texas), Capt. John Newland Maffitt of N. C., and many others.

[32] Q. Why then did the North teach that the South opposed the Union?

A. Partly through misunderstanding of the South's position; and chiefly through "political propaganda." (Director explain).

[33] Q. When and how did Jefferson Davis publicly proclaim his loyalty to the Union and its ideals?

A. Many times, especially in his matchless farewell address in the United States Senate, after Mississippi had seceded (1861).

[34] Q. Was it disloyal for General Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, J. E. B. Stuart and others to resign from the United States Army ?

A. No.

[35] Q. Why not?

A. Because the Constitution of the United States provided for a Union of Independent and self-governed states, and a citizen's first duty was to his state. Secession was a legal right.

[36] Q. Where had most of the Generals of the Confederate States of America received their military training?

A. West Point, United States Military Academy.

[37] Q. What rank did Robert F. Lee hold in the U. S. Army, at the time the first seven Southern States seceded?

A. Lieutenant Colonel.

[38] Q. What position was he offered by the Secretary of War of the Federal Government?

A. He was offered the command of the entire U. S. Army.

[39] Q. What reason did he give for declining?

A. He declined and resigned from the Army because he owed allegiance to his native state, Virginia.

[40] Q. What other great military genius likewise resigned from the U. S. Army and cast his lot with Virginia?

A. General Thomas J. Jackson (Stonewall).

[41] Q. Did the people of the South believe that slavery was right?

A. No, not as a principle; and the colonies of Virginia and Georgia had strongly opposed its first introduction, but after the Constitution of the United States had recognized the slaves as property, and the wealth of the South was largely invested in negroes, they did not feel it was just to submit to wholesale robbery.

[42] Q. How were the slaves treated?

A. With great kindness and care in nearly all cases, a cruel master being rare, and lost the respect of his neighbors if [11||12] he treated his slaves badly. Self-interest would have prompted good treatment if a higher feeling of humanity did not.

[43] Q. What was the feeling of the slaves toward their masters?

A. They were faithful and devoted and were always ready and willing to serve them.

[44] Q. How did they behave during the War between the States?

A. They nobly protected and cared for the wives and children of soldiers in the field, and widows without protectors; though often prompted by the enemies of the South to burn and plunder the homes of their masters, they were always true and loyal.

[45] Q. What were the principles of the Southern people?

A. They believed that each State should regulate her own affairs, according to its best interests, with no meddling with the management of other States, and that each State should loyally support the Constitution of the United States.

[46] Q. Who was most prominent in defining “State rights”?

A. John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina.

[47] Q. What steps did the Southern people take after the election of Mr. Lincoln?

A. They seceded from the Union, and at once took possession of the forts, arms and ammunition within their borders.

[48] Q. Did the forts surrender without resistance?

A. In nearly all cases.

[49] Q. In what order did the States secede?

A. South Carolina, December 20, 1860. Mississippi, January 9, 1861. Florida, January 19, 1861. Alabama, January 11, 1861. Georgia, January 19, 1861. Louisiana, January 26, 1861. Texas, February 1, 1861. Virginia, April 17, 1861. Arkansas, May 6, 1861. North Carolina, May 20, 1861. Tennessee, June 24, 1861. Missouri, October 31, 1861. Kentucky, November 20, 1861.

[50] Q. What other State attempted to secede?

A. Maryland.

[51] Q. How was this prevented? [12||13]

[Image 3] [13||14] [14||13]

A. The Maryland Legislature was closed by the United States Marshal and the secession members were sent to prison on September 18, 1861.

[52] Q. What had happened before this in Baltimore?

A. Federal troops in passing through the city to invade the South, were attacked on April 19, 1861, by the citizens of Baltimore, and a fight ensued in the streets, and the first blood of the war was there shed.

[53] Q. What noted poem was written concerning this period?

A. Barbara Frietchie, by John Greenleaf Whittier, a distinguished New England poet.

[54] Q. Does it give a correct picture?

A. No, it has been extremely misleading because it was untrue.

[55] Q. Did Maryland take any part in the cause of the South?

A. Yes, most valiant part, by furnishing many regiments of men and other aid for carrying on the war, and those who gave this aid endured persecution and imprisonment by the Federal authorities, as well as from those at home who opposed secession. Maryland was only kept in the Union by force.

[56] Q. What honor did General Lee confer on Maryland officers?

A. In the last retreat of the world-famed fighting army of northern Virginia he appointed Col. H. Kyd Douglas and Col. Clement Sullivane, two staff officers, one twenty-four years of age, the other twenty-six, to command the rear guard of the two divisions of the little army on its way to Appomattox.

[57] Q. What was the first step taken by the seceded States?

A. They proceeded to organize a government, by uniting themselves under the name of the Confederate States of America, and adopted a constitution for their guidance.

[58] Q. Whom did they elect as their President?

A. Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi; U. S. Senator from that State when Mississippi seceded.

[59] Q. Why was Mr. Davis the unanimous choice of the Confederate States? [13||14]

A. Because he was considered one of the greatest constitutional lawyers in the United States, and also had the most intimate knowledge of military affairs.

[60] Q. What was his military experience?

A. He had been educated at West Point; served ten years in the U. S. Army in Indian frontier warfare (1828-1835).

[61] Q. What greater military experience had he?

A. When he was serving in Congress from Mississippi, he resigned his seat to become a Colonel of Mississippi troops in the war with Mexico, 1846.

[62] Q. In what way did he win especial distinction?

A. By his military strategy when he went to the assistance of General Zachary Taylor's troops and was acclaimed the hero of Buena Vista and Monterey.

[63] Q. What reward did the United States Government offer him?

A. The post of Brigadier General, U. S. A.

[64] Q. Did he accept?

A. No, he declined, and returned to civil life.

[65] Q. What high position did he later occupy?

A. He was Secretary of War (1853-57) in President Pierce's cabinet.

[66] Q. Did he attain any especial prominence as Secretary of War?

A. Yes, his record stands as one of unusually high achievement. It has been said that there have been few Secretaries of War who were so thoroughly and practically prepared for the duties, because he was familiar with every detail of army life and needs.

[67] Q. What were some of his notable achievements as Secretary of War?

A. (a) Making great improvements at West Point Military Academy, (b) planning a transcontinental railway, (c) being instrumental in securing more territory by purchase from Mexico, (d) supervising the building of the great aqueduct bringing the water supply to Washington, etc.

[68] Q. By what name is this aqueduct commonly known? [14||15]

A. It is called Cabin John Bridge. It is one of the sights of Washington, D. C.

[69] Q. Did Mr. Davis resign his seat in the Senate as soon as Mississippi seceded?

A. No, his State seceded on January 9th, and he remained in the Senate until January 21st, pleading for some pledge from the North that would secure the interest of the people of the South.

[70] Q. Does it appear from this that he led his people to secession?

A. No; like General Lee, he was led by the people of his State, obeying their call, and believing that his first duty was to his State.

[71] Q. Who was elected Vice President of the Confederate States of America?

A. Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, eminent in his country's history.

[72] Q. Had the Confederate States any other President or Vice President?

A. No; Mr. Davis was the first and only President, and there was no other Vice President than Mr. Stephens.

[73] Q. Where did the first Congress of the Confederacy meet?

A. At Montgomery, Alabama, on February 4, 1861, and on the 9th of February, Mr. Davis was unanimously elected President, and inaugurated on the 18th of February, in the Alabama State House.

[74] Q. What city was the first capital of the Confederate States of America?

A. Montgomery, Alabama.

[75] Q. Whom did Mr. Davis select for his cabinet?

A. Robert Toombs, of Georgia, Secretary of State; Leroy P. Walker, of Alabama, Secretary of War; Charles G. Memminger, of South Carolina, Secretary of the Treasury; Stephen H. Mallory, of Florida, Secretary of the Navy; Judah P. Benjamin, of Louisiana, Attorney General; and John H. Reagan, of Texas, Postmaster General. The last three named continued in the cabinet as long as the government lasted. [15||16]

[76] Q. Who succeeded Memminger as Secretary of the Treasury?

A. The Honorable William Trenholm, of Charleston, South Carolina.

[77] Q. Who succeeded Walker as Secretary of War?

A. The Honorable Frank Lubbock of Texas.

[78] Q. Where and when was the capital moved?

A. To Richmond, Virginia, on May 6, 1861.

[79] Q. Did the Confederacy have a flag?

A. Yes; Congress, on March 6, 1861, at Montgomery, Alabama, passed an act adopting the first flag of the Confederacy, called the "Stars and Bars."

[80] Q. How many stars had this flag at this time?

A. Seven, as only that number of States had then seceded, but other stars were added as the other States came into the Confederacy until there were thirteen. There were three bars, two red and one white.

[81] Q. Who designed the "Stars and Bars"?

A. Orren Randolph Smith, of North Carolina, whose design was submitted to a committee appointed by the Confederate Congress.

[82] Q. Has there been any dispute about the designer of the first flag?

A. Yes, there have been other claims presented, but these have been refuted by evidence before committees from all Confederate organizations.

[83] Q. Why was another flag adopted later as a "battle flag"?

A. Because the "Stars and Bars" were mistaken at

the battle of Manassas for the flag of the United States, and it was unsafe to use it in battle.

[84] Q. Who designed the battle flag?

A. General Beauregard, after the battle of Manassas, and his design was adopted by Congress as a battle flag and used to the end of the war (April 1865).

[85] Q. What was the battle flag? [16||17]

A. The cross of St. Andrew on a field of red, the cross blue, on which were thirteen white stars.

[86] Q. What other flag was used?

A. The battle flag on a large field of white was adopted by Congress as the flag of the Confederacy, but it was found that so large an expanse of white might be mistaken for a flag of truce, and Congress ordered a band of red across the end of the white field.

[87] Q. Was this last flag ever used?

A. No; it was adopted just before the fall of the Confederacy, and was never used.

[88] Q. How are these flags used by the different Confederate organizations?

A. The Confederate Veterans have for their emblem the battle flag, and the Sons of Veterans have adopted the last flag of the Confederacy, while the Daughters of the Confederacy use the "Stars and Bars," the first flag adopted by the Confederate States, and the children of the Confederacy the battle flag on a large field of white.

[89] Q. When was the first shot fired in the War Between the States?

A. At Fort Sumter, in the harbor of Charleston, on April 12, 1861.

[90] Q. Where did the last fight occur?

A. At Palmetto Ranch, near Brownsville, Texas, on May 13, 1865, between a Confederate force of 300, under Gen. James E. Slaughter, and a Federal force of 500, commanded by Col. T. F. Burrett.

[91] Q. Who was Commander-in-Chief of the Confederate forces?

A. General Robert E. Lee, best loved and honored of all generals.

[92] Q. Where was the first battle fought?

A. At Manassas, Virginia, on July 21, 1861, and it was a great victory for the Confederate army.

[93] Q. What was considered one of the great moments of the battle of Gettysburg? [17||18]

A. Pickett's charge on Cemetery Ridge, famed in history and literature.

[94] Q. Who was General Pickett?

A. General George Edward Pickett (1825-1875) was born in Richmond, Virginia. (a) He graduated at West Point; (b) was a lieutenant in the war with Mexico (1846) and later was in Indian warfare on the frontier; (c) like Generals Lee, Jackson, Stuart and others he resigned from the United States Army, to become an officer in the Confederate Army, where he became noted as one of the most daring and brilliant commanders of all time.

[95] Q. Which are generally conceded to be the three most noted battles of the War Between the States?

A. Shiloh, Gettysburg, and Chickamauga.

[96] Q. What is considered by historians as the decisive battle of the war?

A. Gettysburg.

[97] Q. Why?

A. Because it was conclusive evidence to an unbiased mind that the Federal supplies and forces greatly outweighed and outnumbered the Confederate forces.

[98] Q. How many were enrolled in the Federal, or Northern Army?

A. Two million, seven hundred and seventy-eight thousand, three hundred and four (2,778,304).

[99] Q. What number were enrolled in the Confederate army?

A. Six hundred thousand (600,000).

[100] Q. How many more men were in the Northern army?

A. More than three times as many as the South had in the field.

[101] Q. How many years did the war last?

A. Four years; and there is no record, in all the world's history of an army that endured more privations with greater fortitude or fought more bravely than the soldiers of the Confederacy.

[102] Q. Under what disadvantages did the Confederate army fight? [18||19]

A. Not only did the Confederates have greatly inferior numbers, but they were poorly armed, often scarce of ammunition, and scantily fed and clothed.

[103] Q. What was the spirit of the army?

A. Always ready to follow their leaders and never willing to give up the fight. "Victory or death" was their motto.

[104] Q. When did the war come to a close?

A.. April 9, 1865, when Gen. Lee surrendered his army at Appomattox, Va.

[105] Q. How many men did he surrender?

A. About 25,000.

[106] Q. To what Northern general did he surrender?

A. General U. S. Grant, who had 120,000 men in his army.

[107] Q. Was the Confederate army defeated?

A. No; it was overpowered by numbers, and its resources exhausted.

[108] Q. What soon followed General Lee's surrender?

A. The surrender of all the Confederate forces and the capture of President Davis and his cabinet in Georgia.

[109] Q. What were the conditions of surrender, as made by General Grant?

A. These conditions were liberal and generally observed, except in the case of President Davis and a few others. Mr. Davis was subjected to many humiliations, even to being put in irons.

[110] Q. Why do the people of the South honor him so greatly?

A. First, for his integrity of character as a man and patriot, and because he suffered the greatest martyrdom for their cause.

[111] Q. Were the people of the South punished for engaging in the war?

A. Yes; by losing nearly all that they possessed, and further by having a horde of men called “carpet-baggers” sent down South to rule over them and rob them of the little left to them by the ruins of war.

[112] Q. Did the Confederate States have any army or navy at their command at first, or any preparations for war? [19||20]

A. None; they had hoped to “depart in peace.”

[113] Q. What effort was made by leading statesmen of the South to arbitrate peacefully?

A. Senator Jefferson Davis and others urged President Lincoln immediately after his election to call a National Constitutional convention.

[114] Q. What did they hope to gain by this?

A. They believed that if the Northern and Southern leaders would get together and talk matters over calmly, war might be avoided.

[115] Q. Did Mr. Lincoln call such convention?

A. No; he refused, and instead called for 75,000 volunteers to “put down the insurrection in the South.”

[116] Q. Why was this unwise and unjust?

A. It was unjust because the States had a perfect legal right to withdraw from the Union when the original compact had been broken, and unwise because it

precipitated a horrible war of bloodshed that might have been avoided.

[117] Q. Where was President Davis imprisoned?

A. In Fortress Monroe, Virginia.

[118] Q. For how long?

A. Nearly three years.

[119] Q. Name two of the most noted commanders of the Confederate Navy.

A. Admiral Raphael Semmes and Commodore Mathew Fontaine Maury.

[120] Q. What is Commodore Maury called in naval history?

A. The “Pathfinder of the Seas.”

[121] Q. Name another noted naval officer who resigned from the United States navy to join the Confederate navy?

A. Capt. John Newland Maffitt of North Carolina.

[122] Q. Name a noted sea fight in which it was first demonstrated that a “gunboat” (warship) could and should be “ironclad”

A. The fight between the “Monitor” and the “Merrimac” in Hampton Roads, Va.

[123] Q. To which navy did the Merrimac belong? [20||21]

A. It belonged to the Confederate navy and destroyed several Federal gunboats during the first year of the War Between the States. It was the first “ironclad” boat.

[124] Q. Who built the Monitor for the United States navy?

A. Captain John Ericsson, a noted inventor.

[125] Q. Where did these first “ironclad” gunboats meet?

A. In the battle in Hampton Roads, Va., March 9, 1862, where the better built Monitor finally forced the Merrimac to retire.

[126] Q. Who was considered the greatest cavalry and artillery commander who was not educated at West Point?

A. General Nathan Bedford Forest of Tennessee—called “The Wizard of the Saddle.”

[127] Q. Name some other great cavalry commanders.

A. General John Hunt Morgan of Kentucky, and General Mosby of Virginia were two of the most famous.

[128] Q. Why?

A. Because they led independent commands, often making the most daring raids into enemy territory.

[129] Q. Who was called the “Plumed Knight” and noted for his daring and gallantry?

A. General J. E. B. Stuart, of Virginia.

[130] Q. Where was General Stuart born and educated?

A. He was born and reared in Patrick County, Virginia, and graduated from West Point in 1854.

[131] Q. What were his early military experiences?

A. (a) In 1857 his regiment was sent to Kansas to enforce order; (b) he also saw service in Indian warfare.

[132] Q. When did he resign from the United States army?

A. He resigned in 1861, when Virginia seceded, and he was commissioned Lieutenant Colonel, Virginia troops, winning distinction in the first battle of Bull Run.

[133] Q. Name some of his later services.

A. (a) He was commissioned Major General of Cavalry in the Confederate States army, and during the battle of Antietam made a raid into Pennsylvania. (b) He aided General Stonewall Jackson at the battle of Chancellorsville and took [21||22] temporary command when General Jackson was killed.

[134] Q. What was most unusual in his military career?

A. He was independent in his actions and allowed to make raids or battles where he chose, and report to General Lee when he could.

[135] Q. When was General Stuart killed?

A. He was mortally wounded at “Yellow Tavern” in 1864, when he attempted to check the advance of General Sheridan on Richmond.

[136] Q. Were there any other independent commanders?

A. Yes. General Mosby of Virginia and General John Hunt Morgan of Kentucky were allowed similar privileges.

[137] Q. Did the officers of the Federal army approve of this plan?

A. No, it was practically unheard of in any other “regular army,” and the Union men and Northern papers called them “Gorillas.”

[138] Q. Was that fair?

A. No, because they were not lawless but of such unusual daring and had such initiative that President Davis and General Lee, Commander-in-Chief of the Confederate States Army, realized they could perform greater service independently.

[139] Q. *Were there any other officers granted such privilege?

A. Yes, it was not infrequent west of the Mississippi, particularly in Texas, where communication was difficult.

[140] Q. Who was the youngest Brigadier General of the Confederate States army?

A. General Felix H. Robertson of Texas. He was a cadet at West Point; resigned to volunteer in the Confederate Army at the age of 18; fought with Hood's Texas Brigade in the army of Northern Virginia, and was commissioned Brigadier General at the age of 22.

[141] Q. Who was the youngest cavalryman that obtained enduring fame?

[142] *Study and read books concerning these men—they are very interesting tales. [22||23]

A. John Pelham, of Alabama.

[143] Q. What great General was called “General Lee's Right Arm”?

A. General Thomas J. Jackson (Stonewall).

[144] Q. How did he get his soubriquet?

A. In a close engagement during the first battle of Bull Run there was some confusion, and General Barnard E. Bee (Texas), in order to rally his men, called out, “Look, see Jackson standing there like a stone wall.”

[145] Q. When was Stonewall Jackson killed, and how is he ranked as a strategist?

A. General Jackson was killed in 1862. Foreign countries have sent military experts to study what is known as the Valley Campaign. He is considered one of the military geniuses of the world.

[146] Q. Of whom was it said “Three Commonwealths claim him,” and why?

A. General Albert Sydney Johnston, who was killed at the Battle of Shiloh. He was born in Kentucky, lived in Texas and fought for Texas Independence; was first buried in Louisiana. Later his remains were removed to Austin, Texas, where he rests under a magnificent recumbant statue in the State Cemetery.

[147] Q. For what was the army of the South particularly noted?

A. For its great commanders—great as soldiers and great as men of stainless character—and for the loyalty of the men of the ranks, who were dauntless in courage, “the bravest of the brave,” ever ready to rush into the “jaws of death” at the command of their great leaders.

[148] Q. What did a noted Englishman say of the Confederate States of America, in a poem to General Lee?

A. “No nation ever rose so pure, or fell so free from stain.”

[149] Q. What private soldier of Georgia became a noted Southern poet and musician?

A. Sidney Lanier. [23||24]

[150] Q. For what is he chiefly noted?

A. As a poet, and a man who was a splendid example of soldier and citizen.

[151] Q. What did he do?

A. He taught history, literature and mathematics; studied law; composed music; played first violin in the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra while teaching in Johns Hopkins University.

[152] Q. How did he die?

A. From tuberculosis caused by exposure and hardship while a prisoner of war.

[153] Q. What noted ode did he write?

A. A composition for the first Worlds Fair held in America, which was the Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia in 1876. The music of this ode was written by the distinguished American composer Dudley Buck.

[154] Q. Name some of Lanier's notable works.

A. "Tigre Lilies," his first novel in 1867. (b) "Science of English Verse," and ten other volumes of classic literature. (c) Poems published in many leading magazines, and later published in book form.

[155] Q. How may we learn more about him?

A. (a) By reading his "Life and Letters," published by his wife and son. (b) These letters will instruct us in history, biography and literary criticism. [24||25]

[Image 4] [25||26] [26||25]

THE SEAL OF THE CONFEDERACY

[156] Q. Did the Confederate States of America have an official seal?

A. Yes, by a joint resolution, approved April 30, 1863, the Confederate Congress adopted a "seal for the Confederate States."

[157] Q. What was the design? And of what material was it made?

A. It was made of silver and represented the equestrian statue of Washington in the capital square (Richmond, Va..) and was surrounded by a wreath showing the principal agricultural products of the Confederate States.

[158] Q. Where and by whom was it made?

A. Under the instruction of Judah P. Benjamin, Secretary of State, and James M. Mason, Confederate Commissioner to England; it was made by J. S. Wyon, maker of the great seals of England.

[159] Q. Where is the seal now?

A. In the Confederate Museum in Richmond, Virginia.

[160] Q. Has there been any dispute about it?

A. Yes, many erroneous statements concerning it have been published.

"MASON AND DIXON LINE"

[161] “Q. What was the “Mason and Dixon Line”?”

A. A boundary line between Maryland and Pennsylvania (east and west), surveyed in 1763-1767 to determine disputed territory of the lands of the families of William Penn of Pennsylvania and of the Lords Baltimore of Maryland.

[162] Q. Why is the name used in connection with the War Between the States?

A. Simply because with an imaginary extension westward it happened to be almost a boundary that actually divided the states of the North from the states of the South in the controversies of the fifties and sixties.

[163] Q. Do any people believe the name came into use because of the War of Secession, as some historians call the War Between the States?

A. Only those who are ignorant of the history of the United States.

CONFEDERATE HEROES SELECTED BY SOUTHERN STATES FOR STONE MOUNTAIN MEMORIAL

[164] Q. Name the five best known men of each Confederate State whose names were selected for the Stone Mountain Memorial.

A. ALABAMA: Admiral Raphael Semmes; General Joseph Wheeler; Major John Pelham; General Henry D. Clayton; Dr. Lafayette Guild.

ARKANSAS: General Patrick R. Cleburne; General Thomas C. Hindman; General Thomas J. Churchill; General

Daniel C. Govan; General James F. Fagan.

FLORIDA: General William Wing Loring; General Edmond Kirby Smith; General James Patten Anderson; General Edward Aylesworth Perry; General Robert Bullock.

GEORGIA: General John B. Gordon; General Ambrose Ransom Wright; General F. M. B. Young; General H. T. Benning; General Thomas R. R. Cobb.

KENTUCKY: Major General John C. Breckenridge; Lieut. General Simon Bolivar Buckner; Brigadier General John Hunt Morgan; Brigadier General Ben Hardin Helm; Major General William Preston Johnston.

LOUISIANA: General T. P. Beauregard; General Leonidas Polk; General Francis T. Nicholls; General Alfred Mouton; General Harry T. Hays.

MISSISSIPPI: General E. C. Walthall; General Will T. Martin; General Earl Von Dorn; General William Barksdale; General Robert Lowry.

MISSOURI: Governor Claiborne Fox Jackson; General Sterling Price; General Joseph O. Shelby; General John S. Marmaduke; General Francis Marion Cockrell.

NORTH CAROLINA: Lieut. General D. H. Hill; Major General R. F. Hoke; Major General Stephen Ramseur; Brigadier General W. D. Pender; Brigadier General Bryan Grimes.

SOUTH CAROLINA: General Wade Hampton; General Richard Heron Anderson; General Stephen D. Lee; General [27||28] Joseph St. Joseph Brevard Kershaw; General Martin Witherspoon Gary.

TENNESSEE: General B. F. Cheatham; General

Nathan Bedford Forrest; General John Adams; General Felix Zollicoffer; General William B. Bate; Sam Davis, Confederate Hero Scout.

TEXAS: Judge John H. Reagan, Postmaster General of the Confederate States of America; General Albert Sidney Johnston; General John B. Hood; General (Governor) Lawrence Sullivan Ross; General Tom Green.

VIRGINIA: General Robert E. Lee; General J. E. B. Stuart; General Joseph E. Johnston; Commodore Matthew Fontaine Maury; General A. P. Hill.

[165] Q. How were these men chosen?

A. By Special Commissions in each State, appointed by the Governors, at the request of the Stone Mountain Memorial Association.

[166] Q. Is this a fair decision?

A. Not altogether, as there were others equally brave, and we should study the lives of all as much as possible. [28||29]

ADDENDA

[167] Q. When did the United Daughters of the Confederacy organize?

A. On September 10, 1894, at Nashville, Tenn.

[168] Q. For what purpose did they organize?

A. To preserve the true history of the Confederacy and keep in sacred memory the brave deeds of the men of the South, with no bitterness toward the government of the United States under which we live.

[169] Q. What other purposes had the Daughters of the Confederacy?

A. (a) To build homes, or through State Legislation to secure them, for the care of Confederate Veterans and their wives. (b) To secure pension laws in Southern States to help them to remain in their own homes when possible.

[170] Q. After their benevolent work, what does the United Daughters of the Confederacy consider next in importance?

A To teach their children from generation to generation that there was no stain upon the action of their forefathers in the War Between the States; and the women of the South; who nobly sustained them in that struggle will ever feel that their deathless deeds of valor are a precious heritage to be treasured for all time to come.

[171] Q. What are some of the methods used?

A. (a) Giving scholarships and prizes for historical work in high schools, colleges, and universities.

(b) Collecting books historically accurate and presenting them to foreign libraries.

(c) Assisting in such collections in high school, college and university libraries.

(d) Giving prizes for articles written concerning the South's part in the making of America.

(e) Conferring Crosses of Service on Soldiers of the Spanish American and World War, who are descendants of Confederate Veterans. [29||30]

[172] Q. Name the three most noted monuments erected by the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

A. (a) The Jefferson Davis Monument in Richmond, Virginia.

(b) The monument on the Battle Field of Shiloh, near Memphis, Tennessee.

(c) The monument at Arlington (Va.) National Cemetery which is known as the Peace Monument.

[173] Q. Where is the most imposing monument?

A. The Jefferson Davis Monument at his birth place near Fairview, Kentucky, which was begun by the Confederate Veterans and completed by the United Daughters of the Confederacy. It is next in height to the Washington Monument, in Washington, D. C.

[174] Q. Are there other Confederate Monuments?

A. Yes, hundreds of them. Every Southern State and many cities and small towns have Confederate Monuments to special heroes* and Brigades* that served with distinction.

[175] Q. What is considered the most splendid of all memorials sponsored by the United Daughters of the Confederacy?

A. The Jefferson Davis National Highway, which will extend from Washington, D. C., to San Francisco, to parallel the Lincoln Highway.

[176] Q. Why is it unique?

A. Because (a) it is the only highway in the world inaugurated by a woman's organization; (b) the only one where legislation, and rights-of-way, and beautification, have been secured by people working without compensation.

[177] Q. On what special work, requiring large sums of money are the United Daughters of the Confederacy now engaged?

A. (a) Raising an endowment fund to promote the teaching of Southern History, to be known as the Jefferson Davis Foundation.

(b) Raising fifty thousand dollars for restoration of Stratford Hall, Westmoreland County, Virginia.

[178] *For further information on these lives, always study the Programs sent out annually for the Children of the Confederacy. [30||31]

[179] Q. What is "Stratford Hall."

A. The ancestral home of the Lee family, built in 1725-1729 by Thomas Lee, President of the colony of Virginia, and its first native born Governor.

[180] Q. Who proposed the restoration of Stratford Hall?

A. Mrs. Charles D. Lanier, daughter-in-law of Sidney Lather, and president of the William Alexander, Jr. Chapter, U. D. C., a small chapter in Greenwich, Connecticut.

[181] Q. Why should Stratford be restored?

A. Because it was the birthplace of General Robert E. Lee, and several of the Lee family who were distinguished in the colonial life and the American Revolution.

[182] Q. Name another good reason.

A. Because it is one of the best examples of Colonial architecture on the American continent, and its history

represents the highest type of colonists, who became the founders of our nation.

[183] Q. What organization purchased and is restoring Stratford, and at what cost?

A. The Robert E. Lee Foundation, Incorporated, with Mrs. Charles D. Lanier, President, at a cost of approximately a half million dollars.

[184] Q. Name another important work now being promoted by the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

A. A movement to place the name of Sidney Lanier in the Hall of Fame.*

[185] *NOTE—Directors explain to children the Hall of Fame. [31||32]

DAYS OF OBSERVANCE

[186] Q. Why should we observe:

(a) January 19th?

A. Because it is the birthday of General Robert E. Lee, one of the greatest military leaders of all time, and a man revered and beloved the world over.

[187] Q. (b) April 26th?

A. Because it is the official Southern Memorial Day, selected by a vote of each Confederate organization.

[188] Q. (c) June 3rd?

A. Because it is the natal day of Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States of America, the vicarious sufferer for the whole South. A man among men, a soldier, statesman and gentleman—a great American whose

name we should demand be acclaimed leader of one side of the greatest epoch in American history.

[189] Q. (d) Flag Day—June 14th?

A. Because it proclaims our loyalty to our nation's flag.

[190] Q. (e) July 4th?

A. Because it celebrates our independence as a nation—the birth of a republic—led by Washington, Jefferson and other patriots, proclaiming equality of opportunity, such as no other government has achieved.

[191] Q. (f) Constitution Day—September 11th?

A. Because the Constitution of the United States is considered the greatest document for the safe-guarding of human rights ever penned and our forefathers fought, or died to preserve it.

[192] Q. (g) Armistice Day, November 11th?

A. Because it should ever be held sacred to the descendants of both the Blue and the Grey; to the manhood of America, who fought that other nations might be free, who died, not for conquest but for liberty.

[193] Q. Name another good reason for Armistice Day. [32||33]

[Image 5] [33||34] [34||33]

A. Because the soldiers of America embodied the spirit of the great Commander-in-Chief and World Democrat, Woodrow Wilson, whose ideals were the same eternal principles of human justice for which our forefathers

stood in the days of the American Revolution and the Southern Confederacy.

[194] BIBLIOGRAPHY

A History of the United States, Waddy Thompson.
The Story of Our Nation, Barker & Dodd.
Confederate Military History, Edited by Clement A. Evans.
Memoirs, John H. Reagan.
Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist; Dunbar Rowland.
Jefferson Davis, Morris Scharff.
The South in the Building of the Nation.
The World Book Encyclopedia.
Files of Confederate Veterans (1895-1925).
Life and Letters of General Robert E. Lee, by his Son.
Southern States of the American Union, J. L. M. Curry.
The Memorial Volume of Jefferson Davis (1890), Dr. J. William Jones. [34||35]

[195] OUR SOUTHLAND

Tune—"America"
Our Southland!—Ah! that word,
Like storm-tossed, flutt'ring bird,
Throbs on the air.
That name on starry height,
Fame seized the plume to write,

When might and darkest night
Concealed each star.

Yet Honor with firm heart,
Held Glory's blood-stained chart,
Through murk and storm.
Its stars like unto those
God's azure vaults disclose,
Each, with its own life, glows;
Yet, uniform.

We lift our voice to thee,
Author of land and sea,
Creator All.
Still guide our steps, O God!
In paths our Fathers trod,
Thou wert their King, their God!
Be Thou our All!

Notes

The spacing, indentation, and capitalization are similar to the original. Also, I am leaving all of the spelling and grammar mistakes in this edition because that is how the Children learned them.

[Page Opposite the Cover Page] Across the middle of the page is a handwritten note: “Presented by the Albert Sidney Johnstone Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.”

[Image 1] A drawing of two crossed swords with a laurel wreath and ribbon in front of them.

[1] On the top of the page is a stamp reading “Library University of Texas Austin, Texas.” At the bottom of the page there is another stamp reading “August 21 1935” (perhaps a due date stamp), and a type-printing of the number “382395” (perhaps a catalog number).

[Image 2] The caption under this full-page photograph reads, “STATE CAPITOL, MONTGOMERY, ALA. First Capitol, C. S. A., 1861 A star now marks the spot where Jefferson Davis was inaugurated President of the C. S. A. Placed by the U. D. C. of Alabama”

[4] Blank page

[8] Blank page

[18] The disregard, on the part of the States of the North, for the rights of the Southern or slave-holding States B.

[19] By the passage of laws in the Northern States annulling the rights of the people of the South—rights that were given to them by the Constitution of the United States B.

[21] The rights to regulate their own affairs and to hold slaves as property B.

[22] Were the Southern States alone responsible for the existence of slavery? No; slavery was introduced into the country in colonial times by the political authorities of Great Britain, Spain, France, and the Dutch Merchants, and in 1776—at the time of the Declaration of Independence—slavery existed in all of the thirteen colonies B.

[23] This is the exact wording from B.

[24] Yes, in most all; and our mother country, England, did not emancipate her slaves until 1843, when Parliament paid \$200,000,000 to the owners B.

[25] By enterprising shipowners of New England, who imported the slaves from Africa and secretly sold their cargoes along the coast, after the States of the North had abolished slavery B.

[26] This is the exact wording from B.

[27] Gen. U. S. Grant, who continued to live on their hire and service until the close of the war, and after the emancipation proclamation had been published, while he was leading armies to free the slaves of the South B.

[28] This is the exact wording from B.

[29] At the election of Abraham Lincoln by this party, which was pledged to take away the slaves and offer no terms of payment to the owners B.

- [41-43] This is the exact wording from B.
- [44] How did they behave during the War between the States? They nobly protected and cared for the wives of soldiers in the field, and widows without protectors B.
- [45-48] This is the exact wording from B.
- [49] secede should be spelled “secede,” as in B. Florida, January 10, 1861 B (which is the correct date, not January 19, 1861 as reported in A).
- [50-52] This is the exact wording from B.
- [Image 3] The caption under this full-page photograph reads, “STRATFORD HALL Ancestral Home and Birthplace of Gen. Robert E. Lee. Building and Gardens Being Restored by the Robt. E. Lee Foundation, Inc.”
- [113] On the top of the page is a stamp reading “Library University of Texas Austin, Texas” and at the bottom of the page is the type-printed number “382395” (again, perhaps a catalog number).
- [1413] The pages with photographs are not numbered, so even though the image is on the thirteenth page, the numbering picks up again on the fourteenth page as page 13.
- [55-57] This is the exact wording from B.
- [58] Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi; senator from that State in the Congress when Mississippi seceded, and already distinguished as a soldier and statesman, having gallantly served in the Mexican war, and as secretary of war under President Pierce, and member of both houses of Congress B.
- [69] Did he resign his seat in the Senate as soon as his State seceded? B. The response to this question is the exact wording from B.
- [70] This is the exact wording from B.
- [71] Who was elected Vice President? B. The response to this question is the exact wording from B.
- [72] This is the exact wording from B.
- [73] in the Alabama State House, Montgomery was the first capital of the Confederacy B.
- [75] Who did B.
- [78] This is the exact wording from B.
- [79] Yes; Congress, on March 6, 1861, passed an act adopting the first flag of the Confederacy, called the “Stars and Bars.”
- [80] This is the exact wording from B.
- [83] Why was another flag adopted? B.
- [84-87] This is the exact wording from B.
- [88] the first flag adopted by the Confederate States B.
- [89-90] This is the exact wording from B.
- [91] Who was made commander in chief of the Confederate forces? Robert E. Lee, the best loved and honored of all the Confederate generals B.
- [92] This is the exact wording from B.
- [98] This is the exact wording from B.
- [99] What number was enrolled in the Confederate army? B.

[100-103] This is the exact wording from B.

[104] When General Lee surrendered his army, at Appomattox, Va., on April 9, 1865 B.

[105-108] This is the exact wording from B.

[109] except in the case of President Davis and some others B.

[110-111] This is the exact wording from B, except [110] martyrdom B.

[133] Antietan should be spelled “Antietam.”

[142] This is a footnote at the bottom of the page for [139].

[146] recumbant should be spelled “recumbent.”

[147] This is the exact wording from B.

[Image 4] The caption under this full-page photograph reads, “OFFICIAL SEAL OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA Now in Solid South Room of the Confederate Museum, (Richmond, Va.)”

[26||25] The pages with photographs are not numbered, so even though the image is on the twenty-fifth page, the numbering picks up again on the twenty-sixth page as page 25.

[164] Wiliam B. Bate should be spelled “William B. Bate.”

[167] This is the exact wording from B.

[170] What other purposes have the Daughters of the Confederacy? The response to this question is the exact wording from B.

[178] This was a footnote at the bottom of the page for [174].

[Image 5] The caption under this full-page photograph reads, “THE WHITE HOUSE OF THE CONFEDERACY (1861-1865) Richmond, Virginia, the Second Capitol of the Confederate States”

[34||33] The pages with photographs are not numbered, so even though the image is on the thirty-third page, the numbering picks up again on the thirty-fourth page as page 33.

[194] The World Book Encyclopedia should be spelled “The World Book Encyclopedia.”

Works Cited

- Allison, Mrs. John P. *A Confederate Catechism for Southern Children*. Concord, NC: Kestler Brothers Printers, 1946. Originally printed 1908.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991.
- Andrews, James R. "Reflections of the National Character in American Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 57 (1971): 316-324.
- Baggett, James A. *The Scalawags: Southern Dissenters in the Civil War and Reconstruction*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 2003.
- Bailey, Fred A. "The Textbooks of the 'Lost Cause': Censorship and the Creation of Southern State Histories." *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 75 (1991): 507-533.
- . "Mildred Lewis Rutherford and the Patrician Cult of the Old South." *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 77 (1994): 509-535.
- Beale, Mrs. J. D. "Gavel Presentation Address." United Daughters of the Confederacy. *Minutes of the Fourth Annual Convention, Held in Baltimore, MD*. November 10, 1897.
- Benson, Thomas W., ed. *American Rhetoric: Context and Criticism*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1989.
- Bercovitch, Sacvan. *The Rites of Assent: Transformations in the Symbolic Construction of America*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Billington, Monroe L., ed. *The South: A Central Theme?* New York: Holt, 1969.

- Bitzer, Lloyd. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1-14.
- Black, Edwin. "The Second Persona." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56 (1970): 109-119. Rpt. in *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*. Ed. John L. Lucaites, Celeste M. Condit, and Sally Caudill. New York: Guilford, 1999. 331-340.
- Blackwell, Marilyn S. "The Republican Vision of Mary Palmer Tyler." *Mothers and Motherhood: Readings in American History*. Ed. Rima D. Apple and Janet Golden. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1997.
- Blair, Carole, Marsha S. Jeppeson, and Enrico Pucci, Jr. "Public Memorializing in Postmodernity: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial as Prototype." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77 (1991): 263-288.
- Blee, Kathleen M. *Women of the Klan: Racism and Gender in the 1920s*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991.
- Blight, David. "'For Something Beyond the Battlefield': Frederick Douglass and the Struggle for the Memory of the Civil War." *Journal of American History* 75 (1989): 1156-1178.
- . *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2001.
- Bloch, Ruth H. "American Feminine Ideals in Transition: The Rise of the Moral Mother, 1785- 1815." *Feminist Studies* 4 (1978): 101-126.
- Bodnar, John. *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1992.

- Braden, Waldo W. "The Emergence of the Concept of Southern Oratory." *Southern Speech Journal* 26 (1961): 173-183.
- . "The Concept of Southern Oratory: A Selected Bibliography." *Southern Speech Journal* 29 (1963): 141-145.
- . ed. *Oratory in the Old South, 1828-1860*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1970.
- . "Myths in a Rhetorical Context." *Southern Speech Communication Journal* 40 (1975): 113-126.
- . ed. *Oratory in the New South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1979.
- . *The Oral Tradition in the South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1983.
- Brewer, Kathy S. "Catechisms." E-mail to Amy L. Heyse. 24 Feb. 2003.
- . "Catechisms." E-mail to Amy L. Heyse. 25 Feb. 2003.
- Brock, Bernard L., Robert L. Scott, and James W. Chesebro. *Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth-Century Perspective*. 3rd ed. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1989.
- Browne, Stephen H. "Reading Public Memory in Daniel Webster's Plymouth Rock Oration." *Western Journal of Communication* 57 (1993): 464-477.
- . "Encountering Angelina Grimke: Violence, Identity, and the Creation of Radical Community." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 82 (1996): 55-73.
- . "Remembering Crispus Attucks: Race, Rhetoric, and the Politics of Commemoration." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 85 (1999): 169-187.

- Brummett, Barry, and Detine Bowers. "Subject Positions as Site of Rhetorical Struggle: Representing African Americans." *At the Intersection: Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies*. Ed. Thomas Rosteck. New York: Guilford, 1998.
- Brundage, W. Fitzhugh, ed. *Where These Memories Grow: History, Memory, and Southern Identity*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2000.
- Bryan, Ferald J. *Henry Grady or Tom Watson? The Rhetorical Struggle for the New South, 1880-1890*. Macon: Mercer UP, 1994.
- Buck, Paul H. *The Road to Reunion, 1865-1900*. Boston: Little, 1937.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1969.
- . *The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1970.
- . *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*. 3rd ed. Berkeley: U of California P, 1973.
- Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Campbell, J. Louis. "In Search of the New South." *Southern Speech Communication Journal* 47 (1982): 361-388.
- Campbell, Karlyn K. *Man Cannot Speak for Her: A Critical Study of Early Feminist Rhetoric*. Vol. 1. New York: Praeger, 1989. 2 vols.
- Cash, Wilbur J. *The Mind of the South*. New York: Vintage, 1969.

- Charland, Maurice. "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the *Peuple Quebecois*." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987): 133-150.
- Children of the Confederacy. *General Meeting Minutes*. 2002.
- Cicero. *De Partitione Oratoria*. Vol. 4. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Trans. H. Rackham. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2004.
- Cisco, Walter B. *Wade Hampton: Confederate Warrior, Conservative Statesman*. Washington, D.C.: Brassey's, 2004.
- Clark, Thomas D., ed. *The South Since Reconstruction*. Indianapolis: Bobbs, 1973.
- Clark, Thomas D., and Albert D. Kirwan. *The South Since Appomattox: A Century of Regional Change*. New York: Oxford UP, 1967.
- Climmer, Patricia F. "Protectors of the Past: The United Daughters of the Confederacy, Tennessee Division, and the Lost Cause." Master's Thesis. Vanderbilt U, 1973.
- Coke, Mary. "Catechetical Renewal and Its Implications for R. E." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 31 (1983): 29-40.
- Connelly, Thomas L. *The Marble Man: Robert E. Lee and His Image in American Society*. New York: Knopf, 1977.
- Connelly, Thomas L., and Barbara L. Bellows. *God and General Longstreet: The Lost Cause and the Southern Mind*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1995.

- Conrad, Charles. "Work Songs, Hegemony, and Illusions of Self." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 5 (1988): 179-201.
- Córdova, Nathaniel I. "The Constitutive Force of the Catecismo del Pueblo in Puerto Rico's Popular Democratic Party Campaign of 1938-1940." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90 (2004): 212-233.
- Cornell Law School, Legal Information Institute. "United States Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment." *Cornell Law School*. 1 Jun. 2004. <<http://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/constitution.amendmentxiv.html>>
- Cox, J. Robert. "Memory, Critical Theory and the Argument From History." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 27 (1990): 1-13.
- Cox, Karen L. "Women, The Lost Cause, and the New South: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Transmission of Confederate Culture, 1894-1919." Diss. U of Southern Mississippi, 1997.
- Croly, Jane C. *The History of the Woman's Club Movement in America*. New York: Allen, 1898.
- Current, Richard N. "Carpetbaggers Reconsidered." *A Festschrift for Frederick B. Artz*. Ed. David H. Pinkney and Theodore Ropp. Durham: Duke UP, 1964.
- . *Northernizing the South*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1983.
- . *Those Terrible Carpetbaggers: A Reinterpretation*. New York: Oxford UP, 1988.
- Curti, Merle E. *The Growth of American Thought*. New York: Harper, 1943.

- Davis, Jefferson. *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government*. New York: Appleton, 1881. Rpt. on *The Perseus Digital Library*. March 2004. <<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgibin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2001.05.0129>>.
- Davis, William C. *The Cause Lost: Myths and Realities of the Confederacy*. Lawrence: UP of Kansas, 1996.
- De Cillia, Rudolf, Martin Reisegl, and Ruth Wodak. "The Discursive Construction of National Identities." *Discourse and Society* 10 (1999): 149-173.
- Dickey, Dallas C. "Were They Ephemeral and Florid?" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 22 (1946): 16-20.
- Dorgan, Howard. "The Doctrine of Victorious Defeat in the Rhetoric of Confederate Veterans." *Southern Speech Communication Journal* 38 (1972): 119-141.
- . "Rhetoric of the United Confederate Veterans: A Lost Cause Mythology in the Making." *Oratory in the New South*. Ed. Waldo W. Braden. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1979. 143-173.
- Dorris, James M. "Androgyny and Pedagogy: An Analysis of Interpersonal Communication Textbooks, 1975-79." *Communication Education* 30 (1981): 33-43.
- Dow, Bonnie J. "The 'Womanhood' Rationale in the Woman Suffrage Rhetoric of Frances E. Willard." *Southern Communication Journal* 56 (1991): 298-307.

- . "AIDS, Perspective by Incongruity, and Gay Identity in Larry Kramer's '1,112 and Counting.'" *Communication Studies* 45 (1994): 225-240.
- Downing, Fanny. "Perfect Through Suffering." *The Land We Love* 4 (1868): 193-205.
- Dunovant, Adelia A. "Principles in Their Relation to Human Action." United Daughters of the Confederacy General Meeting. Wilmington, NC. 13 Nov. 1901.
- Ede, Lisa, and Andrea Lunsford. "Audience Addressed/Audience Invoked: The Role of Audience in Composition Theory and Pedagogy." *College Composition and Communication* 35 (1984): 155-171.
- Eley, Geoff, and Ronald G. Suny. *Becoming National: A Reader*. New York: Oxford, 1996.
- Elson, Ruth M. *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1964.
- Erikson, Erik. *Childhood and Society*. New York: Norton, 1950.
- . *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton, 1968.
- . *Dimensions of a New Identity*. New York: Norton, 1974.
- . *The Life Cycle Completed: A Review*. New York: Norton, 1982.
- Eubanks, Ralph T. "The Rhetoric of the Nullifiers." *Oratory in the Old South, 1828- 1860*. Ed. Waldo W. Braden. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1970. 19-72.
- Ezell, John S. *The South Since 1865*. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

- Ferguson, Marjorie. "Invisible Divides: Communication and Identity in Canada and the U.S." *Journal of Communication* 43 (1993): 42-57.
- Fisher, Walter R. "Toward a Logic of Good Reasons." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 64 (1978): 376-384.
- . "Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument." *Communication Monographs* 51 (1984): 1-22.
- . "The Narrative Paradigm: An Elaboration." *Communication Monographs* 52 (1985): 347-367.
- . *Human Communication as Narration: Toward a Philosophy of Reason, Value, and Action*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1987.
- Fitzgibbons, Margaret M. *History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy in California, Centennial Edition 1896-1991*. Mesa: Blue Bird, 1997.
- Flores, Lisa A. "Creating Discursive Space through a Rhetoric of Difference: Chicana Feminists Craft a Homeland." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 82 (1996): 142-156.
- Foner, Eric. *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877*. New York: Harper, 1988.
- Ford, James E., and James F. Klumpp. "Systematic Pluralism: An Inquiry into the Bases of Communication Research." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 2 (1985): 408-429.

- Fore, Mrs. James A. (Cornelia Berry). *A Catechism for the Children of the Confederacy of the North Carolina Division United Daughters of the Confederacy*. Charlotte, NC: Piedmont Printery, 193?
- Foster, Gaines M. *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865 to 1913*. New York: Oxford UP, 1987.
- Francesconi, Robert. "Free Jazz and Black Nationalism: A Rhetoric of Musical Style." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 3 (1986): 36-49.
- Franklin, John H. "The Militant South." *The South: A Central Theme?* Ed. Monroe L. Billington. New York: Holt, 1969. 62-68. Rpt. from *The Militant South*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1956. 1-13.
- . *Reconstruction: After the Civil War*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1961.
- Frisch, Michael. "American History and the Structures of Collective Memory: A Modest Exercise in Empirical Iconography." *Journal of American History* 75 (1989): 1130-1155.
- Gaines, Francis P. *Southern Oratory: A Study in Idealism*. University, AL: U of Alabama P.
- Gallagher, Gary W. *Jubal A. Early, the Lost Cause, and Civil War History: A Persistent Legacy*. Milwaukee: Marquette UP, 1995.
- . Introduction. *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History*. Ed. Gary W. Gallagher and Alan T. Nolan. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2000. 1-9.
- Gallagher, Gary W., and Alan T. Nolan, eds. *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2000.

- Galveston and Texas History Center, Rosenberg Library.* "Vertical Files Index S." March 2006. <<http://gthcenter.org/collections/vertical/VertS.htm>>.
- Gantt, Mrs. James B. "Mrs. Cornelia Branch Stone." *Confederate Veteran* May 1911: 210-211.
- Gaston, Paul M. *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking*. New York: Vintage, 1970.
- Gillis, J. R., ed. *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.
- Glassberg, David. "Public History and the Study of Memory." *Public Historian* 18 (1996): 7-23.
- Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1959.
- Grady, Henry W. "The New South." New England Society of New York. New York, 22 December 1886. Rpt. in Joel Chandler Harris, *Henry W. Grady: His Life, Writings, and Speeches*. New York: Cassell, 1890. 15-16. Rpt. at *Douglass Archives of American Public Address*. <<http://douglassarchives.org>>.
- Green, Elna C. *Southern Strategies: Southern Women and the Woman Suffrage Question*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1997.
- Griffin, Cindy L. "Rhetoricizing Alienation: Mary Wollstonecraft and the Rhetorical Construction of Women's Oppression." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994): 293-312.

- Gronbeck, Bruce E. "The Rhetorics of the Past: History, Argument, and Collective Memory." *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*. Ed. Kathleen J. Turner. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama, 1998. 47-60.
- Gudmestad, Robert H. "Baseball, the Lost Cause, and the New South in Richmond, Virginia, 1883-1890." *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*(1998): 267-300.
- Gulley, H. E. "Women and the Lost Cause: Preserving a Confederate Identity in the American Deep South." *Journal of Historical Geography* 19 (1993): 125-141.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *The Collective Memory*. Trans. Francis J. Ditter, Jr. and Vida Yazdi Ditter. New York: Colophon, 1980.
- . *On Collective Memory*. Trans. Lewis A. Coser. Ed. Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.
- Hall, Stuart. "Signification, Representation, Ideology: Althusser and the Post-Structuralist Debates." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 2 (1985): 91-114.
- . Introduction: Who Needs "Identity?" *Questions of Cultural Identity*. Eds. Stuart Hall and Paul Du Gay. London: Sage, 1996. 1-17.
- Hariman, Robert, and John L. Lucaites. "Public Identity and Collective Memory in U.S. Iconic Photography: The Image of 'Accidental Napalm.'" *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 20 (2003): 35-66.

- Hart, Roderick P. "Contemporary Scholarship in Public Address: A Research Editorial." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50 (1986): 283-295.
- Hasian, Marouf Jr. "Nostalgic Longings, Memories of the 'Good War,' and Cinematic Representations in Saving Private Ryan." *Critical Studies in MediaCommunication*, 18 (2001): 338-358.
- Haskins, Ekaterina V. "'Put Your Stamp on History': The USPS Commemorative Program Celebrate the Century and Postmodern Collective Memory." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 89 (2003): 1-18.
- Hoover, Kenneth. *The Power of Identity: Politics in a New Key*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 1997.
- Hunter, Mary J. "A Rhetorical Analysis of the Speeches of Mildred L. Rutherford, Historian General, United Daughters of the Confederacy." Master's Thesis. Louisiana State U, 1982.
- Jorgensen-Earp, Cheryl R., and Lanzilotti, Lori A. "Public Memory and Private Grief: The Construction of Shrines at the Sites of Public Tragedy." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84 (1998): 150-170.
- Kammen, Michael G. *The Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture*. New York: Knopf, 1991.
- Katriel, Tamar. "Sites of Memory: Discourses of the Past in Israeli Pioneering Settlement Museums." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994): 1-20.
- Kerber, Linda. "The Republican Mother: Women and the Enlightenment—An American Perspective." *American Quarterly* 28 (1976): 187-205.

- . *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1980.
- Kiesling, Scott F. "From the 'Margins' to the 'Mainstream': Gender Identity and Fraternity Men's Discourse." *Women and Language* 20 (1997): 13-17.
- Knapp, Steven. "Collective Memory and the Actual Past." *Representations* 26 (1989): 123-149.
- Kraditor, Aileen S. *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920*. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1965.
- Kritzer, Amelia H. "Playing with Republican Motherhood: Self-Representation in Plays by Susanna Haswell Rowson and Judith Sargent Murray." *Early American Literature* 31 (1996): 150-167.
- Lake, Randall A. "Between Myth and History: Enacting Time in Native American Protest Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77 (1991): 123-151.
- Latham, Brenda. Personal interview. 12 Feb. 2003.
- Lawton, Mrs. St. John Alison, et al. *UDC Catechism of South Carolina's Confederate History*. Charleston: J.J. Furlong, Charleston Printing House, 1919.
- Lee, Richard H. "Address in Clark Country, Virginia." *Confederate Veteran* May 1893: 205.
- Leff, Michael C., and Fred J. Kauffeld, eds. *Texts in Context: Critical Dialogues on Significant Episodes in American Political Rhetoric*. Davis: Hermagoras, 1989.

- Leff, Michael, and Ebony A. Utley. "Instrumental and Constitutive Rhetoric in Martin Luther King Jr.'s 'Letter from Birmingham Jail'." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 7 (2004): 37-51.
- List, Karen K. "The Post-Revolutionary Woman Idealized: Philadelphia Media's 'Republican Mother.'" *Journalism Quarterly* 66 (1989): 65-75.
- Littlefield, George E. *Early Schools and School-Books of New England*. New York: Russell, 1965.
- Logue, Cal M. "Coping with Defeat Rhetorically: Sherman's March Through Georgia." *Southern Communication Journal* 58 (1992): 55-66.
- Lucas, Stephen E. "The Schism in Rhetorical Scholarship." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 67 (1981): 1-20. Rpt. in *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism*. Ed. Carl R. Burgchardt. State College, PA: Strata, 1995. 87-106.
- . "The Renaissance of American Public Address: Text and Context in Rhetorical Criticism." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 74 (1988): 241-260.
- Lynd, Staughton, ed. *Reconstruction*. New York: Harper, 1967.
- Mackin, James A., Jr. "Schismogenesis and Community: Pericles' Funeral Oration." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77 (1991): 251-262.
- Madden, Heidi. "Reference Question from the WWW." E-mail to Amy L. Heyse. 23 Sept. 2003.
- Mandziuk, Roseann M. "Commemorating Sojourner Truth: Negotiating the Politics of Race and Gender in the Spaces of Public Memory." *Western Journal of Communication* 67 (2003): 271-291.

- Martin, Judith N., et al. "Exploring Whiteness: A Study of Self Labels for White Americans." *Communication Quarterly* 44 (1996): 125-144.
- McCardell, John. *The Idea of a Southern Nation: Southern Nationalists and Southern Nationalism, 1830-1860*. New York: Norton, 1979.
- McDorman, Todd F. "Challenging Constitutional Authority: African American Responses to *Scott v. Sandford*." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 192-209.
- McGee, Michael C. "In Search of 'The People': A Rhetorical Alternative." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61 (1975): 235-249.
- McKerrow, Raymie, and Michael Bruner. "Argument and Multiple Identities: Contemporary European Nationalism and Environmentalism." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 34 (1997): 51-65.
- McPherson, James M. *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction*. New York: Knopf, 1982.
- Michel, Kathryn. "Republican Motherhood in the South?: An Examination of the Roles of Elite White Women in North Carolina and Virginia, 1784-1830." Master's thesis. Wake Forest U, 2000.
- Mixon, Harold D. "Henry Grady as a Persuasive Strategist." *Oratory in the New South*. Ed. Waldo W. Braden. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1979. 74-116.
- Moss, Elizabeth. *Domestic Novelists in the Old South: Defenders of Southern Culture*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1992.

- Nakayama, Thomas K. "Show/Down Time: 'Race,' Gender, Sexuality, and Popular Culture." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 11 (1994): 162-179.
- Nakayama, Thomas K., and Robert L. Krizek. "Whiteness: A Strategic Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81 (1995): 63-82.
- Nash, Margaret A. "Rethinking Republican Motherhood: Benjamin Rush and the Young Ladies' Academy of Philadelphia." *Journal of the Early Republic* 17 (1997): 171-191.
- Nolan, Alan T. "The Anatomy of the Myth." *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History*. Ed. Gary W. Gallagher and Alan T. Nolan. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2000. 11-34.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire." *Representations* 26 (1989): 7-25.
- Norton, Mary Beth. *Liberty's Daughters: The Revolutionary Experience of American Women, 1750-1800*. Boston: Little, 1980.
- O'Brien, Michael. *The Idea of the American South, 1920-1940*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1979.
- Olsen, Otto H. "Reconsidering the Scalawags." *Civil War History* 12 (1966): 304-320.
- Osborn, Michael. "Rhetorical Depiction." *Form, Genre, and the Study of Political Discourse*. Ed. Herbert W. Simons and Aram A. Aghazarian. Columbia, SC: U of South Carolina P, 1986. 79-107.

- Osborne, Charles C. *Jubal: The Life and Times of General Jubal A. Early, CSA, Defender of the Lost Cause*. Chapel Hill: Algonquin, 1992.
- Osterweis, Rollin G. *Romanticism and Nationalism in the Old South*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1949.
- . *Judah P. Benjamin, Statesman of the Lost Cause*. New York: Putnam, 1972.
- . *The Myth of the Lost Cause, 1865-1900*. Hamden, CT: Shoe String, 1973.
- Owsley, Frank L. "The Irrepressible Conflict." *The South: A Central Theme?* Ed. Monroe L. Billington. New York: Holt, 1969. 91-93. Rpt. of "The Irrepressible Conflict." Twelve Southerners. *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition*. New York: Harper, 1930. 69-74, 90-91.
- Parry Giles, Shawn, and Trevor Parry-Giles. "Collective Memory, Political Nostalgia, and the Rhetorical Presidency: Bill Clinton's Commemoration of the March on Washington, August 28, 1998." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 86 (2000): 417-437.
- Pepper, Stephen C. *World Hypotheses: A Study in Evidence*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1942.
- "Platform of the States Rights Democratic Party." Courtesy of the Carl Albert Congressional Research and Studies Center at the University of Oklahoma. 1948. Rpt. at *The Smoking Gun*. July 2006. <<http://www.thesmokinggun.com/archive/dixiecrat1.html>>.

- Pollard, Edward A. *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates: Comprising a Full and Authentic Account of the Rise and Progress of the Late Southern Confederacy—The Campaigns, Battles, Incidents, and Adventures of the Most Gigantic Struggle of the World's History*. New York: Treat, 1866. Rpt. at *Making of America Books*. <<http://www.hti.umich.edu>>.
- Poppenheim, Mary B., et al. *The History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy*. Richmond: Garrett, 1925.
- Potter, David M. *The South and the Sectional Conflict*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1968.
- Prichard, Mrs. W. B. "Work and Spirit of the United Daughters." *Confederate Veteran* Jan. 1913: 17.
- Procter, David E., Roger C. Aden, and Phyllis Japp. "Gender/Issue Interaction in Political Identity Making: Nebraska's Woman vs. Woman Gubernatorial Campaign." *Central States Speech Journal* 39 (1988): 190-203.
- Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County*. "Cornelia Berry Fore Papers." Manuscript Collection Three. March 2006. <<http://www.plcmc.org/libLoc/papersFore.pdf>>.
- Pugh, Mrs. Thos. B. "Address to UDC Annual Convention." United Daughters of the Confederacy General Meeting. New Orleans, LA. Nov. 1902.
- Rabinowitz, Howard N. *The First New South, 1865-1920*. Arlington Heights, IL: Davidson, 1992.

- Rable, George C. *Civil Wars: Women and the Crisis of Southern Nationalism*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1989.
- Radford, John P. "Identity and Tradition in the Post-Civil War South." *Journal of Historical Geography* 18 (1992): 91-103.
- Ramsdell, Charles W. "Preoccupation with Agriculture." *The South: A Central Theme?* Ed. Monroe L. Billington. New York: Holt, 1969. 77-90. Rpt. of "The Southern Heritage." *Culture in the South*. Ed. W. T. Couch. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1934. 1-15, 17-23.
- Ransom, John C. "Reconstructed But Unregenerate." *The South: A Central Theme?* Ed. Monroe L. Billington. New York: Holt, 1969. 93-96. Rpt. of "The Irrepressible Conflict." Twelve Southerners. *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition*. New York: Harper, 1930. 15-22.
- Reid, Ronald F. *American Rhetorical Discourse*. 2nd ed. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland, 1995.
- Repp, Arthur C., Sr. *Luther's Catechism Comes to America: Theological Effects on the Issues of the Small Catechism Prepared In or For America Prior to 1850*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1982.
- Rowland, Kate M. "Resolutions on the Name of the War." United Daughters of the Confederacy General Meeting. Richmond, VA. 10 Nov. 1899.
- Roy, Abhik, and Robert C. Rowland. "The Rhetoric of Hindu Nationalism: A Narrative of Mythic Redefinition." *Western Journal of Communication* 67 (2003): 225-248.

- Rubin, Anne S. "Redefining the South: Confederates, Southerners, and Americans, 1863-1868." Diss. U. of Virginia, 1999.
- Rutherford, Mildred L. "A Scripture Catechism for Baptist Sunday-Schools." Atlanta: Foote, 1898.
- . "Georgia: The Empire State of the South." Delivered on February 12, 1914. N.p., n.p., n.d.
- . "'Wrongs of History Righted.' Address by Historian General UDC, at Savannah, Ga., Fri., Nov. 13, 1914." Athens, GA: McGregor.
- . "The Civilization of the Old South: What Made it: What Destroyed it: What has Replaced it." United Daughters of the Confederacy General Meeting. Dallas, TX. 9 Nov. 1916.
- Sandell, J. W. "'New South' and 'Lost Cause.'" *Confederate Veteran* Dec. 1912: 573.
- Saxon, John D. "Contemporary Southern Oratory: A Rhetoric of Hope, Not Desperation." *Southern Speech Communication Journal* 40 (1975): 262-274.
- Schwartz, Barry. "The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory." *Social Forces* 61 (1982): 374-402.
- Scott, Anne F. *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1970.
- . *Making the Invisible Woman Visible*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1984.

- . *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1993.
- Scroggs, Jack B. "Carpetbagger Constitutional Reform in the South Atlantic States, 1867-1868." *Journal of Southern History* 27 (1961): 475-493.
- Simpson, John A. "The Cult of the 'Lost Cause'." *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 34 (1975): 350-361.
- . *Edith D. Pope and Her Nashville Friends: Guardians of the Lost Cause in the 'Confederate Veteran'*. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 2003.
- Sims, Anastasia. *The Power of Femininity in the New South: Women's Organizations and Politics in North Carolina, 1880-1930*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1997.
- Sklar, Kathryn K. "Catharine Beecher: Transforming the Teaching Profession." *Women's America: Refocusing the Past*. Ed. Linda K. Kerber and Jane De Hart Mathews. New York: Oxford UP, 1982.
- Slagell, Amy R. "The Rhetorical Structure of Frances E. Willard's Campaign for Woman Suffrage, 1876-1896." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 4 (2001): 1-23.
- Slagle, R. Anthony. "In Defense of Queer Nation: From Identity Politics to a Politics of Difference." *Western Journal of Communication* 59 (1995): 85-102.
- Smith, Essie W. B., et al. *History of the Virginia Division United Daughters of the Confederacy: 1895-1967*. N.p.: United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1968.

- Smith, Mark M., ed. *The Old South*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2001.
- Smith, Ralph R., and Russel R. Windes. "The Progay and Antigay Issue Culture: Interpretation, Influence and Dissent." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 28-48.
- Snyder, Ann E. *The Civil War From a Southern Stand-Point*. Nashville: Publishing House of the M. E. Church, South, 1890.
- . *A Narrative of the Civil War*. Nashville: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1899.
- Stiles, Robert. "Address Delivered Before Washington and Lee University." *Southern Magazine* 1875: 42.
- Stone, Cornelia B. *U.D.C. Catechism for Children*. Galveston: J.E.B. Stuart Chapter No. 10, U.D.C., 1912. Originally published 1904.
- . "Mrs. Stone's Response to Addresses of Welcome." United Daughters of the Confederacy General Meeting. Atlanta, GA. 11 Nov. 1908.
- . "Vivid Reminiscences of the Old Plantation." *Confederate Veteran* Dec. 1912: 568-569.
- Taylor, William R. *Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and American National Character*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1979.
- "The Southern Manifesto." *Congressional Record*, 84th Congress Second Session. Vol. 102, part 4 (March 12, 1956). Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1956. 4459-4460. July 2006. Rpt. at *Clemson University*. <<http://www.strom.clemson.edu/strom/manifesto.html>>.

- Thelen, David. "Memory and American History." *Journal of American History* 75 (1989): 1117-1129.
- Thomas, Mrs. J. Jefferson. "Response to the Address of Welcome." *Minutes of the Third Annual UDC Meeting, Held in Nashville, TN*. November 11, 1896.
- Thomas, Sarah P. "Was 'Ole Mis' Lazy?" *Confederate Veteran* Aug. 1915: 351.
- Thurmond, Strom J. "Presidential Nomination Acceptance Speech." Delivered in 1948 to the States Rights Democratic Party. *National Public Radio*. July 2006. <<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=865900>>.
- Tolnay, Stewart E., and E. M. Beck. *A Festival of Violence: An Analysis of Southern Lynchings, 1882-1930*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1992.
- Towns, W. Stuart. "Ceremonial Orators and National Reconciliation." *Oratory in the New South*. Ed. Waldo W. Braden. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1979. 117-142.
- . *Oratory and Rhetoric in the Nineteenth-Century South: A Rhetoric of Defense*. Westport: Praeger, 1998.
- Trefousse, Hans L. *The Radical Republicans: Lincoln's Vanguard for Racial Justice*. New York: Knopf, 1969.
- Trelease, Allen. "Who Were the Scalawags?" *Journal of Southern History* 29 (1963): 445-468.
- . *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction*. New York: Harper, 1971.

- Turner, Kathleen J., ed. *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 1998.
- United Daughters of the Confederacy. *Minutes of the First Annual Convention, Held in Nashville, Tennessee*. September 10, 1894.
- . *Minutes of the Thirty-Third Annual Convention*. November 16-20, 1926.
- . *Program: UDC 36th Annual Convention*. Biloxi, MS. 17-23 November, 1929.
- . *Home Page*. 2004. <<http://www.hqudc.org/>>.
- Vandiver, Frank E. "The Southerner as Extremist." *The South: A Central Theme?* Ed. Monroe L. Billington. New York: Holt, 1969. 69-76. Rpt. from *The Idea of the South*. Ed. Frank E. Vandiver. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1964. 43-53, 55.
- Wagner-Pacifici, Robin. "Memories in the Making: The Shapes of Things That Went." *Qualitative Sociology* 19 (1996): 301-321.
- Wander, Philip. "The Third Persona: An Ideological Turn in Rhetorical Theory." *Communication Studies* 33 (1984): 197-216. Rpt. in *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*. Ed. John L. Lucaites, et al. New York: Guilford, 1999. 357-379.
- Watson, Thomas E. "The Negro Question in the South." *Arena* VI (October 1892): 540-550. Rpt. in George Brown Tindall, ed., *A Populist Reader. Selections from the Works of American Populist Leaders*. New York:

- Harper, 1966. 118-128. Rpt. at *Worth Robert Miller/Southwest Missouri State University*. <<http://history.smsu.edu/wrmiller/Default.htm>>.
- Weaver, Richard M. *The Southern Tradition at Bay: A History of Postbellum Thought*. New Rochelle: Arlington, 1968.
- Wells, June M. "A Talk Given by June Murray Wells, President General United Daughters of the Confederacy. Talk at South Carolina State House, Columbia, South Carolina." 8 Jan. 2000: 1-4. Rpt. at *Electric Scotland*. March 2006. <<http://www.electricscotland.com/history/america/udctalk.htm>>.
- Welter, Barbara. "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860." *American Quarterly* 18 (1966): 151-174.
- West, Decca L. *Catechism on the History of the Confederate States of America*. N.p.: n.p., 1934. Originally written 1926.
- Whites, LeeAnn. "'Stand By Your Man': The Ladies Memorial Association and the Reconstruction of Southern White Manhood." *Women of the American South*. Ed. Christie A. Farnham. New York: New York UP, 1997.
- Williams, Alfred B. *Hampton and His Red Shirts; South Carolina's Deliverance in 1876*. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries, 1970.
- Wilson, Charles R. *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1980.
- Wood, Forrest G. *The Era of Reconstruction, 1863-1877*. New York: Crowell, 1975.

- Woodward, C. Vann. *Origins of the New South, 1877-1913*. N.p., Louisiana State UP 1951. Vol. IX of *A History of the South*. 10 vols.
- . "The Heritage of History." *The South: A Central Theme?* Ed. Monroe L. Billington. New York: Holt, 1969. 102-110. Rpt. of "The Search for Southern Identity." *Virginia Quarterly Review* 34 (1958): 321-325, 328-338.
- Wright, Mrs. D. Giraud. "Welcome Address to the UDC Fourth Annual Meeting. United Daughters of the Confederacy." United Daughters of the Confederacy General Meeting. Baltimore, MD. 10 Nov. 1897.
- Zelizer, Barbie. "Reading the Past Against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12 (1995): 214-239.