

PERSONAL CONFEDERACIES:
WAR AND PEACE IN THE AMERICAN SOUTH, 1840-1890

By

JAMES J. BROOMALL

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2011

© 2011 James J. Broomall

To Tish

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In writing this acknowledgement, a highly personal endeavor, I see it as only fit to break orthodoxy in acknowledging those closest to me at the beginning rather than the end, for it is upon them I have leaned most heavily. My parents not only offered the emotional support to sustain a flagging spirit during the trials of graduate school but also generously sacrificed vacations, resources, and time to join me on prolonged research trips, read untold papers, and patiently hear me out during my many diatribes. Their love and support provide a constant guide. During my first year in graduate school at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, while pursuing a degree in Museum Studies, I met Tish Wiggs. Several years and states later she remains my constant companion, my best friend, and now my beloved wife. I have dedicated this dissertation to her as reflection, however small, of my respect, admiration, and love. This work is as much hers as mine and without her firm trust, constant help, and unwavering faith I'd still be working on Chapter One. It is an unparalleled joy to have Tish in my life.

Among my friends in North Carolina, Jeff Curry, Ernie Dollar, Chris Graham, Chris Meekins, and David Southern provided unwavering support whenever home and helped form many of the ideas underpinning this work during our long, meandering conversations. My in-laws, Sefton and Cheryl, have always given me a warm home to visit. In Delaware and beyond, Rob Burdick, Matt Williamson, and Steve Wismer have remained the best of friends.

I found a warm, welcoming, and sustaining home at the University of Florida. Among my peers I benefited from conversations with and the comments of Joe Beatty, Joel Black, Clay Cooper, Jim Flook, Matt Hall, Allison Fredette, Jenn Lyon, Ben Miller, Chris Ruehlen, Dan Simone, Taylor Patterson, and Angie Zombek. In particular, coffees

with Angela Diaz, bike rides with Scott Huffard, local dinners with Heather Bryson, elaborate dinners with Jason Daniels, football games with Roger Smith, and beer with Brian Bredehoeft always provoked long, thoughtful conversations that directed this work and me in manifold ways. Thank you all so much for your friendship and your help. Among the faculty, Professor Steve Noll patiently guided me as a naive teaching assistant and then later as a teaching associate; I constantly strive to animate my classroom and my teaching as Dr. Noll does each day. Professor Ben Wise offered numerous books, critical readings, and gentle advice that pushed my work in new and fruitful directions. Committee members Sean Adams, Matt Gallman, Jon Sensbach, and Sevan Terzian each carefully read this document, offered trenchant comments, and provided outstanding examples of scholarly rigor. Professor Gallman, in particular, has been with this project and me since the beginning and always provided thoughtful advice, wonderful references, and careful guidance. The committee's time, care, and attention is deeply appreciated. The dissertation's chair, William A. Link, is a person of untold generosity, charity, and goodwill. He has eagerly read every word I have written since I entered graduate school and always asked for more. Such dedication is more than I could have hoped for in a mentor and his example of scholarly productivity and rigor is more than I can ever hope to match. Through constant phone calls and emails, on racquetball courts and bike trails, at coffee shops and conferences, Dr. Link served as an unwavering guide lifting me up when I needed help and pushing me harder when I became lazy. Working with Dr. Link and enjoying the company of his family has been and continues to be one of my great pleasures.

Beyond the protection of Keene-Flint Hall I found a welcoming academic community that proved to be, truly, a community. During a one-year teaching appointment at Virginia Tech, Mark Barrow, Joe Forte, Dennis Hidalgo, Marian Mollin, Matt Saionz, Dan Thorp, and Peter Wallenstein provided support and help when I truly needed it. Over the years, at sundry conferences, Paul Anderson, Bill Blair, David Brown, Paul Cimbala, Catherine Clinton, William Davis, Barb Gannon, Jeff McClurken, Andy Slap, and LeeAnn Whites provided formal and informal comments that greatly advanced my thinking. Aaron Sheehan-Dean has generously given his time to my work; the clarity of his comments is unmatched and our conversations are always illuminating. Brian Luskey offered a very thoughtful reading of material underpinning Chapters 3 and 4 during a critical period of methodological configuration. Finally, Peter Carmichael has been a trusted confidant, good friend, and intellectual companion since we first met—every email exchange and face-to-face meeting with Pete is pure joy.

In researching this project and writing this work I benefitted greatly from generous outside support. I would like to formally acknowledge both these institutions and the awards they granted: the Louisiana History Research Fellowship awarded by the Louisiana State University Libraries' Special Collections; the Research Appointment Fellowship awarded by the Institute for Southern Studies, University of South Carolina; and the Archie K. Davis Fellowship awarded by the North Caroliniana Society, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. The University of Florida's History Department, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the Richard J. Milbauer Chair provided generous support for conferences, research, and travel. All of the mistakes and errors herein are the fault of the author solely.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	4
ABSTRACT.....	9
CHAPTER	
1 CONSTRUCTING SOUTHERN MEN.....	11
2 BOOKS AND BEARS	26
Words	29
Actions.....	42
Conclusions	59
3 WORDS AND WAR	60
Education.....	62
On the Eve of Secession	73
Conclusions	84
4 INTO THE DARK FOREST OF DESPAIR	85
Leaving for War	88
Uniforming an Army	95
Camp and Field	106
Field of Battle.....	121
Conclusions	136
5 CIVIL WARS CONTINUED.....	139
Homeward Bound	141
Carnage and Chaos.....	145
Authority Restored	160
Civil War to Personal Peace	168
Conclusions	183
6 PERSONAL RECONSTRUCTIONS	185
Personal Transformations.....	189
Discontented Confederates	203
Ignominious Oaths and Contested Citizenship	220
Conclusions	229

7	FALLEN CONFEDERACIES AND INVISIBLE EMPIRES.....	231
	White Carolinians and Their Causes	234
	Ghosts of the Confederacy	252
	Landscapes of Terror.....	263
	Conclusions	274
8	PAPER SOLDIERS	276
	Wars Remembered.....	279
	Confederacies Continued	296
	Civil Wars Closed	303
	Conclusions	312
9	RECONSTRUCTING SOUTHERN MEN	314
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	318
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	342

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

PERSONAL CONFEDERACIES:
WAR AND PEACE IN THE AMERICAN SOUTH, 1840-1890

By

James J. Broomall

December 2011

Chair: William A. Link
Major: History

This study explores the personal lives and cultural expressions of white Southerners during the crucial period of 1840 to 1890 focusing specifically on men who became Confederate soldiers. Many previous works have artificially divided southern history into prewar, wartime, or postwar periods, thereby missing rich opportunities to understand overlapping influences and to examine patterns of behavior over time. My project considers Southerners across this central epoch to describe and understand the thoughts and emotions, which governed their lives. This work advances a new framework for examining some of the central issues and questions in nineteenth-century southern history by conjoining the typically bifurcated areas of men's personal and public lives. This study seeks not only to understand Southern whites on their own terms but also to explain their actions within a cultural context.

Illuminating men's inner experience of themselves penetrates the changing nature of personal and social relationships. This work argues that an honor-based, antebellum culture created distances among men and required clenched emotional expression, at least publicly. Subordinates rarely questioned elite whites, men who

commanded themselves and their emotions with a firm hand. The exigencies of civil war forced the reconfiguration of these norms, as Southerners were thrown together for prolonged periods of time under intense strains—all the while being separated from suffering families. With military defeat white men questioned themselves as never before, sometimes suffering from terrible self-doubt. The crisis of war necessitated new models of expression between veterans and among men and women; unharnessed feelings became a necessary mechanism to cope with the traumas of wartime experiences. So, too, did whites embrace a virulent, martial masculinity, which they wielded during Reconstruction and beyond to suppress freedpeoples and restore white rule. Thus, in the wake of Civil War, contrasting models of private and public expression emerged, which were born from the exigencies of war and the crisis of defeat.

CHAPTER 1 CONSTRUCTING SOUTHERN MEN

On May 20, 1861, brothers Levi and Henry Walker enlisted as privates in Company B, the Ranaleburg Riflemen, of the 13th North Carolina. Born in August 1841, Levi worked as a farmer and textile worker in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina. Henry, his senior by five years, taught school and lived in Mecklenburg. Confident in their cause and excited by the prospects of war, the two men visited a photographer. The Walker brothers were ushered into a room; two chairs sat near a wall. Maybe the photographer arranged the scene; perhaps the brothers came to the studio with an image in mind. Seconds later, a camera immortalized them. The two men were similarly dressed; both wore smartly tailored coats. Leaving their top buttons undone, the men proudly exposed crisp white shirts and neatly tied, dark cravats. Levi's left arm extended, his hand gripped Henry's. Henry affectionately placed his arm around Levi's back. Both men sat with their legs crossed. The newly minted soldiers were preparing to leave for war.

It was now July 1, 1863. General Robert E. Lee's Army of Northern Virginia had invaded the small Pennsylvania town of Gettysburg. Levi remained a private but his brother Henry had been elevated to the rank of third lieutenant in May 1863. The day was warm and clear.¹ Despite hard marching and gunfire, the Tar Heels remained in high spirits as Confederate forces pressed Union lines back into town. The 13th North Carolina deployed for battle—part of Maj. Gen. William D. Pender's assault on Seminary Ridge. The gray line surged forward. Four men had already fallen with the regimental colors, and Levi now proudly held the banner. Hot lead entered his left leg,

¹ David G. Martin, *Gettysburg, July 1* (Conshohocken, PA : Combined Books, 1996), 591.

dropping him instantly. Later, in a field hospital, surgeons removed the limb. On the fourth of July, the Confederate army retreated. Levi, along with thousands, was left behind. Just under two weeks later his brother Henry, fighting near Hagerstown, Maryland, caught a piece of lead. He, too, was hit in the left leg. The leg was taken off, just below the knee, just like Levi.²

Levi was later confined to a federal prison hospital until released and exchanged in October 1863. Henry, too, was captured and imprisoned on Johnson's Island, Ohio, only to be exchanged in the spring of 1864. The two brothers who had set off to war identically clad now shared the same battle scars. Years then decades passed. Around 1880, the brothers returned to the photographer's studio. No longer dressed in uniforms of gray, the two men wore dark, tidy, civilian suits. Once youthful faces had taken on age; their faces were now covered with whiskers. War did not break the bonds of brotherhood, however. As before, Levi gripped Henry's hand. Henry's arm extended around Levi's back. Older, more mature, the men's expressions were restrained. Awkwardly seated, legs open, two empty pant legs offered an outward sign of a long-passed war that still held sway over, continued to shape, the lives of these two men.

The lives of Levi and Henry Walker are etched on the photographer's glass, recorded in scattered public records, and mentioned in a few histories. But unfortunately little else about them can be found. How they felt about each other as brothers over the course of their lives, or how the war changed the nature of their relationship, is forever lost. Yet, despite these limitations, the experiences of these two men, the physical

² This biographical information is largely garnered from Greg Mast, *State Troops and Volunteers: A Photographic Record of North Carolina's Civil War Soldiers* (Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, Division of Archives and History, 1995), 183.

traumas they endured, and the bonds they publicly exhibited are telling and representative of the narrative arc of this work, “Personal Confederacies: War and Peace in the American South, 1840-1890.” The title is reflective of white Southern men’s behavior, experiences, and expectations during these critical decades of the nineteenth century. Student compacts, military alliances, networks for mutual support, and secret conspiracies each demonstrate distinct phases in Southerners’ lived experiences.

Between the years 1861 and 1865 three out of every four white Southern men of military age mobilized for civil war. One in five did not survive the conflict, and tens of thousands, like Levi and Henry Walker, were maimed horribly.³ The legacy of Confederates’ defeat became, in C. Vann Woodward’s memorable phrase, “the burden of southern history.”⁴ Understanding this history, its legacies and its influences, requires a long view, for southern history did not stop or begin with the Civil War. Nor can we understand the war’s impact without considering its origins. “Personal Confederacies” examines this long view through the writings and the experiences of the people who lived it. In thinking about and writing about the Civil War something of the personal has been lost. By focusing on the men who became Confederate soldiers, this work considers the war’s human cost as revealed in changing emotional expressions, social

³ Between 750, 000 and 850, 000 men served in the Confederacy, representing 75 to 85 percent of its draft-age white male population. The number of Confederate dead is contested. On the one hand, Gary Gallagher contends that one in three men died in the war, while Drew Gilpin Faust, on the other, offers the more conservative estimate of one in five. Gary W. Gallagher, *The Confederate War: How Popular Will, Nationalism, and Military Strategy Could Not Stave Off Defeat* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1997), 28-9 and Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008), xi and 273-4, in fn. 2. See also, James Marten, *Sing Not War: The Lives of Union & Confederate Veterans in Gilded Age America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011), 3-4 and 75-124.

⁴ C. Vann Woodward, *The Burden of Southern History*, rev. ed. (1960; repr., Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1991), 187-91.

interactions, and models of gender identity. Charting these personal transformations demands a broad timeframe; describing southern culture and its changing expressions is no easy task. Therefore, to capture the tenor of antebellum life, the profundity of civil war, and the trials of Reconstruction this work will consider the period spanning, roughly, 1840 to 1890.

Many previous studies have artificially divided southern history into prewar, wartime, or postwar periods, thereby missing rich opportunities to understand overlapping influences and to examine patterns of behavior over time.⁵ My study considers Southerners across this central epoch to describe and understand the personal thoughts and cultural expressions, which governed their lives. This work advances a new framework for examining some of the central issues and questions in nineteenth-century southern history. By conjoining the typically bifurcated areas of men's personal and public lives, this study seeks not only to understand Southern whites on their own terms but also to explain their actions within a cultural context. Illuminating men's inner experience of themselves penetrates the changing nature of personal and social relationships. This work argues that an honor-based, antebellum culture created distances among men and required clenched emotional expression, at least publicly. Their subordinates rarely questioned men, and they commanded themselves and their emotions with a firm hand. The exigencies of war forced the reconfiguration of these norms, as Southerners were thrown together for prolonged periods of time under intense strains—all the while being separated from suffering

⁵ Exceptions to this rule include especially Anne C. Rose, *Victorian America and the Civil War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *The Shaping of Southern Culture: Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1890s* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001); and Peter S. Carmichael, *The Last Generation: Young Virginians in Peace, War, and Reunion* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).

families. With military defeat men questioned themselves as never before, sometimes suffering from terrible self-doubt. The crisis of war necessitated new models of expression between veterans and among men and women; unharnessed feelings became a necessary mechanism to cope with the traumas of wartime experiences. So, too, did whites embrace a virulent, martial masculinity, which they wielded during Reconstruction and beyond to suppress freedpeoples and restore white rule. Thus, in the wake of Civil War, contrasting models of private and public expression emerged, which were born from the exigencies of war and the crisis of defeat.

The chapters of this work examine a series of changing expressions and experiences. I review these shifts in a socio-cultural context to understand how white Southerners were shaped by and responded to broader transformations as witnessed especially in their emotional lives and gender identity.⁶ Each chapter's thematic focus is tied to broader shifts in southern culture. My dissertation is organized into three parts, each reflecting an important moment in nineteenth-century southern history. Part I begins by characterizing prewar life, focusing on how college life and personal diaries, hunting treks into field and forest, shaped conceptions of manhood and controlled the expression and release of emotions. The Civil War crisis forced a reconsideration of antebellum behavior, as men looked at each other and their families in new ways. The personal repercussions of men's responses to these outside forces underpin Part II. Social upheaval, strides toward the restoration of order, and personal transformations each reflected different responses to the forces of civil war and emancipation. Making

⁶ This approach is deeply influenced by Rhys Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (1982; repr., Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 5-7 and 323-57.

sense of the war proved difficult, however, and whites turned variously to violence and to public record to renew old fights as chronicled in Part III.

This project initially intended to examine the postwar lives of Civil War veterans, black and white, living in the American South. As the research progressed, particular questions reoccurred, while specific sources came to dominate the answers. Choices were made, and some issues emerged. How, for instance, could I understand Southerners' emotional reactions to military defeat without understanding their emotional expressions before the Civil War? In what terms did veterans understand and communicate their wartime experiences? Did they communicate these thoughts and feelings to others? What I found proved exciting and frustrating. Some sources would offer fascinating glimpses into a veteran's tragic struggles with what would now be called post-traumatic stress disorder; other materials said little and revealed even less. Therefore, I began concentrating on sources written by white men and women, most of who were well educated and therefore more prone to dedicate time and energy to writing. In addition, I widened my gaze to include the prewar and wartime South as a way to understand the complexities of the postwar era. The resulting study relies on a sampling of manuscript collections. Based on the papers of over eighty families, this work draws from the stories of men and women in order to reconstruct an otherwise fragmentary cultural history.

This dissertation assumes the primacy of the individual and his or her experience, along with the personal and intellectual contours of southern culture. It seeks to humanize what could otherwise become a faceless story. The sampling is admittedly exclusive, reflecting men from similar backgrounds, and is based on a

flexible conception of the term “Southerner.”⁷ Significantly, though, each of these men served the Confederacy in some direct capacity—as an infantryman, as an officer, as a government official. Rather than a generational model, which imposes age restrictions, this method connects people experientially, but only with an examination of how age and experience shaped reactions and ideas in sometimes starkly different ways: the contrasting views of a veteran of both the Mexican-American War and Civil War, versus a twenty-two-year-old Confederate soldier.⁸

Forged by the crucible of war, veterans shared a set of experiences that forever altered their conceptions of self; but the particularities of an individual’s background framed the terms on which the war was cast and recast.⁹ The lives and experiences of several men undergird each chapter to provide focus and allow for close readings that speak directly to a particular topic. For example, Josiah Gorgas—a white Pennsylvanian who migrated south before the war and served as a Confederate officer—illustrates both the chaos of 1865 and the increased stability brought with the New South’s rise in the 1870s. Other figures include Edmund Kirby Smith (a white southerner who worked

⁷ So, for instance, every man or woman in this study lived in the South before the war. The overwhelming majority were southern by birth, but I also included emigrants as their loyalties and involvement in the war proved telling. Moreover, serving in Confederate armies wedded these men, in my thinking and in their writing, to a distinctly Southern identity.

⁸ Peter S. Carmichael compellingly discusses the significance of a generational experience. I readily acknowledge the centrality of age as a unique historical context. However, I depart from this model because I am interested more in the experiences of veterans as a collective whole. That said, Carmichael’s trenchant analysis forces scholars to take seriously the importance of age group when attempting to understand the material and political conditions of a particular period. Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, see especially the Introduction to his work for an explanation of methodology.

⁹ David Herbert Donald suggests in his essay, “A Generation of Defeat,” that “segregation and disfranchisement should be viewed as the final public acts, the last bequests, of the Southern Civil War generation.” The resonances of war, in other words, were strong enough according to Donald to directly shape the actions of white southerners some thirty-five years after the conflict in very tangible ways. David Herbert Donald, “A Generation of Defeat,” in *From the Old South to the New: Essays on the Transitional South*, ed., Walter J. Fraser, Jr. and Winfred B. Moore, Jr. (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1981), 7.

actively in education), George A. Mercer (a wealthy Georgian from Savannah), William J. Clarke (a white lawyer from New Bern, N.C.), and Henry Brown Richardson (a Maine native who settled in Louisiana just before the war).

The manuscript collections of families and individuals remain essential to penetrating Southerners' inner worlds. Whites' recorded words—diary entries, letters written to friends and loved ones, and public sentiments expressed in newspaper—reveal how men both understood and gave meaning to the war and Reconstruction. As such, individuals are quoted often and freely throughout this work as their words, the nuance in their expressions sheds great light on broader patterns. As scholars such as Daniel Singal and Stephen Berry have demonstrated, close readings of Southern writers can reveal much about abstract thoughts, cultural forms, social conditions, and personal lives.¹⁰ A letter from former Confederate General Edmund Kirby Smith, written to his wife Cassie in October of 1865, is particularly illuminating and demonstrates the potential of this approach: “Wife I did not fight for the negro or for the perpetuation of slavery. I took up arms through a sense of duty and in defense of principles whose complete triumph I shall live to see if not by force of arms, by the awakened sense of the people of the U.S. to their true interests and to wisdom. Our people should not leave [the South], instead of seeking asylums abroad, their own destinies and the triumph of the principles which they fought are in their own hands, let them seek by every possible means the reestablishment of the state government in the natural course of events the

¹⁰ Daniel Joseph Singal, *The War Within: From Victorian to Modernist Thought in the South, 1919-1945* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982) and Berry, *All That Makes a Man*.

military must then give way to the civil rule.”¹¹ In this brief passage Kirby-Smith grapples with his wartime experiences, the Civil War’s larger meaning, his place as a citizen of the South and the United States, and the South’s future destiny. Thus, we gain a range of insights into one of this project’s central questions: How did soldiers transition into civic life, and by what means did veterans mentally and emotionally close their civil wars? By weaving together such vivid portraits within a particular chapter we gain broader insights into men’s inner experiences and how they changed their conceptions of “self” over time as related to the Civil War and Reconstruction.

Southerners’ experiences between the 1840s and 1890s shed light on men’s public lives. By considering public performances this study reaches beyond the idiosyncrasies of individual’s alone and makes larger conclusions about Southerners’ behavior. Cultural performances compose one segment of this analysis. Unruly behavior or charivari, hunting, college experiences, soldier life, Klan violence, and public spectacle reveal not only civic strife or action, but served also as public representations of social thought. Just as important are the essential social and economic systems of the nineteenth-century South, which will form the other prong of inquiry. Agricultural development, successful businesses, and the operation of school systems were each pursuits actively engaged in by Southerners, which fostered social and personal change. Rather than attempting to include these sundry topics within each chapter, chapters are topically organized concentrating on particular subjects as understood by several representative men.

¹¹ Edmund Kirby Smith to Wife [Cassie], 2 October 1865, Kirby-Smith Papers, Southern Historical Collection, Louis R. Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; hereinafter cited as SHC.

The shift from civil war to civic peace was not only a national transformation but also a personal process. The forces of war transformed and then underpinned Southerners' notions of manliness and emotional lives. To understand fully white Southerners' actions and reactions, my work examines their more personal, intimate stories. Rather than a series of composite biographies, however, this project inserts men and women into the culture, which they continually shaped and reshaped to discern broader patterns. In his famous explication of Balinese cockfights, Clifford Geertz contended that by attending or participating in these events the Balinese received a kind of sentimental education. "What he learns there is what his culture's ethos and his private sensibility . . . look like when spelled out externally in a collective text."¹² While historians do not have the benefits (and pitfalls) of direct observation, we can reconstruct elements of older cultures. This work will do so to locate, in Geertz's terms, culture's ethos and individual's sensibilities. Ultimately, "Personal Confederacies," has three primary concerns: illuminating how the American Civil War affected men and exposing how they thought and felt during the nineteenth century; mapping shifting discourses about race, manhood, and citizenship that were changed by war; and framing men's cultural and emotional lives as historical processes that directly contributed to the South's social and political life.

I consider Southerners' cultural and emotional lives as fundamental to the experiences of Civil War and Reconstruction. Jan Lewis demonstrates the importance of emotional worlds in revealing people's shifting fears and hopes, values and perceptions, while Rhys Isaac uses broader patterns of social behavior to chart how

¹² Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (1973; repr., New York: Basic Books, 2000), 449.

changing cultural systems communicate meaning.¹³ These and other scholars have shown how culture creates and structures social relations. Building upon these approaches, this project primarily uses letters, diaries, memoirs, and public performances to illuminate how manliness and emotionalism pervaded the world of white Southerners. By connecting men from across southern states, this work ultimately seeks to explore the cultural and intellectual lives of Southern whites, their strides toward reconstruction, and the means by which they became invested, or divested, citizens, thus creating a complex portrait of the white Southerner and his public place. This work moves chronologically, charting men from specific areas of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Louisiana. Nonetheless, “place” is privileged only at particular points, as this work looks more toward individuals and their expressions.

The American Civil War defined the South and its people. But only through the process of reconstruction could they make meaning of their wartime experience.¹⁴ Soldiers had watched as dear friends and foreign foes, alike, were cut down on fields of battle. Southerners’ self-identities were gradually transformed in the postwar years most visibly demonstrated in public performances, cultural production, political behavior, and

¹³ Jan Lewis, *The Pursuit of Happiness: Family and Values in Jefferson’s Virginia* (1983; repr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) and Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia*.

¹⁴ Following the lead of scholars such as David Blight and Steven Hahn, I define reconstruction expansively, beyond its traditionally defined ending of 1877 to explore more fully the war’s consequences. In addition, the word “reconstruction” is assigned double meanings to suggest both its political and personal dimensions. As Heather Cox Richardson has recently observed, “Reconstruction is a process, not a time period.” See David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001) and Steven Hahn, *A Nation under Our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003). Heather Cox Richardson, “North and West of Reconstruction: Studies in Political Economy,” in *Reconstructions: New Perspectives on the Postbellum United States*, ed., Thomas J. Brown (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 90. For a discussion of Reconstruction’s periodization and reperiodization see Thomas J. Brown, “Introduction,” in *Reconstructions*, ed., Brown.

intellectual life. We have come to better understand why soldiers fought, but must now fully realize the results of that decision.¹⁵ Louis Menand has demonstrated the war's transformational impact on the nature of ideas and self. For Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., he writes, "The war had burned a hole, so to speak, in his life."¹⁶ What else might be revealed though, if we turn Menand's northern gaze southward? By uncovering the war's meaning for its participants—during a period in southern history viewed by many scholars as "mutated, and dwindled into nostalgia," in Michael O'Brien's words—this study illuminates men's inner experience of themselves and in so doing penetrates what motivated Southerners to behave the way they did.¹⁷

By examining the intersection of ideas and actions among Confederates, my work charts an evolving discourse and explores men's inner experiences. Several questions are pivotal. How did the prewar era and wartime experiences affect the Southerner's perception of his place in society, and in what ways did these forces direct the transition from citizen to soldier and vice versa? In what ways did notions of "self" change in a society transformed by emancipation and war? How, in turn, did veterans

¹⁵ The rationale for why men fought in the Civil War is highly debated. For the parameters for this debate, see especially Gerald F. Linderman, *Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat in the American Civil War* (New York: The Free Press, 1987), James M. McPherson, *For Cause & Comrades: Why Men Fought in The Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), Stephen W. Berry II, *All That Makes a Man: Love and Ambition in the Civil War South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), and Aaron Sheehan-Dean, *Why Confederates Fought: Family and Nation in Civil War Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

¹⁶ Louis Menand, *The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2001), quote on 61, but see especially Chapters One to Three.

¹⁷ Michael O'Brien more than any other scholar has tried to correct the impression that the years after Appomattox were an intellectual wasteland. For this critique see his essay "The Middle Years: Edwin Mims," in Michael O'Brien, *Rethinking the South: Essays in Intellectual History* (1988; repr., Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993), 131. Stephen Berry influenced my overall thinking here, see especially Berry, *All That Makes a Man*, 11.

envision their relationship to state, region, and nation? And what ideas and emotions did veterans evoke to understand and communicate their wartime experiences?

As scholarship such as Stephen Berry's *All That Makes A Man* and Bertram Wyatt-Brown's *Southern Honor* illustrate, the emotional lives and gender roles of Southerners were critical to shifting patterns of thought and regional identity. Moreover, as Gail Bederman argues, manliness itself is a historical process that changes over time. "Personal Confederacies" focuses on how Southerners felt, thought, and behaved and then contextualizes these inner experiences within broader discourses about gender, race, and citizenship. By focusing on the lives of individual men, this project accesses how people mentally, morally, and emotionally engaged with life, thereby explaining why certain acts were committed and how particular ideas were expressed. Ultimately, this dissertation constructs a different narrative of Civil War and Reconstruction—heretofore often cast in political, social, and economic terms—by interrogating the contrasting ways in which war shaped the cultural lives of southern men, their strides toward citizenship and the shifting contours of manliness.¹⁸

War destabilizes ideas about race, manhood, and identity. Military defeat cancelled, or at least undermined Confederate veterans' manliness. The values underpinning antebellum white men—honor, virtue, and sacrifice—were gradually refashioned through the process of cultural negotiation for the reconstruction of their manhood. This work is concerned with both the personal and the public, as

¹⁸ Culture, writes Raymond Williams, "is one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language." I am mainly using culture to indicate particular models or ways of life and in reference to symbolic systems. See, Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, revised edition (1976; repr., New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), quote on 87, see also 87-92.

disentangling one from the other proves impossible.¹⁹ While this dissertation is most definitely cultural history, it understands culture to be undergirded by politics and power. Michel Foucault's formulation of discursive inquiry offers a fruitful means to reveal these processes. Rather than a history of thought, an analysis of the discursive field seeks to, in Foucault's words, "grasp the statement in the exact specificity of its occurrence," and to "determine its conditions of existence."²⁰

While still engaging a wide body of scholarship this work remains distinct in four specific ways. First, I am shifting the locus of inquiry to understand better Southern whites. Through an examination of gender identity and emotional expression, I am writing a cultural history of Southern men that posits the primacy of the individual in the expansive public arena. By retrieving the stories of men this work broadens the terms in which Civil War and Reconstruction are both understood and portrayed. As scholars, we must recognize the great importance of intellectual and cultural lives, for the manifestations of these inner worlds formed the fabric of the American South. Second, this project considers a largely under-explored topic, at least among American historians: the soldier as citizen and vice versa.²¹ Few studies have expansively

¹⁹ Rhys Isaac describes this as a circularity in which the scholar "cannot understand and translate action-statements unless they have some comprehension of the culture; but such grasp can only be effectively acquired by close attention to particular action-statements." Rhys Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (1982; repr., Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 325.

²⁰ Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans., A. M. Sheridan Smith (1969; repr. and trans., New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 28. An excellent distillation of Foucault's ideas on discourse is found in Gail Bederman, *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), 24-6.

²¹ Robert A. Nye has written a brilliant historiography on civilian and military masculinities in the nineteenth- and twentieth- century, which focuses primarily on Europe, but acknowledges what work has focused on the American experience. Nye observes: "much in modern history has depended on a nation's ability to manage this transition between civilian and military masculinities in ways that neither jeopardized the efficient conduct of warfare nor troubled civilian peace." Robert A. Nye, "Western

examined how Southerners became soldiers and the processes by which veterans became citizens. It is vital to understand how the forces of war and emancipation changed these men and their notions of self and place in society. Third, this study takes emotions history seriously and considers this lens as an invaluable mechanism for recovering men's inner experience of themselves and penetrating the nature of personal and social relationships. White men's private, emotional landscapes advance a powerful explanation for their public behaviors. Moreover, emotions history offers a lens into white Southerners' lives, a path to recover their living presence and a way to recapture how history felt.²² Finally, Southerners' letters, words, and actions, when contextualized within the framework of broader discourses, break down traditional periodization. Private letters and public acts construct a different portrait of men grappling with the war in varied ways to isolate its fundamental meanings to their lives.

Masculinities in War and Peace," *The American Historical Review*, vol. 112, no. 2 (April 2007): 417. Moreover, two recent studies take seriously the issue of how soldiers reintegrated themselves back into civilian life, see Jeffrey W. McClurken, *Take Care of the Living: Reconstructing Confederate Veteran Families in Virginia* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009) and Marten, *Sing Not War*.

²² *An Emotional History of the United States*, ed. Jan Lewis and Peter N. Stearns, (New York and London: New York University Press, 1998), 1.

CHAPTER 2 BOOKS AND BEARS

Leonidas Lafayette Polk, born in Anson County, North Carolina in 1837, had lost his father and a mother by the age of fifteen. He inherited over 350 acres of land and seven slaves, his share of the estate's division. Educated in local schools and a graduate of Davidson College, Leonidas became a politician, a Confederate officer, an editor, and an agrarian leader. Before his meteoric rise in public life, however, Leonidas pondered the responsibilities of manhood. Taking his lessons from others, Leonidas methodically recorded William Denton's naive but sincere poem, "What makes a man?" The poem stated that it was neither age nor family, not attire or wealth. Clothes, rings, pipes, and wines were but fleeting pleasures; titles and books meant nothing. All these things "united never can, avail to make a single man." Instead, "A truthful soul, a loving mind . . . a spirit firm, erect and free, that never busily bends a knee; that will not bear a feather's weight of slavery's chain, for small or great." Such a man, it continued, must speak to God from within and never make league with sin. He must be brave, and bow nowhere but at God's throne; he should tremble "at no tyrants nod" and be a soul "that fears no one but God." If he could "smile at curse or ban, that is the soul that makes the man."¹

In the poem's words Leonidas found a vision for manhood that melded the spiritual and the valiant, and required ethereal qualities and firm resolve. In constructing his own models of manhood Polk looked to the example of others. Denton, a professor

¹ L. L. Polk, N/D [circa 1858], Box 1, Folder 1, Leonidas L. Polk Papers, SHC. Punctuation and capitalization have been altered for the format. This poem appeared throughout the nineteenth- and early twentieth- century in newspapers. For an early version, see William Denton, *Poems for Reformers* (Dayton, Ohio: William and Elizabeth M. F. Denton, 1856), 28-9. See also, William Denton, *Radical Rhymes* (1871; repr., Wellesley, Mass.: Denton Publishing Company, 1881), 29-30.

and spiritual leader, offered guidance to the young Polk and his fluid masculinity. Ultimately, a man's soul, his mind, and his character mattered most. These attributes, not social position or economic success, were the materials of manhood. Leonidas found value in these lines, for he included the transcription alongside considerations of moral influence and charity toward others. How, though, were the characteristics of manhood created, learned, or impressed? What exactly made southern white men, men?

A rich, if still burgeoning, body of literature has recently addressed Southern men and southern masculinities. This interpretive vision advances an understanding of manhood as a process, constructed and reconstructed by men and women. The powerful analytical framework of honor (a vision which dominated interpretation for the past three decades, though goes back much further) is now posited as an ethos central to manliness, but only part of masculinity. Instead, historians such as Stephen Berry, LeeAnn Whites, Lorri Glover, and Craig Thompson Friend have insisted on the primacy of gender analysis in understanding Southerners and their self-identities.² This the dissertation's first chapter engages this conversation by considering the antebellum lives of Southern white men through their words and their experiences in the forests and

² Dominant works on southern honor include: Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1982); Edward L. Ayers, *Vengeance and Justice: Crime and Punishment in the 19th-Century American South* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1984); and Kenneth S. Greenberg, *Honor & Slavery: Lies, Duels, Noses, Masks, Dressing As a Woman, Gifts, Strangers, Humanitarianism, Death, Slave Rebellions, the Proslavery Argument, Baseball, Hunting, and Gambling in the Old South* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996), 24-31. On manhood as a process, Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995). Southern studies considering the gendered lives of men: LeeAnn Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender: Augusta, Georgia 1860-1890* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995); Stephen W. Berry II, *All That Makes A Man: Love and Ambition in the Civil War South* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); *Southern Manhood: Perspectives on Masculinity in the Old South*, ed., Craig Thompson Friend and Lorri Glover (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004); and Lorri Glover, *Southern Sons: Becoming Men in the New Nation* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007).

fields hunting. This setting allows for an interrogation of men's private lives and public expressions during periods of both isolation and sociability. Moreover, quiet moments writing and the intensity of the hunt reveal two central problems guiding relationships and behavior: the exercise of passion and restraint.³ Self-examination, emotional release and control, and demonstrations of manliness became processes by which Southerners learned the contours of manhood and explored themselves and their place in society. As elite white men were called to meet social expectations, life unfolded in particular patterns. The melding of the public with the private helps to understand antebellum men on their own terms, for these two areas of life and expression are often artificially separated in the scholarship, thereby creating partial portraits.

Southerners embraced a white masculinity that permitted personal disclosures, but only to their most intimate associates. Public masks ensured absolute mastery; relationships with women, children, and slaves defined manhood. Patriarchy and paternalism depended upon personal conduct, and power was realized only through the successful governance of family and the continued maintenance of independent households. Men learned how to wield power and represent their manliness; furthermore, models of behavior were neither monolithic nor static. Privileged young men learned their duties and obligations both from their families and their peers. Men often made sense of their social roles, private thoughts, and personal feelings in letters and diaries. By learning how to command themselves and others with a firm hand—

³ See, Dickson D. Bruce, Jr., *Violence and Culture in the Antebellum South* (Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1979) and Ted Ownby, *Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, & Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990).

witnessed especially in militia musters, hunting expeditions, horse races, and duels—men overly demonstrated the public requirements of southern manhood.

Words

George Anderson Mercer, raised in wealth and privilege, recognized the responsibilities and obligations of southern manhood. Born in 1835, the Savannah native was named after his mother's father, George Anderson, a prominent cotton merchant. His father, Hugh Mercer, a successful banker and graduate of the United States Military Academy, held a prominent place in Savannah society; his great grandfather, General Hugh Mercer, had fallen at the Battle of Princeton during the American Revolution.⁴ Self-conscious and introspective, Mercer maintained a diary that resulted in a remarkable five-volume record of his life spanning the antebellum and postbellum eras.

George's writing habits were not unusual among Americans, yet their expression of thoughts and feelings were.⁵ Nineteenth-century men and women craved emotional expression, and diaries served as an important medium. A century earlier diarists revealed little about personal motivations and feelings, typically recording only events and transactions. Colonial Americans, historian Jan Lewis explains, "had neither the taste nor the skill for self-examination."⁶ Only in the nineteenth century did journal

⁴ George Anderson Mercer Diary, 17 December 1865, Box 1, Volume 5, George Anderson Mercer Papers, SHC and Robert Manson Myers, *The Children of Pride: A True Story of Georgia and the Civil War* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972), 1623. Johnny Mercer, the famed musician and composer, was grandson to George Anderson Mercer, thus extending the family successes into the twentieth century.

⁵ Lewis, *The Pursuit of Happiness*, 209-16.

⁶ Lewis, *The Pursuit of Happiness*, quote on 214, see 212-6. The best investigation of an eighteenth-century diary of this ilk remains, Laurel Thacher Ulrich, *A Midwife's Tale: Martha Ballard from Her Diary, 1785-1812* (New York: Vintage, 1990). For a different model of analysis in a work of similar power, see Rhys Isaac, *Landon Carter's Uneasy Kingdom: Revolution and Rebellion on a Virginia Plantation* (Oxford

writing become an important private ritual, a place to escape from the tedium of life. Diary pages were confessionals for the expression of inner thoughts, feelings, and concerns. Journals became a place to purge and ponder.⁷ These records provide remarkable insights in how Southern men viewed themselves, their families, and their place in the world. Within the pages of their writing, Southerners expressed the ways they experienced life. The texts are performative—an articulation and retelling of a lived reality. Such constructions fostered the development of both a public and private self. Men’s written projection of dreams and fears provided a sense of purpose and unity in their lives.⁸ Were these private records also spoken thoughts? It remains difficult to tell, though such intimate sentiments were reserved only for the closest family and friends; southern culture demanded public veneers. Instead, these words, feelings, and thoughts were captured on paper, safely bottled up from the public but still shaping the individual’s expressions and perceptions.⁹

Diarists probably represented a minority in southern society, though we will never know because of fragmentary records. Men’s proclivities, tastes, and lifestyles largely decided who would, or would not write. William J. Clarke, well educated like Mercer, found writing tedious. A graduate of the University of North Carolina and trained in law,

and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004). On eighteenth-century conceptions of self and identity, see *Through a Glass Darkly: Reflections on Personal Identity in Early America*, eds., Ronald Hoffman, Mechal Sobel, and Fredrika J. Teute (Chapel Hill and London: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History & Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

⁷ Berry, *All That Makes A Man*, 74.

⁸ Victor Turner, *The Anthropology of Performance* (New York, 1987) and Greg Dening, “Texts of Self,” in *Through a Glass Darkly*, 157-62.

⁹ Michel Foucault cautions us not to define the thoughts, images, and preoccupations revealed in such records but rather the discourse itself, which forms a “monument” within the respective work. Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 106-17 and 135-40.

Clarke owned eight slaves, a house, and a mill, and he employed a white servant.¹⁰ Yet he never became a planter and suffered financial difficulties. Clarke frequently wrote business letters and infrequently corresponded with family, except his wife and children, with whom he maintained regular correspondence when separated. In writing to Frances Miller, his wife Mary's sister, William drew from a comment his son made. "Writing is a great bore," he declared, "tho' he would talk a great deal to the person he is addressing were they present."¹¹ While a self-proclaimed talker, William chose conversation rather than correspondence.

Moreover, not all diarists so intensely interrogated themselves. Scores of Southerners maintained journals to record debts, detail their farm's economy, or simply record random thoughts. Nevertheless, diarists in particular, and their expression of feelings and thoughts more broadly, represent a significant thread in southern society deserving of sustained attention to reveal broader social and cultural processes. In these records we learn much about the inner lives of men.

Southern whites constructed elaborate guards and public masks to maintain and reinforce the South's power structure. These displays, so integral in their self-identification, produced distinct divisions between men's private and public lives.¹² As such, Southern diarists' purpose in writing depended greatly on their intended audience, which, in turn, created different documents. On the one hand, many authors created

¹⁰ 1850 Census, Wake County, North Carolina, p. 57, and 1850 Census, Wake County Slave Schedule, North Carolina, p. 667.

¹¹ William J. Clarke to Frances Miller, 24 February 1856, in *Live Your Own Life: The Family Papers of Mary Bayard Clarke, 1854-1886*, ed., Terrell Armistead Crow and Mary Moulton Barden (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 43-5.

¹² Drew Gilpin Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 18-9 and Berry, *All That Makes A Man*, 19-40.

instructional and reflexive journals intended for personal consumption only—these works functioned as secret vessels. The first page of Mercer’s diary included an admonishment to prying eyes: “Dont read the contents of a page, For fear that you’ll provoke my rage.” In a similar vein, John Burgwyn MacRae labeled his college journal, kept while attending the University of North Carolina, “strictly private,” while Martin Witherspoon Gary warned in his notebook from South Carolina College: “Read no man’s secrets without his consent”¹³ Curious interlopers were probably unhindered by written warnings, but the sentiments reflected the author’s sincere attempt to guard and secure his innermost thoughts and feelings. Keeping a private journal private is, of course, a timeless pursuit. But the tension between the public and private self in southern society is all too clearly demonstrated in writers’ desires to guard their sentiments. Secret diaries offered men a refuge; an unrestricted arena to explore themselves, their internal worlds and outer responsibilities. Here men could expose themselves rather than hide behind poses. But the domain had to be secured.

On the other hand, some diarists wrote for public revelation and for posterity. These journals were to be read and enjoyed by family and friends, perhaps even printed and published. The first entry in Josiah Gorgas’s journal included a dedication to his children, and the hope that his writings would prove gratifying and instructional.¹⁴ The content of such educational documents was often more controlled and directed, though even these public works revealed much about men’s private lives. Rather than

¹³ Mercer Diary, N/D (circa January 1851), Box 1, Volume 1, Mercer Papers, SHC; John Burgwyn MacRae Diary, circa 1866, Series 3, Folder 14, John Burgwyn MacRae Papers, SHC; and Martin Witherspoon Gary, circa January 1851, MSS/Volumes, Martin Witherspoon Gary Papers, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; hereinafter USC.

¹⁴ Josiah Gorgas, 1 January 1857, in *The Journals of Josiah Gorgas*, ed., Sarah Woolfolk Wiggins (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1995), 3.

interrogations of self, public diaries were more often interpretations of life, of events, and of people.

Rather than merely temporary instruments, Southerners' journals were, and indeed still are, living documents. Their survival into the present suggests the documents' very importance. Mercer's diary—initially an instrument to document nature, detail hunts, and record “scraps” of information—became a tool to help him navigate life and its requirements. In each recording Mercer captured a particular moment in time, immortalizing the emotion, experience, or idea. In one of his first entries George wrote: “If it pleased God to spare my life and I ever reached the age of manhood, that I would read my little book, with the greatest pleasure, that would remind me of the happy days of childhood long passed away, and as I intend, in this little volume, to describe some of the happy hours which I have passed, & which I hope to pass again in my sweet home.”¹⁵ Seldom commenting on national events or politics, at least before his post-Civil War entries, Mercer envisioned his journal as a record of his maturation into manhood and means to capture an otherwise lost past. A particularly wistful passage written while he attended Princeton University encapsulates the broader tenor and purpose of much of the antebellum writings. Looking at his postings, reviewing boyhood scenes, George counted the profound changes. “Oh! How different is my position now, from what it was when I first penned these simple, but heart-felt words—how many friends have bidden me God speed, and gone to their last long home. How the simple pleasures of my youth have given place to joys less lasting, and I fear less pure. I am at college, far away from

¹⁵ Mercer Diary, N/D [1848?], Box 1, Volume 1, Mercer Papers, SHC.

home, and rapidly verging into manhood.”¹⁶ The prospect of manhood created excitement and nostalgia, suggesting inner tensions—part of the maturation process. Mercer turned to his diary to recount both his hopes and his fears.

Southerners’ diaries became a symbolic and literal extension of self. Mercer happily contented himself in writing, for the records he produced were his “immortal part.” The work that consumed him, the digging and the delving, bestowed “around me all the seeds of knowledge I can glean: for then, when I am declined into the vale of years, and am falling into the sere and yellow leaf, I can sit beneath the vine and fig tree which mine own hands have planted: the wilderness of age will blossom as the rose, and the vines I am training to clamber about my green stem, will sustain, refresh and crown me with flowers, when root and branch of me are [~~striking~~] withering away.”¹⁷ In his diary, then, George created a refuge and a record, a place to remember and repose. Most importantly, though, as he read the diary’s entries George envisioned more clearly his own transformation into manhood.

In Mercer’s estimation these changes were a mixed blessing at best. He envisioned aging as a departure from youthful innocence into the more pressing, less pure, demands of life. But for Mercer, the diary, its words and cherished memories, could blunt “manhood’s severer duties.”¹⁸ George hoped that he could maintain his humanity, his humility, as he aged by always keeping close where he had been. This vision of manhood combined the past, present, and future, and was built with the hope

¹⁶ Mercer Diary, 29 April 1855, Box 1, Volume 1, Mercer Papers, SHC.

¹⁷ Mercer Diary, 7 August 1859, Box 1, Volume 2, Mercer Papers, SHC.

¹⁸ Mercer Diary, 10 March 1855, Box 1, Volume 2, Mercer Papers, SHC.

that the duties and obligations of adult life could always be dulled by remembrances. In the diary's pages the flowing sequence of past and future were divided by the present.¹⁹

Just like George Mercer, college caused Martin Witherspoon Gary pause. He marveled at the mental and physical changes brought with time. Enrolled at South Carolina College from 1850 to 1852 (as a member of a widespread student revolt, Gary left South Carolina and graduated from Harvard), Gary joined the state's elite as they trained for their public lives. While there he maintained a short-lived diary. Keenly observant, he pronounced that so many men expected college to be an "earthly paradise" only to be discontented and yearning for an idealized past. "The child," he wrote, "longs to mingle in the sports of the school boy & the school boy looks forward" to the day that he will be in college. Once in college he "looks back to the days when he was free from the cares of the world." Gary's admonishments for his overly nostalgic peers could have been spoken directly to Mercer, for he challenged what Mercer so cherished. Eventually becoming an ardent secessionist and prominent South Carolina politician, Gary was a man of action and grounded in the present. In college, he trusted, man was "surrounded by many whose hearts beat in unison with his own," but to be wary of those who might attack his character and soil his good name.²⁰ Yet, despite such cynicism, Gary, like Mercer, ultimately wanted to be understood. Instead of turning to the pages of a secret diary Gary reached out, seeking people with whom he could confide secrets, and unfold his thoughts without the fear of betrayal.²¹ Ultimately, Gary

¹⁹ Thomas R. Flynn, *Sartre, Foucault, and Historical Reason: Toward an Existentialist Theory of History*, 2 vols., vol. 1 (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1997), 10-6.

²⁰ Gary, "Journal of college life," 24 March [1851], MSS/Volumes, Gary Papers, USC.

²¹ Gary, "Journal of college life," N/D, 24 March [1851], MSS/Volumes, Gary Papers, USC.

embraced a more robust, public masculinity remaining deeply concerned about status and symbol but also willing to divulge his more private self.

For men such as Gary and Mercer, writing offered a space and a time to contemplate themselves and their place in southern society. Both men purged themselves of their fears and doubts as they spilled ink upon paper. In their observations and writings, comments and commentaries, they were, however unconsciously, constructing their own models of manhood. While hundreds of actions, in hundreds of ways, profoundly shaped Southerners, self-examination and observation served as key ingredients to their conceptions of manliness. Both men eventually assumed public roles—Mercer, as a prominent Savannah lawyer, and Gary as a South Carolina politician—but they differed in how they balanced their private and public lives. For Mercer, manhood and maturity were burdens and marked the loss of youthful innocence. Suffering from self-doubt, wrought with anxiety, he navigated the social sphere with great difficulty often yearning for the domestic arena where he felt most secure. Gary, on the other hand, embraced the public arena and sought to lead men rather than to be led. Confident and determined, he commanded himself forsaking those who threatened his independence. These men reveal the different processes by which they navigated self-discovery and emotional maturation.

For all their differences in attitude and disposition, Mercer and Gary were conjoined by similar experience and were products of the same culture. Associations and exclusions, based on class structure and social practices, defined Southern masculinity. Gender and race organized interactions, and as Mercer and Gary considered their maturation outside forces shaping their self-identities. The genteel

background of these two men allowed for their entry into college and fostered their writing practices. Moreover, the power and privilege they enjoyed, and would continue to enjoy, as white southern elites contributed to their constructions of masculinity as young men.

As Southerners' commented on others they learned much about themselves. Social elites with an appetite for reading voraciously consumed classical literature and English novels, especially, but also enjoyed American authors. Those who wrote explications distilled personal inclinations and characteristics as they considered the meanings of literary works. A unique opportunity for comparison between two men, and their ideals of manhood as articulated through writing, is found in reactions to Benjamin Franklin's *Autobiography*. Both Josiah Gorgas and George Mercer were most happily situated at home, among their books and papers. Both kept copious diaries, though, as noted, Mercer's private and Gorgas's public. Yet these two men, so strikingly similar in their tastes and interests, offer divergent responses to Franklin's *Autobiography*. (Despite their similarities, the two men were separated in age by nearly twenty years, though their reactions are opposite of what one might expect given their point in life.) Franklin intended the work as a record of his life and accomplishments, a tale of progress and parables. In his childhood Josiah Gorgas devoured the book, reading and rereading it with great pleasure. But in 1858 he reread the book with a mixed reaction. Most pointedly, he criticized Franklin's emphasis on worldly success and material gains. Rather than a "brave, open and generous nature that lies open before us in these pages," he found a "correct, disciplined, self-restrained, persevering, able and patriotic

citizen.”²² Reading Franklin’s autobiography the same year, George Mercer reacted more positively. The elements that Gorgas found most distasteful were those, which pleased Mercer the most. Franklin’s life rated as among the best to be “profitably perused,” and its most “public features” provided useful examples. So taken by the book, Mercer dedicated several pages in his diary to describe an overview of Franklin’s public life and accomplishments. He had made this practice a rule “after the perusal of a useful instructive work,” often taking notes in the book itself—necessary, he thought, to achieve an important end.²³

Why, though, the contrast? What were these men drawn to and repulsed by? Josiah Gorgas, born in Pennsylvania in 1818, married Amelia Gayle in 1853, the daughter of former Alabama governor John Gayle. Although a career soldier and forced to move frequently, the American South captured Gorgas’s mind and imagination. He enjoyed planting gardens and dreamed of owning slaves and a plantation.²⁴ And, while Gorgas, like Franklin, firmly believed that mastery and self-command served as avenues to success, his pursuit of manhood had become more romantic and more detached from his northern upbringing.²⁵ Material success was only one component in a man’s contribution to civilization. Gorgas wanted his successes to be grander and earned with more difficulty; he wanted his life to be brave and generous. By focusing on the economy of time and the counting of pennies, Gorgas felt Franklin had missed

²² Gorgas, 15 March [1858], in *The Journals of Josiah Gorgas*, 17. See also, Berry, *All That Makes A Man*, 34-5.

²³ Mercer Diary, 8 August 1858, Box 1, Volume 2, Mercer Papers, SHC.

²⁴ For instance, Gorgas Diary, 28 January [1857] and 3 June [1860], in *The Journals of Josiah Gorgas*, 5 and 34, respectively. On white Southerners’ dreams of slaveholding, see Walter Johnson, *Soul by Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999).

²⁵ Berry, *All That Makes A Man*, 34-5.

something. In contrast, Franklin's path to success captivated Mercer, who later in life constructed elaborate daily routines like those of Franklin. Mercer observed that "a man in active business can accomplish very little in a literary way without system."²⁶ The South that Gorgas so eagerly chased after was often vexatious to Mercer who lived it. The bravery now gone, Mercer set about finding the best means to build his civilization. The self-restraint, economy of time, and careful calculation of detail that propelled Franklin also drove Mercer. For these men, then, southern manhood and its requirements meant very different things. Both men wanted to make their mark on the world but traveled very different paths.

Despite dramatically experiences, writing offered men a similar means of release. As Southerners poured over old journal entries they became lost in nostalgia not unlike someone looking through old pictures today. Diaries evoked memories—both pleasurable and painful—and were central to the emotional lives of writers. Past writings could bring a man to tears, or fill him with joyful remembrance.²⁷ Parents encouraged their sons publicly to stifle their emotions and exert self-control. Diaries offered an avenue for men to fulfill their parent's stern requirements, while still satisfying their own emotional needs and expressions.²⁸ In writing and within the domestic sphere, feelings ran more freely, and private exposure was more expressive. This is perhaps reflected best as writers contemplated mortality. In dealing with death, writing offered solace.

²⁶ Mercer Diary, 5 January 1868, Box 1, Volume 5, Mercer Papers, SHC. On Franklin's system, Benjamin Franklin, *Autobiography and Other Writings*, ed., Ormond Seavey (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 90-2.

²⁷ For instance, Mercer Diary, 12 September 1851 and 29 April 1855, Box 1, Volume 1, Mercer Papers, SHC.

²⁸ On men's emotional command, Glover, "Let Us Manufacture Men," 34-5 and Berry, *All That Makes a Man*.

After his mother's passing, Mercer bid her farewell, recalled their joyful shared experiences, and wished her well in "a better, brighter land." Mercer's mourning caused him to consider humanity's fragility and contemplate life's course. He noticed the gray hairs on his father's head, and how "Sisters, Brother, Cousins and all, are stealing from the sun-shine into the shadow of life. We are all hastening towards the grave: what my experience may be, God only knows."²⁹

Life's uncertainty seems recurrent in the works of nineteenth-century writers, especially in diaries and letters among family. Frequent deaths among friends and relatives surely shaped the perspectives of the living. Upon the birth of one of Josiah Gorgas's children he remarked: "Since my last entry a daughter [Mamie] has been born to us. She is a nice plump looking little pet. Will she live to look over these pages which here record the opening of her book of life? Heaven grant it."³⁰ Hopeful for the future, though very much aware of potential pain, Josiah deemed his daughter's prospects uncertain. William Clarke's perspective was similarly hardened. In one letter he announced great joy at receiving a letter from his wife, Mary Bayard Clarke, though her trials saddened him. Long ago he might have gone "raving mad" to know that the "idol" of his soul was suffering; but now he was like an egg, having "been so long in hot water that I have become hardened." Though tough, Clarke remained unprepared for life's trials. In a particularly melodramatic moment, he told Mary that he wished for death at the Battle at the National Bridge, the site of his wounding during the Mexican-American War. There he could have died like a "brave man and been spared the sufferings I have

²⁹ Mercer Diary, 29 April 1855, Box 1, Volume 1, Mercer Papers, SHC.

³⁰ Gorgas, 13 December 1857, in *The Journals of Josiah Gorgas*, 13.

since endured.” Many men, like Clarke, were wholly unprepared for life’s trials. Absolving himself, he trusted in fate to deliver them from their woes and looked forward to the day that God might present them pleasure, thereby allowing them to laugh at old troubles.³¹

Southerners’ words recorded the stern requirements of white masculinity. Permitted few public disclosures and defined by guarded interactions, the feelings shaping men were expressed privately among family or within their writings. Diaries served as venues for the exploration of feelings and for the expression of fear and depression. Josiah Gorgas felt compelled to write in his one-day future record that he felt very downcast, though for no good reason.³² Perhaps Gorgas was offering an explanation, for many Southerners suffered from a tension between what was expected and what could be achieved.³³ Away at Princeton after his mother’s death, George Mercer mourned his position and place. He longed to pour his “joys and sorrows” into his mother’s “willing ears, to breathe my Mother’s name among the forests where she died.”³⁴

Bertram Wyatt-Brown’s groundbreaking scholarship on honor and shame—expanding the work of Julian Pitt-Rivers and Pierre Bourdieu—found complex systems of behavior that regulated Southerners’ inner and outer worlds, especially among elites. Wyatt-Brown concluded that Southerners’ efforts never to lose face resulted in the suppression of self-examination, which produced an array of emotional reactions

³¹ Clarke to “Dear Wife” [Mary Bayard Clarke], 12 August 1858, in *Live Your Own Life*, 43-5.

³² Josiah Gorgas, 26 February 1858, in *The Journals of Josiah Gorgas*, 16.

³³ Berry, *All That Makes A Man*, 44.

³⁴ Mercer Diary, 29 April 1855, Box 1, Volume 1, Mercer Papers, SHC.

ranging from violence to depression.³⁵ As the accounts herein demonstrate, Southerners indeed suffered from depression and doubt but also engaged in self-examination, however privately. Such men systemically considered paths to personal improvement. Their journals—devices that required time, supplies, and solitude—served as tools of introspection and self-development. Diaries and writing thus fulfilled for Southern whites a private life that they guarded publicly. As they expressed themselves and examined themselves these men were exploring notions of manhood.

Actions

Avid sportsmen and South Carolina planter William Elliott sought to ensure his own immortality by publishing a collection of hunting and fishing stories aptly titled, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water* (1846). An absentee landlord, Elliott infrequently visited one of his outlying plantations at Chee-ha, a fertile swatch of land some forty miles southwest of Charleston. On a clear autumn day in October 1837, one of these visits occasioned a hunt with a group of fellow planters.³⁶ The party dispatched their drivers and dogs to flesh out game, and then waited. Elliott climbed the knoll of a pond enclosed by tree and brush. From a distance he could hear the dogs crying as they tramped along catching scents. A large dark object broke his solitude, followed by the appearance of another, smaller one. To his great surprise they were bears. Rather than attacking, Elliott surmised that the animals were fleeing from the hounds. “They ran straight for me, however, until they had approached within twenty yards; when the

³⁵ Wyatt-Brown most clearly articulates his vision in Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Hearts of Darkness: Wellsprings of a Southern Literary Tradition* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), xiii-xvi.

³⁶ Theodore Rosengarten, “Introduction,” in William Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water; including Devil-Fishing, Wild-Cat, Deer, and Bear Hunting, etc.*, new introduction by Theodore Rosengarten (1846; repr., Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1994), ix-xi.

leading bear, a large one, stopped and looked me full in the face. A yearling bear followed, and, as if prompted by curiosity, reared himself on his hind legs and looked inquisitively over the shoulder of the leader.”³⁷ Elliott drew a bead on the large bear, took aim between his eyes, and pulled one trigger on his double-barrel shotgun. The large bear disappeared instantly, while the smaller bear, in its shadow, rolled away. Riding to the spot, Elliott found the large bear motionless, positioned in the same upright position he held before the shot; the animal was stone dead.³⁸ The other bear’s trail led deeper and deeper into a swamp. Elliott sounded his horn, calling for his companions who failed to answer as they and the dogs were now pursuing deer.

Once his companions arrived they were astonished by Elliott’s tale. “‘A bear!’ cried the hunters in astonishment. ‘You joke!—we never saw one in these woods!’ ‘True, nevertheless! Ride up with the hounds, and it will be hard but I will show you blood!’”³⁹ Planters such as Elliott, and their prickly dispositions, interpreted such questioning as an affront, perhaps even personal insult. Hunting was not only a contest between man and nature, but among hunters. Sportsmen pushed themselves, tried their skills, and demonstrated their mettle to their companions. The remarks of Elliott’s companions were friendly taunts, yet challenges nonetheless. Elliott’s spirits were immediately uplifted as the surprised party crowded the bear and offered their congratulations. To his further delight the horses showed uneasiness upon sight of the

³⁷ William Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water; including Devil-Fishing, Wild-Cat, Deer, and Bear Hunting, etc.*, (London: Richard Bentley, New Burlington Street, 1867), 216-7; hereinafter all citations are from the 1867 edition unless otherwise indicated.

³⁸ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 217.

³⁹ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 220. The hunters’ surprise may have reflected a very real depletion of once abundant bear. Nicolas W. Proctor, *Bathed in Blood: Hunting and Mastery in the Old South* (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 2002), 23.

bear and the dogs' mistrust amounted almost to terror—these reactions only elevated the hunter's self-confidence and satisfaction. Standing above hunting peer and animal companion, Elliott insisted that the party continue after the wounded bear. Once again the party expressed disbelief. “Now we know you joke,’ said they in a breath; “you fired but one barrel!’ ‘But that,’ said I, ‘had bullets for two.’”⁴⁰ Pointing to the torn brush and the blood soaked ground he illustrated what they refused to believe. Elliott then called for the men to surround the bear, “set on the dogs, and then hurra! for the quickest shot and the surest marksman!”⁴¹

The party closed in, hearts beating quickly and fingers resting on triggers. But “there was no room for chase, or fight—*the bear lay dead before us!* A grand hurra burst from us!—a grand flourish of horns!—and my hunting-cap was whirled aloft on the muzzle of my gun! . . . I was delighted—exalted—overmuch, perhaps!—but my pride was soon to have its rebuke.”⁴² A member of the party accused Elliott of luck. “What a damper!—to tell a man who was priding himself on having made a magnificent shot, that it was nothing but luck.” Elliott retorted that to have found the bears was luck, indeed, but to “have disposed of them, thus artistically, excuse me!”⁴³ A game of oneupmanship ensued. Elliott recited a litany of his kills over the expedition, his sure aim, his deft reflexes and quick instincts. The man deferred. With his manly prowess now reasserted the party continued the hunt.

⁴⁰ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 221.

⁴¹ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 221.

⁴² Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 222.

⁴³ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 222-3.

So, what does hunting have to do with southern culture and what can it tell us about Southern men? Hunting and its violence were expressive forms of culture through which men symbolically illustrated their assumptions about the world.⁴⁴ In the fields and on the hunt, men were removed from the trappings and traditions of ordinary society. By the mid-nineteenth century, women, both in the United States and England, were participating in foxhunts, a sport of the genteel and elite. Yet, many hunts remained an all-male arena in which hunters constructed and enacted rituals and rites creating a uniquely homosocial culture.⁴⁵ Significant elements of male sensibility were derived from hunting excursions.

Trips into the forest loosened cruelty, hatred, violence, and death but also engendered admiration, passion, love, and respect.⁴⁶ Hunting symbolized Southerners' internal contests between passion and restraint, piety and aggression.⁴⁷ Most explicitly, of course, hunting privileged and rewarded aggression. In field and forest men channeled unrestrained passion and unchecked aggression into the pursuit of game; an activity socially sanctioned and approved. But the feelings unleashed on the hunt did not ebb quickly and may have even been augmented. The pursuit of wildlife instilled pugnacity and bloodlust, and in a culture arguably predisposed to violence, hunting only

⁴⁴ Bruce, *Violence and Culture in the Antebellum South*, 196.

⁴⁵ Ted Ownby, *Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, & Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 21-7. On women in hunting and sport, see Nancy L. Struna, "Beyond Mapping Experience: The Need for Understanding in the History of American Women's Sport," *Journal of Sport History* 11 (Spring 1984): 120-33 and Cartriona M. Parratt, "Athletic 'Womanhood': Exploring Sources for Female Sport in Victorian and Edwardian England," *Journal of Sport History*, vol. 16, no. 2 (Summer, 1989): 140-57.

⁴⁶ This reading relies on, Geertz, "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight," 417-21, especially.

⁴⁷ Bruce, Jr., *Violence and Culture in the Antebellum South*, 233 and Ownby, *Subduing Satan*.

increased Southern militancy.⁴⁸ For all its brutality and violence, however, trips into the woods allowed men to ponder nature's wonders, enjoy the conservation of close friends, and escape from the demands of daily life. During hunting trips, then, men explored masculine identities and ideals, which were then constructed and reconstructed, enacted and performed.

The successful hunter was rewarded not only by the conquest of his quarry but also by the congratulations of friends and family. Men derived great self-confidence from these experiences expanding sometimes already overblown egos.⁴⁹ As chronicled in William Elliott's tale of the bear kills, men showcased their prowess and manliness to each other leading to conflict and admiration. On the hunt men confronted themselves, their limitations and possibilities, and each other, carefully measuring just what made a Southern man. The South's vast forests and abundant wildlife consistently awed the region's visitors.⁵⁰ Yet the panoply of flora and fauna were never distributed equally, or uniformly accessed by blacks and whites. Southern men of all classes and backgrounds went hunting and fishing with some frequency. Their motivations and models of behavior differed wildly, however. Poor whites, generally without their own pork,

⁴⁸ Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1982) and John Hope Franklin, *The Militant South, 1800-1861* (1956; repr., Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002). See also, Sheldon Hackney, "Southern Violence," *American Historical Review*, 74 (February 1969): 906-25 and Edward L. Ayers, *Vengeance and Justice: Crime and Punishment in the 19th-Century American South* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1984). For excellent comparison between early-twentieth-century Northern and Southern violence see, Jeffrey S. Adler, "Murder, North and South: Violence in Early-Twentieth-Century Chicago and New Orleans," *The Journal of Southern History* 74, no. 2 (May 2008): 297-324.

⁴⁹ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 181.

⁵⁰ See, for instance, the early accounts of John Lawson, *A New Voyage to Carolina*, ed., Hugh Talmage Lefler (1714; repr., Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1967) and Robert Beverley, *The History and Present State of Virginia*, ed., Louis B. Wright (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1947).

chickens, or cows, used hunting and fishing to supplement often meager, grain- and corn- based diets.⁵¹ Enslaved and freed blacks, too, relied on game for protein.⁵² Because of the expense of rifles and shotguns and, for African Americans, restrictions on firearms, traps and dogs were commonly employed to capture game.⁵³ For white Southern planters hunting was a sport—an elite ritual that distinguished them from those who hunted for subsistence, or “pot-hunters” as they were derisively known.⁵⁴ These men used the hunt to evoke their connections, real and constructed, to the Old World aristocracy.⁵⁵ For hunters of every class, though, gaming and its spoils reinforced men’s claims to patriarchal authority despite substantial differences in purpose and practice.⁵⁶

More ritualistic than practical, the pageantry associated with the planters’ hunt bolstered social prestige and reified class relations. Vast personal kingdoms were created by imaginative and aggressive white planters. These improved lands precluded access to anyone but landowners themselves and their elite guests. Such men of wealth defined their social standing through manners, dress, demeanor, conversational

⁵¹ Steven Hahn, *The Roots of Southern Populism: Yeoman Farmers and the Transformation of the Georgia Upcountry, 1850-1890* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 58.

⁵² On slaves hunting and fishing, see Eugene D. Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World The Slaves Made* (1972; repr., New York: Vintage Books, 1976), 62-3. On firearm ownership among free blacks before Turner’s Rebellion, see Melvin Patrick Ely, *Israel on the Appomattox: A Southern Experiment in Black Freedom from the 1790s Through the Civil War* (New York: Vintage Books, 2004), 181-2, especially.

⁵³ Proctor, *Bathed in Blood*, 85.

⁵⁴ Stephanie McCurry, *Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, & the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 15 and Daniel Robinson Hundley, *Social Relations in Our Southern States* (New York: Henry B. Price, Publisher, 1860), 37-8 and 343.

⁵⁵ W. J. Cash, *The Mind of the South*, with a new introduction by Bertram Wyatt-Brown (1941; repr., New York: Vintage Books, 1991), 30.

⁵⁶ Proctor, *Bathed in Blood*, 1 and 12-3.

style, and, significantly, their hunting customs. Hunting clubs attended by enslaved blacks allowed fiercely independent men to demonstrate freedom from material want, servile subjection, and subordination.⁵⁷ Planters' commitment to the preservation of hunting as an elite ritual ignited conflict with those who claimed common rights to land and resources. (Planters often gifted the spoils of their hunt to signal authority and reinforce dependence.⁵⁸) As a result, in the early-to-mid nineteenth century wealthy whites engaged in court disputes and called for legal regulations to codify their position.⁵⁹ But, as historian Nicolas W. Proctor explains, the lack of meaningful enabling legislation resulted in the nullification of most hunting laws in the antebellum South. Only in the final years of the antebellum era were proponents of conservation-minded hunting successful, though these actions were tinged by class biases.⁶⁰ Hunting, its customs and its character, thus reflected planters' command of resources, control of time, and conquest of nature.

Young adults of all classes were welcomed into this fraternity of men through ritual and rite. A son met his father's friends, perhaps enjoyed a nip from a communal flask, and experienced the excitement, sweat, fear, and triumph of the hunt. While a deeply emotional experience, men learned mastery over self, society, and nature.⁶¹ For the elite, hunting parties were supported by drivers, typically enslaved blacks, who beat

⁵⁷ Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia*, 131; Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South*, 75, 104-5; Proctor, *Bathed in Blood*, 76-98 and 104-18.

⁵⁸ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 191.

⁵⁹ Stuart A. Marks, *Southern Hunting in Black and White: Nature, History, and Ritual in a Carolina Community* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 28-37; Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 254-8; and McCurry, *Masters of Small Worlds*, 7-16.

⁶⁰ Proctor, *Bathed in Blood*, 13 and 34.

⁶¹ Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 195-6.

thickets and tracked game with packs of seasoned dogs, often of English and Irish blood.⁶² Mounted hunters traversed open terrain, patiently waiting until opportunity or chance allowed them a shot. For the majority of white Southerners, the hunt banded together men of agreeable dispositions who wanted to enjoy the companionship of congenial neighbors, kin, or even strangers—men who shared a similar image of masculinity.⁶³ Ritual sometimes marked the novice's successful first kill. William Elliott explained how a senior hunter would slit the dead animal's throat and then bath in blood the neophyte's face—not a typical practice but highly suggestive nonetheless. This blood symbolically joined the hunter to the hunted and a fellowship of sportsmen.⁶⁴ In Elliott's telling of one man's entry into this brotherhood, the man's face remained "glaring like an Indian chief's in all the splendor of war-paint." In the evening he returned home to his wife, who heartily welcomed her husband after seeing the "stains of victory" upon his face.⁶⁵ In this not-so-subtle vignette the hunter reached back to his ancient forebearers, becoming provider of food and conquerer of the forest. Hunting evoked man's civilized and primal nature, and functioned as a rite of passage into manhood.

The pursuit and conquest of game created a stage upon which hunters enacted their own masculine dramas, and explored their emotions and fears. In an explosive and dangerous atmosphere, men reveled in the passion and intensity engendered by the

⁶² Dickson D. Bruce, Jr., *Violence and Culture in the Antebellum South* (Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1979), 197. On men's devotion to these dogs, see, for instance, Edward Porter Alexander, in *Fighting for the Confederacy: The Personal Recollections of General Edward Porter Alexander*, ed., Gary W. Gallagher (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 22.

⁶³ Proctor, *Bathed in Blood*, 99-100.

⁶⁴ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 173-4. See also, Ownby, *Subduing Satan*, 24 and Proctor, *Bathed in Blood*, 106-8.

⁶⁵ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 174.

pursuit of game. William Elliott's poetic description of a hunt captures the range of sensations: "The ground was favorable for the sportsmen, for a road ran parallel with the direction of the cry, and thus the whole field got placed, and took a fair start with the dogs. 'There they go! Look! for the hedge! Rowser leads—he leaps the hedge—ha! he has overrun the track. Black has caught it up—it is all right! There they go—look at them!—listen to them! . . . Does it not make your pulse quicken. Is there not a thrill of pleasure shooting through your frame? Can you tell your name? Have you a wife? a child? *Have you a neck?* If you can, at such a moment, answer questions such as these, you do not feel your position and are but half a sportsman!"⁶⁶ While written partly for effect, Elliott's account evinces the hunt's exhilaration, confusion, and anticipation; the hunter's focus, delight, and quickened pulse. In these moments, the pursuit, capture, and conquest of the quarry were all that mattered in a man's world. Indeed, in the thrill of the hunt men's families were temporarily forgotten and worldly duties cast aside, thereby only reinforcing how rigorously masculine hunting proved.

Southerners showcased their rifles and shotguns, and presented deft displays of marksmanship. Hunting was not simply a contest with nature but among men, and sporting called forth men's ideals, hates, fears, and ambivalences. Hunting and its accretions were definitively masculine symbols par excellence.⁶⁷ Men formed close bonds with their rifles, some even naming them. George Mercer, who had named his gun "Sweep Lips," recalled while at college that "never, shall I forget the day when first a gun was mine. It stands out brightly among the brightest scenes of my boyhood. I could

⁶⁶ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 164.

⁶⁷ Geertz, "Deep Play," 417-21, especially.

not compute my happiness—my gun . . . was a treasure without a price.”⁶⁸ Edward Porter Alexander—future Confederate general and expert artillerist—wrote that during his youth his gun was the “dearest possession on earth.”⁶⁹ Rates of gun ownership in the South was higher than in any other region of the country, and reinforced white supremacy and male patriarchy. Planters regarded firearms as necessary components of the machinery of control.⁷⁰

The hunt’s violence and stimulation created an irrepressible appetite in Southern men. A “ruling passion” for the hunt still gripped an aged and infirmly hunter who was unable to do much beside dream of past glories.⁷¹ This particular quality spilled over into many aspects of southern life creating men with grand visions and lofty, self-appointed positions.⁷² In its extreme, hunting and its culture of violence schooled Southerners in the art of war. William Elliott observed, “Assuredly, there is no such preparatory school for war; and the expert hunter will, I doubt not, show himself the superior in the field to another, every other way his equal, yet wanting this experience!”⁷³ Elliott’s words were not mere hyperbole. Hunting explicitly demonstrated men’s dominance over nature, and suggested their mastery over women and slaves. Moreover, horses, guns, and killing echoed the rigors of combat.⁷⁴ While not

⁶⁸ Mercer Diary, 9 May 1855, Box 1, Volume 2, Mercer Papers, SHC.

⁶⁹ Alexander, in *Fighting for the Confederacy*, 3 and Proctor, *Bathed in Blood*, 44.

⁷⁰ Franklin, *The Militant South*, 69.

⁷¹ Meshach Browning, *Forty-Four Years of the Life of a Hunter; Being Reminiscences of Meshach Browning, a Maryland Hunter*, Revised and illustrated by E. Stabler (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1859), vi.

⁷² Berry, *All That Makes A Man*, 21.

⁷³ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 282.

⁷⁴ Proctor, *Bathed in Blood*, 72 and Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 191 and 196.

contributing directly to war, like slave patrols, dueling, excessive drinking, and contests of political honor, hunting increased southern militancy and violence.

The hunt's bloodlust and brutality sometimes led to excessive, gratuitous killing. Meshach Browning, a poor white from Maryland, dedicated his life to hunting. His hunting career, which spanned over forty years, resulted in an astounding number of kills: between eighteen hundred to two thousand deer, three to four hundred bears, around fifty catamounts and panthers, and scores of wolves.⁷⁵ George Mercer's childhood hunting diary often included compilations of his spoils. On one long weekend near his Savannah home Mercer reckoned he had killed 11 doves, 2 larks, 1 large fowl hawk, 1 partridge, 1 snipe, 2 squirrels, and some robins and black birds. He and his cousin had together shot and killed one large duck and a coot. This same cousin and an "old colored man" killed many more doves, larks, and robins.⁷⁶ Immoderate killing was especially prevalent among young men who eventually learned moderation. Many hunters were concerned about the disappearance of game and called for conservation. Reformers such as William Elliott and Daniel Robinson Hundley admonished those who engaged in the reckless destruction of forest, field, and game.⁷⁷ Yet, despite calls for restraint, the passions and excesses engendered by the hunt became part of some men's values. Gratuitous killing demonstrated unrestrained passions. Southern society usually condemned such overtly emotional displays but the field's seclusion allowed for, even encouraged, these demonstrations. Such behavior did not accord with the

⁷⁵ Browning, *Forty-Four Years of the Life of a Hunter*, vi.

⁷⁶ Mercer Diary, circa 1850, Box 1, Volume 1, Mercer Papers, SHC.

⁷⁷ Hundley, *Social Relations in Our Southern States*, 168-9 and Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 283.

principles of all, of course, but most hunters recognized excitement and passion as integral to the hunt.⁷⁸

The ritualistic homosocial culture of hunting enflamed men's wants and desires. The day's quarry was most explicitly coveted. Yet men admired each other, and the prowess, manliness, and skill-sets so openly displayed. Many of the stories of William Elliott have a homoerotic subtext.⁷⁹ In his "A Business Day at Chee-Ha" Elliott told how hounds, after chasing a wounded deer to water's edge, drove the animal deep into the river. Elliott first implored Robin, an enslaved huntsman, to fetch the deer. Robin refused, saying that the dogs would mistake him for a deer and drown him. "Drown *you*, you prince of fools!—they know an ass from a deer," Elliott derisively shot back.⁸⁰ He then began to undress to jump into the water himself when a fellow hunter, Loveleap, rode to the scene. Telling Elliott that he was too hot for the water's extreme cold, Loveleap offered to go in his stead. He began undressing, at first quickly, and then "more deliberately, it seemed to me, than before. At last the work was ended, and his manly form, untrammelled by dress, stood prominently forth on the river's brink, like the statue of one of the Athletae of ancient Greece!" By this time, however, the deer had moved too far making the swim too dangerous.⁸¹ Loveleap consoled his companion for the loss and promised a venison steak.

The large, powerful body of Loveleap epitomized manliness and captivated Elliott. While he may indeed have had sexual longings for his companion, Elliott more

⁷⁸ Proctor, *Bathed in Blood*, 110-2.

⁷⁹ McCurry, *Masters of Small Worlds*, fn 26, 16.

⁸⁰ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 209.

⁸¹ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 211.

likely coveted what Loveleap represented.⁸² Deprived of the climatic moment of the deer's death Elliott turned instead to admire his companion's manhood. This imagery is especially powerful if we juxtapose his admonishment and humiliation of Robin, the black "cowardly" slave and Loveleap's antithesis, to the chiseled, white form standing by the river's edge. The story may be read in an entirely different light as well. By shedding his clothing, unhindered by social convention, Loveleap returned to "man's" natural state. In the woods, George Mercer reflected, men could "freely laugh and skip and dance, without fear of offending some would be critic, who seems a stern, stiff, silly dignity the only true index to a manly character."⁸³ It was perhaps the freedom of Loveleap's actions, the informality the occasion afforded, which most pleased Elliott. Either reading only reinforces the intensely homosocial culture of the hunt, an arena that offered men an escape from rigid social conventions.

Southerners hunted for pleasure, for excitement, and for camaraderie, but they also resolutely believed that sport bolstered character and advanced personal development. Hunting instilled values and shaped men. Nineteenth-century huntsmen were especially careful to detail hunting's attributes and explain how it bolstered men's productivity. Eighteenth-century observers such as William Byrd II and J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur had associated hunting with idleness and sloth, often casting aspersions on the character of "lazy" Indian hunters.⁸⁴ Hunters' narratives relived the

⁸² On the late Victorian ideal of the large, powerful man, see Bederman, *Manliness & Civilization*, 7-10.

⁸³ Mercer Diary, 23 May 1855, Box 1, Volume 2, Mercer Papers, SHC.

⁸⁴ William Byrd, *Histories of the Dividing Line Betwixt Virginia and North Carolina*, with introduction and notes by William K. Boyd (1728; New York: Dover Publishers, Inc., 1967), 285-6; J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, *Letters From an American Farmer* (1782; repr., New York: Fox, Duffield & Company, 1904), 69-71; and Proctor, *Bathed in Blood*, 37.

thrill of the chase and recounted accomplishments, but authors' themes and ideas sought to instill larger social lessons.⁸⁵ William Elliott's fast-paced narrative of his hunting and fishing expeditions also included a contemplative "Random Thoughts on Hunting," an explanation of why hunting mattered to men and society. He held that hunting promoted observation, punctuality, sagacity, and promptitude. "[T]he rapid glance, the steady aim, the quick perception, the ready execution," he wrote, "these are among the faculties and qualities continually called into pleasing exercise; and the man who habitually applies himself to this sport will become more *considerate*, as well as more prompt, more full of resource, more resolute, than if he never had engaged in it!"⁸⁶ These learned traits guided men not only in the fields but also at the hearth. The hunt schooled Southerners in manliness, mastery, and desire. With proper resolve and self-control whites used these values to assert their authority over the environment and its inhabitants.⁸⁷ The results of hunting and sport, nineteenth-century Southerners contended, became evident in how southern gentry surpassed their northern counterparts.⁸⁸ Consistent physical activity and fresh country air developed an acute but calm mind and fine physical development.⁸⁹

Just how Southern men attributed the improvement of mind and body to hunting is illustrated in George Mercer's childhood journal. Remarkable in its depth and breadth,

⁸⁵ Bruce, *Violence and Culture in the Antebellum South*, 210-11.

⁸⁶ Elliott, *Carolina Sports by Land and Water*, 282. For similar sentiments, see Hundley, *Social Relations in Our Southern States*, 39-40.

⁸⁷ Berry, *All That Makes A Man*, 17-27.

⁸⁸ On the more general literary trend to establish southern distinctiveness in the mid-nineteenth century, James C. Cobb, *Away Down South: A History of Southern Identity* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 22-6.

⁸⁹ Hundley, *Social Relations in Our Southern States*, 39-41.

the journal contains fine drawings of rifles, powder horns, hunting bags, and vignettes from nature. In writing his text, Mercer constructed models of masculinity. The records of kills and accounts of hunts reflected a young man assuming manly roles. Such action-statements demonstrate the processes by which Mercer formed a self-identity as portrayed through acts he deemed culturally valued—pugnacity, control, aggression, and reflection.⁹⁰ Appreciation for nature came through observation and possession. This relationship seems contradictory today. To nineteenth-century Southerners, however, admiration and aggression became wedded in the hunt.⁹¹ As Mercer penned in his journal, each bird became “the object of a thousand hopes and fears: and so I became a hunter, a lover of Nature.”⁹² Mercer’s admiration for, and eventual possession of, two hawks illuminates his sentiments. He killed the first bird, a sparrow hawk, at a long distance as it was flying overhead. The “other was one of the largest and most beautiful hawks I have ever seen.” Colored by a mixture of brown and yellow ochre, George carefully denoted its markings and gorgeous tail. On the hunt he had to be very cautious, “and sneak a good deal, before I could get a shot at this wary bird; but at last he lit on a large dead pine tree, and I got behind another one; it was a very long shot but I fired and fortunately broke his wing, for he was so large and tough that the shot would have done but little damage, if they had hit him in any other place.” A black man, presumably one of the Mercer family slaves, went to fetch the wounded bird. The hawk “struck at him with its talons and tore a piece out of his . . . jacket, as easily as if it had

⁹⁰ On performative statements, see Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia*, 324-6.

⁹¹ Dickson D. Bruce, Jr., contends that when Southerners “had a particularly difficult notion to express, violence was not an uncommon way of doing it.” Bruce, *Violence and Culture in the Antebellum South*, 211.

⁹² Mercer Diary, 9 May 1855, Box 1, Volume 1, Mercer Papers, SHC.

been paper.”⁹³ Awed by the bird’s beauty, taken by its deft movements and final defense, Mercer demonstrated his admiration by assiduously recording the encounter, proudly recounting the kill.

George Mercer’s journal entries help illustrate how Southerners used sport and nature to elevate and improve themselves, at least according to their own standards. Frequently commenting on nature’s sublimity, hunting became his path to its appreciation. During his long excursions into the woods George instructed himself about the natural world’s wonders, and his own limitations and promises. He developed skills of perception, learned how to capture what he desired, and mastered self-control—as George confronted nature he also confronted himself. His hunting sketches and descriptions of excursions into the woods offered amusement but more importantly a record. “The fleeting moments, which, unless, thus employed, might have been lost forever, have been used with pleasure and advantage, and when tired of my books or my play, or otherwise disengaged, I have sat down to this little volume with a certain kind of quiet joy, which can be known only to those who have experienced it.”⁹⁴ The timeless qualities of writing and recording are especially poignant when paired with his subject matter, conquest and killing. George attempted to manage time itself, and, as a hunter, take away the very existence of other animals.

Mercer’s fascination with nature extended well beyond the hunt, however, as he acted as an amateur naturalist. He versed himself in Linnaean taxonomy, stuffed birds for display and observation, and constructed complex lists of fish and other wildlife

⁹³ Mercer Diary, circa 1850, Box 1, Volume 1, Mercer Papers, SHC.

⁹⁴ Mercer Diary, 12 September 1851, Box 1, Volume 1, Mercer Papers, SHC.

found near his Savannah home and observed in his travels north.⁹⁵ In the woods Mercer sought escape, a place to contemplate and wonder. On one page he wrote a line from George Blythe Shelley encapsulating his sentiments: “Away, away from men and towns, To the silent wilderness.”⁹⁶ Some years later Mercer would describe nature as a Mother whose “‘bare bosom’ I could never take my fill.”⁹⁷ Southerners’ curiosity about the natural world extended back to the seventeenth-, and especially eighteenth-, century. While Southerners themselves were largely marginalized by Europe’s community of natural scientists, the South and the Caribbean were ripe with specimens.⁹⁸ Efforts to track and record the South’s richness in flora and fauna culminated most famously in Thomas Jefferson’s *Notes on the State of Virginia* (1787), which included a section on minerals, vegetables, and animals. By observing and documenting the natural world, Southerners rationalized and systematized the untamed, thereby making the unfamiliar familiar.

Men’s pursuit and conquest of wild-game illuminates their innermost drives and desires, while the hunt itself, its rituals and rites, symbolically related social relationships and cultural assumptions. Mastery and manhood were displayed most prominently by hunters, but the hunt also taught self-control and how to properly channel passion. The domestic arena and men’s relationships therein were pivotal to emotional and personal

⁹⁵ Mercer Diary, “stuff birds,” “In the Linnean system,” and “The list,” circa Winter 1851, Box 1, Volume 1, Mercer Papers, SHC.

⁹⁶ Mercer Diary, 24 September 1850, Box 1, Volume 1, Mercer Papers, SHC.

⁹⁷ Mercer Diary, 9 May 1855, Box 1, Volume 1, Mercer Papers, SHC.

⁹⁸ Susan Scott Parrish, *American Curiosity: Cultures of Natural History in the Colonial British Atlantic World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2006), 5-23 and 103-35. On the broader desire to classify knowledge, Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (1970; New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 125-62.

growth. Yet, antebellum Southern men also divorced this area from field and forest, where models of expression and modes of manhood were quite different.

Conclusions

This chapter offers a cultural reading of manhood and emotional expression. As demonstrated through behavior, experience, and writing, whites' confronted themselves and their society as they negotiated masculinity and its requirements. Diaries, social expectations, and public performances illuminate how Southerners' considered and met these requirements by conforming to some and jettisoning others. Whites were expected to stifle outward displays of untamed passion—a model of character carefully instilled by family and learned through schooling. Unruly adolescents sometimes pushed the boundaries of these requirements, confronting their elders until forced into submission. Young men acted in concert during such altercations, but still within the confines of a largely competitive environment in which men created distance between each other. Maturation caused many pause, and pursuits such as writing or hunting became prominent avenues to vent particular types of feelings and negotiate different models of manhood. Ultimately, white antebellum Southern men embraced an aggressive model of masculinity defined by their worldly pursuits and dominance over women and slaves. But, inwardly and among family they considered the implications of their behavior and their writings reveal that these men remained contemplative and feeling.

CHAPTER 3 WORDS AND WAR

In the middle years of the 1850s, George Anderson Mercer replaced the streets and fields of Georgia for the College of New Jersey's ivy and brick. Just as he studiously recorded his youthful hunting expeditions so, too, did he recount his college experiences. Mercer recognized the period's transformative potential, for as he attended school he matured into manhood. The diary's purpose, he wrote, "may . . . beguile a weary hour" and soften "manhood's severer duties." College broadened Mercer's mind, but with his education came "the hardening influence of world-knowledge."¹ He experienced everything good and bad that came with college life. Mercer joined the "secret society" ΔKE, and he watched in disappointment as many promising young men were "ruined" by vice. He praised students who rose above temptations and physical pain to behave like men.²

Problems of restraint and passion defined southern masculinity, paramount in antebellum college life.³ And the South's white sons came to college to become men and learn restraint and release. The student bodies of the state universities in Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina were drawn mainly from wealthy, slaveholding families. So, too, did Southern sons go north to elite institutions such as Yale and the

¹ George Anderson Mercer Diary, 10 March 1855, Box 1, Volume 2, George Anderson Mercer Papers, SHC.

² See, Mercer Diary, 10, 17, and 31 March 1855, and 4 and 14 April 1855, Box 1, Volume 2, Mercer Papers, SHC.

³ On a concise summation of these themes explored more broadly in southern culture, see Dickson D. Bruce, Jr., *Violence and Culture in the Antebellum South* (Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1979), 233-40.

College of New Jersey.⁴ Colleges served as a training ground for these young men to become future republican leaders. Students such as George Mercer wrote about and recognized adolescence as a central period in their emotional and intellectual development. Young men underwent prolonged periods of confusion, doubt, and restlessness but also experienced exultation, joy and happiness.⁵ Students' experiences in debate societies, among their peers, in the midst of unruly behavior, and during episodes of violence demonstrate the processes by which young Southerners grappled with social, cultural, and gendered expectations. Their responses reflected perceptions of manhood.⁶ More likely to be anxious and uncertain, students occupied the space between child- and adult- hood in which they learned social, cultural, and gendered expectations. Examining college life in the final decades of the antebellum era reveals the developing dispositions and shifting perceptions of these young men. Southern universities assembled sizable groups of adolescents from similar social backgrounds for prolonged periods. Their emotional and behavioral patterns disclose broader cultural truths.⁷ Pugnacious and thoughtful, restrained and unruly, students embraced fluid models of masculinity during their college years, which would underpin their adult lives and anchor them during the trials of civil war.

⁴ For an excellent view of the University of North Carolina and its antebellum student body, see Tim Williams, "Intellectual Manhood: Becoming Men of the Republic at a Southern University, 1795-1861," Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2010.

⁵ Steven Mintz, *Huck's Raft: A History of American Childhood* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004), 75-93.

⁶ Southern men wore "masks" that conferred power; only unmasking these men would convey powerlessness, see Kenneth S. Greenberg, *Honor & Slavery: Lies, Duels, Noses, Masks, Dressing As a Woman, Gifts, Strangers, Humanitarianism, Death, Slave Rebellions, the Proslavery Argument, Baseball, Hunting, and Gambling in the Old South* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996), 24-31.

⁷ Joanne B. Freeman, *Affairs of Honor: National Politics in the New Republic* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 290.

Education

For elite white boys higher education represented a significant part of their public and private maturation. Away from home, among young men of similar standing, students elevated their minds and formed lasting social connections. Parents expected their sons to learn restraint in both behavior and emotional expression.⁸ Southerners attending school in the antebellum era underwent a very different experience than their forbearers, however. Since the Revolutionary War, Americans had placed greater value on education to ensure that a virtuous and independent citizenry supported the burgeoning republic. These values were instilled first in the home by Republican Mothers, and then in schools for those possessing the monetary means.⁹ Educational reform, initiated in the early Republic, heightened during the 1830s and 1840s. As Jeffrey A. Mullins explains: “By the late eighteenth century men of letters understood ‘science’ to include both the inquiries into the physical world carried on by ‘natural philosophy’ and the inquiries into the human and social world conducted by ‘moral philosophy.’”¹⁰ Thus, reform-minded educators at northern institutions such as Princeton, and southern ones such as the University of North Carolina, designed a liberal education which targeted the student’s mental and moral systems.¹¹

⁸ Lorri Glover, “Let Us Manufacture Men,” 23-35 and Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South*, 9-22.

⁹ Linda K. Kerber, *Women of the Republic: Intellect & Ideology in Revolutionary America* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1980), 35-6, 189-90, and 200.

¹⁰ Jeffrey A. Mullins, “Honorable Violence: Youth Culture, Masculinity, and Contested Authority in Liberal Education in the Early Republic,” *American Transcendental Quarterly* vol. 17, issue 3 (September 2003): 163. See also, Bruce Kimball, *Orators & Philosophers: A History of the Idea of Liberal Education* (New York and London: Teachers College Press, 1986), 141-56.

¹¹ In North Carolina, distinguished graduate of the University of North Carolina and lawmaker Archibald D. Murphey initiated a series of state school reforms between 1812-1818.

To develop students' minds, colleges and universities established a core curriculum of history, moral philosophy, noble ideas, and ancient languages. Other subjects included chemistry, metaphysics, trigonometry, and rhetoric.¹² History, philosophy, and languages guided Southerners' understanding of ancient civilizations, their rise and their fall.¹³ Southern boys attending college had already mastered or would learn Latin and Greek. They read Cicero, Homer, Tacitus, and Xenophon, which were works to be recited and thoroughly understood. Martin Gary, for instance, included in his notebook from the South Carolina College small biographies of Homer and Dante; he also detailed the fall of Rome. Tales of moral progress and corruption emerged from this system of learning and caused men to consider how they might one day contribute to the South.

Educators sought also to craft their young students into respectable men of character. Pedagogy was coupled with personal development. William Hooper, a clergyman and an educator at the University of North Carolina, spoke before that University's student body about the obligations and purpose of education. So taken by his speech, the students requested its printing. "Now, I think I may venture to assert," Hooper pronounced, "without danger of contradiction, that the chief business of education is, to develope, to cultivate, and to train towards perfection, all the useful and agreeable powers of man." The acquisition of knowledge was essential to education, but only part of the experience. "To discipline the heart, to regulate the temper, to imbibe virtuous affections, and to fortify them by a course of virtuous habits--these are

¹² Faust, James Henry Hammond and the Old South, 14.

¹³ Berry, All That Makes a Man, 26-7.

the most difficult and the most valuable attainments to which the morning of life can be devoted.”¹⁴ Students’ emotional lives, their temperament and their character, were honed in college life. As young men navigated manhood, they learned how to temper emotions and assume self-control, necessary requirements for success in life.

Idealized perceptions never matched lived realities, and young men could grow into irascible tyrants. Planters raped enslaved women, hot-tempered politicians argued and fought with political rivals, and men of all classes followed a code of honor that might some day demand violent confrontation. The roots of misbehavior can be located in the trials of youth. Endless rules regulated school life and young men, away from home, tried their elders in countless ways.

A young man’s departure from home marked a crucial moment in his growth and development. Leaving home was an experience common to young men of all social classes, though the reasons for departure varied. Those who were poor often sent children away out of necessity. For elite young men, the transition into academy or college life marked one part of a broader passage into manhood.¹⁵ Edmund Ruffin, Jr., son of the famed Virginia agriculturist Edmund Ruffin, traveled a typical path for southern planters. At age fourteen he left his home on the James River to attend a New England boarding school. His institution, the New Haven Gymnasium, included lessons in geography, arithmetic, modern and classical languages, and rhetoric. The school also stressed exercise, including country walks, running, and fishing; students also learned

¹⁴ William Hooper, “The Discipline of the Heart, To Be Connected with the Culture of the Mind; A Discourse on Education, Delivered to the Students of the College, at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, August 22, 1830, and Published by Their Request,” (New York: Sleight and Robinson, Printers, 1830), 3 and 22, respectively.

¹⁵ Joseph F. Kett, *Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America 1790 to Present* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1977), 23-9 and 35.

self-control, the importance of study, and the art of public speaking. The classes, according to Edmund, had three times as many boys from southern and border states as from the North.¹⁶ After one year's time Edmund returned to Virginia where he attended the University in Charlottesville, graduating in 1834; he then managed the family's plantation.

Like many wealthy sons, George Mercer left the South for a northern education, attending Princeton University. A full fifteen years after he had started the practice, George started a new diary dedicated to "College Jottings" and intended, once again, to be kept private. Recognizing the transformative period in his life, he reflected, "There are, in everyone's life, moments that we would rescue from . . . Oblivion—scenes and incidents that he would trust to a surer keeper than a too often treacherous memory." The book was designed to entertain as Mercer was "touched by the recollections of youth's purer and more innocent hours."¹⁷ With these ideas and goals George set a course for the literary and mental preservation of youth, while steeling himself against the difficulties of manhood. Though a frequent traveler in his youth, the challenges of and experiences at college produced profound internal changes heretofore inconceivable. He contented himself to write in August 1855 that he felt "more like a man, and have, I trust, a better appreciation of . . . the obligations and duties of one."¹⁸

In a sense, college represented life in a microcosm, thereby preparing students for their eventual social roles. Thomas W. Mason, a student at the University of North

¹⁶ E[dmund] Ruffin to Mother, 22 September 1828, and E[dmund] Ruffin to Father, 8 October [1828], in "School-Boy Letters of Edmund Ruffin, Jr.," ed., Kirkland Ruffin, *North Carolina Historical Review* vol. X, nos. 1-4, (January-October 1933): 291 and 293-6, respectively.

¹⁷ Mercer Diary, 10 March 1855, Box 1, Volume 2, Mercer Papers, SHC.

¹⁸ Mercer Diary, 15 August 1855, Box 1, Volume 2, Mercer Papers, SHC.

Carolina, offered the following observation: “The characters of the students at College correspond to the characters of those out in world. That at college, as out in world, there are the idle who have no energy, the fickle-minded and meddlesome who, for want of proper employment, are ever ready to jump into any kind of excitement, but best of all that there are those, ever ready to perform well the duties incumbent upon them. Thus may college in truth be called—a world in miniature.”¹⁹ Mason understood the importance of college’s preparatory role, and how men’s behavior reflected their evolving character. Concerned parents wanted their sons to realize personal potential, and not to succumb to vice or lethargy. As such, parents freely dispensed advice offering solace or counsel as the situation demanded. Ruffin Thomson suffered from the “blues” while attending college. His father, William H. Thomson, concerned about Ruffin’s well-being and future success, recommended that his son abstain from drink, tobacco, and coffee. Ruffin claimed abstinence, having consumed less than six cups of coffee since arriving in Chapel Hill. “I am strictly a temperate man,” he wrote, “except in eating night suppers which consist of partridges and oysters.”²⁰

Parents’ admonishments and sons’ claims of virtue did little to offset the potential for a young man’s dissolution at college. A common refrain heard across the nation were complaints of carousing, cheating, and corruption marred the character of many men.²¹ Mercer criticized what he claimed to be the ruin of many “promising young men”

¹⁹ “The Journal of a Day,” Class Composition of Thomas W. Mason, [1856], in *Documenting the American South*, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss05-09/mss05-09.html> [accessed 26 August 2010].

²⁰ Ruffin Thomson to Pa, [Feb. or March 1861], Box 1, Folder 3, Ruffin Thomson Papers, SHC.

²¹ See, for instance, Mercer Diary, 14 April 1855, Box 1, Volume 2, Mercer Papers, SHC.

at college.²² And perhaps, some students fell too far to ever climb back up to respectability. Indeed, as one young collegiate contended, “The dangers to which a young man is exposed during that part of his life which he passes in college, are numerous and difficult to oppose with a firm, unyielding spirit.”²³ Nevertheless, it would be more accurate to assert that most men, despite some slides and missteps, graduated from college and assumed respectable lives marking that epoch in men’s lives a period of learning and growth, experimentation and experience.

Progressive educators across the North and the South instilled students with a sense of judgment that allowed them to independently detect how natural and moral laws operated. These pedagogical practices had the unintended consequence of equipping youth with conceptual tools that challenged authority.²⁴ These factors, coupled with Southerners’ predilections for manly displays, could create explosive atmospheres on college campuses, North and South. Jeffrey A. Mullins documents numerous incidents of student violence at Northern colleges and academies (which included sizable numbers of southern students), while Lorri Glover finds similar displays of violence and unruly behavior at southern institutions.²⁵ Pride, independence, and manly power shaped students’ behavior—qualities embraced by the southern gentry.²⁶

²² Mercer Diary, 31 March 1855, Box 1, Volume 2, Mercer Papers, SHC.

²³ Bartholomew Fuller, “The Dangers of a College Life,” Class Composition, [1848], in *Documenting the American South*, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss04-19/mss04-19.html> [accessed, 27 August 2010].

²⁴ Mullins, “Honorable Violence,” 161-4 and Clay Cooper, “No Oath Registered in Heaven: Identity, Erudition, and Gender in the East Tennessee Secession Crisis,” Unpublished Master’s Paper, University of Florida, in author’s possession, 10-12.

²⁵ Mullins, “Honorable Violence,” Glover, ““Let Us Manufacture Men,”” 39-41, and Lorri Glover, *Southern Sons: Becoming Men in the New Nation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), 69, 77. See also, Kett, *Rites of Passage*.

²⁶ Cooper, “No Oath Registered in Heaven.”

As in today's campus culture, college students engaged in sexual experimentation, indulged in excessive drinking and spending, and questioned authority. Modern observers might mark such excesses as belying personal faults. For nineteenth-century Southerners, however, self-mastery signaled a man's total control over himself. Men's profligate lifestyle and unruly behavior only reinforced their elevation over slaves, women, and children, while promoting personal independence.²⁷ In its extreme form, shows of autonomy produced raucous displays. Across campuses, for instance, students played "rough music," meant to disturb townspeople and annoy unpopular faculty. These displays ranged from groups of drunken students making a commotion to organized, processional groups. In 1838, students at the University of North Carolina formed an organization, "The Ugly Club," which used horns, tin pans, and lusty lungs to disturb the peace. Rather than simply making noise, this ritualistic disorder expressed hostility toward an individual or group.²⁸ While white adults certainly engaged in charivari, rough music, and other forms of ritualistic disorder, students' often inchoate displays were a means to learn self-governance and also participate in, partially reinvent, long-standing cultural traditions. Testing authority and pushing boundaries marked their departure from youth and their journey into manhood. Moreover, such events allowed youth to experiment in forms of emotional release. Engaging in rough music or charivaris mixed joy with hostility, the restrained with the uncontrolled.²⁹

²⁷ Glover, "Let Us Manufacture Men," 29.

²⁸ For a broader discussion of unruly behavior, see E. P. Thompson, *Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture* (New York: The New Press, 1991), 468-91.

²⁹ Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 445-6.

Rough music and charivari are best deemed restrained violence or, displaced violence. Yet, control was not always practiced. Students battered doors, made explosives, carried knives and pistols, and smashed windows.³⁰ Riots and violent protest occurred with some frequency; events that should be understood separate from charivari in form but running parallel in purpose. Typically, these displays originated at a perceived slight, or were a gesture of defiance meant to establish or demonstrate independence. These episodes illustrate Southerners' quest for autonomy and self-mastery, though composed comportment among the student body remained paramount for a university's successful maintenance. Conflicts ensued among faculty, governing bodies, and students. Essentially, these disputes resulted in a contest of wills, with student expulsion being a typical outcome in particularly egregious violations (such as cases involving firearms and violence). A series of events at the University of Virginia between 1836 and 1840 represents the spectrum of potential behaviors.

The University of Virginia, from its founding, required that all students during hours of recreation should be taught the manual of arms, military evolutions and maneuvers, under a standing military organization commanded by officers. This order was modified to include volunteers only. A student military company had formed by 1830.³¹ The organization became a fixture at public celebrations, but its members often engaged in unruly behavior drawing faculty censure. In September 1836, the company

³⁰ See, for instance, Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia, 1819-1919: The Lengthened Shadow of One Man*, 5 vols., vol. II (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920), 266-71 and 291-2 and Kemp P. Battle, *History of the University of North Carolina*, 2 vols., vol. I (Raleigh, N.C.: Edwards & Broughton Print. Co., 1907), 452-4.

³¹ Thomas Jefferson to Peter Carr, 7 September 1814, in *Early History of the University of Virginia, as Contained in the Letters of Thomas Jefferson and Joseph C. Cabell*, ed., Nathaniel Francis Cabell (Richmond, VA: J. W. Randolph, 1856), 388. See also, Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia, 1819-1919*, vol. II, 116-23.

formed as usual, though intentionally neglected to receive the faculty's approval as done in past years. Upon questioning, the company's captain disavowed any knowledge of such requirements—a direct affront to the faculty's authority. Application was eventually made in October, and the faculty granted permission and renewed the traditional regulations that included no musket fire on the Lawn or in the Ranges; a uniform requirement; the handling of weapons during military exercises only; and the return of weapons to the Charlottesville armory. The company would be dissolved if these regulations were violated. In early November, the company informed the faculty chairman that they refused to accept the regulations. The company boldly claimed to exist as a state military body independent of the University.³²

The war of words soon escalated. The first incident involved a series of unlawful musket volleys over a two-hour period. The faculty then ruled that the entire company would be expelled for this act. The students met for Saturday drill, November 12th, and heard the faculty's pronouncement. Disorder followed. The Lawn echoed with shouts and stray gun shots. Crowds of students soon joined the company. One group marched to the Rotunda, raised the company's flag, which they then shot to shreds. By nightfall, groups of students had joined the company creating a cacophony of noise. Large crowds fired weapons, battered doors, and broke windows. Saturday's chaos spilled over into Sunday. The University's bell rung continuously, faculty and their families fled to the second stories of their homes, and students engaged in riotous behavior. On Tuesday morning, November 15th, two magistrates and a local sheriff were called to restore order. A grand jury convened on the 16th, and, three days later, handed out

³² Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia, 1819-1919*, vol. II, 302-4.

indictments. Muskets were handed in, the company disbanded, and responsible students dismissed.³³

Despite the tumult of the student military company's protest, they projected their venom on objects, not individuals. The men demonstrated a manly prowess to faculty and students alike, thereby accomplishing their goal of establishing independence.³⁴ But the incident's explosiveness, the students' destruction of property, and the defiance of University law resulted in severe and deserved censure. Nevertheless, in understanding the development of Southern men this episode is highly illuminating. In negotiating their transformation into men, Southern students made their claim upon their immediate world. In their demonstration of freedom from perceived subjection, the students desperately fought for their honor, dignity, and station. In doing so they communicated the importance of aggressive self-assertion through displays of violence if necessary, and their determination not to defer to a law they deemed unjust. This behavior translated to broader social values dearly held by the Southern gentry whose sons composed the majority of the University of Virginia's student body.

University students did not forget the short-lived rebellion. Each year on the anniversary of the November revolt, the military company's fearlessness and bravado were ritualistically evoked, reenacted, and memorialized. Young masked men engaged in disruptive behavior, parading around the campus and creating a ruckus. These groups seized temporary control of the University's formalized and processional landscape, the Lawn, inverting its form and function. Students released aggression,

³³ Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia, 1819-1919*, vol. II, 304-8.

³⁴ Thompson, *Customs in Common*, 478-91 and Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 437.

displayed manly prowess, and defused built-up tensions. Events culminated on November 12, 1840, however, with the murder of Professor James A. G. Davis.³⁵ That day, as usual, masked students remembered the rebellion through celebration and commotion. Davis, hearing great noise in front of his pavilion on the East Lawn, attempted to remove the mask from one of the young men. The man fired on and fatally wounded Davis. Joseph E. Semmes, a student from the Deep South, and William A. Kincaid of South Carolina, were held responsible.³⁶ The shooting, though an aberration, marked the events always high-pitched emotional fervor and potential for catastrophic conclusion.³⁷ Furthermore, the incident resulted in the adoption of an honor code. Designed to build trust among students and faculty and strengthen the University of the Virginia's sense of community, the "Code of Honor" reflected a vision of how southern men were suppose to act.³⁸ Young men's ruckus behavior and displays of violence were essential to their maturation but not always socially accepted. The honor code served to guide adolescents toward a more restrained masculinity.

The student body, in first rebelling and then remembering, announced their community's judgment against governing bodies.³⁹ They consciously mocked the authority of both the University and its faculty in an effort to assert what they deemed to be their own legitimate rights and power. In their failure and in Davis's murder, students

³⁵ Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia, 1819-1919*, vol. II, 302-9.

³⁶ Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia, 1819-1919*, vol. II, 309-11.

³⁷ As Joseph Kett remarks, faculty abuse itself was not unusual at the University of Virginia, or other campuses for that matter, though Davis's death was an aberration. Typically, faculty were accosted, mocked, even battered, but not shot at. Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 54.

³⁸ "The Code of Honor," University of Virginia, found at <http://www.virginia.edu/uvatours/shorthistory/code.html> [accessed 24 July 2011].

³⁹ Thompson, *Customs in Common*, 487.

learned boundaries, perhaps rethinking how better to control their feelings. These qualities, transcendent of pedagogical practices and course curriculum, were central to the college experience for Southerners and how they envisioned their future role and place in society. For on college lawns, in university classrooms, and among their peers, Southern whites, poised between childhood and manhood, were introduced to the qualities and characteristics of masculinity.

College life created distances between men fostering competitions and encouraging manly displays but also fostered feelings of kinship. College students joined secret societies, fraternities, literary clubs, and debating groups that promoted friendships and contests. Parents encouraged their sons to form bonds with other students but asked that they choose their friends wisely. Colleges were the testing ground for future leaders, and friendships formed could underpin later economic, social, and political relationships. In school, men built reputations, gained independence, and wielded power in an environment devoid of women and dependent upon enslaved labor.

On the Eve of Secession

In the summer of 1859, Virginian John W. Daniel delivered an address entitled “Oration on the Illustrious Dead” at Lynchburg College. Beneath the “time honored arches of Westminster abbey,” Daniel conjured an image of a fallen soldier “with his sword at this side, and his martial cloak around him.” This hero, down in “dark bosom of mother earth,” was not forgotten, for his country still “honors him as he honored her.” Statesmen, soldiers, and sages traveled to his mausoleum “to mingle their tears for his lamented genius, & departed worth.” Daniel evoked the fallen citizen soldier to stir his audience’s emotions and create a portrait in their minds. Though deceased, the soldier lived on, immortalized by his country and her citizenry. This powerful imagery

introduced and then underpinned the main thrust of Daniel's speech, which looked to the present. "The old ship of state is riding rudderless o'er the waves of oceans," he argued, "the waters of disunion are rolling around her, and in the dim distance, we behold a dark abyss yawning to close over her forever." Even in this dark hour, however, Daniel demanded that "the spirit which animated our Illustrious Dead should inspire us to action, each sail may again be spread, and a prosperous breeze may bear her o'er the bosom of the deeps."⁴⁰

Such romantic images of the illustrious war dead left white Southerners, paradoxically, prepared to mobilize in defense of home but wholly unprepared for the consequences, magnitude, and sheer terror of civil war. Daniel's speech neatly combined classical allusions with current political and sectional strife in his effort to propel young Southern men to action, even to arms. Himself still a young man, Daniel directed his words at the personality and psychology of his audience at Lynchburg College. Men who had structured lives of classroom recitation, intense study, and monotonous dormitory living were called to look beyond themselves to something bigger. Daniel's speech appealed to their feelings and their desire for immortality.

The themes of Daniel's speech—camaraderie, manliness, the citizen soldier, and emotional sensibility—defined the dreams of young men. Heightened sectional tensions swayed young men's minds. Peter Carmichael's thoughtful reading of Virginia's last generation of young slaveholders (many of whom attended the University of Virginia) cautions against a one-dimensional reading of Southern men as lazy, immoral, and

⁴⁰ John W. Daniel, "Oration on the Illustrious Dead," 28 June 1859, Box 13, Folder 1859, Speeches, Papers of John W. Daniel and the Daniel Family, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, VA; hereinafter UVA.

hotheaded. Carmichael instead calls for an understanding of men's emotional lives and gender identity within the context of the South's intellectual and religious life.⁴¹ Yet, becoming a man in college served as an important transitional phrase, a period in which young men could be hotheaded and thoughtful, lazy and diligent. Male college students often behaved with complete disregard for college faculty and officials.⁴² Pride, independence, and manliness guided students' behaviors and were emblematic of an idealized masculinity.⁴³

While the young wealthy scions attending college cannot stand as representative of the white South, they can illuminate a host of themes related to gender and emotions. In the final years of the antebellum era an emotional fervor gripped the United States, as young men were swept up by political strife and considered the prospects of war.⁴⁴ By 1860, college campuses were governed by eager adolescents swayed by raw emotions and eager for armed conflict. Riots and flagrant displays of impudence reflected students' increased militancy. Such behavior was certainly a continuance of the disorder witnessed throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, but heightened chaos also reflected sectional strife and increased passion. Furthermore, college

⁴¹ Peter S. Carmichael, *The Last Generation: Young Virginians in Peace, War, and Reunion* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 5-6.

⁴² Lorri Glover, *Southern Sons: Becoming Men in the New Nation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), 69, 77 and Clay Cooper, "No Oath Registered in Heaven: Identity, Erudition, and Gender in the East Tennessee Secession Crisis," Unpublished Master's Paper, University of Florida, in author's possession, 10-12.

⁴³ Cooper, "No Oath Registered in Heaven," 11; Glover, *Southern Sons*, 2-3, 81; and Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *The Shaping of Southern Culture: Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1890s* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), xi.

⁴⁴ On sectional tensions before the Civil War see especially, Elizabeth R. Varon, *Disunion!: The Coming of the American Civil War, 1789-1859* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 273-335 and Michael F. Holt, *The Fate of Their Country: Politicians, Slavery Extension, and the Coming of the Civil War* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2004), 109-27.

students rehearsed among their peers the larger political debates directing the nation's course. Eager to control their destinies, young Southern men bristled under overbearing peers or elders. Bertram Wyatt-Brown's reading of southern white adolescence posits the primacy of honor, shame, and guilt in guiding behavior. Young men wielded self-assertion like a cudgel to assert mastery over their social inferiors.⁴⁵ Men's temperament could be explosive as witnessed so famously and repeatedly in their adherence to the code duello. More recently, though, scholars have questioned the reliance on honor and mastery suggesting that this framework reinforces the nineteenth-century model of the planter-cavalier. Instead, a range of masculinities shaped and defined Southerners—what it took “to be a man” varied by time and place.⁴⁶ In examining white Southerners on the eve of secession a range of personalities emerge, guided by varied principles. Young men underwent personal changes that were part of the maturation process but also exhibited different public personas.

Paul B. Means, a graduate of the University of North Carolina, offered an address to the Dialectic Society expressing timeless sentiments. Means cast college as a transformative experience. “When the student enters upon his career here,” he spoke, “as when Eneas entered the temple at Carthage, ‘the cloud’ of parental affection,—which has shielded and protected him from the snares and vicissitudes of other storms—, is almost invariably dissipated by the fierce blasts of temptation. Here for the first time he feels that, in the frail barque of existence, he is sent forth upon the ocean of

⁴⁵ Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 161-74, especially.

⁴⁶ For excellent historical and historiographical discussions see, Friend and Glover, “Rethinking Southern Masculinity: An Introduction” in *Southern Masculinities* and LeeAnn Whites, *Gender Matters: Civil War, Reconstruction, and the Making of the New South* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 4-6.

life, and must 'paddle his own canoe' or sink beneath its boisterous waves."⁴⁷ Many young men would sink, falling into dissipation, whereas others would rise above youth's tempestuous storms.⁴⁸ For each camp the choice was theirs, each mistake and triumph of their own making. This process of maturation connected to southern manhood. The renowned journalist J. D. B. Debow considered the importance of education in an 1860 issue of his *Review* and elucidated its effect on men. Debow's concluded that education was "not mere getting lessons, but the bringing up a child from infancy to manhood." Manliness connected to emotional bearing. Schooling, Debow continued, taught men how to give proper vent to feelings.⁴⁹ As witnessed throughout the middle decades of the nineteenth century, then, Southern men learned from their families and were directed by their elders as to when and where they could show raw emotions, expose an unvarnished self. Their emerging character—forged through adherence to social dictates—constructed a clenched, closed version of southern manhood.

Wealthy men negotiated the process of maturation among their peers and within the confines of University life. In June 1857, the University of North Carolina's Dialectic Society—an organization started in the eighteenth century for the promotion and discussion of ideas—engaged in a debate on men of action versus men of thought. Replete with erudite references to classical and ancient civilizations, each student also recognized the great importance of the topic to their present-day lives. For debater Hugh Thomas Brown men were physically made for activity. He questioned: "For what

⁴⁷ Paul B. Means, "Inaugural Address of Paul B. Means for the Dialectic Society," 8 May 1868, found in *Documenting the American South*, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss06-19/mss06-19.html> [accessed 13 May 2011].

⁴⁸ Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 23-35.

⁴⁹ J. D. B. Debow, "Home Education and Schools," *Debow's Review* (Dec. 1860), vol. 29, issue 6, 717.

is his animal strength, his erect posture, his nervous system, his noble impulses, patriotic feelings, his commanding voice, noble mein? and why is he capable of so much physical endurance? and why does this splendid machinery grow weak, decay, and speedily end in dissolution, when not kept in vigorous exercise.”⁵⁰ The answer, of course, was that men were made for action. Such notions were not universally held, however. William M. Coleman, one of Brown’s counterparts in the Dialectic Society, praised humanity’s ability to reason and deliberate. “Mind,” he argued, “is the distinguishing feature of our race, its own earnest of immortality.”⁵¹ Yet, men such as Brown feared heavy deliberation and its deleterious effects. “Atheism, Skepticism and Infidelity,” would surely follow Brown wrote, when man turns from Nature’s beauty and truth.⁵²

In the University of North Carolina’s halls, men of thought would carry the day as their deeds were debated most successfully. Beyond the buildings of college life, however, Southerners had to be men of action and thought. Even the debaters themselves demonstrated that. Both Brown and Coleman graduated from North Carolina to become successful lawyers—they were men of calculation and deliberation. In 1861, however, both men were also compelled to action with military enlistment—Brown would be killed in 1861, while Coleman would survive the conflict and eventually

⁵⁰ Hugh T. Brown, "Have Men of Action Been More Beneficial to the World Than Men of Thought?" Debate Speech of Hugh T. Brown for the Dialectic Society, 2 June 1857, found in *Documenting the American South*, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss05-13/mss05-13.html> [accessed 1 October 2010].

⁵¹ William M. Coleman, "Have Men of Action Been More Beneficial to the World Than Men of Thought?" Debate Speech of Hugh T. Brown for the Dialectic Society, 2 June 1857, found in *Documenting the American South*, "<http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss05-16/mss05-16.html>" [accessed 8 May 2011].

⁵² Brown, "Have Men of Action Been More Beneficial to the World Than Men of Thought?", 2 June 1857, found in *Documenting the American South*, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss05-13/mss05-13.html> [accessed 1 October 2010].

become a professor of philosophy at Columbia University. For the white South's wealthy sons, thought and action were necessary parts of the ideal and vital to the successful navigation of the demands of their society, their family, and their personal destinies.

Debate societies fostered a homosocial environment where young men could advance knowledge and interrogate a variety of intellectual issues. Charles Wilson Harris, who helped established North Carolina's Dialectic Society in the eighteenth century, had as its aim "to cultivate a lasting Friendship with each other, and to Promote useful Knowledge."⁵³ Ultimately, the debate group gave many future leaders an early forum to rehearse their reactions to contemporary problems. Between 1850 and 1859, the Society considered, among other things, slavery, secession, westward expansion, party politics, and disunion—the debates in the halls of Congress were echoed in the Dialectic Hall.⁵⁴ As the Society's members looked abroad to a strained nation grappling

⁵³ Charles Wilson Harris quoted in Lindemann, "The Debating Societies," True and Candid Compositions: The Lives and Writings of Antebellum Students at the University of North Carolina, found in Documenting the American South, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/chapter/chp05-02/chp05-02.html> [accessed, 12 May 2011].

⁵⁴ Erika Lindemann, "The Debating Societies," True and Candid Compositions: The Lives and Writings of Antebellum Students at the University of North Carolina, found in Documenting the American South, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/chapter/chp05-02/chp05-02.html> [accessed, 12 May 2011]. A full list of topics: 1850 Should slavery as it now exists in our country be justly considered a reproach? (negative); 1850 Should the United States stop diplomatic correspondence with Austria? (negative); 1851 Were the wars of Napoleon Bonaparte beneficial to Europe? (negative); 1851 Has a state the right to secede? (negative); 1851 Was the Mexican war justifiable? (negative); 1852 Would it be expedient for the legislature of North Carolina to pass the Maine liquor law? (affirmative); 1852 Should the general government afford any assistance to the Colonization Society? (affirmative); 1853 Ought Judge Hall to have fined Gen. Jackson when New Orleans was under martial law? (negative); 1854 Are we progressing? (negative); 1854 Should any more foreigners be naturalized? (negative); 1854 Is extension of territory detrimental to the United States? (affirmative); 1854 Should Cuba be annexed to the United States? (affirmative); 1855 Is southern slavery justifiable? (affirmative); 1855 Does civilization increase happiness? (affirmative); 1856 Ought our government to favor the building of the Pacific Railroad? (negative); 1857 Should representatives be ruled by their constituents? (affirmative); 1857 Should the United States establish a national bank at the present financial crisis? (affirmative); 1858 Should the United States punish the Mormons as traitors? (affirmative); 1858 Should a college be located in a city or in the country? (decision not recorded); 1859 Ought the United States to extend her territory? (affirmative); 1859 Is the existence of two great political parties in the United States desirable? (affirmative); 1859 Ought the United States to aid in building a Pacific Railroad? (affirmative); 1859 Would disunion be profitable to the South? (negative).

with the threat of disunion they themselves experienced sectional discord. In one letter three representatives of the society opined: “the Dialectic Hall is composed of members from different sections of the country between whom the most violent enmity has sprung up which instead of subsiding has been steadily growing worse and worse for several years, until peaceable union is now no longer possible . . . We therefore respectfully submit to the Executive Committee, whether unceasing hostility and bitter hatred which defeat the most important end of a body constituted for mutual improvement, are preferable to peaceable separation.”⁵⁵ Their resolution reflected deliberation and forethought. But their inability to resolve matters within the membership illustrates powerful emotional sway and an unwillingness to compromise.

Whereas some young scions were drawn to the revered Dialectic Society, others found voice through unruly behavior. In the heady days of 1858, amidst the angry passion of political strife, a “lawless club” was formed. The University of North Carolina’s chronicler, Kemp Battle, wrote, “the minds of many were unsettled by the portentous rumblings of the coming war.” The club’s members formed a brotherhood that pledged to breach University rules and regulations. Members indulged in excessive drinking, filled the air with “direful uproars and furious din,” rung the University’s bell violently and continually, and destroyed property. When the faculty tried to restore order, stones were hurled at the men.⁵⁶ Tumultuous behavior, contests among men, and displays of bravado were part of southern college life and essential ingredients in

⁵⁵ Clement Dowd, William Bingham, and Stuart White, Letter from Dialectic Society Members to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, 18 April 1856, found in *Documenting the American South*, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/unc/unc06-128/unc06-128.html> [accessed, 12 May 2011].

⁵⁶ Kemp P. Battle, *History of the University of North Carolina*, 2 vols., vol I (Raleigh, N. C.: Edwards & Broughton Printing Company, 1907), 690-91.

making a man from an adolescent. The “lawless club” demonstrated fierce battles between youth and elders, but class rank also stratified student bodies. The University of North Carolina had a long tradition known as “Fresh Treat” in which first-year students paid for watermelons.⁵⁷ The assigned day created a festival like atmosphere and promoted contests and competition. In 1860, Ruffin Thomson described the day. They had contracted for about eight hundred melons costing nearly one hundred and forty dollars, money collected from the “Newies.” He described it as a “great festal day” in which the University body turned out, many receiving “numberless bruises & hurts, & c.”⁵⁸ “Fresh Treat,” like similar activities, promoted contests among men and reinforced social hierarchies. Vigorous displays of bravado ensured personal victory and reward.

Agitated spirits and demands for mastery animated students of the South Carolina College during the so-called “guard house riot.” A southern man was not controlled by anyone but himself.⁵⁹ Charles F. McCay was an inept administrator, thereby making his eighteen-month tenure as South Carolina College’s president a “tragedy” in the words of one observer.⁶⁰ An unanimous student resolution on 15 January 1856 asked former President Francis Lieber, whom McCay replaced, to withdraw his resignation and renew his presidency. Several days later students petitioned the board

⁵⁷ William Sidney Mullins to P. Henry Winston, 23 September 1840, found in *Documenting the American South*, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/unc/unc06-51/unc06-51.html> [accessed 30 September 2010] and James L. Dusenberry Diary, 7 August 1841, found in *Documenting the American South*, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/dusenberry/journal/#jld-p087> [accessed 30 September 2010].

⁵⁸ Ruffin Thomson to William H. Thomson, Box 1, Folder 3, 6 August 1860, Thomson Papers, SHC.

⁵⁹ Glover, ““Let Us Manufacture Men,”” 29.

⁶⁰ Daniel Walker Hollis, *University of South Carolina*, Volume I: South Carolina College (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1951), 194.

of trustees requesting McCay's dismissal.⁶¹ Words were bolstered by action. Students communicated their position through disorderly nightly displays that included the explosion of firecrackers and loud noise. McCay did little in retaliation. Events culminated in South Carolina College's worst display of student violence.

In early February, classes were suspended upon the death of Professor Robert Henry. Because of a delay in burial, classes were further postponed—a restless student body grew unruly. Conditions were ripe as an old dispute between college students and Columbia's town marshals (police force) erupted into a series of violent encounters between 17-18 February 1856. Events started as a group of intoxicated students passed by the city guard house. One of the students, Edward Niles, caught sight of an old nemesis, Marshal Burdell. The two exchanged heated words. Burdell's staff imprisoned Niles, while the remaining students fled to campus crying out, "College," as a signal to rally the student body. John C. McClenaghan and John Taylor Rhett, among the crowd of students now gathered at the jail, planned to attack Marshal Burdell with clubs. Blows were exchanged between Burdell and the young men. President McCay pleaded moderation without success. The town mayor summoned the militia as students began arming themselves with weapons from the cadet arsenal. Events culminated at the town's market house as the militia and the student body faced off. Some 200 armed citizens confronted more than 100 armed students. Former president Thornwell—a highly respected figure among the students—was called from the

⁶¹ Hollis, University of South Carolina, 196.

Seminary and quieted the students.⁶² Forty students were either expelled, suspended, or simply did not return to school once it reopened after the incident.

“The guard house riot,” writes the University’s chronicler, “was much more than the usual college upheaval resulting in a tin-pan serenade or intoxicated parade up the main street. Loss of life was barely avoided and the entire State was shocked.”⁶³ Newspaper editors looked not to the youth themselves for explanation but to southern leaders. “Disobedience, resistance to law, and to authority, has been so often inculcated by great men and editors, that it is not wonderful that boys should have regarded it as chivalric to be disobedient.”⁶⁴ The young men at South Carolina College, like those at other universities, were preparing to be state and regional leaders. The *Daily South Carolinian*’s provocative assertion suggests an interesting correlation between men’s immediate lives and projected futures. The newspaper’s editors were clearly dismayed by the students’ actions and elders’ poor example. But it can also be argued that these young men were simply fulfilling a prescribed social role. Compelled to reshape their local environment to better their lives, men’s actions commanded broader attention provoking both approbation and condemnation. Publicly self-confident and exuding bravado men ran toward energy and éclat.⁶⁵ While we can never be sure if the students’ actions had broader implication it is tempting to wonder: did the perceived infringement upon personal liberties implicitly mirror larger fears about northern aggression? Were the students acting out to publicly prove their worth as men?

⁶² On the events, see Hollis, *University of South Carolina*, 197-202.

⁶³ Hollis, *University of South Carolina*, 199.

⁶⁴ *Daily South Carolinian* quoted in Hollis, *University of South Carolina*, 205.

⁶⁵ Berry, *All That Makes A Man*, 35.

Conclusions

As masters of small worlds, southern youth took full advantage of their miniature stage. And this microcosm may be best understood as a glimpse into broader social tensions and modes of cultural expression. Young men's experiences at college had significant bearing on their personal development and future public lives. We may draw at least three conclusions from these men's actions and thoughts. First, college men (of similar age and background) often acted in concert. This is no small matter, for few venues in antebellum life—beyond irregular gatherings such as court day, militia musters, and church—offered a consistent and continual homosocial environment. Many of these same men, bound together by fraternities, societies, and dorm living, would be swept together by the tides of war. For instance, a group of Louisiana men, attending North Carolina's university, officially withdrew from school to return to their home state to muster for military service—they acted together in college as they would fight together in war.⁶⁶ Second, college life not only promoted intellectual competition and discourse but often provoked physical altercations and heated debates. If unwilling to bend before university administrators, how would these same men react to what many Southerners were calling a "tyrannical" federal government? Finally, a strong emotional current threads through students' actions. Men's experiences in college not only prepared them for their adult lives but also offered experiences that would influence their decisions during the secession crisis. In understanding these men, their experiences and their expectation, we must look also to their expression of feelings.

⁶⁶ Resolution, [January 1861], found at Doc South, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss06-05/mss06-05.html> [accessed 24 July 2011].

CHAPTER 4 INTO THE DARK FOREST OF DESPAIR

In the fall of 1863, Marion Hill Fitzpatrick wrote to his wife Amanda while encamped above Culpeper Court House, Virginia. Having been wounded at the Battle of Glendale in June 1862 and at Fredericksburg on 13 December 1862, Hill was now a hardened veteran but also physically impaired. On 20 October 1863, he and fellow members 45th Georgia Infantry had stopped for a rest after marching for almost a week and a half. A frustrated General Robert E. Lee had unsuccessfully pursued General George G. Meade's Army of the Potomac. Unable to attack, Lee instead conducted a series of tactical maneuvers. Men such as Hill Fitzpatrick were worn down by the marching, countermarching, and sudden commands to double quick (a fast-paced march similar to a trot). He proudly told Amanda, "I kept up pretty well but was tired enough to fall down and give up, but that would not do." At one point during a long march orders came down suddenly to form into line of battle. Shells fell down among the men for a period but the expected federal attack never came. The next morning, during a hard rain, the soldiers tore up and burned a railroad line. After the day's labor the regiment went into camp, when more rain began to fall. "We waded branches and mud holes," he wrote, until finally stopping and starting a fire to warm his drenched body. Hill's sufferings provoked him to conclude: "My poor pen fails to give even a faint description of the sufferings of the soldier. I will leave it for future historians to tell, but never will justice be done the subject."¹

¹ M. Hill Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 20 October 1863, in *Letters to Amanda: The Civil War Letters of Marion Hill Fitzpatrick, Army of Northern Virginia*, ed., Jeffrey C. Lowe and Sam Hodges (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998), 94.

Hill Fitzpatrick's experiences were neither unusual nor was his reaction atypical. Instead, he represented one among tens of thousands of white Southerners engaged in a prolonged and bloody contest that would determine their personal fate and that of the Confederate nation. The physical and psychological trials he endured, the destruction he both witnessed and created, and the isolation he felt were emblematic of the soldier's plight. War reshaped Southerners in its unforgiving image, casting a long shadow over southern culture. Between 1861 and 1865, these men and their families would be tried in a thousand ways. Steadfastness, manliness, and fierce independence were ideal characteristics of a man and a soldier. Some would meet these lofty standards, while still others would be pushed beyond their endurance. Those who adhered to cultural ideals and performed well in battle were initiated into an extended warrior fraternity that altered men's perceptions of and interactions with others on whom they came to depend so deeply.

Yet the long gray lines of hardened veterans seared into the American psyche hardly resemble the volunteers who marched off to service in 1861. Rather, southern civilians became Confederate soldiers. The eager and independent green recruits of 1861, desperate for a fight, would become obedient veterans, acting when ordered. As one veteran later recounted: "These men, in 1861, would have clamored for immediate attack as the only hope of accomplishing anything, and had their commander insisted, in such a case, upon obeying without him. In 1864, having become soldiers, they obeyed orders even at cost of failure. They had reduced themselves to the ranks—that was all."² Both personal and private forces drove this process, thereby vastly

² Eggleston, *A Rebel's Recollection*, 82.

complicating a neat narrative offered in hindsight. Indeed, as Edward Ayers astutely observes, twentieth-century audiences “understand the plot lines of war, dramatized every day on sports fields and in action films: good causes and bad, cowardice and bravery, sacrifice and glory, winners and losers, sudden victories and unexpected reverses.”³ But such understanding obscures more than it reveals. This chapter returns back to the contentious and uncertain days of 1860 and then moves forward into the years of civil war to recapture Southerners’ lived experiences. Five interlocked sections compose the chapter’s content and mark off, in a sense, the different phases, which transformed the antebellum civilian into the eager secessionist, the raw recruit into a military soldier, and the Confederate soldier into a hardened veteran. Yet these broad transitions are discussed only through the words and experiences of a fairly narrow section of men who composed the Confederate armies. Members of the officer class, slaveholders and their sons, underpin much of the discussion that follows because of the frequency and depth of their correspondence. Moreover, how they perceived and encountered war links intimately with the models of behavior exhibited in the previous two chapters because of connections across class.

In these processes men confronted each other and their families on unfamiliar ground. Antebellum men who thrived on personal independence had to succumb to military command structures; families that normally guarded their public interactions disclosed themselves in the exigencies of war; hot-headed men prone to fight with each other had to eat with, sleep near, and depend upon one another while serving in the

³ Edward L. Ayers, “Worrying about the Civil War,” in *Moral Problems in American Life: New Perspectives on Cultural History*, ed., Karen Halttunen and Lewis Perry (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1998), 157.

ranks. Each of these trials and thousands of others caused pause, which bore new models of manhood and emotional expression.

Leaving for War

On 23 May 1861, William J. Clarke prepared to march off for war. The date proved fitting. “This day fourteen years ago,” he wrote his wife Mary, “I parted from you to march for Mexico; today I probably leave for North Carolina to report to the Gov’r of North Carolina for duty.”⁴ Rather than a summer soldier, William knew all too well what to expect. “It *may* be that before another moon has ‘waxed and waned’ I shall see and hear ‘the shout, the shock and the groan of war.’” But he little feared the realities of combat, for the same “Almighty hand that covered my head in battle heretofore has lost none of its power, and his mercy is as great now as it was then.”⁵ Trusting in the spiritual, he turned instead to the worldly. Clarke’s vision of the war strongly reflected his role as a man within society and among family. “I pray for strength that I may do my duty under all circumstances, and ‘quit’ myself as becomes the husband of a heroic woman, who would rather wear weeds for a brave man than smile welcome to a craven and a coward, who loitered at home, in inglorious safety, while his brethen and countrymen were in the tented field. If I leave no other heritage to our noble boys this at least they shall have a name unsullied by cowardice, unblackened by treachery!”⁶ Clarke’s words, overladen by bravado, suggest a model of manhood that shaped Southerners’ expectations and perceptions. Southern independence would require submission to military service. Confederate soldiers exemplified everything that made a

⁴ William J. Clarke to Mary Bayard Clarke, 23 May 1861, in *Live Your Own Life*, 73.

⁵ William J. Clarke to Mary Bayard Clarke, 23 May 1861, in *Live Your Own Life*, 74.

⁶ William J. Clarke to Mary Bayard Clarke, 23 May 1861, in *Live Your Own Life*, 74.

man sacrificing self for family, home, and country. The revelation of fears was unbecoming and men were expected to embody the masculine ideal as they marched off to war in their military attire.

Clarke's prognosis for a prolonged war, grounded in his experiences during the Mexican-American War, set him apart from other Confederates. From Virginia to South Carolina to Louisiana and beyond, Southern whites prepared themselves for war but expected only a quick struggle, reflected in their short terms of enlistment. Men were swept up by the excitement of enlistment and the possibilities for glory. Clarke himself would go on to do his duty and receive military promotions. Even though Clarke acquitted himself well as a soldier, the conflict changed him and his relationship to his family forever. Men's encounter with war produced psychological transformations.⁷ The grim realities that dawned on many as the war entered its second year, were far from Southerners' minds in the South's halls and homes in the final days of the antebellum era, however.

As recent scholarship has demonstrated, public and personal obligations propelled men to join the army. Nina Silber summarizes: "Soldiers may have spoken of their private responsibilities to home and family as a way to show their investment in a nation-state, a state that, in turn, protected their homes and made possible their private pursuit of happiness."⁸ This powerful argument goes a long way in explaining the mass

⁷ Reid Mitchell, *Civil War Soldiers: Their Expectations and Their Experiences* (New York and London: Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1998), 56.

⁸ Nina Silber, *Gender & the Sectional Conflict* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 3. See also, Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender*, 15-40; Aaron Sheehan-Dean, *Why Confederates Fought: Family & Nation in Civil War Virginia* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 13-37. For broader treatments of why men fought, see especially James M. McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades: Why Men Fought in the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997);

mobilization of so many white Southern men. Moreover, entwining the public with the personal advances an understanding for the mixed emotions and sentiments expressed on the eve of civil war. As soldiers embarked for the front and an unknown future, they and their families were filled with anxiety, excitement, and sadness. A narrative emphasizing only soldiers' eagerness for conflict misses a rich opportunity to explore the more intimate and varied experiences of Southern whites.

Great excitement gripped the South as men prepared for battle, but departures from family and home also provoked profound feelings of loss. No moment better captures this mixture than the soldier's sendoff. An observer in Fayetteville, North Carolina, captured the moment before departure in compelling terms. "Ah—how mournfully it sounded—I never saw such a shaking of hands—so many goodbyes & God bless you's to be said—at last they were 'all aboard!'" The account continued describing "a touching scene" as "tears streamed from the eyes of men and soldiers as well as from women and children as they waved their last adieus . . . Isn't it sad to think how many such partings are taking place all over our land."⁹ Such personal openness and emotional transparency had few parallels in an often closed antebellum southern culture. But the mobilization of men and the sundering of families did not allow for prolonged deliberation or reservation. Instead, the emergency of the moment commanded expressive outpourings, at least of a particular sort. Newly minted soldiers and their families realized that these fleeting moments might be their last earthly moments together and many looked toward a heavenly afterlife.

Reid Mitchell, *Civil War Soldiers: Their Expectations and Experiences* (New York: Touchstone, 1998) and *The Vacant Chair: The Northern Soldier Leaves Home* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

⁹ Louis to Mame, 2 May 1861, Lenoir Family Papers, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/imls/lenoir/lenoir.html> [accessed 28 July 2011].

Antebellum Southerners had developed strong emotional bonds with their families.¹⁰ These connections first spurred secession and then maintained the struggle. Men such as William J. Clarke fashioned themselves as protectors of home. In 1860 and 1861, these abstractions were made tangible as uniformed legions left their homes and communities in often elaborate departure ceremonies. The martial masculinity demanded in war was constructed from personal dreams, familial relationships, and state demands.

Men's perceptions and feelings on the eve of war varied as wildly as their expectations and experiences. For the youthful, especially, military life provided a source (at least initially) of constant excitement and an arena to prove their worth as men.¹¹ Ruffin Thomson was typical of many young enlistments. Although a solid student and a member of the Dialectic Society at the University of North Carolina, Ruffin was a restless young man. He had spent one year at the University of Mississippi before being expelled for repeatedly carrying a pistol and then discharging the weapon from a dorm room window.¹² Ruffin left North Carolina in 1861 to enlist in the Confederate army. He found service to be exhilarating and a far cry from stuffy recitation halls. Writing to his father in June from Manassas Junction, Virginia, Ruffin compared his new situation to the one he had just left. "[I]t is not like being at College," he wrote, "for the stir of camp

¹⁰ Sheehan-Dean, *Why Confederates Fought*, 27.

¹¹ Berry, *All That Makes A Man*, 166-68.

¹² J. M. Phipps [Corres. Sec.] to Sir [W. H. Thomson], 25 March 1859, Box 1, Folder 2, Thomson Papers, SHC.

life & the excitement of being so near the enemy fills up all that time which at College is so very tedious.”¹³ Ruffin was part of a wave of students leaving North Carolina.¹⁴

Young Southerners perceived the war’s transformative potential—the moment when they could make their mark. Secession, like college and hunting, offered young men passage into manhood and for older men bolstered reputation.¹⁵ Henry Brown Richardson was by no means a typical Confederate recruit—he was a native of Maine—but his journey to war echoes throughout the South. Richardson had spent much his young adulthood traveling. Henry sent his parents numerous letters detailing his life. Irreverent and playful, introspective and meditative, the correspondence between Henry and his parents richly details the young man’s transition into manhood during a period of growing sectional tension. Looking toward the future, Henry lightheartedly asked his parents how it would please them to have another daughter, “not by in the course of Nature, but in the Law?” If they had no particular objections, “and if the [sectional] ‘crisis’ blows over I think I shall find somebody with whom to ‘divide my sorrows and double my joys.’”¹⁶ By 1860, Henry was living in Tensas Parish, Louisiana. The move to southern latitudes proved startling. “I say after much consideration and research,” he wrote, “I am convinced that Adam when driven out of Paradise was sent to Tensas Parish, Louisiana.” In brief, he continued, it was hot, and he sweated “so fearfully that I fear my skin may yet become a mear network, and that I shall perspire some of my vital organ

¹³ Ruffin Thomson to “Pa,” 30 June 1861, Box 1, Folder 4, SHC.

¹⁴ J. M. Gaines to Ruff, 6 May 1861, Box 1, Folder 3, Thomson Papers, SHC.

¹⁵ Berry, *All That Makes A Man*, 168.

¹⁶ Henry B. Richardson to parents, 1 November 1857, Box 1, Folder 5, Henry Brown Richardson and Family Papers, Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Collections, Special Collections, Hill Memorial Library, Louisiana State University Libraries, Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University; hereinafter LSU.

through the enlarged meshes.”¹⁷ Yet, despite Louisiana’s thick, hot air, Henry found a new home in Tensas Parish.

The tides of war quickly engulfed the Maine native. Disdainful of Lincoln and the Republican party, he sided with his new southern brethren.¹⁸ Though claiming to not be brave, Henry welcomed war. He had “nothing to loose and all the world before me to gain; and when I had conquered my physical fears I doubt not I could fight like a tiger. In view of these circumstances (and a unanimous election by its members) I have joined the Tensas Cavalry.”¹⁹ Henry recognized the war as a test of his manhood. The trials of combat would try his mettle and tame his fears. Ensnared among the community’s young men, Henry bolstered his standing. Henry also reflected on how his allegiance to the Confederacy marked his maturity and loyalty. Years later he reflected on the war’s beginning. “I felt I did then, and am certain I do now, that if I owed allegiance to any government (as I doubtless did) it was to that of the State of Louisiana, and that is far from being a matter of wonder or sorrow that I should have offered my feeble arms in defense of that state, it was not only natural, but a thing that I, and all who have any interest and sympathy for me, ought to be glad—even proud of.”²⁰

Henry’s decision to fight for the Confederacy and his loyalty to Louisiana vexed his parents. In the ensuing years, Henry fought against the Union as he waged a paper battle with his parents. He called the Confederacy “the only object on earth (excepting

¹⁷ Henry B. Richardson to parents, 5 June 1860, Box 1, Folder 7, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU.

¹⁸ Henry to parents, 26 Sept 1860 and Henry to parents, 6 April 1861, Box 1, Folder 7, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU.

¹⁹ Henry to parents, 6 April 1861, Box 1, Folder 7, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU.

²⁰ Henry to parents, 8 March 1865, Box 1, Folder 8, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU.

yourselves) for which I care . . . an object to whose defence I am . . . bound, alike by my convictions of its justness, my solemn oath, and what I believe to be the best, and most honorable instincts of my nature.”²¹ Loyalty to state and local government, fidelity to comrades, and youthful enthusiasm contributed to an unwavering faith to the Confederacy. Moreover, military service marked a crucial part of southern manhood during the wartime era. For the slaveholders and their sons reared on works like *Ivanhoe* and its chivalric mythology, the business of war seemed hardly more than an adventure. And, indeed, remarked one observer, “it was only after a year or more of active service in the field that they began to suspect what the real work and the real character of the modern soldier is.”²² Thus, the volunteers of 1861 were diving into unknown waters. Military service would eventually force psychological and emotional transformations recasting these men and their self-identities.²³ But in the early days of the conflict Southern men remained tightly tethered to the civilian world. Confederate volunteers saw war as their chance to become men and fulfill the masculine, martial roles assigned to them, and embodied by them. The brief emotional disclosures, glimpsed at railroad depots, front gates, and home parlors demonstrate the beginnings of a broader transformation experienced between men and women. Yet, before such changes were fully realized, Southern civilians still had to become Confederate soldiers.

²¹ Henry to parents, 27 August 1863, Box 1, Folder 7, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU.

²² George Cary Eggleston, *A Rebel's Recollections* (1874; Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959), 70.

²³ Mitchell, *Civil War Soldiers*, 56-7.

Uniforming an Army

Historian Bell Wiley memorably wrote that the “Confederate private envisioned by Richmond authorities in 1861 was a nattily dressed person.”²⁴ Each year the Confederacy’s *Army Regulations* prescribed the same idealized uniform to be worn by men serving in southern forces. Commissioned officers were expected to wear a frock coat of gray fabric with a skirt extending halfway between the hip and the knee. The double-breasted coat included specific buttons, button arrangements, and insignia to designate men of different ranks. Enlisted men, too, sported a long double-breasted frock coat of gray cloth. Trousers were sky blue, with the headpiece was modeled after the style of the French kepi.²⁵ The Confederate government constructed an elaborate vision of uniformity which encompassed how its enlisted men and their officers should appear in field and in battle. Uniforms suggested expertise, courage, and obedience.²⁶ Expectations, though, rarely reflected reality. Despite the Confederate government’s unaltered prescriptions each year, there was considerable discrepancy between the clothing designated and the garment actually worn.²⁷ Initially the Confederate government could not marshal the resources to outfit the vast numbers of mobilized men. And then later, design could not meet demand. Thus emerged a motley assortment of uniform types and materials that little resembled the standards established in the *Army Regulations*.

²⁴ Bell I. Wiley, *The Life of Johnny Reb* (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1943), 108.

²⁵ Wiley, *The Life of Johnny Reb*, 108 and *Confederate Army Regulations*, 188-90.

²⁶ Paul Fussell, *Uniforms: Why We Are What We Wear* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2002), 3-4.

²⁷ Wiley, *The Life of Johnny Reb*, 108.

How, then, are we to understand government projections and uniform reception? How does clothing inform our understanding of white Southerners? First, a soldier's outward appearance most explicitly marked his station, thereby separating him from civilian populations. Military uniforms—like all dress—elicited aesthetic and emotional responses from observers. For much of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century, clothing defined social status and life station; the cloth used for the construction of a garment readily distinguished an enslaved African American from a white planter.²⁸ Uniforms alerted audiences to the wearer's pursuits and, ideally, accentuated his masculinity and bellicosity.²⁹ Second and paradoxically, although the soldier's outward appearance separated him from the civilian world, in the war's early years especially, cloth and clothing sent from home connected military men to their families. Enslaved laborers of the rich transported a variety of items back and forth throughout the campaign season and during prolonged encampments, while men of more modest means employed struggling wives to weave cloth and sew garments. Ultimately, a man's cloth and clothing spoke a great deal about the Confederacy's tumultuous beginnings and how a civilian became a soldier.

Military service drew together men from every state of the Confederacy and beyond. For the average soldier, the armies being assembled in 1861 were nearly inconceivable in scope and scale, thereby making the experience incomparable. Even veterans of the Mexican-American War had never served in an army larger than 10,000

²⁸ Mary Ellen Roach and Joanne B. Eicher, *The Visible Self* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1973); Linda R. Baumgarten, "Leather Stockings and Hunting Shirts," in *American Material Culture: The Shape of the Field*, ed., Ann Smart Martin and J. Ritchie Garrison (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997), 252-4; Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia*, 43-4.

²⁹ Fussell, *Uniforms*, 11.

men.³⁰ Summer soldiers and old veterans alike were swept up by the excitement. West Point graduate and Chief of Confederate Ordnance Josiah Gorgas described 1861 as the “most eventful period” in his life, with days feeling like weeks.³¹ Another graduate of the United States Military Academy, Edward Porter Alexander, captured a scene in Richmond during the early months of excitement: “troops from all over the South were arriving every day & resigned Southern officers out of the old army were coming in from every territory, & camps of instruction were formed near the city where raw troops were drilled, loose companies organised into regts. & regiments into brigades, field & staff officers were appointed & assigned, arms & equipments were issued, & as fast as any body was organised & equipped it was sent forward to one of the above named points.”³² The hustle and bustle of men, the issuing of arms and equipment, and the organizing of companies into regiments tangibly portrayed the project of Confederate nationalism, and served to instill pride and esprit de corps in Southern whites.

For raw recruits, soldiering at first did not come easily. While many sons of the South had militia experience, musters, parades, and tactical demonstrations hardly prepared them for prolonged campaigns and military combat. Virginia-native Carlton McCarthy dedicated an entire chapter in his postwar memoir to the “little things which made the Confederate soldier peculiarly what he was”—chiefly the evolution of military dress, an adjustment to the hardships of campaigning, and an understanding of what was and was not necessary to perform the tasks of a soldier. The volunteers of 1861,

³⁰ Joseph T. Glatthaar, *General Lee's Army: From Victory to Collapse* (2008; repr., New York and London: Free Press, 2009), 66.

³¹ Gorgas, 12 June 1862, in *The Journal of Josiah Gorgas*, 41.

³² Alexander, in *Fighting for the Confederacy*, 37.

he wrote in only partially exaggerated tone, sported heavy boots, wore large, bulky double-breasted coats, carried pistols and knives, wore large, heavy knapsacks, and lugged around an almost endless assortment of other items. "All seemed to think it was impossible to have on too many or too heavy clothes, or to have too many conveniences, and each had an idea that to be a good soldier he must be provided against every possible emergency."³³ The summertime soldier's cumbersome items and unwieldy appearance reflected his unrealistic expectations for a short war. Over time, long marches and experiences in the field produced a more streamlined appearance.

As soldiers grappled with unfamiliar equipment and uniform parts, the Confederate government struggled to supply the armies. Provisions were quickly established to mobilize civilian populations on the armies' behalf. According to Confederate records, volunteers were to furnish their own clothes. These men would then be compensated for their expenses by the government.³⁴ This became known as the Commutation System, and \$25 was allotted for six months time. This system was established so that the government did not have to build elaborate facilities for the production of cloth and clothing in case of a short war. Moreover, the civilian population had already sent most of its men off to war in the spring and summer of 1861 in garments stitched at home.³⁵ The Commutation System itself ended officially 8 October 1862, and most soldiers in the main armies were regularly receiving government

³³ Carlton McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia, 1861-1865*, introduction by Brian S. Wills (1882; repr., Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), quotes on 16 and 17, respectively.

³⁴ O.R., IV, I, "AN ACT to provide for the public defense," 6 March 1861, 126.

³⁵ Leslie D. Jensen, "A Survey of Confederate Central Government Quartermaster Issue Jackets," Part I, *The Military Collector & Historian* (Fall/Winter, 1989), online edition without pagination, <http://www.military-historians.org/company/journal/confederate/confederate-1.htm> [accessed, 5 March 2011].

clothing by 1863.³⁶ Yet, networks between the home front and the front of war continued well past the system's short-lived history.

The sustained influx of items manufactured at home and the varieties therein gave Confederate armies a specific appearance and character. George Cary Eggleston remembered later that the lack of an efficient quartermaster system initially left it up to the "undisciplined mob of plucky gentlemen" to prosecute the war as best they could, "trusting to luck for clothing and even for food."³⁷ While certainly an exaggeration, Eggleston isolates the civilian features of early Confederate armies. Such connections home were augmented by Southern women's invaluable services to support the "cause." Material contributions, in particular, greatly bolstered the mobilization effort.³⁸ Female members of the Lenoir family and other women from their North Carolina community busied themselves sewing during the war's first years especially. Julia Lenoir, in writing to her grandmother, described the scope of their work. They had been working hard throughout the fall of 1861 surpassing their requests and asking for more. By November, members of the family were knitting socks and gloves, sewing overcoats for the upcoming winter as well as "jean shirts" to ensure the men's warmth. Beyond those items sent for military service, women also began the home production of cloth. In the same letter Julia described some "very pretty homespun" woven that fall, though it was, in her words, "the most uncommon looking I ever saw."³⁹ This homespun

³⁶ Jensen, "A Survey of Confederate Central Government Quartermaster Issue Jackets," Part I.

³⁷ Eggleston, *A Rebel's Recollection*, 75.

³⁸ On the perceptions and realities of confederate women's efforts see, Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*, 53-64.

³⁹ Julia to Grandma, 4 November 1861, Lenoir Family Papers, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/imls/lenoir/lenoir.html> [28 July 2011].

revolution received the praise of civilians and soldiers alike. In 1863, Hill Fitzpatrick congratulated his wife's weaving efforts, though as Drew Faust notes, many men had considerable reservations about the potential decline in women's health and status when engaged in such work.⁴⁰ Furthermore, as Faust contends, postwar accounts heralding women's home production exaggerated the extent of their activities. Instead, she writes, "Southern households did not become factories; women were more likely to sacrifice, to live with deprivation and shortage, and to hope for a swift end to the war."⁴¹ Piecemeal efforts and improvisations demonstrated women's resolve but also the extent of their deprivations.

The transfer of parcels and handwritten requests for specific items formed the threads of correspondence and exchange that wove together otherwise separated families. Hill and Amanda Fitzpatrick maintained an unusually extensive record of clothing requests and sewing accomplishments. What stands out especially in this correspondence is the importance of these material items as symbols of affection and remembrance. In one letter Hill described his wife as "a true and heroic Southern woman," for her sewing efforts on his behalf. He continued, "I shall appreciate them the more when I get them because you worked and made them for me, but really I did not intend to burden you with that task, but you say and I know it is so that it is a pleasure to you to fix my clothes for me."⁴² Clothing's symbolic meaning was never so apparent as when an expected garment did not arrive. Dick and Tally Simpson came from a

⁴⁰ Hill Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 15 September 1863, in *Letters to Amanda: The Civil War Letters of Marion Hill Fitzpatrick, Army of Northern Virginia*, ed., Jeffrey C. Lowe and Sam Hodges (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998), 87 and Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 46-7.

⁴¹ Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 51.

⁴² M. Hill Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 10 September 1863, in *Letters to Amanda*, 85

prominent, well-heeled South Carolina family. When Dick returned from home “with not one single article of clothing,” he expressed great dismay. In an admonishing letter to his sister, Tally wrote, “All the others of the company have received what they wanted as far as I know, such as woolen socks, scarfs, under shirts, woolen shirts, drawers, &cc, but what have we got from home? I leave the question for home folks to answer.”⁴³ For those without the same means as the Simpson family, absent clothing reflected material want. Over time Hill Fitzpatrick recognized his family’s strained resources and tried to minimize his requests; furthermore, by 1863 he and other soldiers were drawing almost extensively from the government.

Soldiers fussed over details, sometimes writing out elaborate instructions for their garments based on extensive wear and field experience. These small details, however trivial, reflect the growing knowledge of a Southerner immersed in the soldier’s world. The experience of James A. Graham was typical. In one letter he described his shirts as fitting very well and requested specific dimensions for future shirts detailing collar depth and wristband width. In another letter James asked for another pair of pants to be cut by “Carmichael” according to a series of previously determined measurements.⁴⁴ To have clothing preferences was (and still is) by no means unusual. But in these particular circumstances a soldier’s instructions reflected broader changes as civilians became seasoned veterans adept at outdoor living and functioning like a military man.

As the government’s production increased soldiers became more disconnected from the civilian world, at least materially. Fitzpatrick became quite adept at patching his

⁴³ TNS to Mary Simpson, [1 November 1861], in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 84.

⁴⁴ James A. Graham to Mother, 8 May 1861 and James A. Graham to Mother, 16 July 1862, in *The James A. Graham Papers, 1861-1884*, ed. H. M. Wagstaff, The James Sprunt Historical Studies (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1928), 104 and 125.

garments, modifying his clothing, and even sewing for fellow soldiers.⁴⁵ Before the war he knew little about such “women’s work” and perhaps thought even less about the time and skills involved in the construction or modification of garments. Now, forced to take up the needle for repairs and other work, Hill approvingly wrote to his wife, “Many a soldier can now realize the value of woman’s work that thought but little or nothing about it before the war commenced.”⁴⁶ Necessity, then, awakened men’s recognition of what women had been doing so well for so many years. The crisis of war disrupted gender relations forcing men into roles traditionally reserved for women and vice versa.

Soldier’s forays into the realm of domesticity reflected broader material changes. Reduced to the minimum, the summertime soldier became a seasoned veteran. A soft felt hat replaced the cap, the double-breasted coat was exchanged for a short jacket, knapsacks were discarded for blanket-rolls, and unnecessary items were discarded. Though stripped of the superfluous details found in the war’s early months, the soldier’s uniform continued to instill pride and distinction. Cut differently than civilian garb, a military uniform projected a man’s investment in the Confederacy—and became, in a sense, an essential part of the man’s military career. The Confederate soldier, after some time in the field, consisted of “one man, one hat, one jacket, one shirt, one pair of pants, one pair of drawers, one pair of shoes, and one pair of socks.”⁴⁷ A hardened Hill Fitzpatrick related to his wife Amanda, “I tell you the less a soldier is burdened with the

⁴⁵ See, M. H. Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 5 March 1863, 8 March 1863, 27 September 1863, 24 February 1864, and 10 April 1864 in *Letters to Amanda*, 56, 57, 91, 120, and 134 respectively.

⁴⁶ M. H. Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 17 April 1863, in *Letters to Amanda*, 62.

⁴⁷ McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia*, 26. Clothing reveals much about social values, individual/group psychologies, and cultural aesthetics. What people wear and how they wear it carries messages and meanings. On the broader significance of costuming, see Baumgarten, “Leather Stockings and Hunting Shirts,” in *American Material Culture: The Shape of the Field*, 251-5.

better he can get along.”⁴⁸ Additional equipment and clothes offered luxury but were not necessary for a soldier’s survival or comfort. Once men consciously realized this they further left the civilian world. North Carolinian James Graham told his mother about his experience in battle, which taught him to never “carry anything more with me than I absolutely need and can carry on my back in case of necessity.” He continued, quite tellingly, “It will not do to try to play soldier and gentleman at the same time. In order to be a soldier you must take it rough.”⁴⁹

And, indeed, many soldiers did “take it rough.” The demands of the campaign season, inadequate supplies, and the monotony of war and military maneuvers, took dramatic physical tolls. Hill Fitzpatrick—like many men—often suffered from inadequate footwear. Though his battered feet had mended in one letter, his shoes were nearly worn out. “I would wear out any thing,” he wrote, “the way we had to march and the kind of roads we had to go over. A great many are entirely barefooted.”⁵⁰ Tally Simpson, too, complained of being poorly shod. “My boots are giving way, and there are no prospects for another pair.”⁵¹ Such trials tested men. Putting on a brave face to his wife, Hill noted that it was “useless for a man to say what he can stand and what he cannot stand until he tries and I find as much depends upon the energy and spirits of a man, as his strength.”⁵² For men such as Hill Fitzpatrick, these experiences were transformative.

⁴⁸ M. H. Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 10 September 1863, in *Letters to Amanda*, 85. See also, Linderman, *Embattled Courage*, 183-4.

⁴⁹ James A. Graham to Mother, 19 March 1862, in *The James A. Graham Papers*, 119.

⁵⁰ M. Hill Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 4 December 1862, in *Letters to Amanda*, 33.

⁵¹ TNS to Mary Simpson, 24 April 1862, in *Far, far from home*, 117.

⁵² M. Hill Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 5 December 1862, in *Letters to Amanda*, 35.

Writing to his wife Amanda, he stated, “I have learned to stand up for my rights since I joined the army without regard to any man’s feelings when necessary.”⁵³

As the war progressed and families’ supplies dwindled, Confederate soldiers relied almost entirely upon the government for clothing and comfort. Museum professional Les Jensen, through examination of extant clothing and extensive research, questions the image of the “ragged rebel.” Jensen locates this mythology among postwar apologists. He instead finds men well supplied, suffering only from the rigors of the campaign.⁵⁴ Indeed, W. W. Blackford’s postwar account notes: “In books written since the war it seems to be considered the thing to represent the Confederate soldier as in a chronic state of starvation and nakedness. During the last year of the war this was partially true, but previous to that time it was not any more than falls to the lot of all soldiers in an active campaign.”⁵⁵ As one observer described the Confederate armies at Gettysburg: “The soldiers of this division are a remarkably fine body of men, and look quite seasoned and ready for any work. Their clothing is serviceable, so also are their boots; but there is the usual utter absence of uniformity as to color and shape of their garments and hats: gray of all shades, and brown clothing, with felt hats, predominate.”⁵⁶

By mid-war, then, Confederate soldiers wore serviceable but varied uniforms, which created a motley appearance. Army regulations remained a far cry from reality

⁵³ M. Hill Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 20 June 1862, in *Letters to Amanda*, 16.

⁵⁴ Jensen, “A Survey of Confederate Central Government Quartermaster Issue Jackets,” Part I, online edition without pagination, <http://www.military-historians.org/company/journal/confederate/confederate-1.htm> [accessed, 6 May 2011].

⁵⁵ W. W. Blackford, *War Years with Jeb Stuart* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1945), 99.

⁵⁶ *Two Witnesses at Gettysburg: The Personal Accounts of Whitelaw Reid and A. J. L. Fremantle*, ed. Gary W. Gallagher (St. James, NY: Brandywine Press, 1994), 88-9.

and while soldiers still instilled pride among the southern people, they did not resemble the tidy, uniformed ranks of their federal counterparts. Hard marches and the rigors of outdoor living reduced the men and their uniforms. In a letter to his sister, Dick Simpson related, "Dirt is all the go, in fact we live in dirt."⁵⁷ Similarly, Hill Fitzpatrick told Amanda, "I am having my undershirt washed today for the first time in five weeks, only dabbled out in cold water and no soap once."⁵⁸ James Graham described himself in one letter as being "dirty as a hog."⁵⁹ Large swarms of men in close and constant proximity to one another bred disease and spread vermin. Soldiers' clothes during prolonged campaigns could be covered with lice making life unbearable.⁶⁰

When soldiers reentered the civilian world their appearance sometimes created embarrassment. While on picket duty in Virginia Dick Simpson overheard a piano playing. He left his comrade at the post and visited the house requesting a performance by the owner's daughter. "I went into the parlor and here she came. I pulled off my hat and made a bow, but forgot that I had not combed my hair that day, also that I was in my shirt sleeves and my breeches were worn out behind." Both he and she were embarrassed and the situation became awkward.⁶¹ Dick's personal embarrassment was rooted in material conditions. But the episode itself is illustrative of the broader separation, even estrangement, which sometimes arose between soldiers and society.⁶²

⁵⁷ RWS to Anna Tallulah Simpson, 13 June [1861], in *Far, far from home*, 13.

⁵⁸ M. Hill Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 1 August 1862, in *Letters to Amanda*, 21.

⁵⁹ James A. Graham to Mother, 15 March 1862, in *The James A. Graham Papers*, 118.

⁶⁰ William A. Fletcher, *Rebel Private: Front and Rear, Memoirs of a Confederate Soldier* (New York: Dutton Book, 1995), 19-20.

⁶¹ RWS to Caroline Virginia Taliaferro Miller, 12 August 1861, in *Far, far from home*, 56.

⁶² On this broader process see, Linderman, *Embattled Courage*, Chapter 11.

Soldiers are most recognizably defined by their uniforms. The overburdened Southern combatants marching off to war in garments from home would barely resemble the stripped-down, government-clad veteran of 1863. Changing uniforms and shifting expectations composed a central part of Southern men's broader transformation from civilian to soldier. The matériel of war served as an outward sign and signal of this process. Uniforms even delineated a shape—athletic, tightly focused, and obedient—that reflected the ideal of a combatant.⁶³ The Confederacy's material culture, thus, not only reflected the war's progression but also men's changing stations.

Camp and Field

Years after the Civil War's close Confederate artilleryman Carlton McCarthy fondly recalled "the cheerful, happy scenes of the camp-fire."⁶⁴ His nostalgic remembrance did not include the monotony, dangers, and privations of camp but did contain a core truth about the bonds formed among men. Soldiers formed bonds as intimate and as familiar as family.⁶⁵ Much of the Confederate soldier's wartime emotional community was formed and then fostered among his fellow soldiers in camp and field. Such affinity was partly a natural extension of prewar friendship and kinship networks. Men from the same communities who rallied to the Confederate cause together experienced life in Confederate armies.⁶⁶ The months and years spent soldiering forged these connections

⁶³ Fussell, *Uniforms*, 14.

⁶⁴ McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia*, 194.

⁶⁵ Reid Mitchell, *Civil War Soldiers: Their Expectations and Their Experiences* (New York and London: Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1988), 17. On male intimacy among youth, see E. Anthony Rotundo, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* (New York: BasicBooks, 1993), 75-91.

⁶⁶ Moreover, the volunteers of 1861 who would one-day compose the ranks of the Army of Northern Virginia shared demographic characteristics. As Joseph T. Glatthaar demonstrates in his exhaustive and compelling study of General Lee's Army, twenty-five was the average age for volunteers in 1861 and

into indissoluble bonds. The feelings soldiers shared and expressed among each other were part of their struggle to understand and define the realities of military service, its dangers and their distances from home. Revealing these emotions and uncovering these bonds exposes Southern white men's fundamental beliefs and values.⁶⁷ While at times, as Stephen Berry argues, soldiers "kept each other at a distance," many Confederates would come to see each other as brothers with whom they endured one of the greatest trials of their lives.⁶⁸ Soldiers came to depend upon each other for their comfort, for their safety, and for their very survival. Home and family remained paramount in soldiers' minds and hearts, but these same men came to see the military camp as their substitute home and their immediate comrades as a substitute family.⁶⁹

The transition into military life was anything but easy, however. Most recruits had been born and raised in the same state; many continued to live and work in a very circumscribed geographic area.⁷⁰ The sights, smells, and sounds of military camps (which were essentially small cities with all the accompanying benefits and troubles) proved disconcerting to the neophyte.⁷¹ John Dooley related the unfamiliarity of his first night in camp: "I felt strange enough, I assure you, lying down this my first night in camp. The strange faces and forms, the near and distant sounds of an army of men

almost three of every four were single. Glatthaar, *General Lee's Army*, 18, see also 17-28. See also, Linderman, *Embattled Courage*, 26-7.

⁶⁷ On method, Freeman, *Affairs of Honor*, 289-93.

⁶⁸ Berry, *All That Makes a Man*, 181.

⁶⁹ Mitchell, *The Vacant Chair*, 158-9, McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades*, 77-89, and Sheehan-Dean, *Why Confederates Fought*, 58-60.

⁷⁰ According to Joseph T. Glatthaar, eighty percent of the men who entered service in 1861 and ultimately served in the Army of Northern Virginia were born and lived in the same state. Many of these men lived in the same community, an area of no more than a twenty mile radius. Glatthaar, *General Lee's Army*, 36.

⁷¹ Glatthaar, *General Lee's Army*, 66-77.

talking, shouting, singing, and all upon different subjects.”⁷² Excitement and confusion commingled for new recruits in the early days of military service. Raw recruits had to learn quickly the military routine and succumb to discipline. Although possessing a deep sense of duty, Southerners’ sense of honor insisted upon self-determination, individual liberty, and manliness. Surrendering oneself to the army created turmoil.⁷³ One soldier, in the first year of the conflict, described the tension between individualistic men and army discipline. He told his sister that some of the “men go to the City and get drunk and come back and when the officers go to take them to the gard house they will curse them and then they get bucked and a bayonet tied in their mouth and stay double the length of time.”⁷⁴ Antebellum southern society rewarded men’s independence, which contributed to aggressive, self-interested behavior. Military service demanded subordination and the sacrifice of self for the collective. Men resisted this process certainly but also came to recognize, even embrace, its benefits.

In creating soldiers the army had to first control men, their actions and their reactions. No small part of this transformation involved how men revealed and released personal emotions, especially in combat situations. A unit’s fighting effectiveness—and very survival—could be decided by whether or not fear governed soldiers’ actions. Fear, anxiety, and apprehension were natural reactions to the experience of combat.⁷⁵ Such feelings could never be wholly alleviated but taming their effects was crucial. Encamped soldiers drilled daily, formed for parades, inspections, and roll calls, and spent

⁷² John Dooley *Confederate Soldier*, ed. Durkin, 5.

⁷³ Glatthaar, *General Lee’s Army*, 34-5 and 42, 50-2.

⁷⁴ John Forman to “sister,” 20 December 1861, Box 1, Folder 2a, Robert A. Newell Papers, LSU.

⁷⁵ Linderman and Dean, and McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades*, 30-45.

considerable time on guard or picket duty. By stripping away the volunteer's individualism and governing his life by routine and limitations, the military instilled discipline and created unit cohesion while never completely stifling individualism and self-esteem.⁷⁶ The repetition of drill and the creation of unit identity aimed at regimenting soldiers' behavior while under fire. Responses were to be automatic and soldiers had to maintain composure. Effective fighters could not surrender themselves to feelings of nervousness and the impulse to run and hide. The forging process could be tiresome, however. An exasperated Tally Simpson wrote: "Drill, drill, drill; work, work, work; and guard, guard, guard. Eat, e-a-t. Alas!"⁷⁷ Similarly, John Dooley recognized drill, inspection, and military review as "very necessary and exceedingly useful," but "a *great bore*."⁷⁸

On one level, military life created barriers between men by stifling their models of expression, at least while under the watchful eye of commanders. A military company's behavior had to be regimented, uniform. But on a broader level the experiences that could be so dehumanizing also forced men to see each other's humanity. Consistently performing the same tasks, the same maneuvers, forged disparate groups into a single whole. The sight of long gray lines acting in concert was inspiring and signaled the Confederacy's hopes. One observer, upon visiting a regimental camp, commented, "It looked like war itself to see one thousand soldiers walk out in the field, formed in battle

⁷⁶ As Joseph Glatthaar writes: "The drill and discipline pulled units together. It hardened them for the battlefield experience and it created an élan within companies, regiments, and even brigades. Soldiers, who already identified with their companies from recruitment on the local level, began to see themselves as a group . . . For all to achieve, each individual component must succeed, and each person must rely on everyone else to perform effectively." Glatthaar, *General Lee's Army*, quote on 51, see also 76. See also, McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades*, 46-61.

⁷⁷ TNS to Mary Simpson, 18 June 1862, in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 129.

⁷⁸ John Dooley, in *John Dooley Confederate Soldier*, ed. Durkin, 59-60.

array seeing the southern flag waving over our new country against the northing armies, and the drums . . . beating that warlike march which braved them on to battle.”⁷⁹ The military demanded collaboration among men, and an individual’s identity became tied to his company letter and regimental designation. These outward markers instilled personal pride and upon successful performance in battle earned public approbation.

Repetitive drill and the manual of arms ensured a regiment’s performance in battle, but men anchored each other during the trials of war. The private’s immediate sphere consisted of his messmates—a squad of four to eight men with whom he cooked, ate, slept, lived, breathed, and fought. The mess forged comradeship, a rapport among men which combat cemented.⁸⁰ Squads composed a company, and ten companies—one-hundred men each—formed a regiment.⁸¹ South Carolinian Tally Simpson, who himself was surrounded by friends and family during early service, suggested to his sister Anna that a soldier’s happiness largely depended upon the composition of his company. Disease, furloughs, casualties, and the vicissitudes of war changed ideal arrangements over time, however. Tally himself lost many of his comrades because of external circumstances, which promoted hardships and dilemmas. As he considered the prospect for reenlistment in the winter of 1862, Tally feared the reorganization of his regiment and the accompanying loss of familiar faces—such fears were rightly founded and many men declined to reenlist. By that fall the loss

⁷⁹ Preston H. Sessoms to Penelope E. White, 27 September 1861, found in *Documenting the American South*, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss06-09/mss06-09.html> [accessed, 8 March 2011].

⁸⁰ Linderman, *Embattled Courage*, 235.

⁸¹ W. J. Hardee, *Rifle and Light Infantry Tactics; for the Exercise and Manoeuvres of Troops When Acting as Light Infantry or Riflemen* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1861), 5-6; *Regulations for the Army of the Confederate States, 1863* (Richmond: J. W. Randolph, 121 Main St., 1863), 17; and “Army Organization in the Civil War,” Gettysburg National Military Park, <http://www.nps.gov/archive/gett/getttour/armorg.htm> [accessed 26 December 2010].

of his original mess saddened Tally greatly.⁸² Soldiers became deeply devoted to their company and the men therein. As James A. Graham contemplated his future assignment—he was away from his company serving as an adjutant—he told his father, “I would rather be with my old company than any company I know of; for it is the best drilled company I ever saw and one of the best companies I ever saw in every particular.”⁸³ After returning from a prolonged illness an elated Hill Fitzpatrick told his wife that his “heart throbs” by the prospect of rejoining his comrades in arms.⁸⁴ Such reactions suggest the broader emotional bonds formed among Confederate soldiers. These men realized quickly that the war would be anything but short and their comfort and safety demanded mutual dependence.

The homosocial world of the military camp and the ersatz family of the regimental company could never replace home and family. But soldiers with protracted service experienced a complex change in attitude in how they related to toward family, community, and other soldiers. As Gerald Linderman posits, by the Civil War’s later phases soldiers became convinced, quite accurately, “that those at home did not understand the experience through which they were passing, and they resented, with less justification, that civilian incomprehension.”⁸⁵ Tally Simpson, for instance, complained of a leaking tent, wet bed clothes, and drenched shoes in a letter home. In fact, he continued, “everything around us is wet.” Seeking sympathy, Tally questioned:

⁸² TNS to Anna Tallulah Simpson, 15 January 1862 and 27 July 1862; TNS to Mary Simpson, 12 October 1862, in *Far, far from home*, 105, 139 and 153, respectively. See also, McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life*, 38.

⁸³ James A. Graham to Father, 7 March 1862, in *The James A. Graham Papers*, 116.

⁸⁴ M. H. Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 5 January 1863, in *Letters to Amanda*, 49.

⁸⁵ Linderman, *Embattled Courage*, 216.

“Now if you can imagine how disagreeable such a state of affairs is, do so. If you cannot, I CAN.”⁸⁶ Tally’s letter of course implied his family’s incomprehension of his situation—only other soldiers could truly empathize with his plight. Soldiers suffered from privation and were exposed to severe dangers while in camp. Henry Brown Richardson remarked to his parents that after enlistment in the spring of 1861, he and his regiment were sent outside the city of New Orleans where they “drank bad water and fought mosquitoes.” In an 1865 letter written after four years of hard service and a stint in a military prison, Henry still considered the year camping near New Orleans “the hardest service” he had seen.⁸⁷

Messmates endured the hardships of outdoor living, which required sharing and encouraged intimacy. Soldiers’ relationships were greatly strengthened by physical contact.⁸⁸ Inadequate clothing, meager blankets, and exposure drew men together at night, especially during the cold months even when encamped in winter quarters (men typically constructed small huts complete with fireplaces during winter encampments). Modern sensibilities eroticize bed-sharing, however, nineteenth-century men commonly bedded together out of necessity and for comfort.⁸⁹ Dick Simpson, for instance, related without embarrassment to his cousin Caroline his sleeping arrangements: “We suffered

⁸⁶ TNS to Mary Simpson, 1 August 1861, in *Far, far from home*, 38.

⁸⁷ Henry Brown Richardson to parents, 8 March 1865, Box 1, Folder 8, Henry Brown Richardson and Family Papers, LSU. On the dangers of camp life, Glatthaar, *General Lee’s Army*, 67-77.

⁸⁸ An excellent discussion of this process among men from another army is found in Brian Joseph Martin, *Napoleonic Friendship: Military Fraternity, Intimacy & Sexuality in Nineteenth-century France* (Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 2011), 75-9, especially.

⁸⁹ Jonathan Ned Katz, *Love Stories: Sex between Men before Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 6. As Katz also relates, the nineteenth-century sleeping habits between some men developed into more, intimate sexual relationships. It is difficult to document such encounters among Civil War soldiers, though the possibilities are extremely intriguing.

very much with cold, but by crowding together and keeping close we managed to keep tolerable warm.”⁹⁰ Similarly, James A. Graham related to his mother that, after arriving at Fort Macon, North Carolina, he slept with Tom Whitted.⁹¹ Shared bedding ensured warmth. John Dooley explained the arrangement fully and its accompanying benefits and pitfalls. He and his comrades had but four blankets among them. So, he explained, “we must manage economically. The way we adopt is for all three to sleep together, lying on one blanket and covering with the other three.” If each man slept in the same position, the arrangement was ideal. But if someone moved the blankets shifted and one man would go uncovered. Thus, the men positioned themselves together closely, each lying in the same direction. When someone required a “change of base” he announced his intention and the men shifted accordingly.⁹² Night after night, throughout Confederate camps, small groups of men arranged their bedding, pooled their resources, and huddled for warmth.

Soldiers’ intimate contact and coordinated behavior promoted deep, cherished bonds thus forging strong emotional connections between men. In a moving letter to the parents of deceased Confederate James Hay Knighton, who died of disease (a very common occurrence in camps), John Doyle described the terms of their friendship: “A long period as a messmate afforded me ample means to know him as he was.”⁹³ Doyle’s

⁹⁰ RWS to Caroline Virginia Taliaferro Miller, 17 August 1861, in *Far, far from home*, 61. See also, RWS to Caroline Virginia Taliaferro Miller, 3 February 1862, in *Far, far from home*, 108-9.

⁹¹ James A. Graham to Mother, 22 April 1861, in *The James A. Graham Papers*, 103.

⁹² Dooley, in *John Dooley Confederate Soldier*, 70-1. See also, RWS to Caroline Virginia Taliaferro Miller, 17 August 1861, in *Far, far from home*, 61. See also, RWS to Caroline Virginia Taliaferro Miller, 3 February 1862, in *Far, far from home*, 108-9.

⁹³ J. M. Doyle to Dear Sir [Josiah Knighton], 24 May 1862, Box 1, Folder 3, Josiah Knighton and Family Papers, LSU.

words indicated an intimacy acquired through their companionship as messmates. Long hours spent by the fireside fostered deep, personal knowledge revealing a more authentic, inner-self otherwise missed by others. Moreover, as Carlton McCarthy fondly, if somewhat nostalgically, related, “In winter quarters every man had his ‘chum’ or bunk-mate, with whom he slept, walked, talked, and divided hardship or comfort as they came along; and the affectionate regard of each for the other was often beautiful to see.”⁹⁴

McCarthy’s description of these “chums” suggests a partnership not dissimilar to marriage between man and wife. Here, then, were circumstances induced by wartime hardships that altered the shape of an otherwise commonplace nineteenth-century occurrence (that is, occasional bed-sharing among men or the sharing of resources) to advance friendships and deepen relationships. As Herman Melville wrote, “there is no place like a bed for confidential disclosures between friends.”⁹⁵ Thus messmates and winter quarter “chums,” as Carlton McCarthy related and as we shall see in later chapters of this work, formed unions that remained unbroken, in many cases for decades.⁹⁶

Confederates’ tight-knit communities starkly reflected racial hierarchies. Entrenched racism and white Southerners’ sensibilities excluded enslaved African Americans from sleeping arrangements despite blacks’ intimate and continual service. John Dooley related that Ned, their “servant,” “lies out side the shelter, and wrapped in his blanket rolls close to the fire, with his feet in the ashes and often missing but by little

⁹⁴ McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life*, 89.

⁹⁵ Herman Melville, *Moby Dick*, ed. Tony Tanner (1851; repr., Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 54.

⁹⁶ McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life*, 89.

of burning his toes.”⁹⁷ Military service coupled with whiteness forged the bonds of brotherhood among Southern men; moreover, they together waged a war of independence to continue enslaving others. Race afforded privilege in the South and Confederate soldiers derived power and self-identity through the dominance of African Americans. Whites violently resisted black equality and consciously reconstructed social hierarchies in their camps to ensure their own superiority.⁹⁸

Social divisions, too, arose in camp. Contrasting views on religion, temperance, and vice created tensions within camps as large groups of men, bounded by confined areas, had to interact with each other daily. An otherwise cheerful and social Tally Simpson eschewed his comrades one fall afternoon feeling isolated and dispirited. “The soldiers are grouped around laughing and conversing gaily,” Tally wrote, “some eating, others cooking, and many otherwise occupied. I however am differently inclined this afternoon and feel a short confab with the darling ones at home sweet home will afford me ten thousand times more pleasure than the participation in any little scenes enacted in camp.”⁹⁹ Tally’s words reveal a fundamental truth about soldiering: even men’s cherished friendships could not substitute for home fully. A letter from a soldier’s mother, sister, father, or wife could instantly transport him back to hearth and home. Family profoundly shaped how soldiers’ perceived and experienced the Civil War.¹⁰⁰ Settled camps and strong communication lines allowed families to exchange regular

⁹⁷ Dooley, in John Dooley *Confederate Soldier*, 72.

⁹⁸ Fredrickson, *Racism*, 81.

⁹⁹ TNS to Anna Tallulah Simpson, 24 September 1862, in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 146.

¹⁰⁰ McClurken, *Take Care of the Living*, 20-1 and 34-40, and Sheehan-Dean, *Why Confederates Fought*, 103-5. See also, Reid Mitchell, *The Vacant Chair: The Northern Soldiers Leaves Home* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

correspondence. The importance of a letter from home cannot be overestimated. “A soldiers’ life to all appearances is one of idleness,” Tally wrote. “But there is a moment in his life which is transcendently sweet, rendered still sweeter the more seldom it appears, and that is the moment he is made the recipient of a precious letter from home.”¹⁰¹ Exultations quickly became condemnations when mail was not seen. During a particularly long spell of silence (not attributable to inconsistency mail service in this instance) Tally lashed out at the “Home Folks,” “Are you getting tired of writing, is paper getting scarce and dear, or are you all getting too lazy to postpone doing nothing to write me a few lines saying that all are well and expressing some affection for your absent boy and buddie?”¹⁰² Letters certainly relieved the monotony of camp life and kept families connected but also ensured that soldiers were not forgotten while away at the front. Moreover, communication with home remained an essential component of soldiers’ extended, emotional lives. A letter from home boosted morale and generated great happiness, whereas silence soured even the brightest countenance.

Families provided soldiers a bulwark against the trials of war and the results of military service. In their letters home, men described battles and soldier life, they spoke of their trials and their personal changes.¹⁰³ They discussed, in other words, a world in motion. Their correspondence home searched for consistency and familiarity. Soldiers drew comfort from domestic scenes around table and hearth, and hoped, ultimately, that

¹⁰¹ TNS to Mary Simpson, 2 December 1862, in *Far, far from home*, 160.

¹⁰² TNS to “Home Folks,” 15 January 1863, in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 171.

¹⁰³ See especially TNS to Caroline Virginia Taliaferro Miller, 14 July 1862 and TNS to Mary Simpson, 2 December 1862, in *Far, far from home*, 135-6 and 163-4, respectively.

their place would remain unfilled.¹⁰⁴ Soldiers expressed their fears obliquely. For instance, remarks about changed appearances was one manifestation of inner worries. Hill Fitzpatrick told his wife: “I doubt whether you would know me or not hardly if you were to see me now,” while Tally Simpson wagered his sister that she would not recognize him at ten steps. “I am very ugly,” he said, “my beard is shaggy, teeth black, clothes dirty and worn, finger nails long and black, nose little inclined to drip.”¹⁰⁵ The words of Tally and Hill, probably more hyperbole than reality, suggest that soldiering had transformed these men in fundamental ways that proved disconcerting.

Holidays seemed especially trying for soldiers. An imprisoned John Dooley mournfully wrote his family on Christmas Day: “Dismal Christmas! Alas, it is all the more gloomy because we can’t help thinking of the loved ones at home, and the brighter the outer world, the denser grow our prison shadows.”¹⁰⁶ Tally Simpson wished his folks well during the yuletide hoping that they were enjoying merriment.¹⁰⁷ He and several friends, making the best of their otherwise bad situation, continued holiday traditions. The men prepared a big eggnog, and Tally promised that the first cup would be raised to his sister’s health and happiness. The next morning he awoke full of eggnog but without a “big head,” presumably meaning a hangover.¹⁰⁸ James Graham, too,

¹⁰⁴ Glatthaar, *General Lee’s Army*, 292-95.

¹⁰⁵ See, respectively, M. H. Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 1 August 1862, in *Letters to Amanda*, ed., Lowe and Hodges, 21 and TNS to Sister, 2 December 1862, in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 163.

¹⁰⁶ *John Dooley Confederate Soldier*, ed. Durkin, 153.

¹⁰⁷ TNS to Anna Tallulah Simpson, 21 December 1861, in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 102.

¹⁰⁸ TNS to Anna Tallulah Simpson, 20 December 1861 and 21 December 1861, in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 101-2.

described a “splendid dinner Christmas day” replete with eggnog on Christmas Eve in a letter home on the thirty-first of December 1863. The following year James requested a box in preparation for the holidays to include no less than “a turkey, some chickens, butter, vegetables, sorghum, apples, a big cake, some ‘slapjacks’, a pound or two sugar, a few eggs, and two or three bottles of bandy, as I want to have a regular good time Christmas.”¹⁰⁹ Such elaboration celebrations were not necessarily common, however, as both the Graham and Simpson families had considerable wealth and were slaveholders. One soldier writing in early January 1863 noted that the holidays came and passed quickly, bringing little merriment.¹¹⁰

As the conflict progressed and the pace of campaigning quickened, distance from home and the war’s relentlessness drove men to desperation. By 1863 and 1864, otherwise stout men crumbled under the war’s continuous pressures and demands. Many intimate discussions with comrades exposed feelings and fears, but only conversations with the home folks survive. Brig. Gen. Thomas Lafayette Rosser wrote forlornly to his wife: “Oh! my darling how I suffer in your absence--sometimes I think that if the war does not soon end, that I will leave this country in order that I may enjoy undisturbed your society.”¹¹¹ Such sentiments are especially pointed coming from a high-ranking Confederate officer who, at the war’s close, was among the diehard rebels

¹⁰⁹ James A. Graham to Mother, 31 December 1863, James A. Graham to Mother, 3 December 1864, and James A. Graham to Mother, 30 December 1864 in *The James A. Graham Papers, 1861-1884*, 175, 200, and 204 respectively.

¹¹⁰ Letter from TIVOLI, 9 January 1863, in *Writing & Fighting from the Army of Northern Virginia*, ed., William B. Styple (Kearny, NJ: Belle Grove Publishing Co., 2003), 180.

¹¹¹ Thomas Lafayette Rosser to Wife, 7 July 1863, Box 1, Folder 1860-1873, Thomas Lafayette Rosser Papers, UVA.

who tried to prolong the conflict.¹¹² Rosser tried to close the distance between battlefield and homefront in his letters as he struggled to improve himself as a man and as a spouse. “I am just learning my duty to my dear wife,” he wrote, “and my darling you must not entertain any fears concerning my behavior in your absence. As God lives my dear Wife I promise most solemnly that I will not drink again.”¹¹³ Rosser desperately sought to reshape himself since marriage, and hoped his love would overcome the temptations of camp. Rosser recognized the razor’s edge of soldiering. By enlisting in Confederate armies, soldiers abstractly protected hearth and home; but by serving in Confederate armies families were left without the protection men typically afforded. A scared Sarah C. Goodwyn related to her husband Artemus, for instance, that she felt “unprotected” without him around.¹¹⁴ Women were certainly not helpless and more than met the trials of war, but the disruption of the traditional antebellum family unit offered unforeseen hardships for men and women.

Despite distances between the homefront and battlefield, letters back and forth created important arteries of communication and support. Soldiers worried about their families and families expressed concern for their soldiers. Emotions changed, gender relations shifted. South Carolinian James Sloan worried about his duties to his family and the maintenance of his farm. Like Thomas Rosser or the Goodwyn family witnessed above, Sloan’s vision of soldiering was deeply invested in home and southern ideals of

¹¹² On his efforts to continue the war, see Thos. L. Rosser, Lieut. Gen’l Comd’g, Head Quarters Army N. VA, 12 April 1865 and Thos. L. Rosser, Lieut General, Head Quarters A. N. Va., 28 April 1865, General Orders, No. 4, Box 2, [Wartime] Scrapbook, Thomas Lafayette Rosser Papers, UVA.

¹¹³ Thomas Lafayette Rosser to Wife, 7 July 1863 and 24 December 1863, respectively, Folder 1860-1873, Box 1, Rosser Papers, UVA.

¹¹⁴ S. C. Goodwyn to dearest Husband, 23 Dec 1864, Box 1, Folder 2, Artemus Darby Goodwyn Papers, USC.

manhood. In one letter to his wife Sloan offered to risk everything: "I dont see how I can stay in the servis and you have evey thing to do for you are not able to do every thing that is to do there, for it will take a man person with you to take care of & keep the place up and it would not do to get strangers, write to me if you are willing for me to leave the company."¹¹⁵ Subsequent letters show the balance Sloan was able to strike: continued service with significant stints home for farming.¹¹⁶ Hill Fitzpatrick, like many of Lee's men, infrequently went home because of the difficulty in getting furloughs. Hill sympathized with his wife Amanda, her trials and her difficulties, and wrote constantly about his desire to come home. In one letter, though, he offered a realistic assessment of how farmwork would have to be continued. "Pitch in like a man an attend to it, and everything of that sort. You must be the man and woman both now you know, and get corn to keep your other hogs from Ma, so you can maybe have enough of your own hogs next winter to do you."¹¹⁷ Military service forced resolve but demanded flexibility. Southerners endured innumerable hardships in camp and at home. Men responded to each other in ways that promoted intimacy and mutual dependence. They assumed new roles, as did their families, which altered prescribed gender roles with women performing the tasks of men and men conducting work reserved for women.

Soldiers' experiences in camp, letters to and from home, and the bonds forged among men, create a complex portrait of Confederate's gender identity and emotional lives. Rather than adhering to a rigid type of masculinity, Southerners came to embrace

¹¹⁵ J. F. Sloan to "Dear wife," 22 June [1862], Box 1, Folder 20, James F. Sloan Papers, USC.

¹¹⁶ See for instance, B. H. Wright, "To all whom it may Concern," [furlough], 8 November 1863 and Joel Ballenger, [furlough notice], 6 August 1864, Box 1, Folder 23, Sloan Papers, USC.

¹¹⁷ M. H. Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 16 December 1863, in *Letters to Amanda*, ed., Lowe and Hodges, 104.

a more flexible, pliable model of manhood.¹¹⁸ War demanded the rethinking of old assumptions and creative responses to new situations. Older ideals, emphasizing discipline, duty, and moral purity, were combined with current norms demanding aggressiveness, violence, and bravado to create new modes of manhood forged by war. Military service also recast mindsets and emotional sensibilities. In the “land of danger, far, far from home,” in the pointed words of Dick Simpson, Confederates came to rely upon each for physical comfort, protection, and psychic ease.¹¹⁹ Long fireside chats, shared rations, and communal living bound men together for the conflict’s duration and promoted, after the conflict, friendships lasting decades. That said, soldiers were not only responding to the necessities of their immediate realities but also waging a conflict to preserve racial slavery.

Field of Battle

At the beginning of 1863, Robert Wallace Shand took stock. He offered his musings in a small diary, a present from his friend John R. Osment, who had taken it during the Battle of Fredericksburg and still included the former owner’s name—an artilleryman from Pennsylvania. Shand soon expected peace, but he was sorrowfully reminded of the “precious souls” now gone. The men he knew “in childhood & in youth, at school & at college,” had “shed their life blood in the field of battle—let this but remind me of the uncertainty of human life.”¹²⁰ Civil War combat altered the expectations,

¹¹⁸ Several recent scholars have developed complex portraits of southern masculinity. See in particular, Carmichael, *The Last Generation*; Berry, *All That Makes A Man*; Sheehan-Dean, *Why Confederates Fought*; and McClurken, *To Take Care of the Living*.

¹¹⁹ RWS to Caroline Virginia Taliaferro Miller, 4 July 1861, in *Far, far from home*, ed. Everson and Simpson, 24-5.

¹²⁰ Robert Wallace Shand Diary, 1 January 1863, Robert Wallace Shand Papers, USC.

outlooks, and dispositions of Confederate soldiers such as Robert Shand. On the battlefield, life became random, fleeting, and unpredictable. Shand's dreams of a Confederate victory would never come.

As Robert Shand deliberated in his diary on New Year's Day, 1863, he realized all too clearly that that year might be his last. The American Civil War heightened, if not awakened, Americans' awareness of life's fragility. For combatants, battle and the war's associated sufferings provoked prolonged meditation and deliberation, changing self-perceptions and self-conceptions. Ironically, though, the trials of battle left men profoundly altered but also unable to adequately describe the forces precipitating such changes. North Carolina soldier Walter Clark, for instance, related to his mother: "No one can imagine anything like it [battle] unless he has been in one."¹²¹ Many civilians were left with more questions than answers as to why the men they knew before the conflict were changing so much. As Gerald F. Linderman maintains, the prewar expectations of soldiers could never be fully reconciled with their wartime experiences, for the shock and terror of the battlefield were too great for soldiers' ideas and belief systems to remain unchanged. Many became convinced, Linderman suggests, "that those at home did not understand the experience through which they were passing, and they resented . . . that civilian incomprehension."¹²² Aaron Sheehan-Dean's study of Virginians perhaps best captures the complex shades of soldiers' sentiments. He writes,

¹²¹ Walter Clark to Mother, 26 September 1862, in *The Papers of Walter Clark*, Vol., One, 1857-1901, ed. Aubrey Lee Brooks and Hugh Talmage Lefler, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1948), 80.

¹²² Linderman, *Embattled Courage*, 216.

“men placed increasing importance on their emotional ties with family members, even as the violence of the war alienated them from the values of home.”¹²³

Combat formed an axis of citizen soldiers’ lives, transforming men and recasting them in war’s unforgiving image. Although the average Civil War soldier spent very little time in battle (though this did vary by year and location), the effects of their time under fire proved profound and enduring. While scholars have taken divergent views on soldiers’ responses to battle, most agree that combat acted as an engine of change. James M. McPherson argues that the stress of battle broke soldiers’ senses. Men rose above the suffering around them by relying on courage, comradeship, and ideology as “sustaining” motivational factors. Gerald Linderman concludes that Civil War combatants ultimately suffered a crippling disillusionment arising “from the demolition of soldiers’ conception of themselves and their performance in war.”¹²⁴ Recent scholarship has looked beyond the battlefield tracing the war’s cultural, social, and intellectual consequences. Soldiers and civilians’ incomprehension as to why some survived the conflict and others perished altered mental and moral universes. Louis Menand suggests that the war gave rise to new ideas about ideas. Pragmatism and compromise emerged as important concepts that made it more difficult for people to be driven to violence by their beliefs.¹²⁵ While Menand uses the war’s consequences to discuss ideas, Drew Gilpin Faust’s recent study, *This Republic of Suffering*, sees the transformative nature of death in American culture, religion, and state. “Americans had,”

¹²³ Aaron Sheehan-Dean, *Why Confederates Fought: Family & Nation in Civil War Virginia* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 2.

¹²⁴ Linderman, *Embattled Courage*, quote on 240, see 216-65 on the broader process.

¹²⁵ Menand, *The Metaphysical Club*, 440.

she writes, “not just lost the dead; they had lost their own lives as they had understood them before the war.”¹²⁶

The Civil War battlefield and the war’s unrelenting toll remain crucial to understanding Southerners’ dispositions and mindsets, for men’s sense of self shifted with the conflict’s intense destruction and brutality. This section recreates glimpses from the battlefield and beyond to recount how soldiers perceived and experienced combat. The ordeal of battle—its hardships and its traumas—directly contributed to how Southern men came to conceive of themselves as men, how they interacted with friends and family, and why the war cast such a long shadow over their lives.

Before the thunder of battle men bore the burden of long marches. Nineteenth-century armies generally traveled and maneuvered without the benefit of boat or train, both of which were typically reserved for extremely long distances or special circumstances. These marches were exhausting and caked the men in dirt and grim. John Dooley described a typical scene: “During these marches the men are oftentimes unrecognizable on account of the thick coverings of dust which settle upon the hair, eye-brows and beard, filling likewise the mouth, nose, eyes, and ears.”¹²⁷ Consumed by dirt and grim, soldiers surrendered their personal comfort and cleanliness while on campaign. Marches to an unknown destination only heightened this sense of surrender. Rumors certainly traveled up and down the ranks as to where they were heading and why, but ultimately the soldier’s life was unpredictable.

¹²⁶ Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008), 268.

¹²⁷ John Dooley *Confederate Soldier*, ed. Durkin, 8-9.

Discipline, prolonged marches, and military maneuvers demanded the curtailment of men's autonomy. The majority of the southern people were tied to the rhythms of nature and the cycles of the land. Moreover, white men were reared in a culture celebrating personal independence. Men who valued their autonomy went to war to preserve it; yet, military service demanded the surrender of certain liberties.¹²⁸ To endure these hardships became a point of pride. Yet, even the most phlegmatic men were also consumed by anxiety and doubt because of the uncertainties they were forced to confront day in and day out. It was a soldier's duty to act when called to duty, but not to question why. South Carolinian Tally Simpson complained, "Our present life while in the advance is such that when we go to bed at night we know not when we will be called up [and] when we eat one meal we know not when or where we will eat again."¹²⁹

Confederates' responses to campaigning reflected their measure of manhood. On the one hand, patriotic men ready for a fight were excited by the anticipation of battle. Marching broke up the monotony of camp life, and military action fostered a meaningful sense of purpose. Spirits were especially high during Lee's offensive strikes into Maryland and Pennsylvania in 1862-63. On the other hand, enlisted men and low-ranking officers were subsumed by the command structure. They acted only when directed. Men who were rarely questioned in the antebellum era now questioned themselves and their circumstances, forced to surrender themselves to military command.

¹²⁸ Mitchell, *Civil War Soldiers*, 57.

¹²⁹ RWS to Anna Tallulah Simpson, 22 August 1861, in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 63.

For those who had never before “seen the elephant,” the battlefield’s sights, sounds, and smells were unfamiliar, even otherworldly. Before seeing actual combat many soldiers experienced the morbid results of conflict. John Dooley left a vivid account of his first encounter with a battlefield. Upon reaching camp he noticed the burial of “some of the heroes who had fallen two days before.” The scene was affecting. “It was anything but encouraging to a heart which naturally shrank from deeds of blood and scenes of death to behold these mangled heroes dropped carelessly in to the graves prepared, and the cold earth flung by colder hands upon their mutilated forms. I turned half sick from the ghastly spectacle and thought that I, too, before another day passed by, might be numbered with the dead and rudely thrust beneath dear Mother earth.”¹³⁰ Dooley confronted his own mortality in looking at the earthen mounds. He was now on borrowed time. Fully buried bodies offered the dead dignity at the very least, whereas others suffered a more ignominious fate. Half-burials or temporary graves putrefied bodies creating awful smells, smells that were never known before.¹³¹ To add to the horror, bodies that were temporarily covered by brush only or not all left exposed parts (fingers, eyes, toes) to be picked at by roaming hogs. These scenes offered a disturbing visual cue of the potential fate of every soldier and also jarred a man’s emotional sensibility. At such moments control over feelings could become impossible as men literally stared death in the eye realizing that they faced the potential indignity of being ravaged by hogs or dying without ever giving their loved ones proper closure.

¹³⁰ John Dooley Confederate Soldier, ed. Durkin, 3.

¹³¹ Dick to Anna, 8 August 1861, in *Far, far from home*, 49.

Incomprehension, terror, and revulsion signal the soldier's difficulties in processing their immediate reality.

Curiously, though, the battlefield's abstractions proved both revolting and compelling, especially in the war's first year. Even the most introspective, self-consciousness, and reticent of men could be absorbed by morbid curiosity. An otherwise sensitive Dick Simpson apologized to his sister Anna for not having an opportunity to collect battlefield relics but promised some "yankee bones" if requested.¹³² Similarly, a young Thomas L. Wragg wrote to his father after visiting the battlefield at Manassas and recounted: "I took a walk to the battle-field the other day and wanted to get a Yankee skull (which were scattered over the ground) to send to you, but having no way to do so I did not take them, there was one very large one with a bullet hole in his forehead."¹³³ Neither soldier, at least as recorded in their letters, collected any bones. Perhaps the act of collecting human remains, once put into motion, proved too troubling, or simply too impractical. Or, maybe an empty offer was made only to satisfy what they perceived as the curiosity of those at home. But the desire to discuss such details or even collect the material records of battle suggests the strange culture and curiosities that war created. Most men had never before confronted death on such scale and under such circumstances. To come through experience unchanged usually proved impossible.

Bleached bones, rows of graves, and the smell of rotting flesh may have grounded soldiers in the earthly realities of war but often induced men to turn above

¹³² RWS to Anna Tallulah Simpson, 22 August 1861, in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 64. On the process more broadly, Mitchell, *The Vacant Chair*, 3-11.

¹³³ Thomas L. Wragg to Papa, 25 August 1861, in *A Confederate Chronicle: The Life of a Civil War Survivor*, Pamela Chase Hain (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2005), 46.

looking to higher powers. On campaign in the spring of 1862, James Knighton assured his family that he trusted in God completely. His faith allowed him to look to higher powers for protection and assurance of his safe return.¹³⁴ Jimmy's faith could not ward off the microbes that consumed so many unfortunately. He perished in a hospital, a death which a family friend described as "shocking in the extreme to our sensitive feelings." But the writer, John Doyle, asked Jimmy's father to "submit cheerfully to the decrees of him above, remembering at all times, that we may be soon called upon to follow his footsteps"—surely welcomed words to a grieving but still deeply religious father.¹³⁵ Religious fervor offered men a concrete avenue of expression, a long-established channel in which to safely funnel fears. Godliness could ensure men's courage as Drew Gilpin Faust and Samuel J. Waton have argued.¹³⁶ Moreover, faith in God's "plan" gave war and death higher meaning. As witnessed especially in the Confederate revivals of 1862 and 1864, religion provided a bulwark against the uncertainties of war and a framework for understanding. What they could not understand or comprehend mattered deeply, of course, but was part of a larger plan over which they had no control.

Once called to action, orders came quickly. Rations were cooked and men prepared for marching. Soldiers probably experienced a vast array of emotions after hearing such news. Most expected the battle to come but could not predict exactly when

¹³⁴ See, for instance, James H Knighton to Father, 20 April 1862 and Jimmy H Knighton to Sister Maggie, 25 April 1862, Box 1, Folder 3, Josiah Knighton and Family Papers, LSU.

¹³⁵ J. M. Doyle to Dear Sir [Josiah Knighton], 24 May 1862, Box 1, Folder 3, Josiah Knighton and Family Papers, LSU.

¹³⁶ Drew Gilpin Faust, "Christian Soldiers: The Meaning of Revivalism in the Confederate Army," *The Journal of Southern History*, vol. 53, no. 1 (Feb., 1987): 86-7 and Samuel J. Watson, "Religion and Combat Motivation in the Confederate Armies," *Journal of Military History*, vol. 58, no. 1 (Jan., 1994): 40.

or where.¹³⁷ Many engaged in rituals before moving to the front. Some had no stomach to eat before an anticipated engagement with the enemy too consumed by anxiety, whereas others dedicated their final moments in writing home or thinking of loved ones.¹³⁸ Once engaged, an array of personal proclivities, social forces, and external forces shaped soldiers' psychology. The vast majority of Confederates entered their first fight only after spending prolonged periods with their comrades in arms. For the soldier citizen the bonds forged between men helped shift the "burden of fear from the individual to the group," as Joseph Glatthaar explains.¹³⁹ These informal support networks significantly underpinned why men chose to stay and fight, or flee from the field. Furthermore, Southern whites were raised in a culture that promoted masculinity and honor, forces which demanded resolve and action. Men of the officer class, in particular, knew all too well that the eyes of their comrades and community were constantly watching. Their behavior and displays of bravado were not only emblematic of larger social ideals but also gave credence to prewar social hierarchies.¹⁴⁰ While there were exceptions, most Confederate officers met and exceeded expectations. Ellison Capers, for instance, was congratulated for his display of "coolness & courage,

¹³⁷ TNS to Mary Simpson, 9 November 1862, in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 158 and Marion Hill Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 15 September 1863, in *Letters to Amanda*, ed., Lowe and Hodges, 86-7.

¹³⁸ On pre-battle anxiety, see TNS to Caroline Virginia Taliaferro Miller, 22 January 1863, in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 176. On pre-battle letter writing, see J. H. Knighton to Uncle Josiah, 6 April 1862, Box 1, Folder 3, Josiah Knighton and Family Papers, LSU.

¹³⁹ Glatthaar, *General Lee's Army*, 316.

¹⁴⁰ On the important wartime role of Confederate officers, see Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, 149-77. On officers' role in battle, see McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades*, 54-61 and Glatthaar, *General Lee's Army*, 197-99.

as well as fitness to command.”¹⁴¹ Similarly, over ninety soldiers signed a petition to Confederate President Jefferson Davis advancing the case for the promotion of Colonel William J. Clarke of the 24th North Carolina. Clarke had accorded himself well in battle and rendered faithful service to his country since the summer of 1861. Clarke’s bravery had resulted in a severe wound, a credit to his fighting acumen.¹⁴² Officers’ bold leadership had a heavy, staggering price: “almost a quarter of all officers were killed in action, and four of every five officers were either killed or wounded at least once.”¹⁴³

Ancient codes, entrenched resolve, and peer pressure could move soldiers into action but could not prepare the individual for what he confronted. As many former combatants have related, recreating the sights and sounds of the battlefield is an impossible, or uneven undesirable, endeavor. Fragmentary views and incomplete pictures are the best an historian can capture. John Dooley—through a combination of diary entries and edited materials—tried to convey the confluence of emotions, sights, and sounds during his first engagement, the Battle of Groveton (a preliminary action in the campaign of Second Manassas). He is quoted at length because of the account’s power and unique on-the-ground perspective. “Here we go now, through the woods, deployed in line of battle; about a half mile distant one of the enemy’s batteries is posted looking for some antagonist, and our brigade is told to advance towards this terrible looking affair and afterwards to march by the right flank into some woods near by, and wait for further orders.” As the men waited they came under fierce fire. “Now we go right at them (as it were), they see us, and here come the shells crashing through the

¹⁴¹ R. Y. Dwight to Ellison [Capers], 26 June 1862, Folder 1 (1861-1871) Ellison Capers Papers, USC.

¹⁴² Letter “To His Excellency President Davis,” Box 2, Undated Papers, Folder 28, Clarke Papers, SHC.

¹⁴³ Glatthaar, *General Lee’s Army*, 198.

trees back of us and ploughing up the open field over which we are going.” As dirt flew into the men and artillery rained down the brigade was ordered to load their rifles. “Oh, how scared I felt! If I could only stay out of that fight with honor how gladly would I have done so! But I was today to smell gunpowder for the first time on a field of battle.” The men then deployed into line of battle, marching at the double quick. Federal guns to their fore began blasting away, “belching forth flame, smoke, and bombshells.” On and on the men drove, shells screaming and whistling overhead. “Close up forward—steady—dress to the right—give way on the left—don’t crowd the center,” officers shouted. Suddenly, a shell burst near Dooley knocking down the two men beside him. The line came to a halt near a fence, everyone was to lie down and await further orders. “I was very much frightened and I am sure I wasn’t the only one.” As the battle raged on along an extended front Dooley and his regiment were ordered to withdraw, only to see further action the following day.¹⁴⁴

Dooley’s complex account suggests several important elements of the combat experience. First, the soldier’s actions were rote, requiring no thought; the long hours spent drilling ensured proper responses. On the battlefield this was a necessity, for soldiers felt fear, as Dooley so vividly and repeatedly related. Second, combat heightened senses and accentuated an array of sights, smells, and sounds. The extent and human impact of this action was beyond the soldier’s realm of comprehension, creating simultaneously enhanced awareness and dulled incomprehension. Third, emotions ran freely and fiercely, but could also be controlled and tempered. Dooley tellingly remarked that if he could only stay out of the fight with “honor” he would have

¹⁴⁴ John Dooley Confederate Soldier, ed. Durkin, 18-9.

done so. Powerful social forces compelled him forward for he fought on that day not only for himself but also for his comrades, his family, and for a cause.

Soldiers' experiences in battle demonstrate the vast array of personal feelings and external forces pulling men forward. Dooley, like most survivors, would continue to face battle. These prolonged trials would test men but also change them and their reactions. Artillerist E. Porter Alexander noted the idiosyncrasies, which men exhibited "under the test & stress of battle for the first time." For Alexander, the experience was comparable to touching a hot iron. Without knowing the degree of heat, "He does not grab it promptly with a full strong grip but picks it up & drops it for a time or two, till he gets the measure of the heat & sees whether he can stand it. Well it was in very much that way that officers & men took hold of fighting at first. The men were strongly disposed after firing a volley to fall back a little to load, & officers getting a fair amount of success in a fight were slow to risk that in hope of greater."¹⁴⁵ This process bolstered men's confidence, ensured the battle line's integrity, and allowed for individual reactions without undermining the whole. Furthermore, men's varied reactions demonstrate that no single model of behavior, reflective of masculine ideals, can adequately explain men's responses to something as foreign and unfamiliar as battle. Manly displays demanded steadfastness, but Confederates also allowed men to grow accustomed to battle, if that was ever fully possible.

The sight of federal forces, the artillery's relentless fire, and the volleys of hot lead tested a man's mettle. Shot and shell eviscerated regiments creating gapping holes where men once stood. Soldiers who just moments before were whole men were

¹⁴⁵ Fighting for the Confederacy, ed. Gallagher, 43.

undone by iron and lead. One soldier narrated a particularly horrifying, but still commonplace, scene. “Here is a poor wounded Confederate who is walking up and down, wandering anywhere his cracked brain directs him. Just on top of his head and penetrating to his brain is a large opening made by a shell in which I might insert my hand.”¹⁴⁶ The war’s human cost became painfully apparent to combatants as they witnessed friends receive grievous, life-altering wounds. During periods of intense campaigning men began to doubt their return home. In writing to his wife, Hill Fitzpatrick questioned if he would ever see his son again. “Men are killed and wounded around me nearly every day, and I know not how soon my time may come.”¹⁴⁷ Hill’s remarks were prescient—he was killed just days before the war’s end. These fears were especially commonplace during the rigorous and prolonged campaigns of 1864 and 1865, as Lee and Grant waged ruthless war.

Thinning ranks signaled the loss of friends and family. In a letter to his mother, James A. Graham methodically recounted the wounds sustained by his comrades. A few examples illustrate the letter’s sober tone: “The wounded are Capt. Dickson severely in right side, Myself slightly in right knee, Lt. Patterson severely in groin . . . Mowatt bruised by shell slight, Nelson leg severe, W. H. Newman face & leg severe.” These records extolled the physical cost of combat and began to penetrate the human face of war. But this letter could hardly communicate the prolonged suffering these men would now endure and continue to endure. Graham concluded in another letter sent shortly thereafter: “It makes me quite sad to see” the company “thinned out so.”¹⁴⁸ For

¹⁴⁶ John Dooley *Confederate Soldier*, ed. Durkin, 112.

¹⁴⁷ M. H. Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 26 May 1864, in *Letters to Amanda*, ed., Lowe and Hodges, 150.

¹⁴⁸ James A. Graham to Mother, 17 October and 24 October 1863, 157 and 160.

the men who composed regimental companies, formed messes together, and came to rely upon one another, thinned ranks hit hard. The absent soldier and missing face altered men throwing them into emotional turmoil. “You cannot imagine my feelings,” wrote C. W. Avery to the father of Johnny Caldwell, when his friend did not reform with the Regiment having been killed on the field of battle.¹⁴⁹ South Carolina politician Benjamin F. Perry described widespread mourning and gloominess “for the friends lost in the army.” The war, he feared, “would ruin the country.”¹⁵⁰

In the numbers of dead and wounded, Southern men were forced, however unconsciously, to confront the impact of their national project and to see the results of their decision to secede. Here men surely began to doubt themselves and question the certainty with which they had lived their lives for so long. Squeamishness over the dead dissipated as time wore on and men’s senses hardened. Such distancing allowed soldiers to cope with the incomprehensible, to continue fighting when quitting seemed justifiable. Certainly, these actions are laudable for the resolve and bravery demonstrated, but also questionable for continued fighting meant continued cruelties. “My thoughts on seeing the dead were without one pang of regret or sorrow,” one Confederate wrote.¹⁵¹ Hill Fitzpatrick related to his wife that he had changed much in his feelings. “The bombs and balls excite me but little and a battlefield strewed with dead and wounded is an every day consequence.”¹⁵² These words confirm Gerald Linderman’s conclusions about the soldiers’ increased cynicism and disillusionment;

¹⁴⁹ C. W. Avery to Dear Sir [T. R. Caldwell], 18 July 1863, Box 1, Folder 6, SHC.

¹⁵⁰ B. F. Perry to Liz, 5 December 1862, Box 3, Folder 86, Benjamin Franklin Perry Papers, USC.

¹⁵¹ Fletcher, *Rebel Private*, 49.

¹⁵² M. Hill Fitzpatrick to Amanda, 2 September 1862, in *Letters to Amanda*, 26.

yet, it is easy to exaggerate these sentiments.¹⁵³ John Dooley, for instance, confessed “that the terrors of the battlefield grew not less as we advanced in the war, for I felt far less fear in the second battle of Manassas than at South Mountain or even at Fredericksburg; and I believe that soldiers generally do not fear death less because of their repeated escape from its jaws.”¹⁵⁴ A hardened veteran remained a feeling man, and individual’s reactions varied. Moreover, it is important not to underestimate the eventual emotional toll of combat.

Civil War combat changed the self-identities and emotional dispositions of Southern men. The war’s at times unrelenting pace and sheer terrors wielded control over even the most resolute soldiers. The effects could be crippling. After the Battle of Fredericksburg (a resounding Confederate victory), a dispirited Tally Simpson wrote that the Confederate camp was “sad and quiet,” and “at times the blues nearly kill me. I have no heart for any thing.”¹⁵⁵ A frustrated and disheartened Thomas Lafayette Rosser wrote to his wife in moving terms. Though he himself had escaped wounds, the men under his command had suffered, and many had been killed. He mourned their loss but found it impossible to write an account of affairs. He could only turn to his wife. Isolated, he felt himself “a changed man” and maintained that he could only “rely in mercy of a just God to whom I constantly pray for protection and deliverance[.] Oh! my darling wife if I could only be with you for a short time!”¹⁵⁶ Such inclinations led men to desperately

¹⁵³ Linderman, *Embattled Courage*, 216-65.

¹⁵⁴ *John Dooley Confederate Soldier*, ed. Durkin, 99.

¹⁵⁵ TNS to Caroline Virginia Taliaferro Miller, 18 December 1862, in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 167.

¹⁵⁶ Thomas [Lafayette Rosser] to “darling Wife,” 7 July 1863, Box 1, Folder 1860-73, Thomas Lafayette Rosser Papers, UVA.

pray for the war's end. James A. Graham declared himself a "strong peace-man" after coming off battle in the war's final months. Such a state of mind, he wrote, always formed after a fight. He sincerely wished "the Yankees would make peace and go home and let us alone."¹⁵⁷

As southern soldiers anticipated the war's conclusion in the spring of 1865, they remained haunted by the ghosts of the past four years—scenes etched in their minds that they surely wished could be erased. John Dooley tried to exorcise some of these demons. "Oh, the horrid scenes around us!" he wrote. "Brains, fractured skulls, broken arms and legs, and the human form mangled in every conceivable and inconceivable manner."¹⁵⁸ Such scenes were scarring. Old assumptions were undermined, while new, unfamiliar feelings arose to comprehend changing perceptions. How survivors met these transformations would largely dictate their role during the Confederacy's collapse.

Conclusions

As the Battle of Chickamauga raged into its second day on 20 September 1863, General James Longstreet's Corps, fresh from the battlefields of Pennsylvania and Virginia, arrived by rail. Men of Kershaw's Brigade were sent to attack Union lines stationed on a knoll near Snodgrass farm. Members of the 3rd South Carolina surged up Snodgrass Hill, Tally Simpson among them. "Gallantly pushing forward in the front rank of his company," a minnie ball passed through his heart. The fallen body was then

¹⁵⁷ James A. Graham to Mother, 6 February 1865, in *The James A. Graham Papers, 1861-1884* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1928), 209.

¹⁵⁸ *John Dooley Confederate Soldier*, ed. Durkin, 23.

riddled with grape and canister shot. As they soldiered together, so they slept together. Tally was buried next to Captain Williams, a family friend.¹⁵⁹

In the last winter of his life, Tally had come to recognize the brutality and costs of a war that now disgusted him. On Christmas day he wrote: "If all the dead . . . could be heaped in one pile and all the wounded be gathered together in one group, the pale faces of the dead and the groans of the wounded would send such a thrill of horror through the hearts of the originators of this war that their very souls would rack with such pain that they would prefer being dead and in torment than to stand before God with such terrible crimes blackening their characters."¹⁶⁰ Gone were the epic pledges to honor the southern cause instead replaced by sickened hearts and hardened minds.

Soldiers struggled to create emotional stability without the presence of their families. Occasional furloughs, visits from home, and regular correspondence when mail service allowed maintained webs of infrequent contact; yet, longings for home produced an emotional void. Confederates found solace in their comrade-in-arms, using camp life to recreate, however unevenly, a sense of home and a foundation for support.¹⁶¹ In the nineteenth-century home individual wills were suppressed to promote the central values of harmony, self-control, and moderation.¹⁶² These same values were demanded in camp. But Confederate soldiers also had to demonstrate toughness, aggression, and

¹⁵⁹ Rev. John M. Carlisle to Richard Franklin Simpson, 22 September 1863, in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 284.

¹⁶⁰ TNS to Anna Talullah Simpson, 25 December 1862, in *Far, far from home*, ed., Everson and Simpson, Jr., 168.

¹⁶¹ Sheehan-Dean, *Why Confederates Fought*, 58.

¹⁶² Ted Ownby, *Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, & Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 12.

ambition in battle.¹⁶³ Southern whites embraced a flexible model of masculinity that not only ensured the successful navigation of their various roles but also offered a modicum of personal and psychological happiness. In understanding Southern men we must understand the changes they experienced during the Civil War years, for the models of manhood embraced and the types of emotions expressed were firmly grounded in the trials of their wartime experiences.

¹⁶³ Sheehan-Dean, *Why Confederates Fought*, 58.

CHAPTER 5 CIVIL WARS CONTINUED

Confederate President Jefferson Davis' long flight from Richmond, Virginia, ended on 10 May 1865 in southern Georgia. Members of the Fourth Michigan Cavalry captured the Confederate President as he tried to flee from his party's camp into the surrounding woods and swamps. Most likely wearing a shawl or a cloak (common apparel for nineteenth-century men), Davis' captors quickly spread the story that they seized him in woman's garb.¹ As one popular song, "Jeff in Petticoats," remarked: "Jeff Davis was a warrior bold, And vowed the Yanks should fall . . . But when he saw the Yankees come, To hand him if they could, He jumped into a petticoat, And started for the wood."² Thoroughly emasculated and completely defeated, the feminized image of a captured Jefferson Davis symbolized the Confederacy's collapse and the humiliation of Southern men as men.

This chapter suggests a different narrative of the Civil War's conclusion—heretofore often cast in political, economic, or military terms—by examining the emotional and intellectual contours of veterans during the crucial year of 1865. Just how white Southerners interpreted their wartime experiences directly impacted their position in society in the war's aftermath. This chapter considers three entwined points, which shaped men's experiences in the war's aftermath: soldiers' personal traumas, the veteran's initial shift from soldier to citizen, and fluctuating notions of manliness. I posit

¹ Anne Sarah Rubin, *A Shattered Nation: The Rise and Fall of the Confederacy, 1861-1868* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 136-7. See also John Taylor Wood Journal, 10 May 1865, Volume 3, John Taylor Wood Papers, SHC.

² "Jeff in Petticoats," quoted in Michael Kimmel, *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (New York and London: The Free Press, 1996), 77. On this episode see also, Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*, 135-8 and Nancy D. Bercaw, *Gendered Freedom: Race, Rights, and the Politics of Household in the Delta, 1861-1875* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003), 76.

that with war came a series of unintended outcomes, which unsettled veterans and left them grappling with themselves, their government, and their society for years to come. White Southern men invested themselves completely in the cause of war but remained wholly unprepared for its consequences. In reconstructing themselves as men, Southerners created distinct narratives of the conflict that shaped their understandings of postbellum culture and their engagement with society.

The transition from civil war to civic peace was not only a national transformation but also a profoundly personal experience. Southern men—publicly defined by postures, poses, and codes of honor—now experienced doubt, and began in the spring, summer, and fall of 1865 to reconstruct ideas of manliness in order to make sense of and lend meaning to their military lives.³ This reading of Southerners modifies more orthodox accounts of Confederate soldiers, which tend towards teleology and bounded categories—unreconstructed rebel or resigned veteran, for instance—that do not capture fully the transformation that Confederate veterans negotiated to become Southern civilians.⁴ The tidy groupings of soldier, veteran, and civilian often collapsed

³ Stephen W. Berry contends that scholars have unconsciously misread white Southern men concentrating more on their public face than their private dreams and doubts. I wholly agree with this assertion but also emphasize the entirely unique set of circumstances met at the war's end, which forced Southerners to face doubt, in particular, as never before. Stephen W. Berry II, *All That Makes A Man: Love and Ambition in the Civil War South* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 10-1, especially. For insights on the intellectual dimensions of the shift from civil war to civic peace see Leslie Butler, "Reconstructions in Intellectual and Cultural Life," in Thomas J. Brown, ed., *Reconstructions: New Perspectives on the Postbellum United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁴ Most scholars, though notable exceptions exist, can be divided into two camps: those who posit that the war was remembered but its pains and consequences were eventually forgotten, and those who charge that the conflict did not decisively change white Southerners' intellectual frameworks, barring readjustment to emancipation. These studies, otherwise extremely careful and sensitive treatments, tend to underestimate the importance of this transitional period in white Southerners' reconceptualization of self. On this first point see especially Paul M. Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study of Southern Mythmaking* (1970; reprint, Montgomery, AL: NewSouth Books, 2002), Prologue and Chapter One and Gaines M. Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, The Lost Cause, and The Emergence of the New South, 1865 to 1913* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 15-35, specifically. James L. Roark, *Masters Without Slaves: Southern Planters in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: W. W. Norton

during the Civil War's close and beyond, as these men fought with each other, with black Southerners, and with white Unionists throughout the war's denouement. Personal conflict, anger, and violence proved as important as ideology in shaping Southern whites' sense of self.

Homeward Bound

Thousands of men, footsore and threadbare, choked the dirt roads leading from Appomattox Court House shortly after Lee's surrender on April 9, 1865.⁵ According to the terms of surrender, Confederate veterans were permitted to pass through federal lines unmolested. For most, that is exactly what happened. One soldier encountered a squad of Union cavalry who quietly passed his party without a word spoken.⁶ Another Confederate, Thomas Devereux, ran across a group of Sherman's infamous "bummers" after he crossed over the Neuse River, in North Carolina. After some "discussion as to whether they would take" their horses, the federals respected the men's paroles and allowed them to pass.⁷ Even if such encounters passed without incident, tensions remained high. These men had, after all, faced each other on the war's killing fields.

Federal troops attempted to lighten the atmosphere by emphasizing the importance of reconciliation. Confederate artilleryman E. Porter Alexander maintained

& Company, Inc.), Chapter Four and Peter S. Carmichael, *The Last Generation: Young Virginia in Peace, War, and Reunion* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), Chapter Eight are each particularly representative of the second camp.

⁵ 9 April 1865 marked the date of General Robert E. Lee's surrender to Lieutenant General Ulysses S. Grant. For the next three days, Lee's men, numbering over 28,000, were paroled. Most waited for the official paroles—still, scores departed immediately. Jay Winik offers a narrative account of the exchanges between, and then meeting of, Grant and Lee. See, Jay Winik, *April 1865: The Month That Saved America* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2001), 173-199. For a more straightforward reading, if still highly useful, see, Frank P. Cauble, *The Surrender Proceedings, April 9th, 1865 Appomattox Court House* (Lynchburg, VA: H. E. Howard, Inc., 1987).

⁶ J. E. Whitehorne Diary, 14 April 1865, J. E. Whitehorne Papers, SHC.

⁷ Thomas P. Devereux, Recollections of "Petersburg to Appomattox," Devereux Papers, SHC.

somewhat nostalgically in his postwar memoir that Union General Ulysses S. Grant had initiated a “spirit of kindness” with his surrender terms.⁸ Moreover, the federal soldiers’ deliverance of three days’ rations to starved Rebels only heightened feelings of amicability. But a formal acceptance of defeat did not close Southerners’ wars, for veterans did not always separate their wartime experiences from their postwar lives. “[T]he war and its objects, its causes, & causes of its failure,” wrote Virginian John “Ham” Chamberlayne, had been seared into his heart “as with a branding iron.”⁹ The burning embers of rebellion continued even when the fire of Lee’s army had been extinguished. One week after Appomattox, on his return home, Sergeant J. E. Whitehorse described the memory of Lee’s surrender as stinging “like an open wound.”¹⁰ Emasculated by defeat and wanting to lessen the pain of surrender Whitehorse took solace in his family and looked forward to putting in a crop. The familiar domestic sphere, however, was now melded into his former military life. In his diary’s final entries for April 1865, Whitehorse longingly wished that Lee had ordered his brigade “to burst through the invaders back in Appomattox.” Clearly, his inner war had not ended, and Whitehorse hopefully noted that many of the local “boys” wanted to start a “Confederate Veterans Organization.”¹¹ Whitehorse’s thoughts about the war, his agony over defeat, and his desire to start a veterans group suggest the Virginian’s

⁸ Edward Porter Alexander, *Fighting for the Confederacy, The Personal Recollections of General Edward Porter Alexander*, ed. by Gary W. Gallagher (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 544. William B. Holberton describes a pervasive feeling of good cheer among Northern and Southern soldiers. See, Holberton, *Homeward Bound*, 90-2.

⁹ John Hampden Chamberlayne to Sally Grattan, 1 August 1865, in John Hampden Chamberlayne, *Ham Chamberlayne-Virginian: Letters and Papers of an Artillery Officer in the War for Southern Independence, 1861-1865*, ed. C. G. Chamberlayne (Richmond, VA: Press of the Dietz Printing Co., Pub., 1932), 333.

¹⁰ Whitehorse, 16 April 1865, Whitehorse Papers, SHC.

¹¹ Whitehorse, 16 April and 22 April 1865, respectively, Whitehorse Papers, SHC.

transitional status at the war's close. At home, Whitehorne would presumably attempt to reassert a patriarchal vision of the household, though one fundamentally altered by the war as he would come to realize.¹² But his personal requirements had changed. As Whitehorne settled into old patterns of domestic life he also looked toward his wartime comrades as his postwar friends with eyes filtered by the fallen Confederacy. Most prominently, then, family and fellow veterans would generate former soldiers' emotional support.

As men had marched together in war so they trod home together. During this crucial period of readjustment, during a time when soldiers would confront for the first time scenes of the ruined South, they would do so among their wartime comrades. Maintaining military discipline and keeping, as long as possible, unit cohesion, Confederates controlled the terms of military collapse.¹³ These measures, however small, demonstrate responses to the Confederacy's failure that reflected how men would begin to reconstruct manhood.

Second Lieutenant Kena King Chapman arrived in Richmond, Virginia, in the late morning hours of April 18, 1865. He and his men were exhausted, their uniforms soiled and frayed by rain, mud, and hard marching. Having traveled over a hundred miles of dirt roads and countryside in one week's time, the men were "foot sore and almost broken down."¹⁴ The physical exhaustion that pained them was quickly subsumed by an emotional collapse as the party gazed over the blackened cityscape. By the twentieth,

¹² On changes in the household, see Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender* and McClurken, *Take Care of the Living*.

¹³ Marten, *Sing Not War*, 40-2.

¹⁴ Kena King Chapman, 17 April 1865, Chapman Papers, SHC.

Chapman and his men had exchanged the darkened streets of Richmond for the blue waters of the James River. The steamer *Red Jacket* plodded down the meandering river toward Smithfield, Virginia. The journey must have been hard, a painful close to a difficult war. While resigned, Chapman was not defeated. With an almost naïve optimism he recorded: "It galls me to think of it but I must submit *for the present* hoping always that the tide will again turn in our favor."¹⁵ Three days later Chapman was home, physically at least. Mentally, he was still fighting the war and "marching with [his] old brigade."¹⁶

Chapman and Whitehorne each demonstrate how despair conflicted with the desire for regeneration. Military service and the Confederate cause forever altered their self-perceptions and redefined their understanding of civilian life. By returning home, however, these men made a decision for moderation, which represented an impulse typical of Southern whites, who supported the restoration of civic order and believed that defeat was providential.¹⁷ By unifying martial and civil spheres within the domestic realm Confederate veterans who returned home pronounced the importance of a restrained, if still volatile, manliness. Even if these men were relieved by the war's end, though, many maintained their allegiance to the Confederate cause albeit in different form contributing to the rise of the Lost Cause. Thus, the men who returned home in the spring of 1865 resigned themselves to the war's decision and publicly embraced, however unhappily, defeat.

¹⁵ Chapman, 20 April 1865, Chapman Papers, SHC.

¹⁶ Chapman, 23 April 1865, Chapman Papers, SHC.

¹⁷ Marten, *Sing Not War*, 61-4 and Jason Phillips, *Diehard Rebels: The Confederate Culture of Invincibility* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2007), 182.

Many would turn to other former soldiers for solace and support, for these men, in fundamental ways, were the only ones able to understand fully the thoughts and feelings gripping ex-Confederates at the war's end.¹⁸ The mix of sentiments and emotions gripping homebound men is best captured in Rufus Barringer's diary entry for 8 August 1865: "At Home! How joyous the greeting! How sad. Oh! How sad the scenes, the changes, the remembrances of four years of war, now before me."¹⁹

Carnage and Chaos

Soldiers' response to the Confederacy's collapse should be understood as a clash between radically different understandings of, and reactions to, civilian and military masculinities.²⁰ For most of the war's participants, the shock of battle lingered well past military conflict and became an essential ingredient in veterans' self-identification.²¹ Yet, this terrain proved unfamiliar to men who began to question themselves and the cause for which they fought. The majority of soldiers, on the one hand, desirous of reunion and pressed by the necessity of want, peacefully returned home, started working, and attempted to restore order. On the other hand, some battle-hardened veterans emboldened by defeat provided the catalyst for violence in an

¹⁸ The impulse to seek out other veterans among nineteenth-century French soldiers is described in great terms in, Brian Joseph Martin, *Napoleonic Friendships: Military Fraternity, Intimacy & Sexuality in Nineteenth-Century France* (Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 2011), 148-70, especially.

¹⁹ Rufus Barringer Diary, 8 August 1865, Box 1, Folder 3, Rufus Barringer Papers, SHC.

²⁰ Nye, "Western Masculinities in War and Peace," 417-22. This interpretation relies heavily upon Bederman's notion that gender is a *historical, ideological process*. Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 5-10 especially. See also Kimmel, *Manhood in America*.

²¹ This article heeds the call of Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper to eschew the use of the term "identity" as a category of analysis because of its imprecise. Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper, "Beyond 'Identity,'" *Theory and Society*, vol. 29, no. 1 (Feb., 2000): 1-47.

explosive postwar atmosphere shaped by rage, hatred, and vengeance.²² The resulting tension produced social upheaval that presaged Reconstruction-era violence, and revealed the United States' initial inability to manage fully the South's collapse in civil authority.²³ Veterans' oppositional behavior overturns any notion of a unified response to the Civil War and deconstructs Lost Cause mythology, which sought to portray Confederate soldier's mournful return to a ravaged South—an image so powerful that it has even captured the historian's imagination. Confederate soldiers could not seamlessly return to prewar society, however, for the war's consequences were too varied, the sting of defeat too strong, and the forces of emancipation too monumental. The war's traumas, pains, and conclusions proved too decisive in white Southerners' personal reconstructions.

²² T. J. Stiles has argued that Civil War soldiers experienced a process of violentization, in which an individual passes through a series of stages before finally equating violence with power and self-fulfillment. While Stiles's case of Jesse James is surely an extreme version of this process the paradigm itself offers vast insights into explaining post-war violence. T. J. Stiles, *Jesse James: Last Rebel of the Civil War* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003), 161-5. Carter notes that the war itself exaggerated the South's antebellum culture of violence. See Carter, *When the War Was Over*, 19

²³ Violence and disorder during the Civil War's close include: Dan T. Carter's *When the War Was Over: The Failure of Self-Reconstruction in the South, 1865-1867* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), begins at the end, and uses Appomattox as a point of departure to examine Southern self-reconstruction. Carter's book, a masterful treatment of race, politics, and political leadership in the postwar South, offers an impressionistic discussion of the war's close to introduce his highly detailed exploration of Southern home rule. Mark Bradley offers an excellent discussion of the war's close in North Carolina, and follows the journeys of several Army of Tennessee soldiers. Mark L. Bradley, *This Astounding Close: The Road to Bennett Place* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000) and Mark L. Bradley, *Bluecoats & Tar Heels: Soldiers and Civilians in Reconstruction North Carolina* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2009). Mark Greenough's case study of Appomattox County, Virginia in the six months following Lee's surrender is the most extended and detailed examination of post-Appomattox disorder. See, Mark K. Greenough, "Aftermath at Appomattox: Federal Military Occupation of Appomattox County May—November 1865," *Civil War History* 31, no. 1 (March 1985): 5-23. As with Carter, Bertram Wyatt-Brown delivers a powerful reading of the South that includes a brief exploration of the war's aftermath. Bertram Wyatt-Brown, "Death of a Nation," in Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *The Shaping of Southern Culture: Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1880s* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001). The mechanics of military demobilization are thoroughly explored in William B. Holberton, *Homeward Bound: The Demobilization of the Union and Confederate Armies, 1865-1866* (Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 2001). The best overall work on 1865 remains Stephen V. Ash, *A Year in the South: Four Lives in 1865* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

Scores of Confederate soldiers fled the Virginia countryside once Lee's surrender appeared imminent. Men who had largely defined themselves in relation to the army collective were now liberated from the military's restrictions. But, these men also felt profound loss.²⁴ The conflicting emotions propelled soldiers to take individual action to sustain the Confederate cause. These responses privileged the ideals of a militant masculinity. Virginian Ham Chamberlayne, for instance, refused to participate in the "funeral at Appomattox" and instead slipped through federal picket lines to travel south.²⁵ Lieutenant Colonel David G. McIntosh, joined by Chamberlayne, went into North Carolina. McIntosh found Confederate General Joseph E. Johnston and offered his services, but was promptly refused. Johnston contended that he had "more artillery than he knew what to do with."²⁶ For officers especially, the Confederate cause burned deeply, and they were determined to prolong the fight. John Dooley, a recently paroled prisoner of war, heard of Richmond's fall in early April 1865 and pledged to join "the shattered Southern army and participate in some more fighting."²⁷ For these recalcitrant rebels the Confederate cause died hard and, their martial lives and aggressive impulses held sway over the terms of surrender agreed upon at Appomattox.

²⁴ For feelings of loss and liberation post-defeat, see Hans-Gerd Winter, "Brutal Heroes, Human Marionettes, and Men with Bitter Knowledge: On the New Formulation of Masculinity in the Literature of the 'Young Generation' after 1945," in Roy Jerome, ed., *Conceptions of Postwar German Masculinity* (Albany: State University of New York Press), 194-5 especially. On military unit cohesion, see McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades*, 85-92.

²⁵ John Hampden Chamberlayne to Edward Pye Chamberlayne and Lucy Parke (Chamberlayne) Bagby, 12 April 1865, in Chamberlayne, *Ham Chamberlayne-Virginian*, 320. For an excellent discussion of Chamberlayne in the postwar years, see Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, Chapter Eight.

²⁶ Joseph E. Johnston quoted in Lynda L. Crist, Barbara J. Rozek, and Kenneth H. Williams, eds., *The Papers of Jefferson Davis*, vol. II (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), 548.

²⁷ Joseph T. Durkin, ed., *John Dooley, Confederate Soldier and His War Journal* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963), 177.

Rather than joining Confederate armies elsewhere, others demobilized at Appomattox considered radical alternatives. For many, vengeance and hatred of the North served as a motivating force that sustained their morale. Although exact numbers are unknown, it is likely that throughout the spring of 1865 hundreds of soldiers set out to fight in the hills and countryside of North Carolina, the trans-Mississippi, and beyond. In the hours and days before surrender, hushed discussions turned to the realm of alternatives for those who deemed capitulation unthinkable. E. Porter Alexander—a trusted Confederate officer to both Jefferson Davis and Lee—suggested continued resistance in correspondence with Robert E. Lee, James Longstreet, and William Mahone on April 9. “If there is *any* hope for the Confederacy it is in *delay*,” Alexander stated. The Army of Northern Virginia should join Johnston’s command in North Carolina, Alexander urged, or take to the hills and become guerilla fighters.²⁸ Lee rejected this course as dishonorable, and perhaps even disastrous; many Confederate officers agreed. Still others, such as Confederate President Jefferson Davis, offered support through word and deed.²⁹ Indeed, small pockets throughout the South became

²⁸ Alexander, *Fighting for the Confederacy*, 531-532. An interesting discussion of guerrilla warfare is found in Winik, *April 1865*, 144-163.

²⁹ On 4 April 1865, Jefferson Davis issued a decree that argued the war had assumed a new phase, and the Confederacy was “relieved from the necessity of guarding cities and particular points.” He urged: “It is...unwise and unworthy of us, as patriots engaged in a most sacred cause, to allow our energies to falter.” Jefferson Davis, Public Proclamation, 4 April 1865, in Crist, Rozek, and Williams, *The Papers of Jefferson Davis*, vol. II, 502. This proclamation appeared in northern newspapers as well. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, for instance, printed the document on April 17. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, “The Dying Confederacy,” 17 April 1865. William B. Feis offers a compelling examination of this document and a brief historiographical discussion of its interpretation by scholars. Feis argues that Davis was not encouraging guerrilla warfare as Lee’s army was still active and attempting to join Johnston’s command. See William B. Feis, “Jefferson Davis and the ‘Guerrilla Option,’” in Mark Grimsley and Brooks D. Simpson, ed., *The Collapse of the Confederacy* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001). Michael B. Ballard contends the opposite. He posits that the “desperate president was proposing a war of persistent guerrilla-type harassment and was personally pledging never to give up.” Michael B. Ballard, *A Long Shadow: Jefferson Davis and the Final Days of the Confederacy* (Jackson, Miss.: University Press of Mississippi, 1986), 57. While Feis’s argument is intriguing, Davis’s retreat, the continual re-establishment of Confederate capitals, and his unwillingness to see Confederate field commanders surrender, suggest

hotbeds of violence as desperate bands—composed of soldiers and civilians alike—harassed black and white Southerners.³⁰

Yet the question remains: Why did soldiers from Lee's army feel inwardly compelled to continue fighting after Appomattox? The majority of Confederate soldiers adhered to the terms of surrender and shed the soldier's identity. But the war's close also created a divisive atmosphere and internal conflict. Men such as Dooley, Chamberlayne, and McIntosh were suspended at the threshold; they were detached from the army but still wanted to serve as soldiers. These men followed an internal sense of duty that allowed them to disregard the terms of formal surrender. Moreover, their allegiance to the Confederate cause, broadly defined, demanded that they resist federal armies until the bitter end. Historian Jason Phillips argues that such men were "diehard rebels" who constructed an ethos of Confederate invincibility that outlasted the Civil War.³¹ Phillips's argument sheds light on the strength of Confederate sentiment even during the Confederacy's darkest days, and helps explain why many soldiers refused to return home. Still grappling with the prospects of defeat, these men chased the dream of succession into the spring and summer of 1865.

In the end, efforts to continue fighting in other theaters of the war and proposals for guerrilla warfare proved untenable. Instead of the widespread destruction associated with a guerrilla struggle, the South erupted into a series of small conflicts initiated by

that he desired to prolong the struggle indefinitely. The actual terms of the engagement are debatable; however, the open discussion of guerrilla warfare among Confederate officers indicates Davis had, at the very least, considered the option even if his prose in the public decree of 4 April did not directly indicate the idea. See also, Gary W. Gallagher, *The Confederate War* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997), 140-153 and Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*, 130-4.

³⁰ Such bands impeded some soldiers progress home, see Marten, *Sing Not War*, 42-4.

³¹ Phillips, *Diehard Rebels*, see Chapter Five and Conclusion for his rich description of this ethos in the war's close and beyond.

men often driven not by ideological commitment but raw emotion. The main thoroughfares and Southern railways stretching across Virginia, North and South Carolina, and Georgia, especially, became lightning rods, charged by throngs of soldiers beginning in early April and continuing well into the summer. Hungry and tired veterans swelled the populations of dozens of Southern communities, which had already weakened infrastructures because of the strains of war. Contests over resources, displays of violence, and outright conflict ensued. For Confederate veterans, these quarrels were part of a broader struggle that tested the boundaries of their manhood. As Robert A. Nye has recently observed, much in modern history has depended on the nation-state's ability to govern the soldiers transition into civilian life "in ways that neither jeopardized the efficient conduct of warfare nor troubled civic peace."³² White Southerners negotiated this unfamiliar terrain as the station of citizen gradually subsumed the role of warrior.

As the Confederate government became increasingly ineffectual and still-active Southern armies faced numerous military setbacks, civil authority faltered in communities such as Danville, Virginia; Greensboro, North Carolina; and Augusta, Georgia. Such civil instability augmented social ferment as demobilized soldiers and civilian refugees were drawn to these major rail centers, which held supplies stores.³³

³² Nye, "Western Masculinities in War and Peace," 417.

³³ Scott Nelson describes the rail lines linking Richmond, Danville, Greensboro, and Charlotte as in sad repair, though recently constructed. These thoroughfares were epicenters of activity and violence in the immediate aftermath of Lee's surrender. As Nelson's study demonstrates, this trend continued well beyond the post-war years because of the profound socio-economic changes enacted by the railroads. Scott Nelson, *Iron Confederacies: Southern Railways, Klan Violence, and Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999).

Contests of power ensued.³⁴ Subsequently, black and white Southerners had to often fend for themselves as federal authorities and local vigilante groups vied for supremacy.³⁵ For many, the Confederate cause no longer resonated as their concerns centered on the necessities of life—food and clothing in particular. One defiant soldier told a newspaper, “I lived four years on goobers, parched corn and rotten meat, and I saw nothing wrong with taking blankets & such from the commissary.”³⁶ Such reactions became widespread as soldiers grasped for meaning once their cause was lost.

Danville, Virginia, served as an immediate destination point for many of Lee’s men after their paroles were issued in mid-April. Arteries leading into the Virginia community swelled with straggling soldiers, overloaded wagons, and wandering civilians.³⁷ Admiral Raphael Semmes, who had burned most of the Confederate navy and outfitted his men as infantry in early April, took note of the scene and described a “stream of fugitives” from Lee’s army “which now came pressing into our lines.”³⁸ The massive influx of people coupled with Lee’s men created a deadly combination. “Large crowds of savage and blood thirsty looking stragglers” paraded the streets, wrote John

³⁴ Union Chaplain Samuel H. Merrill explained in his 1866 account of spring 1865, “When the military power of the rebellion fell the civil government, which had been carried on in the interest of the rebellion, fell with it. There was no law but the will of the strongest, and the weak were without protection.” Samuel H. Merrill, *The Campaigns of the First Maine and First District of Columbia Cavalry* (Portland: Bailey & Noyes, 1866), 374-5.

³⁵ Edward L. Ayers, *Vengeance and Justice: Crime and Punishment in the 19th-Century American South* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 142.

³⁶ *Augusta Chronicle and Sentinel*, n.d., quoted in *Houston Tri-Weekly Telegraph*, 15 June 1865, found in Carter, *When the War Was Over*, 12.

³⁷ The disorder within the town spilled into the countryside throughout April. Union troops from the 24th Corps who were garrisoned in the surrounding area found considerable robbing and pillaging by paroled prisoners. Chris M. Calkins, *The Final Bivouac: The Surrender Parade at Appomattox and the Disbanding of the Armies, April 10- May 20, 1865* (Lynchburg, Virginia: H. E. Howard, Inc., 1988), 150.

³⁸ Semmes, *Memoirs of Service Afloat During the War Between the States*, 819.

Dooley, and they were desperate from hunger and exhaustion, “awaiting an opportunity to do some ugly deed.”³⁹ Without purpose or a point of destination, the crowds grew restless.⁴⁰ Veterans’ aimlessness, unbounded with the collapse of authority, propelled violent acts against people and the destruction of Confederate property.

Danville’s atmosphere was electric. Men “mingled in one promiscuous mass, every one asking [where to go] and but few answering,” according to one witness.⁴¹ Others, demoralized by the Confederacy’s collapse and depleted from their personal travails, turned to the Quartermaster’s stores.⁴² Plundering followed. Dooley captured the scene: “Bales of cotton, wool, bundles of raw cotton, boxes of licorice,” and sundry other items that could be moved quickly were either stolen from or dispensed by the warehouse’s commissary.⁴³ Released from military service and internally conflicted, these veterans lashed out at the institutional features of the nation that they had once sought to defend. In the midst of the confusion, the sound of an explosion rocked the town and scattered the crowd. Confederate ordnance stored near the warehouses had ignited. Burning debris and pieces of shell rained from the sky, killing at least fourteen people, including a number of surrendered Confederate soldiers.⁴⁴ A South Carolinian

³⁹ Durkin, ed., *John Dooley, Confederate Soldier and His War Journal*, 181.

⁴⁰ Bertram Wyatt-Brown describes the soldiers’ profound loss of purpose with great eloquence. “Most white southerners,” he writes, “found their world shattered.” Wyatt-Brown, “Death of a Nation,” 254. See also, Whitelaw Reid, *After the War: A Tour of the Southern States, 1865-1866*, ed., C. Vann Woodward (1866. Reprinted, New York: Harper & Row, Inc., 1965), especially Chapter 34.

⁴¹ Durkin, ed., *John Dooley, Confederate Soldier and His War Journal*, 180.

⁴² Ballard, *A Long Shadow*, 69.

⁴³ Durkin, ed., *John Dooley, Confederate Soldier and His War Journal*, 180.

⁴⁴ Noah Andre Trudeau, *Out of the Storm: The End of the Civil War, April-June 1865* (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1994), 390-391 and Marten, *Sing Not War*, 33.

who witnessed the scene recalled seeing one white man “black and badly torn.” The soldier mournfully continued: “He was the worst looking sight I ever saw in my life.”⁴⁵

Farther north in Lynchburg—a community that was severely taxed during the war—paroled soldiers and white civilians looted Confederate supply stores that held shoes, clothing, and assorted valuables. As the last chapter described, even though the government adequately supplied Confederate soldiers, Southern families often did without. Understanding the intentions of a large unruly crowd is difficult, though one wonders if these groups were lashing out at the symbols which had deprived them for so long or were simply taking for themselves that which they did not before have. Civil authorities quickly lost control, and were forced to close businesses and suspend city services.⁴⁶ Fearful of riots and pressed by plundering, community leaders agreed that federal troops must fill the vacuum in power. “Yankee rule,” it seemed, proved an appealing alternative to civil strife. Union General John W. Turner, the ranking officer, turned over all remaining military supplies to Lynchburg’s poor African American and white populations. On April 16, the federal troops left, thereby initiating a period of uncertainty until the establishment of the Military District of Lynchburg on 24 May 1865, which solidified federal control in Lynchburg and the surrounding counties.⁴⁷

The Civil War’s close provoked self-reflection leaving some veterans to conclude, at least temporarily, that their cause had been pointless. The shock of surrender produced immediate rage, but these feelings of anger abated for most and transformed

⁴⁵ Augustus Dean, “Reminiscences of Augustus A. Dean,” Fredericksburg-Spotsylvania National Military Park, Fredericksburg, Virginia, Bound Volume 425. Hereinafter cited as FSNMP.

⁴⁶ Steven E. Tripp, *Yankee Town, Southern City: Race and Class Relations in Civil War Lynchburg* (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 160

⁴⁷ Greenough, “Aftermath at Appomattox,” 8.

into an emotional depletion.⁴⁸ One former soldier maintained that he had lost the best four years of his life in war. “Oceans of blood has been shed, thousands of lives sacrificed,” he wrote, “all, all for nothing, accomplishing no end leaving the country embittered, distracted, ruined, & no prospect nothing but anarchy & tyranny.”⁴⁹ Surely these sentiments swirled in the minds of many after they were released from military service. Widespread disillusionment with a cause lost coupled with want partially explains why demobilized soldiers attacked symbols of Confederate authority. And, once the tired veterans from Lee’s army traveled into North Carolina, their influence on still-active troops proved disastrous. As former members of Lee’s army came through Johnston’s command they quickly spread news of their defeat. Disbelief and bewilderment seized the members of the Army of Tennessee, though they continued to function as a viable, if shaken, fighting force.⁵⁰ As if word of Lee’s defeat was not enough, members of the defunct army plundered the still-active Army of Tennessee.⁵¹

As with Danville, Virginia, the vast supply stores and rail lines of Greensboro, North Carolina attracted demobilized troops. Soldiers came into the town “rapidly, broken down, hungry, ragged and careworn,” noted a newspaper account from 1866 recalling events from the previous spring.⁵² As the local home guard evaporated and anti-Confederate sentiment grew rampant, authority within the community faltered,

⁴⁸ Wyatt-Brown, “Death of a Nation,” in Wyatt-Brown, *The Shaping of Southern Culture*, 254.

⁴⁹ Author unknown, letter fragment ca. 1865, Series I., Folder 60, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, The Historic New Orleans Collection, The Williams Research Center, New Orleans, Louisiana; hereinafter, NOC.

⁵⁰ Bradley, *This Astounding Close*, 150-3.

⁵¹ Carter, *When the War Was Over*, 12.

⁵² Athos [pseudo.], “Greensboro in April, 1865,” *Greensboro Patriot*, 23 March 1866.

igniting waves of violence. An unruly crowd composed of veterans from Lee's army and local civilians targeted the military warehouses located on East Market Street.

According to the *Greensboro Patriot*, "[t]he great houses of Commissary and Quarter Master stores were thrown open and the contents to the amount of millions of dollars worth were distributed." Anger and necessity drove many to take what they had been deprived of in war.⁵³ Confusion followed as active Confederate units were called to the scene resulting in a terrible instance of carnage and commotion. Lt. Col. A. C. McAlister's North Carolinians disbursed crowds pillaging the warehouses. Shortly thereafter another crowd appeared—mostly Kentuckians and Tennesseans from Brigadier General George G. Dibrell's cavalry of Johnston's army.⁵⁴ McAlister ordered these men to disperse. Perhaps drunk from looted liquor, the soldiers continued to plunder despite McAlister's orders. The Kentuckians and Tennesseans stood their ground and fired into McAlister's men. The Tar Heels fired a deadly volley in response. One man fell dead; three others wounded.⁵⁵ Whatever bonds shared by these Southerners had clearly dissolved in the slow close to a costly struggle.

Violence and collapsed authority gradually transformed the Southern landscape into a "dreamland," to use Wolfgang Schivelbusch's language.⁵⁶ White Southerners' emotions ebbed and flowed between deep depression and nearly maniacal joy as they confronted disheartening news of military setbacks and hopeful rumors of foreign

⁵³ *Greensboro Patriot*, 23 March 1866. See also, John G. Barrett, *The Civil War in North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1963), 387.

⁵⁴ Bradley, *This Astounding Close*, 153.

⁵⁵ Bradley, *This Astounding Close*, 153-154.

⁵⁶ Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery*, trans., Jefferson Chase (New York: Metropolitan, 2003), 10-9.

intervention.⁵⁷ But even the wildest dreams could not stop the pressing realities of defeat, as still-active Confederate armies fell one by one.⁵⁸ The demobilization of Confederate soldiers—paroled and otherwise—initiated successive waves of disorder. With each surrender Southern whites experienced similar feelings of anger, disbelief, and humiliation.⁵⁹ Even if Southerners' range of emotions were similar, responses varied. What remains striking, however, is that Johnston's surrender engendered the same civil strife witnessed in the immediate wake of Appomattox. A war-torn landscape without authority became overwhelmed quickly by the disbursement of thousands of battle-hardened men.

In late April and early May, paroled soldiers and Confederate deserters flooded the North Carolina landscape, crowded towns, and precipitated lawlessness. Concerned citizens asked Union occupiers for protection from marauders.⁶⁰ Scarce resources provoked desperate struggles between civilians and Confederate soldiers. Union Cavalry General Judson Kilpatrick observed squads of Johnston's men traveling through the countryside and committing numerous depredations. In Roxboro, North Carolina, Confederate veterans and white citizens held a meeting. Things went poorly for Roxboro's civilians, however, as the soldiers proceeded to take mules and horses

⁵⁷ Phillips, *Diehard Rebels*, 176-81.

⁵⁸ Johnston's Army of Tennessee, after prolonged negotiations, surrendered on April 26, the Department of Trans-Mississippi entered a "military convention" on May 26, and Confederate brigadier Stand Watie surrendered in the Indian Territory on June 23. Bradley examines in great detail the prolonged negotiations leading up to Johnston's eventual surrender. See, Bradley, *This Astounding Close*, 157-222. For the Department of the Trans-Mississippi, see Robert L. Kerby, *Kirby Smith's Confederacy: The Trans-Mississippi South, 1863-1865* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972), 424-7. On the Confederate Cherokees and the war in the West see W. Craig Gaines, *The Confederate Cherokees: John Drew's Regiment of Mounted Rifles* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989).

⁵⁹ Phillips, *Diehard Rebels*, 173.

⁶⁰ Bradley, *Bluecoats & Tar Heels*, 30-1.

belonging to a Confederate wagon train.⁶¹ While this incident passed without violence, others were not so fortunate. Elizabeth Collier, a refugee of war living near Hillsborough, North Carolina, recounted how a group of men burst into her home, and commenced sacking it “until they had taken everything to eat the house contained.”⁶²

Southerners were deeply frightened by the atmosphere created by the collapse of Confederate armies. Prominent Chapel Hill resident and southern sympathizer Cornelia Phillips Spencer described April as a “most remarkable” period; yet, her soul “sickened to see the marauders coming in day after day from every road—loaded with spoils. Much of what was so ruthlessly taken was wantonly wasted.”⁶³ While Spencer’s “marauders” remain anonymous—in fact, given the tone of her other writing she was probably referring to federal troops—the collapse of the Confederate government and the Army of the Tennessee’s surrender initiated this state of confusion. Provisional Governor Jonathan Worth complained in late April that the vast supplies “along the R. R. are destroyed, wasted and consumed and our troops supplied by foraging parties.”⁶⁴ For the next several months lawlessness and disorder defined the entire state.⁶⁵ William

⁶¹ J. Kilpatrick to Lieut. Col. J. A. Campbell, 30 April 1865, in *OR* 47 (3), 354.

⁶² Elizabeth Collier, [Spring 1865], Collier Papers, SHC. There is some confusion as to the event’s actual date as 27 April is crossed out, but the entry begins “On Monday 27th.” March 27th fell on a Monday in 1865, which may suggest she was recalling an event from the past month. Collier Papers, SHC.

⁶³ Cornelia Phillips Spencer, 4 May 1865, Diary, Cornelia Phillips Spencer Papers, Spencer Volume 3, SHC. For a general account of disorder in North Carolina after the war see Nicholas W. Schenck Diary, [Spring 1865], pp. 41-3. A transcribed copy of this diary is available through the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. <http://library.uncwil.edu/web/collections/Schenck/schenck-full.html> [accessed 5 April 2009].

⁶⁴ Jonathan Worth to Addison [Worth], 22 April 1865, Box 1, Folder 7, Worth Papers, SHC.

⁶⁵ Martin Crawford, *Ashe County’s Civil War: Community and Society in the Appalachian South* (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 2001), 153. For a compellingly deep analysis of violence in Western North Carolina see Phillip Shaw Paludan, *Victims: A True Story of the Civil War* (1981; reprint, Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 2004). For North Carolina’s Lower Cape

McKee Evans succinctly captures these conditions: 1865, he writes, was a time “when governments disappeared, when institutions vanished, and when the loyalties of men were divided.”⁶⁶

Following the rail lines through South Carolina and into Georgia, Confederate veterans descended upon Atlanta, Augusta, and Macon. One newspaper story reported that Atlanta—a city devastated in 1864—had “suffered severely from mob violence.”⁶⁷ The attackers professed to be soldiers from the armies of Lee and Johnston, though their exact identities remained unknown. The distinction between paroled soldier and marauding deserter blurred. The list of abuses included the theft of supplies, horses, and mules from state and Confederate stores and private homes.⁶⁸ Other veterans passed through on their way home desperate for temporary shelter and food, which Georgians provided for as effectively and efficiently as possible given the circumstances. Chief of Confederate Ordnance Josiah Gorgas—who had fled south from Richmond, Virginia, in early April—described Augusta as being “ruled by a mob.” Once all the public stores and many private ones had been raided, the crowds turned to “lay violent hands” on large stores of powder.⁶⁹

Fear see William McKee Evans, *Ballots & Fence Rails: Reconstruction on the Lower Cape Fear* (1966; reprint, Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995).

⁶⁶ Evans, *Ballots & Fence Rails*, 41.

⁶⁷ “Mob Violence,” 11 May 1865, *The Macon Daily Telegraph*.

⁶⁸ “Mob Violence,” 11 May 1865, *The Macon Daily Telegraph*.

⁶⁹ Gorgas, 3 May 1865, *The Journals of Josiah Gorgas*, 163. See also Russell K. Brown, “Post-Civil War Violence in Augusta, Georgia,” *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, vol. 90, issue 2 (Summer 2009): 196-213. In late May, the *Macon Daily Telegraph* complained of a large number of guns and pistols that were fired daily, day and night, in defiance of city ordinance that prohibited the use of firearms within three hundred yards of any home. “Firing Guns and Pistols,” 30 May 1865, *The Macon Daily Telegraph*.

The Confederate armies mustered out of service in 1865 only further fractured the shattered white South. Veterans, fresh from the battlefields of Virginia, North Carolina, and beyond could both help promote a return to normalcy (as witnessed particularly in those who peacefully returned home) and create profound disruptions (as seen in unruly crowds and marauding raiders). How these men affected southern society is difficult to quantify, but a qualified statement is appropriate. The presence of demoralized soldiers, discussions of military defeats, and overt attacks on symbols of Confederate authority contributed to broader “social suffering” among white Southerners.⁷⁰ As soldiers responded to the crises of defeat, shifting emotions and changing gender expectations guided behavior. In the unsettled period between the spring and fall of 1865, white men would continue to publicly shape the postwar South as they privately confronted the demons of war.⁷¹ The violent reactions of some veterans reflected men desperate to gain a sense of control during a period of uncertainty.

⁷⁰ William M. Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 52-3 and *Social Suffering*, ed., Arthur Kleinman, Veena Das, and Margaret Lock (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997). For a broader reading on the long-term consequences of defeat, see Jackson Lears, *Rebirth of a Nation: The Making of Modern America, 1877-1920* (New York: Harper Collins, 2009), 12-50, especially.

⁷¹ Men's eventual retreat from the public arena is well documented. Federal authorities circumscribed the roles of former Confederate soldiers, which thrust Southern women to the fore. Instituted memorial customs, in particular, functioned as public expressions of Confederate sentiments. Scholars such as Gaines Foster have viewed Memorial Days as significant acts of commemoration that furthered the process of reunion. William Blair rightly modifies this assessment contending that these acts also were forms of resistance that perpetuated Confederate identity. Women proved central to the construction of Confederate identity, as David Blight has demonstrated so admirably. Blair complicates this familiar story recounting that while federal authorities circumscribed the roles of former Confederate soldiers, thereby allowing women to dominate public spaces, *Cities of the Dead* continued to provide a means for rebel resistance, in Blair's assessment, in the form of guerrilla warfare through mourning. White Southern women made important decisions concerning the content and form of celebrations while always maintaining an eye toward normative gender roles. Once postwar Confederate identity became linked with cemeteries, Blair posits, it assumed a less threatening role that made reunion easier. William Blair, *Cities of the Dead: Contesting the Memory of the Civil War in the South, 1865-1914* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 77-97. See also, Blight, *Race and Reunion* and Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*.

Authority Restored

Changes came rapidly in the spring 1865, and nothing, by any measure, was inevitable. As the scenes from Danville, Greensboro, Atlanta, and Augusta demonstrate, the wave of military surrenders coupled with the collapse of governing authority produced an ideological collapse among many white Southerners that manifested itself in feelings of animosity and hatred. For these men, the transition into civilian life proved halting and difficult. Once released from the war's killing fields many veterans unleashed their aggression upon the South's physical and material landscape and, in some cases, black and white civilian populations. Military surrender and desertion paralyzed former Confederates creating feelings of uselessness and emasculation. These psychological wounds became physically manifest most immediately and noticeably during the war's denouement.⁷² White men were unmoored and manliness unrestrained during the Confederacy's collapse. The tension between Southern male culture and evangelical culture—explored so revealingly by Ted Ownby—competed, resulting in emotionally charged behavior among men.⁷³ Yet, for every act of violence committed, there were countless instances of restraint and even reconstruction. While violence continued throughout the rest of 1865, local patrols and federal authorities gradually restored order in most communities.⁷⁴ Ironically, the same military training that may have heightened chaos in many areas also facilitated the restoration of order.

⁷² The prolonged affects of war are compelling explored by Dean, *Shook Over Hell*.

⁷³ Ted Ownby, *Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, & Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990), see especially the Introduction for the clearest articulation of his argument.

⁷⁴ For an account of continued violence in South Carolina see Charles M. McGee, Jr. and Ernest M. Lander, Jr., eds., *A Rebel Came Home: The Diary and Letters of Floride Clemson, 1863-1866* (1961; revised edition, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989), 94.

If the years of Congressional Reconstruction were marked by episodes of extreme violence in the South, the roots of this insurgency can be traced to the immediate postwar period. And, Southern men, even if immersed in an antebellum culture of violence, assumed a cloak of increasingly aggressive manliness.⁷⁵ George C. Rable, Richard Zuczek, and James K. Hogue, in particular, have argued that Reconstruction-era violence demonstrates continuity with the Civil War, even if the means and intensity changed over time.⁷⁶ Crucial to white Southerners campaigns of political and social control were locally sanctioned, armed bodies of men that attacked white Republicans, African Americans, and the socially marginalized without remorse. The organizational efforts of Confederate veterans in 1865 adumbrated these later campaigns of terror. Known variously as “police forces,” “regulators,” and “Home Guards,” these groups represented, in essence, antebellum militias reconstituted; or, the resurrection of slave patrols.⁷⁷ Richard Zuczek goes so far as to argue that the antebellum system of slave patrols had fully reappeared in South Carolina by the late

⁷⁵ John Hope Franklin’s *The Militant South* remains the most important statement of antebellum Southern militancy. John Hope Franklin, *The Militant South, 1800-1861* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956). See also, Edward Baptist, *Creating an Old South*.

⁷⁶ Richard Zuczek, *State of Rebellion: Reconstruction in South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996) and James K. Hogue, *Uncivil War: Five New Orleans Street Battles and the Rise and Fall of Radical Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006). The classic statement on Reconstruction-era violence remains, George C. Rable, *But There Was No Peace: The Role of Violence in the Politics of Reconstruction* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1984). See also, Nicholas Lemann, *Redemption: The Last Battle of the Civil War* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2006).

⁷⁷ Sally E. Hadden, *Slave Patrols: Law and Violence in Virginia and the Carolinas* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), Chapter 6 and Epilogue. Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet*, 270. See also, Nicholas Lemann, *Redemption: The Last Battle of the Civil War* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006) and William McKee Evans, *To Die Game: The Story of the Lowry Band, Indian Guerrillas of Reconstruction* (1971; reprint, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995), 60-1.

summer of 1865.⁷⁸ Confederate veterans actively sought to establish order and reform the South's torn social fabric, at least on their terms. These Southern whites invested themselves into the restoration of their communities, thereby defining the terms on which the war closed. Veterans' patterns of motivation can explain the radically different responses of ex-Confederates, and that their oppositional behavior exemplifies the divided white Southern mind that was further fractured by surrender.

For Southern whites, the prospects of peace offered—for a time—the hopeful return of a familiar social order. While defeated as soldiers, Confederate veterans could assert manliness and authority within their respective communities by assuming positions of power. As in the antebellum era, men's authority rested on the subordination of others, especially African Americans. Newly freed blacks became targets of white anger. The development of armed bodies extended men's military personas and created a powerful mechanism for the restoration of a white social order. During the same period white Southern women—through memorial associations and similar organizations—became the public guardians of Confederate memory, which created a potent political dimension to burgeoning Lost Cause mythology.⁷⁹ Southerners masked their militancy through the prose of remembrance and celebration. North Carolinian and former soldier Randolph A. Shotwell, for instance, captured the change between war and peace metaphorically, thereby illustrating his vision of the soldier's strides toward reintegration into civic life and the transformation of war materials into

⁷⁸ Richard Zuczek, *State of Rebellion: Reconstruction in South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 18.

⁷⁹ On these processes among Southern women between 1865 and 1866, see Caroline Janney, *Burying the Dead but Not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008), Chapters 1 and 2.

civilian material culture. He wrote: “The battered sword was steadily resolving itself into the husbandman’s blade, where it had been rudely fashioned at the village smithy. The shattered spear readily became the crook of the pruning-hook. The blood-stained army ambulance relapsed into its olden service as a market-cart.”⁸⁰ Veterans were exorcising the demons of war, and many became dedicated to the reestablishment of white control. Moreover, by propounding a vision of peace Southerners could, at least publicly, suppress the still raw visions of war.

From late spring and into early summer 1865 white men organized themselves into armed bodies. Most often, these groups were sanctioned by the then governing authority—be it Confederate or federal. Lawlessness drew the ire of North Carolina governor Zebulon B. Vance, who issued a proclamation in late April exclaiming that the countryside was filled with bands of soldiers and citizens disposed to commit violence against people and property. Vance asked for restraint, and pleaded for all North Carolina soldiers to return home after parole from Johnston’s surrendered army.⁸¹ Once entrenched in their communities Southern veterans could “unite themselves together in sufficient numbers . . . under the superintendence of the civil magistrates thereof” to restore order, and “arrest or slay any bodies of lawless and unauthorized men who may be committing depredations upon the persons or property of peaceable citizens.”⁸² Ex-Confederates and Union forces then acted on such ideas. As Assistant Adjutant-General J. A. Campbell explained, North Carolina’s “most responsible loyal citizens”

⁸⁰ J. G. De Roulhac Hamilton, ed., *The Papers of Randolph Abbott Shotwell*, vol. II (Raleigh: The North Carolina Historical Commission, 1931), 215.

⁸¹ Zebulon B. Vance, 28 April 1865, quoted in James W. Albright, *Greensboro, 1808-1904* (Greensboro: Jos. J. Stone & Company, 1904), 77.

⁸² Vance, quoted in Albright, *Greensboro, 1808-1904*, 77.

were organized into a “local police force.” After taking the oath of allegiance, the Southerners were armed, given ammunition, and began patrolling the countryside.⁸³

Federal authorities were quite willing to employ former Confederates in the peacekeeping mission. North Carolina lawyer and Rebel sympathizer David Schenck complained of “armed mobs of Confederate soldiers, deserters, & c” that the citizens of Lincolnton put down through confrontation and arrests.⁸⁴ Gen. John McAllister Schofield, commander of the Department of North Carolina, organized Confederate veterans and members of the Home Guard into county militia companies.⁸⁵ Veterans-turned-police under federal military control battled with lawless groups of former Confederates to determine who controlled the countryside. Such bands of white soldiers—often commanded by their former officers—were found throughout the state. While they suppressed outbursts of violence, they also harassed former slaves.⁸⁶ These draconian measures—enacted over the course of late April and early May—proved successful in restoring order in central and eastern North Carolina.

To the north, in the Virginia countryside, scenes of unrest—reminiscent of the problems in North Carolina—provoked Confederate veterans to take action in the spring. In the seventh installment of George Cary Eggleston’s *Atlantic Monthly* article “A Rebel’s Recollections,” the Virginian recalled the emotions and experiences of Confederate soldiers during the spring and summer of 1865. Nearly a decade after the

⁸³ J. A. Campbell, General Orders No. 35, 4 May 1865, *OR* 47 (3), 396.

⁸⁴ David Schenck Diary, [n/d, Spring 1865], Folder 6, Volume 5, Box 2, David Schenck Papers, SHC.

⁸⁵ Schenck, [n/d, Spring 1865] and 24 July 1865, Schenck Diary, SHC. On the military occupation, Bradley, 246-7.

⁸⁶ Evans, *Ballots & Fence Rails*, 68-73 and Evans, *To Die Game*, 61-2.

fact, he had great difficulty expressing and describing the great uncertainty of this period and its lasting impact on mind-sets and emotions. Southern men went to war in 1861 with steadfast confidence, he contended, but this conviction eroded into doubt, subtly changing men's perceptions of themselves. While he found it impossible to chart when confidence changed into "despondency," Eggleston remained painfully aware of its repercussions as former Confederates faced the bitter fruits of defeat. Though the war's end came technically at Appomattox Court House, Eggleston wrote, the real difficulties had not started as the South became engulfed in disorder and its population gripped by suffering.⁸⁷

Lawlessness in the Virginia countryside provoked Confederate veterans to take action; even if defeated in war, Southern men refused to lose control of their communities. Eggleston arrived home only to find the landscape infested by "lawless bands of marauders" who harassed black and white Southerners alike because of the absence of constituted authority. Former Confederates, longing for the comforts of home and a return to stability, instead confronted a dangerous, unpredictable landscape. After the community's soldiers returned to their homes, Eggleston wrote to their district's Union commanding officer. He "granted us leave to organize ourselves into a military police, with officers acting under written authority from him." The ersatz police force patrolled the countryside, disarmed suspicious persons, and arrested individuals and dispatched them to the provost marshal. The soldiers-turned-police

⁸⁷ George Cary Eggleston, "A Rebel's Recollections," *The Atlantic Monthly* 34, issue 206 (December 1874): 663 and 667.

remained active until relieved by the establishment of a Union military post.⁸⁸ Historian Mark Greenough documented similar activities in Appomattox County. He describes an initial period of confusion following surrender that was replaced by greater tranquility during federal military occupation.⁸⁹

In some cases, Southern police groups quickly exceeded their authority, and committed flagrant abuses which drew federal ire. In Virginia, for instance, Appomattox County Sheriff William D. Hix, originally granted authority by the Chief Quartermaster of the Union army's Twenty-Fourth Corps to distribute abandoned Confederate property to the destitute, began stealing. According to the report of a federal officer, Hix, with an armed force of civilians and paroled Confederate soldiers, was taking horses from "common people" and turning them over to wealthy planters. The "common people," in turn, were organizing and arming themselves for their mutual protection. Before the class-based civic strife exploded into civil conflict, federal authorities stepped in to disarm Hix and his men.⁹⁰

South Carolinians adhered to the routes pursued by Virginians and North Carolinians as the state's provisional governor, Benjamin Franklin Perry, "ordered the formation of Volunteer companies in every District" of the state "for the purpose of preserving order & keeping peace." These men were to augment the federal military presence, and received "their instructions from the commandants of the different posts." Perry reported that such measures had relieved the state's white population and helped

⁸⁸ George Clay Eggleston, *A Rebel's Recollections* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959), 181-183.

⁸⁹ Greenough, "Aftermath at Appomattox," 22.

⁹⁰ S. B. M. Young to H. W. Halleck, 15 May 1865, *OR*, Series 1, 46, part 3, 1157. See also, Mark K. Greenough, "Aftermath at Appomattox," 7.

to restore order. But, the companies' linkages to white supremacy became clear as well, for these armed bodies "had a salutary influence in . . . keeping the negroes quiet, & relieving the apprehensions of the people."⁹¹ Armed bodies remained in tact throughout the summer of 1865 and well into the fall. In one community, a group of citizens wrote to Perry requesting the organization of local police forces—an extension of the ad-hoc bodies formed in the war's immediate aftermath. "Our people are anxious to organize such a company to act strictly as a police force to preserve the peace and order & prevent the commission of crimes," they declared, "and act as constabulary force to summon parties before the Provost Court to be guard duty or any other service outside of the great object we have in view, the suppression of crime & the preservation of order."⁹² Such organizations set a deadly precedent later signaled in the rise of the Ku Klux Klan, which gained widespread membership in South Carolina especially.

The wave of postwar militarization presaged the later, and widespread, rise of vigilante groups, as domination, resistance, and violence continued to shape postbellum Southern culture. The emotional turmoil of war and the desire to restore white authority compelled many Confederate veterans to join the ranks of the Ku Klux Klan.⁹³ While the rise and impact of the Ku Klux Klan remains outside this chapter's focus and will be instead considered in a later chapter, the order's direct connection to postwar white militancy is critical in understanding Confederate veterans transformation from soldier to

⁹¹ Benjamin Franklin Perry, "Provisional Governorship of South Carolina," [N/D] Benjamin Franklin Perry Papers, Box 1, Folder 21, SCL.

⁹² W. L. T. Prince, W. Allen Benton, and F. Lynch to Benjamin Franklin Perry, 30 Oct 1865, Benjamin Franklin Perry Papers, Box 1, Folder 8, SHC.

⁹³ On Confederate veterans involvement in the Klan see Nelson, *Iron Confederacies*, 109-10, and Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet*, 268. For linkages between the war's affects on men and Klan membership see, Jacob Alson Long Recollections [typed copy], Jacob Alson Long Papers, SHC. On the alienating affects of war more broadly, Stiles, *Jesse James*, 161.

citizen, and men's emotional upheaval after the war. Ultimately, the disorder provoked by the Confederacy's collapse in central Virginia, North and South Carolina's Piedmont, and middle-to-upper Georgia, was largely quelled by the late summer of 1865, mostly through the efforts of armed white Southerners and federal soldiers. The Southern landscape remained unpredictable and dangerous, however, during the ensuing years. Even if time quieted the chaos of the Civil War's untidy conclusion, the consequences of military defeat held sway over the emotions and politics of Southern whites. The federal government's toleration of, or even compliance with, the organization of armed bands of former Confederate soldiers set a dangerous precedent that partially precipitated the continued militarization of conservative ideology. From 1865 and beyond, white vigilantes vied with federal authorities and African Americans for social and political control.⁹⁴

Civil War to Personal Peace

Defeated in battle and uncertain of the future, Southern whites were driven by emotions of hatred, humiliation, and hubris during the Confederacy's collapse. Public and private conflict shaped this divisive atmosphere. Ex-Confederates struggled to reenter an already shattered South, as they replaced the qualities of a warrior with a more controlled masculinity. War and defeat had "burned a hole," to use Louis Menand's phrase, in Civil War soldiers that changed how they perceived the world and

⁹⁴ For continued discord and a turn to racial violence in North Carolina, Bradley, *Bluecoats & Tar Heels*, Chapters 4, 8, and 9 and Paludan, *Victims*, 99-133. For South Carolina, Zuczek, *State of Rebellion*, 47-108, especially; Poole, *Never Surrender*, Chapters 5 and 6; and Poole, "Religion, Gender, and the Lost Cause in South Carolina's 1876 Governor's Race," 573-7. For the broad view, Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet*, Chapter 6; Foner, *Reconstruction*, 342-45 and 425-59, especially; and Rable, *But There Was No Peace*.

their place in it.⁹⁵ Yet, despite scholars' widespread acknowledgement of the war's transformative effects, few have captured the social tumult of the war's conclusion and its emotional and intellectual impact on Southern whites. Military surrender did not separate war and peace. Rather, defeat was an evolving process, not an event. Slowly, the memories of battle dimmed and Southerners confronted the war's consequences.⁹⁶ As James Marten has recently written, defeat and failure had multiple meanings for Confederate veterans. Efforts to overcome these forms of defeat shaped Southerners' responses during the war's untidy ending. The aftermath of war, he notes, "intersected with constructions of manhood."⁹⁷ The South's fractured landscape mirrored soldiers' unsettled emotional states and mutilated manhood. Men's responses to this crisis fostered their personal reconstructions.

As many soldiers' will to continue fighting eroded, they turned instead to the protection of themselves, friends, and family.⁹⁸ During this critical period in Confederate men's lives they straddled the line between war and peace—a space in which they negotiated the transition between military and civilian masculinities.⁹⁹ The ambiguities of the war's uncertain conclusion did not always allow soldiers themselves to understand clearly such momentous shifts, though in hindsight the transformative nature of this

⁹⁵ Louis Menand, *The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2001), quote on 61, but see especially Chapters One to Three.

⁹⁶ Antoine Prost offers a compelling reading of this process among French veterans of World War I. Antoine Prost, *In the Wake of War: 'Les Anciens Combattants' and French Society, 1914-1939*, trans. Helen McPhail (Providence and Oxford: Berg Publishers Limited, 1992), 11-24.

⁹⁷ Marten, *Sing Not War*, 41.

⁹⁸ Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 12-3.

⁹⁹ For the historical importance of this transformation among western cultures see, Robert A. Nye, "Western Masculinities in War and Peace," *American Historical Review* 112, no. 2 (April 2007): 417-22, especially.

period became apparent. Recalling his experiences in the spring and summer of 1865, former Confederate artilleryist Carlton McCarthy described the veteran's place as a "neutral ground between war and peace,—neither soldiers nor citizens." McCarthy rooted his liminal position in the war's prolonged close. "A real good hearty war," like the American Civil War he wrote, "dies hard"— a prescient remark indeed.¹⁰⁰ In these short sentences the Virginian expressed two problems plaguing ex-Confederates: How would they transition back into civilian life, and by what means could they close their civil wars?

By confronting these issues soldiers began their transformations. Yet, more than simply personal trials, veterans' passages between war and peace were central to the broader project of national reconstruction, for the actions and emotions of Confederates not only determined on what terms the Civil War closed but also shaped the contours of white Southern culture during the postbellum era.¹⁰¹ The vast majority of men looked forward to getting back home and beginning life again, though few envisioned what personal struggles awaited them. Stripped of the traditional trappings of antebellum authority, white men became unmasked. And, as Nancy D. Bercaw has insightfully remarked, they discovered that their identities were "not fixed but fluid, susceptible to the ignominy of defeat."¹⁰² The recognition of such ruptures created consternation, confusion, and emotional outpourings. Capturing the forms in which these thoughts

¹⁰⁰ Carlton McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia* (1882, repr., Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), all quotes on 192-3.

¹⁰¹ For the historical importance of this transformation among western cultures see, Robert A. Nye, "Western Masculinities in War and Peace," *American Historical Review* 112, no. 2 (April 2007): 417-22, especially.

¹⁰² Bercaw, *Gendered Freedoms*, 80.

were expressed offers deeper understandings into how white men negotiated the transition between civil war and civic peace. Henry Brown Richardson and James Burdge Walton, two of the figures underpinning this section, left rich records of their thoughts and feelings while poised at this crucial period. The traumas, triumphs, and setbacks experienced by Henry and James, while certainly not universal or even necessarily representative, shed much light on how Confederate soldiers made sense of the conflict during the war's final phases and beyond.¹⁰³

Grievously wounded and captured at the battle of Gettysburg, Henry finished his war on Johnson's Island, Ohio. In late March 1865, he arrived in Richmond, Virginia, where he was granted a leave of absence for thirty days unless exchanged sooner. He remained in Virginia, recovering until he could strike South and get to "any thing like a Confederacy."¹⁰⁴ Part of a group aptly described by historian Jason Phillips as "diehard rebels," men such as Richardson constructed a culture of Confederate invincibility.¹⁰⁵ As we shall see, this ethos provided fleeting but from the spring until the fall of 1865, Henry's commitment to the Confederacy and his reaction to its defeat shaped him as a man, a veteran, and a citizen. Conversely, as an enfeebled Richardson recuperated in the Old Dominion waiting for his chance to fight again, fellow Louisianian James Burdge Walton anxiously looked to the war's end. Formerly of the Washington Artillery and a veteran of the Mexican-American War, Walton was Richardson's senior by over twenty

¹⁰³ As William L. Barney has noted, for "all the limits of the biographical approach, it remains indispensable for uncovering the individual choices that transform historical processes into concrete actions." William L. Barney, *The Making of a Confederate: Walter Lenoir's Civil War* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 217.

¹⁰⁴ Henry to "Parents," 21 June 1865, Box 1, Folder 7, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU.

¹⁰⁵ Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*, 112-3.

years and had a wife and children waiting for him in Louisiana. Juxtaposing these two men, their experiences and their feelings, reveals a spectrum of divergent reactions to the Confederacy's end, and the different strategies Southerners pursued as they reentered civilian life. Veterans' patterns of motivation can explain the radically different responses of ex-Confederates, and indicate divided white Southern mindsets. The thoughts and experiences of Walton and Richardson offer a revealing picture of how age, life experience, and mindset especially shaped veterans' reactions to the Civil War's end.

In a revealing series of letters composed between the winter and spring of 1865, Walton expressed many of the emotions privately consuming his comrades in gray. His fears and doubts starkly contrast the public hopes of those Confederates who continued to believe in their nation's survivability.¹⁰⁶ In these letters we learn of Walton's perceptions, feelings, and modes of thinking. And from his words we can draw larger conclusions about the priorities, hopes, and fears of Confederate men during the war's closing months. Attachments to family and home, visceral responses to the changing tide of war, and a gendered understanding of a man's role in southern society underpinned soldiers' understanding of the conflict and their place in a fading Confederacy. Through these lenses men found faith to continue fighting but were consumed by desires to return home. During the darkest period of the war Southerners were forced to examine themselves, their beliefs and value systems, to locate sustaining forces. Nevertheless, Walton's letters suggest caution in attempting to universalize the experiences of whites, for while many of his sentiments echoed across

¹⁰⁶ On Confederates' unwavering optimism, Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*, 123-6.

the South, his words also suggest a diversity of opinion. Rather than a point of distraction this is instead an important point in interpreting Confederate veterans for no one experience is representative of a collective whole.

Ensnared in Richmond, Virginia, in February 1865, James projected a bleak view of the war. The two sides, he maintained, were “as wide apart, to day, as they were this day a year gone.” The armies, entrenched in Virginia’s soil, were deadlocked, and it was as though all the bloodshed and fighting had resolved nothing. “The South,” he wrote, “will have nothing Short of Independence & recognition, and the North demands unconditional submission & the ultimate abolition of Slavery.” The fighting would thus continue until the South was exhausted and subjugated, or the North was tired and bankrupt. Walton feared an interminable struggle. Yet, “fortitude” and “manhood” demanded his continued participation.¹⁰⁷ Walton feared the humiliation of defeat but also remained painfully aware of the war’s tremendous costs. In the war’s final months many soldiers, such as Henry Brown Richardson, had lost touch with the bleak realities undermining the Confederate cause instead projecting wildly optimistic prognostications for the future success of their cause.¹⁰⁸ Walton’s vision of the war remained grounded and he feared the South’s course toward total destruction.

While engaged in a very real war, James understood and reconstructed the contest through his letters home, his public musings, and his private feelings. Enduring the conflict required close connections to his family and friends in Louisiana. To them he

¹⁰⁷ [James] Burdge [Walton] to M. A. Walton [Amelia], 6 February 1865, Series I., Folder 56, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, The Historic New Orleans Collection, The Williams Research Center, New Orleans, LA; hereinafter HNOG.

¹⁰⁸ Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, 207; Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*, 123-6; and Phillips, *Diehard Rebels*.

expressed a range of sentiments, expressing his manhood but also exposing fears. On the one hand, he projected a stoic exterior and continued to define himself as a provider for his family's wants and needs. It was the male's prerogative, as he and scores of his comrades maintained, to protect and defend family and home.¹⁰⁹ Though the cause was imperiled, war legitimated men's claims as heads of households. If "my dear friends were only comfortable," he noted, and "beyond want or care I could bear the long separation & exile from all I hold most dear in this world."¹¹⁰ Their continued comfort ensured his own persistence in the army. On the other hand, Walton also turned to his family to express his innermost fears. Such emotional revelations, which portrayed vulnerabilities and doubts, modify historians' narrative of white men's protection of white domesticity and authority at the expense of personal exposure. Instead, Walton willingly wrote home expressing his intense longings, which were severe and disarming. Such desperation "makes me murmur & bewail my misfortunes." Only reflection relieved him, and again Walton felt "that Providence will direct all finally for our good."¹¹¹ Only in the divine could Walton find relief, and only through reflection and writing could he ease his troubled mind. His revelation of personal feelings suggests the dynamic interpersonal relationships and deep levels of trust shared among members of his family. Such personal commitments and longing desires, however sustaining to Walton himself, increasingly eroded his faith in the war and the Confederacy.

¹⁰⁹ Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender*, 30 and Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, 208-9.

¹¹⁰ Burdge to M. A. Walton, 6 February 1865, Series I., Folder 56, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, HNOC.

¹¹¹ Burdge to M. A. Walton, 6 February 1865, Series I., Folder 56, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, The Historic New Orleans Collection, The Williams Research Center, New Orleans, LA; hereinafter HNOC.

By April, he had moved to Augusta, Georgia. Frustrated, he opined: “When Oh! When will the straining of the heart strings cease, when again shall we be united never more to be separated. How I long for . . . that day of supreme happiness which when it is realized will compensate for all the past privation & suffering. I am hopeful ever – and believe now there are long days of happiness in store for all of us. Keep up your courage. We are near the end.”¹¹² Gripped by feelings of powerlessness, Walton continually returned to thoughts of hearth and home. Only in reunification with family could the war’s trials have real meaning. Only in the hopes of domestic bliss could Walton dull his painful miseries. For only in family and at home could Walton make sense of the war he had experienced.

While Walton struggled with military service, Henry Brown Richardson’s faith in the cause remained unshaken, though his long tenure in prison and youthful exuberance may very well have emboldened him to renew fighting. Richardson left Virginia in April to seek a new theater of war. Federal soldiers took him prisoner in Tennessee, quickly ending his personal crusade. Imprisoned, the rebels were administered the oath of allegiance in groups of fifty or more men. Henry and two other men refused. After a brief period of confinement and the realization that it was “no use for one man to try to be the Confederacy,” he succumbed. In a bitter letter to his parents he detailed the ordeal. Asserting that he had sold himself “for a very inferior ‘mess of pottage,’” Henry “worshipped the great golden image, and became a prostitute.”¹¹³ Feelings that a voluntary oath had been coerced angered him most.

¹¹² B. to [Family], 3 April 1865, Series I., Folder 57, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, HNOC.

¹¹³ Henry to “Parents,” 21 June 1865, Box 1, Folder 7, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU.

Emasculated and pained, Henry felt frustration and anger. Yet, despite his extreme displeasure at the war's conclusions and his new prospects as a United States citizen, he endured. Henry felt the need to explain to his parents his new obligations. He intended to keep the oath faithfully while in the United States. No cause could justify breaking it, for his personal honor decided his external actions. But Henry's sense of public honor did not govern his personal feelings. His fidelity to the United States could never "change the desires and emotions" of his heart.¹¹⁴

Thus, at the war's beginning and end gendered language and strong feelings shaped Southerners' understanding of themselves and their conflict. Public reputation directed feelings of self-worth, thereby suggesting a need for outside validation. At the war's beginning men such Richardson understood their commitment to community and citizenship to be central to the rationale for enlistment. These same forces drove Henry to dedicate himself to the Union. Public actions do not always reveal private feelings, however. A rich constellation of emotions framed Henry's thoughts, and the heart often moved him. Intense devotions and demonstrative reactions directed the course of his actions. He understood well the dictates of honor and loyalty, but maintained an internal balance between what society asked of him and what he intensely felt. By considering his public actions only, much of the motivation behind these acts is lost producing more misunderstanding, than understanding.

Even after Henry became a United States citizenship again, he remained emotionally committed to the Confederacy and racked by the pains of defeat. These traumas shaped his bleak outlook for the remainder of 1865. Concerned over her son's

¹¹⁴ Henry to parents, 21 June 1865, Box 1, Folder 7, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU. See also Anne Rubin's excellent account of Richardson's oath. Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*, 164-5.

distressed state, Henry's mother, Eunice, wrote a heartfelt letter of cheer. Solace could be found, she contended, in his meritorious service. She could not comprehend what he had endured and survived. Honor could be found in these sacrifices. "You have almost laid down your life for the Confederacy, and it does seem to me, my dear son that after all you have done, and suffered, now that the Confederacy had ceased to exist," he should spare himself any reproaches for taking the oath.¹¹⁵ A mother's soothing words could not calm Henry's aching heart. Drifting between the homes of friends in Louisiana, Henry lived an unsettled existence and found the inactivity tiresome. But he was without alternative. Not knowing what to do, Henry declared the country "ruined—dead—and will continue so till some labor system is fixed." He bemoaned the condition of African Americans and wished that some of "your anti-slavery people could see the condition of the negroes in this country now and compare it with what it was before the war. Talk about the 'sin of slavery'! If ever there was a sin it was in putting the negroes in their present condition. Who is responsible," he wondered.¹¹⁶ A nonslaveholder himself, Henry struck out at Northerners, at abolitionists, at African Americans. Embittered, lonely, and despairing, he remained without purpose.

In striking contrast, James Burdge Walton found calmness amidst the calamity of the spring and summer of 1865. By May, U. S. soldiers garrisoned his temporary home of Augusta, Georgia, and the stars and stripes flew over prominent buildings. For myself, he wrote, "I shall submit to the condition of things as I find them, having no

¹¹⁵ Eunice Thurston Richardson to Henry Brown Richardson, 15 July 1865, Box 1, Folder 3, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU.

¹¹⁶ Henry Brown Richardson to parents, 21 June 1865, Box 1, Folder 7, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU.

reproaches for the past, no fear of the present, and abundant hope of the future.”¹¹⁷ We may question the sincerity of Walton’s words, for such sentiments could very well have been intended to sooth a worried family. After all, they, not he, had fully felt the economic ruin and personal privations of civil war at the home front. Yet, he seemed possessed by a very real presence of mind, thereby suggesting genuine sentiments. He had done his duty and felt himself glad to have neither brought on war nor helped foster its disastrous close. With these ideas, especially, Walton joined a chorus of Southern whites who refused to acknowledge any wrongdoing in bringing about the conflict.¹¹⁸ With the war over, he wrote, “We must reconcile ourselves to the Will of God,” and embrace the future.¹¹⁹ More importantly, though, Walton gladly turned to his family, people for whom he felt great pride.¹²⁰

Absolving himself both of the war’s causes and conclusions, James turned to higher powers to locate the conflict’s ultimate meaning. Is it not “manifest in this result that Providence has never been with us,” he wondered. If God had desired to give the South victory, God would have spared Generals Stonewall Jackson and Jeb Stuart. And, “the carnage & flow of the dearest blood in the land would have been stayed. I have always been a believer in the efficacy of prayer – this end makes me almost a skeptic.”¹²¹ With these powerful words Walton questioned the effectiveness of prayer,

¹¹⁷ [James] B. [Walton] to Amelia [M. A. Walton], 6 May 1865, Series I., Folder 58, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, HNOC.

¹¹⁸ Barney, *The Making of a Confederate*, 11.

¹¹⁹ B. to Amelia [M. A. Walton], 6 May 1865, Series I., Folder 58, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, HNOC.

¹²⁰ For white men’s embrace of family, Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender*, 142-4.

¹²¹ B. to Amelia [M. A. Walton], 6 May 1865, Series I., Folder 58, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, HNOC. For similar sentiments among southern men, Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender*, 140-41.

wondered about the meaning of God's actions, and doubted the righteousness of the Confederate cause. But these questions had only shaken, not destroyed, his faith. Walton's faltering beliefs and reflections on divine intervention reveal a man desperate to distance himself from a cause he increasingly doubted. His winter letters referenced earlier showed his great distress over the continued bloodshed and fear over the war's destructive course. Personal absolution may have been necessary for psychological survival. Metaphysical pondering could not sustain a family's wants, however. Hoping to secure "happiness & comfort" both for himself and loved ones "in the uncertain days that are before us," Walton left Augusta for New York to negotiate the sale of cotton.¹²² Walton once again balanced the two faces of his manhood. In the same letter that questioned the very foundation of the Christian tradition, Walton also expressed his great concern over his family's material well-being. Only by expressing his public role and exposing his personal self did Walton realize himself fully.

Yet, the continued absence caused him consternation and necessitated explanation. The experiences of the past war suggested continued patience. He wrote to his wife Amelia that he must "do what seems to be right," having learned in "these late long years of trial & privation, to submit to the dictates of fate."¹²³ With these material comforts he hoped to rebuild his family and offered his wife optimistic promises for the future. "I begin to conclude I have a cheerful & hopeful spirit, for really I am not at all desponding and feel I shall be very happy. May I hope that your own, always brave heart, responds to this temper. We may have more to bear up against than we now

¹²² James [B. Walton] to Amelia [M. A. Walton], 10 June 1865, Series I., Folder 59, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, HNOG.

¹²³ James [B. Walton] to Amelia [M. A. Walton], 10 June 1865, Series I., Folder 59, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, HNOG.

discover – but I do not believe it, - at all events, I am not going to give up. Be assured I am quite equal to the occasion.”¹²⁴ His life spared and now having passed through the horrific trials of war, Walton hoped to be born anew, to become a changed man. His joyous outpouring to his wife reflected a man who hoped to embrace life with renewed vigor and filter his experiences through the lens of a newfound happiness.

Whether or not Walton and his family achieved and maintained the happiness they so desired remains unknown, for their private lives were replaced instead by public records. Like scores of Confederate soldiers, the final return home concluded the extended correspondence of many men. Perhaps the very silence suggests success. Where Walton’s pen fell silent, however, Richardson’s was picked up with renewed vigor. Henry slowly conquered the great depression that consumed him for months after the war. By the fall of 1865 he worked as an engineer, maintaining levees in Tensas Parish. Monetary reward and steady work paled in comparison to his newfound joy. In an excited letter to his mother Henry proclaimed: “I have been here for two days, passing the happiest Christmas of my whole life. And I want to tell you what makes me so happy. It is because I am with Miss Nannie Farrar, whom I love more than anybody in the world, and who, I hope, loves me.”¹²⁵ In Anna “Nannie” Farrar, Henry found a new life. Shattered by the death of the Confederacy, Henry thought “there was nothing left to live for, and as if I never could be happy again.” But now, he wrote, “I have been a new man—happier, and I hope better than I ever was before. Indeed it seems to me almost as if I had never lived at all before, and as for the Confederacy, though my views and

¹²⁴ James [B. Walton] to Amelia [M. A. Walton], 10 June 1865, Series I., Folder 59, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, HNOG.

¹²⁵ Henry Brown Richardson to Mother, 26 December 1865, Box 1, Folder 7, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU.

feelings as to the right and justice of the matter are unchanged, I can smile to think how small and insignificant a matter it was to set my heart on, when there is still left such a treasure as Miss Nannie.”¹²⁶ Having once lived for the Confederacy, Henry was ready now to die for Nannie.

Deciphering this transformation is difficult. In the midst of an untamed bliss Henry’s urge to separate himself from the Confederacy and from the pain of war is an understandable reaction. But to suggest that his happiness completely voided the war’s meaning seems wrong. Richardson’s civilian identity eventually subsumed his martial life and while he would forever remain a veteran of the conflict (and in later years often discuss his wartime service), his future role as a husband, perhaps even a father, took precedent. Marriage completed Henry as a man in a way that war never could. Devotion to his wife and his job as an engineer fulfilled him. In a devoted relationship, Henry found an array of new obligations and joys. He happily finished one letter for Nannie after she was called away. He playfully wrote to his parents: “Nannie says ‘write’ and finish her letter while she attends to sundry household matters; and like an obedient and dutiful husband I am writing.”¹²⁷ Obedience to her wishes gave Henry great pleasure. In her he could lose himself. Yet, Henry also recognized his new position as a household head. He told his parents, partly in jest but also reflecting his new responsibilities, “the fact is that since I have become the head of a family, with authority and dominion over the other members thereof, I have delegated to her [Nannie]—she being a weaker vessel, a number of my former occupations and duties; among which are patching and

¹²⁶ Henry Brown Richardson to Mother, 26 December 1865, Box 1, Folder 7, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU.

¹²⁷ Henry to parents, 31 January [1868?], Box 1, Folder 9, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU.

darning, sewing on buttons and writing letters, and the general supervision, direction and care for and of the respectability and decency of the entire family.”¹²⁸ Unable to control the Confederacy or refuse the oath of allegiance, Henry now found himself in charge of a household and delegated tasks to its members with glee. For within the household, among its members, Henry finally realized his role and place as a man.

These narratives suggest something about experiences and feelings at the Civil War’s close. In the conflict’s final months diverse reactions to the Confederacy’s collapse shaped the personal paths of these two men as they began the processes of personal reconstructions. James Burdge Walton, ensconced in the trenches of Richmond, feared an interminable conflict that would keep him away from family and home. His duties as a man demanded faithful service but his feelings as a father, a friend, and a husband made his yearnings for the Civil War’s end powerful. Perhaps in this period his loyalty to the Confederacy waned and he began questioning the conflict that had removed him from those he loved.¹²⁹ Feelings and longings, then, not patriotism, shaped Walton’s understanding of the war’s ultimate meaning. He felt sadness and loss at the Confederacy’s death but also found pride in his family and excitement in what was to come. Ultimately, he distanced himself from the conflict, questioned the Confederacy, and concluded that the war’s results reflected God’s will. War now suggested nothing but pain and agony, whereas as family could bring

¹²⁸ Henry to Parents, 30 November 1868, Box 1, Folder 9, Richardson and Family Papers, LSU.

¹²⁹ J. Tracy Power describes 1864 as a year of “unprecedented” destruction leading many soldiers to conclude that, “1865 would be the last year of the conflict.” By the spring, Power contends many of Lee’s men had a loss of purpose. J. Tracy Power, *Lee’s Miserables: Life in the Army of Northern Virginia from the Wilderness to Appomattox* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 234. See also, Chapters 8 and 9. For a counter argument about the persistence of Confederate loyalty, Jason Phillips, *Diehard Rebels: The Confederate Culture of Invincibility* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2007), see Chapter Five and Conclusion for his rich description of this ethos in the war’s close and beyond.

happiness and joy. He worried less about the future, for anything was better than what he had experienced.

Henry Brown Richardson reached a strikingly similar conclusion, but only after a period of terrible mourning. Walton's junior and a veteran of one war not two, Richardson had no family attachments in the state of Louisiana. These factors surely directed his unwavering devotion to the Confederate cause in the war's final months, and partially explains the divergent reactions by these two Louisianians. And yet the public postures that initially defined Henry's commitment to the Confederacy and defiance of his parent's wishes gave way to strong internal feelings. Like James, strong passions governed him as a man. At the war's close Henry maintained a nearly fanatical commitment to his fallen nation. Inactivity and the humiliation of taking an oath of allegiance drove him to despair. But during this darkest period he became incredibly uplifted by the promise of love. As the pains of war dulled with time Henry found unimaginable happiness with his wife and their burgeoning family. Understanding both men, then, requires a consideration of their emotional lives in conjunction with material realities, a recognition of family with their place as citizens. Through the filter of these ideas and feelings they sifted the uncertainties of the future and carved out their roles as civilians.

Conclusions

Through the words, actions, and emotions of veterans, this chapter demonstrates that Southern white men were forced to confront military defeat and then negotiate a difficult transition between military and civilian masculinities. Some terrorized Southern whites and freed people, others ravaged Confederate property, many collaborated with their former enemies to bring law and order, and still others succumbed to

despondency. Sharp divisions between war and peace do not accurately reflect the ambiguities of this period or the experiences of its participants. Instead, Southern whites experienced a sense of aimlessness and profound confusion, which suggest that the wounds of war were not easily fixed. These men employed different means to grapple with both their inner struggles and outer turmoil, resulting in personal and physical landscapes fraught by disorder. While the spring and summer chaos of 1865 eventually ended, the veterans' inner wars continued, shaping the trajectory of Reconstruction.¹³⁰ Furthermore, Southern men each sought different paths toward their personal reconstructions. These journeys sought to mend the wounds of war and reaffirm veterans' position as Southern men and citizens. Rather than offering tidy conclusions, the stories of these men remained unsettled as they tried to reconstitute themselves and their society. For sons of the South the transition into civilian life proved halting, but pivotal to the South's changing character. Veterans' actions and experiences dictated the atmosphere and direction of postwar life in many Southern communities—their memories of the war and their struggles to find peace contributed to the tumult of the Reconstruction-era. Though these pains, indeed, lessened over time, the consequences of this period echoed for decades.¹³¹

¹³⁰ W. Scott Poole's recent study, *Never Surrender*, while focused on the South Carolina Upcountry, suggests that scholars should reexamine continued resistance and the Lost Cause through cultural forms and expressions. While outside of this paper's purview directly, Poole's argument has influenced my thinking. Poole, *Never Surrender*.

¹³¹ In his provocative 1981 essay, "A Generation of Defeat," David H. Donald posited that, "segregation and disfranchisement should be viewed as the final public acts, the last bequests, of the Southern Civil War generation." Donald holds that white Southerners' simultaneous traumas of defeat and emancipation eventually facilitated racial segregation and disfranchisement. Donald's conclusions, while more far-reaching than what I hope to argue, suggest how deeply the war affected white Southerners' ideas and identities. David H. Donald, "A Generation of Defeat," reprinted in Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton, eds., *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 334; see also 334-40.

CHAPTER 6 PERSONAL RECONSTRUCTIONS

On 2 May 1865, the tired remnants of the Army of Tennessee, encamped in Greensboro, North Carolina, gathered to hear Confederate General Joseph E. Johnston's final orders. He asked his men to return home and discharge the "obligations of good and peaceful citizens" as effectively as they had "performed the duties of thorough soldiers in the field."¹ Johnston's decree represented a hopeful augur for Confederate soldiers' transition from war to peace. The hand of war, however, did not discriminate between field and home, and many white Southerners could not separate the trauma of battle from the tranquility of the hearth. An often-strong public face obscured veterans' private wars.

Poised at the edge of war and peace, the actions and emotions of Confederate veterans not only determined on what terms the Civil War closed but also shaped the contours of white Southern culture during the postbellum era. As former Confederates confronted their future lives as United States citizens, most attempted also to maintain allegiance to their military service. The sacrifices of war and the outpouring of blood were impossible to forget, and Southern men could not separate these wartime experiences from their postwar lives. Recovering such visceral reactions is essential in revealing veterans' more immediate and raw emotions—pure sentiments uncluttered by bold proclamations of continued defiance or burgeoning Lost Cause mythology. In this moment of crisis white Southerners' intellectual orders collapsed, for the Civil War was too momentous and the events afterward too injurious for Confederates to often

¹ J. E. Johnston, General Orders, No. 22, in U. S. War Department, *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, Series 1, 47, part 1 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1895), 1061; hereinafter, *OR*.

comprehend their worlds in the wake of defeat. Negotiating these private landscapes, veterans tried to comprehend what the Civil War meant and how it changed them as men. Between the years 1865 and 1868, especially, a palpable sense of defeat and loss gripped the South—a region that suffered social and economic devastation.

This chapter explores how Confederate veterans reacted to war and defeat with the wider aim of illuminating links between gender and emotions. How white Southern men balanced pain and hatred with a desire to reestablish self—reassert manliness and authority—in a shattered South shaped the atmosphere and direction of Reconstruction. New forms and models of emotional expression and experience emerged during this process. Understanding these responses and Southerners' feelings creates new models for understanding the South itself.² Confederate soldiers were traveling unfamiliar ground as they began the process of becoming veterans. James Marten nicely states the proposition soldiers faced: "They had been soldiers for a year or two or three but would be veterans for the rest of their lives. And the process of becoming a veteran, of being a civilian again, lasted longer and was much harder for many of them than anyone would have expected."³ Southern men suffered irreparable, internal traumas from the Civil War. Soldiers themselves grappled with these inner demons leaving only fragmentary records of inner thoughts and outer struggles. Parsing out veterans' emotions, revealing their continued troubles, is difficult. It seems certain, though, that white Southern men assumed new identities in the wake of war.

² Peter N. Stearns and Carol Z. Stearns, "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards," *The American Historical Review*, vol. 90, no. 4 (Oct., 1985): 813-36.

³ Marten, *Sing Not War*, 49.

Despite scholar's widespread acknowledge of the Civil War's destructiveness, few have ventured into the emotional and mental universe created by this conflict. Using letters and diaries, especially, this chapter illuminates a crucial moment in veterans' lives—a period when dispirited, anxious, and confused Southerners reentered civic life and became civilians once more. In the broadest form, Confederates passed through, or experienced, three distinct phases during the Civil War's end and beyond—each of these phases is represented by a chapter section. These periods were both competing and overlapping, and involved different men driven by divergent interests or gripped by contrasting troubles. First, after military surrender Confederate soldiers grappled with the war's ultimate meaning and projected for what the future might hold. During this crucial moment in ex-Confederates' lives they began the halting process of transitioning from soldiers to veterans. Once reestablished at home many became consumed by depression, were gripped by terror, and encountered dulling numbness. The emotional range that paralyzed men and created domestic tensions composes the second prong of analysis.⁴ And finally, how whites envisioned their place in the reformed country and on what terms they understood citizenship and commitments to state and nation underpins the final section.

Scholars almost uniformly recognize the Civil War's transformative effects upon whites and Southern society, but have reached no consensus as to the degree or extent of change. On the one hand, historians have charged that the war was remembered but its pains and consequences were eventually forgotten. By extension, the conflict did not

⁴ The best treatments on postwar depression and post-traumatic stress are Eric T. Dean, Jr., *Shook Over Hell: Post-Traumatic Stress, Vietnam, and the Civil War* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1997); Wyatt-Brown, "Honor Chastened," in *The Shaping of Southern Culture*; and Jeffery McClurken..... On what emotions reveal, Edward John Harcourt, "The Whipping of Richard Moore: Reading Emotion in Reconstruction America," *Journal of Social History* 36, issue 2 (Winter 2002): 268.

decisively change whites' intellectual frameworks, excepting the monumental readjustment to emancipation.⁵ On the other hand, cultural and intellectual historians, in particular, have stressed that the forces of Civil War and emancipation forever shifted white Southern mindsets. Former Confederates' war of defiance continued into the years of Reconstruction and beyond.⁶ The latter camp is foundational to my examination of Confederate veterans. By considering the interplay between men's private lives and public actions, this chapter offers a new way of understanding men's inner responses to war and the tumultuous, prolonged transition to peace. Defeated in battle and uncertain of the future, Southern men were driven by emotions of hatred, humiliation, and hubris. Whites grappled with a sense of self at the same time that they were struggling to reimpose a public self, especially vis-à-vis freedpeople. Men responded to their internal crises in ways ranging from bewilderment to depression to numbness to rage. Military surrender temporarily paralyzed veterans, creating feelings of uselessness and emasculation. These psychological wounds became physically manifest most immediately and noticeably during the war's close as men were unmoored and manliness unrestrained. In the end, depression and anger shaped Reconstruction as much as political commitments and ideological expressions.

⁵ On the first two points see especially Paul M. Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study of Southern Mythmaking* (1970; repr., Montgomery, AL: NewSouth Books, 2002), Prologue and Chapter One and Gaines M. Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, The Lost Cause, and The Emergence of the New South, 1865 to 1913* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 15-35, specifically. James L. Roark, *Masters Without Slaves: Southern Planters in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1978), Chapter Four and Peter S. Carmichael, *The Last Generation: Young Virginia in Peace, War, and Reunion* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), Chapter Eight each posit continuity in Southern mind-sets.

⁶ Jack P. Maddex, *The Reconstruction of Edward A. Pollard: A Rebel's Conversion to Postbellum Unionism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1974); Anne C. Rose, *Victorian America and the Civil War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Stephen Kantrowitz, *Ben Tillman & the Reconstruction of White Supremacy* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000); and Poole, *Never Surrender*.

Personal Transformations

The outer face of the war's tumultuous close does not fully reveal veterans' inner experiences. In the wake of Appomattox rapid movements, scarce supplies, and unreliable mail service contribute to a gap in the historical record. Nevertheless, it is possible to bridge this divide.⁷ Three rather extended accounts from late 1865 and into 1866 survive, thereby providing an invaluable, if skewed, glimpse into the shifting mindsets of Southern whites and how these men reshaped ideas of manliness. Confederate Commander of the Trans-Mississippi Department Edmund Kirby Smith, Chief of Confederate Ordnance Josiah Gorgas, and George Anderson Mercer, an officer and Savannah lawyer, while not representative of the Confederate rank and file—wealth and rank eschew such an interpretation—do offer a range of reactions to and reflections on the war's meaning and their place within the South, and the United States more generally. Moreover, each man's course during the Confederacy's collapse is emblematic of Southerners' responses more generally: Kirby Smith fled the South entirely for a period, part of a larger exodus; Gorgas relocated in an attempt to begin life anew; and Mercer returned to his prewar home of Savannah.

Grappling with a profound series of changes, men responded to these internal crises in varied ways ranging from bewilderment to depression to numbness. As Confederate veterans confronted their future lives as United States citizens, most attempted also to maintain allegiance to their wartime service. The conflicting personal emotions of anger, pain, and confusion shaped the contours of civilian life just as much as any ideological commitment to either the Confederacy or the United States. These

⁷ For similar problems in documenting the spring and summer of 1865, see Phillips, *Diehard Rebels*, 5.

ideas and sentiments swirled together as veterans confronted reconstruction. Rather than adhering to an overarching ethos, white Southerners gradually reordered new and old cultural materials that both reacted to the new order and reinforced older values—they attempted to regain mastery over both self and society by reordering their worlds.⁸ As Anne Rubin argues, former Confederates worked to create a new identity for themselves as Southerners who remained culturally distinctive from Northern society.⁹ But, these strides toward stability obscure veterans' continued internal struggles. It would not be accurate to contend that all or even most former soldiers suffered from depression in the years after the war. It is notable, however, that these feelings surface time and again in veterans' writings. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, in her article, "The Anxiety of History," nicely captures the South's jaundiced vision after defeat: "Their cause had been just, their defeat brutal. And with their defeat had come the destruction of all that was good and bold and gracious in a mindless, faceless, gray world."¹⁰ After the excitement and confusion of April and May 1865, veterans confronted how defeat shaped them as men and how they would reconstitute themselves within society and

⁸ How Southerners' reacted to the war is a long-standing historiographical debate. For brevity, I will discuss only two of the most relevant works. Foster suggests that white Southerners used the Lost Cause as a mechanism to overcome the anxieties brought with military defeat and New South social and economic change. Southerners remembered the battle but had forgotten the war's pain, its cost, and its issues, and instead formed an understanding of the past forged by ceremonial activities and rituals. Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, Introduction. More recently W. Scott Poole has argued that upcountry South Carolinians fashioned an "aesthetic of the Lost Cause," which they used to publicly articulate a vision for an ordered and organic society. "Devotion to the Confederacy," he writes, "became a religious value for South Carolinians who sought to shape a southern scared world." W. Scott Poole, *Never Surrender: Confederate Memory and Conservatism in the South Carolina Upcountry* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004), 3.

⁹ Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*, 190.

¹⁰ Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, "The Anxiety of History: The Southern Confrontation with Modernity," *Southern Cultures* (1993): 77.

among family. But such a process proved halting and difficult, for Southerners had to first make sense of their failures.

Comprehending the trials they had just endured proved difficult for many veterans. In the spring of 1865, Josiah Gorgas reflected on what had transpired. “The calamity which has fallen upon us in the total destruction of our government is of a character so overwhelming that I am as yet unable to comprehend it. I am as one walking in a dream, and expecting to awake. I cannot see its consequences.”¹¹ George Anderson Mercer, too, expressed similar disbelief and wonderment. He recorded in his diary that he was unable to recover from “the stunning effect of mingled surprise and grief caused by the sudden prostration of our cause. The noble structure we had reared was leveled like a house of cards.”¹² Engulfed by defeat, these men were forced, in the words of Bertram Wyatt-Brown, “to drink the bitter cup of psychological ruin.”¹³ The foundations that defined Southern men and manliness had been shaken by war, and white Southerners had to now refashioned their culture, reconstruct their “civilization,” and recover from a stunning shock. Southerners had to confront the history they created.¹⁴ But the ambiguities of the war’s results did not create tidy conclusions—a fact placed in stark relief by veterans’ responses to, and interpretations of, war and defeat.

Official military parole meant little in the hands of men such as Gorgas and Mercer, who found no honor or place in the newly reformed country but instead

¹¹ Josiah Gorgas, 4 May 1865, [typed copy of journal], Josiah Gorgas Papers, SHC.

¹² George Anderson Mercer, 11 June 1865, Personal Diary, George Anderson Mercer Papers, SHC.

¹³ Wyatt-Brown, “Honor Chastened,” in Wyatt-Brown, *The Shaping of Southern Culture*, 256.

¹⁴ Insights on the relationship between the individual and the social were gained in Thomas R. Flynn, *Sartre, Foucault, and Historical Reason: Toward an Existentialist Theory of History*, vol. I (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1997), 19-22, especially.

uncomfortably resettled into postwar life gradually adjusting to momentous changes. The inability to secure steady income and interaction with federal soldiers, in particular, left Southern manliness embattled, and forced the construction and reconstruction of new social and ideological expressions. Confused and deeply unsettled, Gorgas decided to travel to Alabama. Here, in his adopted state, he would wait before again coming under the authority of the United States government.¹⁵ Though he remained silent on the subject, Gorgas was perhaps drawn to a familiar place to anchor him during a period of uncertainty. One of his first interactions with federal soldiers produced a variety of personal reactions. Feeling amicable enough, he took tea with a group of federal officers. A novel sensation, he wrote, but one to which he had to adjust, as white Southerners' "late enemies" were now their new "masters."¹⁶ By invoking the word "master," specifically, Gorgas assumed a prostrate stance and relinquished control of full liberties to the war's victors—unfathomable gestures only weeks before as he, like many soldiers, pledged to continue the war at all costs. The specter of defeat was now a tangible reality in the form of occupying federal soldiers. Moreover, Gorgas recognized his ambiguous place in a social structure leveled by war. Federal soldiers and the results of emancipation dispossessed Southern whites of the mastery they wielded in the antebellum era's racial order. At least for a time, they were no longer masters of their destiny or agents of power.

Usurpations provoked depression, and though his military service was over, Gorgas's inner wars continued. Without an occupation and in Alabama, far away from

¹⁵ Gorgas, 4 May 1865, *The Journals of Josiah Gorgas*, 167.

¹⁶ Gorgas, 26 May 1865, *Gorgas Papers*, SHC.

his family in Virginia, he became consumed by depression.¹⁷ “With no right to life, liberty or property,” he renewed his interest in leaving the country, though this dream, too, proved fleeting.¹⁸ Men such as Gorgas struggled in the postwar South, often unable especially in 1865-66 to reach any real sense of settlement or finality. For these veterans the past and present mixed together as they grappled with self-definition. During this period of transition veterans expressed feelings of compromise and recalcitrance. George Mercer captured the stormy sentiments of many when he wrote, “The southern people have in good faith given up their patriarchal system of African slavery as the result of the war; they are in good faith willing to maintain union under the Constitution; but they have not consented to surrender their freedom and manhood.”¹⁹ Freedom and manhood, while altered, became foundational to veterans’ personal reconstructions during the postwar era and, once considered in conjunction with racism, help explain their reactionary stand against the forces of federal control and the advancement of African Americans.

Others were not willing to immediately embrace the postwar South’s dramatic changes and instead left the region entirely. Between the years 1865 and 1867, especially, Mexico, the Caribbean, Canada, and Central and South America appealed to diehard rebels as last refuges from Northern rule. Ultimately, according to scholars, some eight to ten thousand Southerners fled the United States rather than face defeat

¹⁷ Gorgas, 31 August 1865, *The Journals of Josiah Gorgas*, 186.

¹⁸ Gorgas, 2 June 1865, *The Journals of Josiah Gorgas*, 175.

¹⁹ Mercer Diary, 17 December 1865, Box 1, Volume 5, Mercer Papers, SHC.

and emancipation, though exponentially more dreamed of leaving.²⁰ Confederate General Edmund Kirby Smith—a Floridian by birth and career United States Army officer before the war—joined these emigrants as he tried to redefine what freedom meant to a defeated Confederate officer.

In late May 1865, Kirby Smith angrily stood by as the surviving remnants of his Trans-Mississippi army were formally surrendered.²¹ The cause, he realized, was all but lost. Earlier that month, Kirby Smith asked one of Shreveport, Louisiana’s leading private citizens, Robert Rose, to convey his regards to the Emperor of Mexico and to make certain that the Emperor understood that the services of Confederate troops “would be of inestimable value to him.”²² Whatever preparations were made for this plan collapsed in mid-to-late May as the armies of the Trans-Mississippi evaporated and Kirby Smith became a commanding general in name only. Unable to secure “terms honorable alike to . . . soldiers & citizens,” Kirby Smith did not participate in the formal surrender and pledged instead to “struggle to the last.” He admonished his men’s actions in a public proclamation: “Soldiers! I am left a command without an army—a General without troops. You have made yr. choice. It was unwise & unpatriotic. But it is

²⁰ Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 15-7; Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*, 173; Phillips, *Diehard Rebels*, 181-2; Andrew F. Rolle, *The Lost Cause: The Confederate Exodus to Mexico* (1965, reprint; Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992); Carl Coke Rister, “Carlota, A Confederate Colony in Mexico,” *The Journal of Southern History* 11 no. 1 (February 1945): 33-50; Blanche H. C. Weaver, “Confederate Emigration to Brazil,” *Journal of Southern History* 27 (February 1961): 33-53; and Donald E. Sutherland, “Exiles, Emigrants, and Sojourners: The Post-Civil War Confederate Exodus in Perspective,” *Civil War History* 31 (September 1985): 237-56.

²¹ Andrew F. Rolle, *The Lost Cause: The Confederate Exodus to Mexico* (1965, reprint; Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992), 50 and Kerby, *Kirby Smith’s Confederacy*, 424.

²² Edmund Kirby Smith to Robert Rose, 2 May 1865, quoted in Kerby, *Kirby Smith’s Confederacy*, 415.

final. I pray you may not live” to regret it.²³ The speech’s strident tone suggested a man in total control of his own destiny and determined in his resolve. And, indeed, by late June Kirby Smith traveled through Texas and crossed into Mexico.

On June 26, 1865, a beleaguered band of Confederate soldiers buried their frayed battle flags under the sands of the Río Grande’s north bank, forded the river’s warm murky waters, and then crossed into Mexico. Edmund Kirby Smith led the party. The once dashing leader was now in shirtsleeves with a silk handkerchief around his neck, a revolver to his side, and a shotgun across his lap. Traveling by mule, Kirby Smith fled the South having left behind everything except, he later explained to his wife, “a clear conscience and a sense of having done my duty.”²⁴ Though assured of his honor, Kirby Smith’s future remained unclear. But, even the “darkness and uncertainty” that awaited him could not “entirely check the feeling of lightness and joy experienced” when he felt himself to be “plain Kirby Smith,” relieved from all cares and responsible only for his own actions.²⁵ Unburdened by the responsibilities of command Kirby Smith seized his newly gained freedom as essential in his quest to close his civil war—ephemeral feelings he would realize only later.

Scores of soldiers from the Confederacy’s eastern and western armies eventually joined Mexico’s fight for independence from French control, while others established the

²³ Proclamation Draft [26 May 1865], Edmund Kirby-Smith to the Trans-Mississippi Department, Kirby-Smith Papers, SHC.

²⁴ N/D Papers, [Edmund Kirby Smith to Cassie Selden Kirby Smith, June-July 1865], Kirby-Smith Papers, SHC. See also, Robert L. Kerby, *Kirby Smith’s Confederacy: The Trans-Mississippi South, 1863-1865* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972), 428-9.

²⁵ N/D Papers, [Edmund Kirby Smith to Cassie Selden Kirby Smith, June-July 1865], Kirby-Smith Papers, SHC.

short-lived Confederate colony of Carlota.²⁶ Even those Southerners who had traveled beyond the South's borders, however, never let home drift far from their minds but instead incorporated these experiences into their Southern self-identification.²⁷ Thomas Cate Reynolds, Missouri's former governor, wrote to diehard Confederate General and Virginian Jubal Early that he still considered himself "a citizen and resident of Missouri" while in Mexico. He hoped to return there one day and wished "success to all efforts to restore the South to equality and *power*." But he would stay abroad where the President and his armies were "powerless to hurt a hair" on his head.²⁸ Perhaps unknown to Reynolds and other exiles, the presence of Confederate troops on the Texas border and Mexico's volatile government was enough for Union General Ulysses S. Grant to dispatch Phil Sheridan and an entire army corps to the Río Grande to patrol the border. Sheridan's command eventually numbered 52,000 men.²⁹ Defiant under defeat but still desperately yearning for home while exiled, these Southerners maintained a position precariously balanced between two lands.

Many historians have rightly portrayed the exodus of white Southerners in the immediate postwar period as the defiant stand of so-called "unreconstructed rebels." While the motivations behind flight were mixed, many remained, "angry, unforgiving enthusiasts of human bondage," in the pointed description of Matthew Pratt Guterl.³⁰ It is

²⁶ Carl Coke Rister, "Carlota, A Confederate Colony in Mexico," *The Journal of Southern History* 11 no. 1 (February 1945): 33-50.

²⁷ Carl Rister, in his article on Carlota, held that despite good fortune most "former Confederates felt bitter about being exiles from the land of their birth. Rister, "Carlota, A Confederate Colony in Mexico," 45.

²⁸ Reynolds quoted in Rolle, *The Lost Cause*, 128.

²⁹ Rolle, *The Lost Cause*, 54-5.

³⁰ Matthew Pratt Guterl, *American Mediterranean: Southern Slaveholders in the Age of Emancipation* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2008), 91.

important not to diminish this image, but the public posturing of exiled Southerners belies a deeper reality. Exposed by the war's uncertain conclusion and concerned over their future standing as United States citizens, many white Southerners fled the country out of fear. High-ranking Confederate naval officer John Taylor Wood, for instance, noted that once in Cuba he was anxious to reach Canada as soon as possible, but was loath "to run any more risk, for they [the federal authorities] are as liable as ever to capture." The news from the United States, he continued, was anything but pleasant.³¹ Exiled soldiers remained tenuously suspended between military and civilian masculinities—not yet residing fully in either station. Southerners abroad embodied several vying personas: Confederate soldier, exiled citizen, and, in many cases, devoted husband and father. Southern whites had to move this cultural material from one order of significance to another to carve out a new position.³² Negotiating these private landscapes, veterans tried to comprehend what the Civil War meant and how it changed them as men.

Once in Mexico, Kirby Smith cast his fortunes elsewhere and traveled to Cuba, compelled by prudence and duty to escape the "excited feelings" of the Northern people and the federal government.³³ In truth, Kirby Smith's bold public posture betrayed a deeper reality of personal conflict—dreams and doubts—that formed his inner experiences and outer persona.³⁴ Kirby Smith's otherwise strong façade quickly

³¹ John Taylor Wood, 19 June 1865, Personal Diary, Volume 3, John Taylor Wood Papers, SHC.

³² Robert Cantwell's work heavily influenced this formulation of movement and culture. See, Robert Cantwell, *Ethnomimesis: Folklife and the Representation of Culture* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993), Introduction, especially.

³³ [Edmund Kirby Smith] [June-July 1865] N/D Papers, Kirby-Smith Papers, SHC.

³⁴ Stephen Berry deeply influenced this methodology. See, Berry, *All That Makes a Man*, especially 11.

dissolved as he penned loving words to his wife, sentiments deeply burdened by his troubles. Once settled in Cuba in the late summer of 1865, Edmund anxiously related to his wife Cassie: “I do not know rightly how to determine upon my future course, whether I shall adopt a new country, see a new home . . . or return to my own people, share their fate and recommence the battle of life amongst those we have long known and loved and who will sympathize with and cheer us in our trials and difficulties.”³⁵ Conflicted, he continued his public-stand against the federal government, though in his private correspondence this decision weighed heavily. Kirby Smith wanted to both return to his wife and maintain his public honor. Kirby Smith’s conflicts portray his conflicting duties as he made strides toward the construction of manhood. His place as a general demanded resolve and defiance, but his role as a husband required love and a commitment to home.

Military defeat called into question white Southerners’ manliness, for these men had, after all, failed in their attempt to construct a new nation.³⁶ Many Southern women, as LeeAnn Whites and other have argued, reassured weary veterans that the values underpinning antebellum Southern manliness—honor, virtue, and sacrifice—had been preserved.³⁷ These beliefs would now serve as the building blocks for the reconstruction of manhood and facilitate veterans’ shift from soldier to civilian.³⁸ Throughout the late summer of 1865 Edmund and Cassie exchanged letters that attempted to resolve the

³⁵ [Edmund Kirby Smith to Cassie Selden Kirby Smith], 21 August 1865, SHC.

³⁶ Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, 216.

³⁷ See especially LeeAnn Whites, *Gender Matters: Civil War, Reconstruction, and the Making of the New South* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), Chapter 5.

³⁸ Bederman, *Manliness & Civilization*, 7.

tangled web of Kirby Smith's exile: a resolution that could bring them together while maintaining honor. "I cannot nor, will not, live much longer," Cassie pleaded, separated from him and pledged to do "anything in honor" to have him with her.³⁹ Edmund preferred to return to the United States if it could be done "without degradation and humiliation." But, he refused to sacrifice his personal respect or his monetary interests, and most importantly, did not want to lose face. To Cassie, though, he also admitted defeat. "The war is over & our cause irretrievably lost." He questioned his earlier actions as perhaps unwise but refused to ever acknowledge his course as wrong.⁴⁰

Kirby Smith's words both reveal and obscure. Self-doubt and internal turmoil wind through his letters, but, a strong external demeanor and a determined course of action counterbalanced those sentiments. By late summer the couple determined a strategy. Cassie would petition President Andrew Johnson, in person, for her husband's return, while Edmund would write General Ulysses S. Grant, his friend from the Mexican-American War, about his status.⁴¹ Once assured that he could return to the United States without penalty or imprisonment, Kirby Smith set sail.⁴² Now, steeled by his family and assured of his honor, Kirby Smith cast his lot with the Southern people within the borders of his native land. He wrote "our people should not leave, instead of seeking asylums abroad, their own destinies and the triumph of the principles for which they fought are in their own hands, let them seek by every possible means the

³⁹ [Cassie Selden Kirby Smith to Edmund Kirby Smith], 15 August 1865, Kirby-Smith Papers, SHC.

⁴⁰ [Edmund Kirby Smith to Cassie Selden Kirby Smith], 21 August 1865, Kirby-Smith Papers, SHC.

⁴¹ [Cassie Selden Kirby Smith to Edmund Kirby Smith], 15 August 1865 and [Edmund Kirby Smith to Cassie Selden Kirby Smith, 2 October 1865], Kirby-Smith Papers, SHC.

⁴² U. S. Grant to E. Kirby Smith, 16 October 1865, Kirby-Smith Papers, SHC.

reestablishment of the state government in the natural course of events the military must then give way to the civil rule.”⁴³ Kirby Smith thus resurrected his earlier stand against the federal government, perhaps more vested in the South after his experiences abroad and more assured of his manliness by rejoining his family.

Kirby Smith’s continued allegiance to the Confederate cause resonated among many Southern whites who, once recovered from the terrible blow of defeat, began to interrogate both self and society.⁴⁴ Veterans’ introspection revealed internal discomfort at the prospects of being defined as United States citizens, while their future status as Southern civilians remained unformed. George Mercer reflected on his place as an American and a Southerner after having read an excerpt of William Makepeace Thackeray’s *Vanity Fair* in which an English traveler to foreign lands rejoiced after hearing “God Save the King.” Mercer was moved to tears as he “reflected that now there was no national song capable of producing similar emotions in me—that I could enjoy none of those grand public feelings that the citizens of a noble and free Government . . . so constantly experience. Alas, I must confess, all my national feeling is buried with the overthrown Confederacy, and there is nothing in the attitude of the U.S. . . . calculated to arouse similar emotions.”⁴⁵ While attempting to parse out his feelings Mercer maintained “an accurate diary of the workings and feelings of the mind.”⁴⁶ This reflex echoed his rationale for keeping a diary when hunting as a child and attending college as a young man, periods crucial to his passage into manhood. Aided

⁴³ [Edmund Kirby Smith to Cassie Selden Kirby Smith, 2 October 1865], Kirby-Smith Papers, SHC.

⁴⁴ Schivelbusch, *The Culture of Defeat*, 69-73.

⁴⁵ Mercer, 22 June 1866, Personal Diary, Mercer Papers, SHC.

⁴⁶ Mercer, 10 June 1866, Personal Diary, Mercer Papers, SHC.

by this device he tried to dissect his intellectual contours, reestablish his elevated prewar social position, and create a proper place in the postwar South. He sought, in a sense, to reconstruction himself as a man and as a Southern citizen.

Over time Mercer enjoyed financial success, though his mind remained “in a most restless discontented and unhappy state.” Geographic place, in particular, provoked considerable reflection and consternation. As with Gorgas and Kirby Smith, albeit under different circumstances, Mercer’s self-conception remained deeply invested in a sense of place. Beginning in the fall of 1866, Mercer renewed annual trips that he had taken before the war to New York City and Saratoga Springs. Once in these cities his “excited temperament was carried away by the noise and busy life—the crowded streets—the gay equipage and handsome buildings—and the beauty of the women one sees in the moving throng.” “After reaching home,” however, “everything . . . seemed dull and listless.”⁴⁷ Mercer justified his northern excursions with his wartime experiences reinforcing the proposition that both war and peace now formed equal parts of his self-identification. During military service, he noted, he had seen “seen no gaiety and had necessarily submitted to many privations.” Now he sought to embrace fully that which he had been deprived. Moreover, he wanted to escape the “stern requirements” of his profession.⁴⁸ Mercer’s emotions ebbed and flowed cyclically after each visit North—neither completely resigned to his new station in Savannah nor willing to resettle in the North, he constructed an uncomfortable middle ground during the Reconstruction-era. Mercer would never fully escape the South that he both loved and loathed or his former

⁴⁷ Mercer, 11 November 1866, Personal Diary, Mercer Papers, SHC.

⁴⁸ Mercer, 11 November 1866, Personal Diary, Mercer Papers, SHC.

travails as a soldier, for these mixed emotions were foundational to his new sense of self.

Whatever financial gain Mercer enjoyed proved unattainable to Josiah Gorgas, who drifted from job to job in Alabama—his destination in the spring of 1865. In the final months of 1866 and into the winter of 1867 Gorgas complained of severe depression caused, he perversely hoped, by poor health, though “mental anxiety” seemed the only real explanation.⁴⁹ On January 6, Gorgas entered a troubled passage into his diary. For the last four months he had lived “in a state of profound depression,” which had made life a burden. He desperately wrote: “I am certain that for no imaginable recompense would I live this life over again . . . annihilation must be the only thing left. Nothing is so terrible as despair.”⁵⁰ Nearly paralyzed by depression Gorgas struggled in the years after the war to resettle, to reestablishment himself, in an increasingly foreign South.

Returning Confederate veterans equated the South’s collapse to that of a fallen Republic from antiquity and their position to that of tormented victim. John Dooley wrote that, if only amid the “universal desolation the cheering form of Liberty would emerge bright, glorious, and triumphant,” what a reward the “haggard war-worn veteran” would meet. “But no! From this mournful wreck and frightful ruin the foul and unseemly head of despotism towers above its destined victims.”⁵¹ With Southern social systems unsettled and the hopes of an independent nation dispelled, white Southerner men turned within feeling wretched and hopeless. Failures both personal and political undermined southern manhood. In responding to these trials many succumbed to depression, for

⁴⁹ Gorgas, 15 October 1866, *The Journals of Josiah Gorgas*, 201.

⁵⁰ Gorgas, 15 October 1866, *The Journals of Josiah Gorgas*, 203.

⁵¹ Dooley, *John Dooley, Confederate Soldier*, Durkin, ed., 204.

their prewar world was now lost and the foundations for their self-identities crumbled. No where is this more apparent than among those who lost the most—members of the slaveholding class who underpin this study.

Discontented Confederates

On June 25, 1865, John Calhoun Clemson arrived home in Pendleton, South Carolina. The grandson of famed South Carolinian John C. Calhoun, Clemson was known by his family as Calhoun. Having served in the Confederate army for 4 years, twenty-two months of which were spent imprisoned on Johnson's Island, Lake Erie, Calhoun came home a changed man. On the one hand, his sister Floride wrote, Calhoun's once poor spelling vastly improved; he had become an avid reader. Friends spoke very well of him, and she felt he "must have improved much." On the other hand, Calhoun's character had subtly changed and his physical appearance had altered. Standing 6 feet 4 inches tall, Calhoun was well proportioned. He now wore a bushy, long beard and his wavy bright brown hair was set off, despite being only twenty-three years of age, by a few stray white hairs, "telling of his sufferings." A dreadful stoop diminished his otherwise towering figure. Calhoun's changed disposition was perhaps most startling to his sister: he appeared to be much graver, his language more profane, and his everyday manners were rough.⁵² Hungry in prison and often suffering from a loss of hope, the Civil War changed John Calhoun Clemson and forever shifted his place in society and his relationship to his family. An altered physical appearance and premature aging were overt signs of the war's more personal, transformative effects.

⁵² Charles M. McGee, Jr. and Ernest M. Lander, Jr., eds., *A Rebel Came Home: The Diary and Letters of Floride Clemson, 1863-1866*, (1961; revised edition, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989), quotes on respectively, 28 May 1865 and 26 June 1865, 88 and 89, see 87-90.

Prickly mannerisms and a somber disposition—deeper, more troubling signals—suggested to Floride that her brother Calhoun’s understanding of the world had been altered. However elusive these more abstract ideas and emotions were to even veterans’ contemporaries, revealing the dispositions that organized how Clemson and other white Southerners comprehended and perceived their worlds is essential to understanding how they thought about, and represented, the war and Reconstruction.⁵³

In the years after the Civil War, veterans’ recorded words were often taut with emotion as they reflected upon the war and its consequences. Men who had once largely defined their lives around an ancient code of honor and mobilized into armies believing in the righteous of their cause were now exposed to self-doubt, shame, and submission.⁵⁴ These emotions were transformative. Arguably, as never before, Southern men exposed themselves and their most inner feelings in written word.

Stephen Berry has greatly advanced our understanding of Southern men’s emotional lives in the antebellum period, but few scholars have followed his lead into the postwar years. Historians’ neglect of Southern whites’ emotions, Berry explains, is often rooted in limitations within source materials. For, as he writes, nineteenth-century men “were encouraged to cloak their hearts and stifle their doubts, to so carefully groom

⁵³ On this point see Daniel Wickberg, “What Is the History of Sensibilities? On Cultural Histories, Old and New,” *American Historical Review* (June 2007): 674-5.

⁵⁴ The classic statement on Southern honor remains Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982). See also Kenneth S. Greenberg, *Honor and Slavery: Lies, Duels, Noses, Masks, Dressing as a Woman, Gifts, Strangers, Humanitarianism, Death, Slave Rebellions, the Proslavery Argument, Baseball, Hunting, and Gambling in the Old South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); Edward E. Baptist, *Creating an Old South: Middle Florida’s Plantation Frontier Before the Civil War* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); and Edward E. Baptist, Stephen Berry, Orville Vernon Burton, Kenneth S. Greenberg, and Mark M. Smith, “Looking Back on Bertram Wyatt-Brown’s *Southern Honor*. A Roundtable,” *Historically Speaking: The Bulletin of the Historical Society* vol. IX, no. 6 (July/August 2008), 13-8.

their public persona as to become it.”⁵⁵ But, the self-doubt provoked by the prostration of the Confederate cause unmoored Southern men, leaving them to grapple with ideas of self and identity. Accessing the internal gymnastics these men performed is quite difficult but the inner thoughts of some whites illuminates a broader world.

After the war’s tumultuous end, white Southerners gradually reordered their worlds to gain mastery over both self and society. Former Confederates worked to create a new identity for themselves as Southerners who remained culturally distinctive from Northern society.⁵⁶ But these strides toward stability obscure veterans’ continued internal struggles as their emotional lives deeply influenced the atmosphere and shape of Southern society.⁵⁷ Men watched as unbounded possibilities and bright prospects corroded into dark horizons clouded by uncertainty. The emotional consequences proved devastating. White men, especially those of pre-war prominence, took solace in the present but only reluctantly planned for the future. War disrupted their public and private lives; the disaster of defeat only heightened this interruption. An overwhelming sense of apprehension that deeply affected mental states and social standings filtered Southerners’ readjustment to postwar life. The private responses of Southerners often ran counter to public accounts that typically emphasized the importance of rebuilding

⁵⁵ Berry, *All That Makes A Man*, 11.

⁵⁶ Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*.

⁵⁷ For the emotional consequences of defeat see Wyatt-Brown, “Death of a Nation” and “Honor Chastened,” in *The Shaping of Southern Culture*. Jackson Lears isolates a pervasive sense of doubt that shaped postwar life despite a public optimism, which he partially roots in the presence of Civil War veterans. T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920* (New York: Pantheon, 1981). In a later work Lears describes this as the “long shadow of Appomattox.” Jackson Lears, *Rebirth of a Nation: The Making of Modern America, 1877-1920* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2009).

region.⁵⁸ Destruction and reconstruction co-existed in their worldviews, for these men did think in simple dichotomies. Rather, men who were internally plagued managed also to maintain a strong facade and emphasized the importance of re-growth.

Few veterans' letters survive from, or were written during the months, even years, after Appomattox.⁵⁹ Scarce resources, prolonged movements, and poor mail contributed to this vacuum. But men were also gripped by listlessness and apathy during this period, often unable or unwilling to record their thoughts. Former Confederate William Alexander Hoke, for instance, found himself penniless and stranded in Texas after the war, yearning for his North Carolina home. In a July 9th letter to his mother Hoke apologized for it had been some time since he last wrote. "I could not write," he explained, "in fact could not for some time open my mouth to any one [as I] felt so badly about out national affairs[.] The result of the hard contest left such a heavy weight upon my heart." He only now felt better because he was more resigned, no less satisfied with the war's results.⁶⁰ Veterans' paralysis and shock poignantly reveal the psychological distress whites sometimes exhibited after the Civil War's end. Disoriented and dispirited men mourned the loss of a cause for which they had given so much. The trauma of defeat wounded these veterans and only after time did their scars become visible.⁶¹ Individualism, self-restraint, and sobriety defined the

⁵⁸ For the public face of white Southerners efforts at rebuilding see, Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*, 172-90, especially.

⁵⁹ For similar difficulties in locating sources materials in this and earlier periods see, Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, 207 and Phillips, *Diehard Rebels*, 5.

⁶⁰ W. L. Alexander to Mother, 9 July 1865, William Alexander Hoke Papers, Series 1.2, Box 2, Folder 12, SHC. For similar reactions see McClurken, *Take Care of the Living*, 66.

⁶¹ On Confederate men's immediate traumas after defeat see, Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 22-6 and McClurken, *Take Care of the Living*, 65-70.

Christian gentleman of the antebellum era. Few men, of course, met all of these expectations but the values shaped southern manhood.⁶² While such ideals continued into the postbellum era, economic hardships and intemperate behavior led many men to stray from the righteous path.

Soldiers' postwar breakdowns not only disrupted the South's white social order but also profoundly affected family life. John Smith Watson, father of famed agrarian leader Tom Watson, returned from war twice-wounded, his Confederate money worthless, and the family's plantation in sad repair.⁶³ Steeling himself against the changes brought by defeat and emancipation, John constructed a mansion in front of his father's modest log house. An elaborate facade complemented by an ornate portico and fluted columns stood as a symbolic rejection of the new order and harkened back to an idealized Old South. By 1868, the house was sold, greatly under value, and John increasingly suffered from what his son termed "the blues." Taking solace in strong drink, Watson became financially ruined by gambling.⁶⁴ Tom later remembered being "firmly governed" by his father, "abused, ridiculed, mocked, and scorned." Had it been otherwise, he mused, "there would be sunshine where now there is shadow."⁶⁵

So, too, however, did families offer solace for veterans. For those soldiers who were married, families became closer, the bonds of affection grew deeper. One Virginia soldier, in the height of war, regretted his earlier conduct. Thomas L. Rosser suffered in

⁶² Karen Taylor, "Reconstructing Men in Savannah, Georgia, 1865-1876," in Friend, *Southern Masculinity*, 2 and Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, 23-4.

⁶³ C. Vann Woodward, *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel* (1938; repr., New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), 12-3.

⁶⁴ Woodward, *Tom Watson*, 13-4. See also, Wyatt-Brown, "Honor Chastened," 262-3.

⁶⁵ Tom Watson quoted in Wyatt-Brown, "Honor Chastened," 263.

his wife's absence. He claimed such desperation if the war did not soon end, that he would leave the country entirely to enjoy her company undisturbed. Most importantly, though, he claimed to be a "changed man" and now relied on the "mercy of a just God to whom I constantly pray for protection and deliverance[.] Oh! my darling wife if I could only be with you for a short time!"⁶⁶ Such heartfelt sentiments were offered throughout the South. George Mercer reflected that, "some of the happiest moments of my life were spent here . . . in the companionship of my little family, my books and my thoughts, when I had no money, was thankful that I could even ~~live~~ live, and, putting aside the spirit of discontent, made a virtue of necessity."⁶⁷ For men who had lost everything family became a sustaining source of pride and support. Doctor Joseph Jones, like Mercer, bemoaned his financial losses but happily turned toward his family for comfort. After having devoted himself entirely to the Confederate cause he found himself with nothing left, "but a wife, three children, my profession."⁶⁸

It is tempting to wonder, though difficult to gauge, how these men interacted with the families they so cherished. John Calhoun Clemson and John Watson suggest men emotionally removed, even combative, while George Mercer's disposition demonstrates a new openness and a new awareness provoked by the war's otherwise disastrous consequences. Conceptions of manhood varied between men and interactions between the sexes adjusted accordingly. Robert Crooke Wood—Confederate veteran and New Orleans businessman—maintained extended correspondence with his newly wedded

⁶⁶ Thomas to "darling Wife," 7 July 1863, Box 1, Folder 1860-1873 Correspondence, Thomas Lafayette Rosser Papers, UVA.

⁶⁷ Mercer Diary, 10 June 1866, Box 1, Volume 5, Mercer Papers, SHC.

⁶⁸ Joseph Jones to Doctor [Paul Eve], 20 July 1866, Special Collections, Howard-Tilton Memorial Library, Tulane University.

wife during his frequent and prolonged business trips after the war. Of course, these letters are from a man removed, but they nonetheless shed some light on families' emotional bonds during a period of great hardship. Instead of folding within himself Rob confessed himself openly to his wife complaining of wretched spirits. "I am in great distress of mind," he wrote, and wanted his wife to know, for "I have resolved never to conceal anything from you. I know I can rely upon your sympathy & loving kindness." In a rather grand gesture he continued: "I would have died cheerfully rather than you should have suffered. In all the long future I will do all I can to make you happy & contented."⁶⁹ Looking toward familial reconstruction, the Crookes would negotiate the trials to political and economic Reconstruction together.

Economic burdens often created psychological distress among veterans. Scores of white Southerners suffered from debt and had difficulties securing employment in the years after the war.⁷⁰ In William B. Hesseltine's study of over five hundred former Confederate officers, almost one out of eight fared poorly after the war, "folded their hands and passed into oblivion."⁷¹ George Mercer—whose family enjoyed great prewar prominence and financial security—was set financially adrift after the war. One anxious diary entry revealed his situation: "For the first time in my life I feel the pressure of want . . . I have announced my resumption of legal practice in the daily papers, but as yet it

⁶⁹ Rob [Robert Crooke Wood] to wife, 1 June 1867, Series 1.2, Folder 5, Trist Wood Papers, SHC.

⁷⁰ Southerners dislocation and economic troubles after the war are discussed in Wyatt-Brown, *The Shaping of Southern Culture*, chapter 11 and James L. Roark, *Masters Without Slaves: Southern Planters in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1977), chapter 5.

⁷¹ Cited in Wyatt-Brown, "Honor Chastened," in Wyatt-Brown, *The Shaping of Southern Culture*, 268.

has brought no clients.”⁷² Economic hardships induced much of the personal anxieties of Mercer and other Southern families. Jeffrey McClurken’s study carefully documents the financial devastation of Pittsylvania County, Virginia, where household incomes plummeted (McClurken’s study looks solely at soldier households). In 1860, the average household was worth \$6,522, and by 1870 had declined by nearly 75 percent to \$1,673.⁷³ For white Southern patriarchs, whose social positions rested on wealth and political prestige, economic collapse proved crippling and families devised numerous strategies for psychological survival.

The restoration of domestic order and the reunification of families served as powerful means of stabilizing the South. The domestic arena offered veterans relief and comfort.⁷⁴ As LeeAnn Whites, Laura Edwards, and Jeffrey McClurken have argued so powerfully, family and household became the foundation for the political and economic reconstruction of southern manhood. Whites’ strides in public stability obscure the shattered lives of many men and their continued sufferings, however. The troubles of disaffected veterans were brought on by an array of causes. Idiosyncratic behavior, lingering traumas from war, crippling financial burdens, or continuations of pre-war behavior are within the spectrum of likely explanations. In many instances it is difficult to assess direct causalities. But how veterans managed such stresses directly impacted family life and necessitated the reevaluation of southern manhood. White men

⁷² George Anderson Mercer, 18 June 1865, George Anderson Mercer Diary, Box 1, Volume 5, George Anderson Mercer Papers, SHC.

⁷³ McClurken, *Take Care of the Living*, 48. See also, Marten, *Sing Not War*, 61-4.

⁷⁴ Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender*, 141-42.

reconfigured their behavior to reclaim the mastery and honor lost in, or at least questioned by, war and emancipation.⁷⁵ Outward signs of stability were often chimerical.

William J. Clarke served with distinction in the two major conflicts of his generation, but war had hardened him. As a captain in the Mexican-American War, Clarke was severely wounded at the Battle of National Bridge and promoted to major for gallantry. A faithful soldier, Clarke gained the admiration of fellow Confederates while serving as colonel of the 24th North Carolina. In 1864, at the Battle of Drewry's Bluff, a shell fragment shattered his shoulder.⁷⁶ While convalescing over ninety men signed a petition asking for Clarke's promotion as referenced earlier in this work.⁷⁷ Yet, Clarke could be quarrelsome and often argued with his commander General Robert Ransom. He never achieved further promotion. Returning to service in January 1865, federal troops captured Clarke at Dinwiddie Courthouse, Virginia; he remained imprisoned at Fort Delaware for the duration of the conflict.

After the war Clarke could recount proudly his admirable service record and boast of his regiment's reputation.⁷⁸ A proud, stolid veneer left the war's other legacies unacknowledged, however. Physically scarred and battered, Clarke felt great pain from

⁷⁵ Whites, "The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender," in *Divided Houses*, ???; Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender*, 137; and Friend, "From Southern Manhood to Southern Masculinities: An Introduction," in *Southern Masculinity*, vii-ix.

⁷⁶ Statement of Edward Warren and R B Haywood, N/D [1864], Folder 8, Box 1, William J. Clarke Papers, SHC.

⁷⁷ "To His Excellency President Davis," N/D, Box 2, Folder 28, Undated Papers, Clarke Papers, SHC. Although the statement is undated, the petition refers to Clarke as being "at present afflicted" with a severe wound and mentions several earlier Civil War battles, thereby suggesting the 1864 date.

⁷⁸ William J. Clarke to Mary Bayard Clarke, 23 May 1861, in *Live Your Own Life*, 74 and William J. Clarke to Mary Bayard Clarke, 27 January 1863, in *Live Your Own Life*, 137.

his wounds. Bedridden from time to time, he struggled.⁷⁹ Few sources denote what must have been his daily trials, but a small diary maintained during the year 1868 is probably a representative slice of decades of suffering. Records of his pain were frequent, especially in the spring and summer months. “Suffered a good deal,” “feeling very badly,” and “my wounds [have] been painful” are just a few lines denoting his considerable anguish.⁸⁰ Physical pains were matched by powerful memories, for Clarke recorded the anniversaries of the battles in Mexico and Virginia in which he was wounded.⁸¹ He remained fortunate in that his profession, law, allowed him to continue working despite these disabilities.⁸² But the physical scars of war left an indelible impression that affected his work and family.

Financial distress, physical pain, and an uncertain future left Clarke short-tempered, depressed, peevish, and prone to excessive drinking. Such feelings and behavior quickly disrupted hopes for a seamless family reunion. His wife Mary, in particular, bore a heavy burden from her husband’s behavior. Confiding to their eldest son Frank, she asserted that William had not been himself since the war and imprisonment. She felt his mind “weakened,” his temperament “very irritable.” Together, Mary hoped, she and her son could hide William’s troubles from the “world and the

⁷⁹ 6, 7, 9, and 26 March, and 24 April 1868, Clarke Diary, SHC.

⁸⁰ 6, 7, and 9 March 1868, Clarke Diary, SHC.

⁸¹ The best reference to this pain is found in his personal diary from 1868. See, for instance, 6 and 7 March, 26 March, 24 April, 15 June 1868. He also noted the “Anniversary of battle at National Bridge Mexico where I was wounded,” 12 August 1868, and “Wounded at Drewry’s Bluff VA in 1864.” He mistakes 15 April 1868 for the “Anniversary,” but then crosses it out writing and instead notes the date “May 15, 1864.” William J. Clarke Diary, 1868, Volumes, Box 2, Clarke Papers, SHC.

⁸² Jeffrey W. McClurken powerfully recounts how disabled veterans, unable to work, turned to the state for aid. McClurken, *Taking Care of the Living*, Chapter 6.

other children as long as possible.”⁸³ They walked a razor’s edge. On the one hand, Mary wanted to hide from the outside world the family’s very real hardships. In particular, William’s weakened body and irritable disposition. By so doing she was upholding an antebellum ideal. In a postwar South destabilized by emancipation and war, the household served as a central avenue to rebuild shaken social hierarchies.⁸⁴ Moreover, Clarke’s intemperance and inability to fulfill his roles as father and husband were unmanly. Exposing these failures to the outside world would undo Clarke and his family. On the other hand, because of William’s condition, Mary continued to maintain control over the household and the family—power which war had initially afforded her.⁸⁵ In particular, she was concerned about Frank’s future and suggested that he carefully head his father’s advice but seek other opportunities if available even if they went against William’s wishes.⁸⁶ Mary’s authority over the household and its members, therefore, extended beyond the war and continued to shape her identity as a woman and a wife.

Southerners’ inability (forced or purposeful) to articulate their inner feelings only heightened feelings of isolation. Southern culture—controlled by public faces and masks—permitted little public disclosure of mental or emotional breakdowns. These trying conditions were perceived as signs of weakness, which affected the family’s

⁸³ Mary Bayard Clarke to Frank Clarke, 20 Nov. [1866], Box 2, Undated Papers, Folder 29, Clarke Papers, SHC.

⁸⁴ On this point see, Edwards, *Gendered Strife and Confusion*, 110.

⁸⁵ On the expansion of women’s roles during the war and the readjustment afterward see, Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*, 208-9, especially; Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 248-54; and Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender*.

⁸⁶ Mary Bayard Clarke to Frank Clarke, 20 Nov. [1866], Box 2, Undated Papers, Folder 29, Clarke Papers, SHC.

image.⁸⁷ Efforts to hide family hardships capture the contrast between Southern whites' public and private lives, and demonstrate the great difficulties Southerners experienced in their strides toward reconstruction. Mary Bayard Clarke understood all too well the importance of maintaining face in Southern society. Because of her sex and her father's strong disapproval of her writing, Mary wrote under pseudonyms, such as Tenella, for much of her career, as she published poems, columns, and stories in southern newspapers, periodicals, and books. During the postwar years she once again had to use masks to ensure her family's maintenance and social standing.

While most Southern families dealt with emotionally scarred or mentally ill veterans within the family home, some Southern men spent time, typically short stints, in insane asylums where authorities attempted to "cure" their illnesses.⁸⁸ Such men suffered from chronic conditions and often exhibited violent behavior that endangered family members. Military service and the war's aftermath correlated to psychological illness, especially if a breakdown occurred during service, or the afflicted suffered from either wounds or severe illness.⁸⁹ Fragmentary records and the lack of a pension system that recognized service-related mental problems create great difficulty in studying the psychologically disturbed and institutionalized Confederate veteran.⁹⁰ Nonetheless, some anecdotal evidence is suggestive. According to the 1866 records of North Carolina's Insane Asylum, for example, seventeen men and one woman, out of

⁸⁷ Wyatt-Brown, "Honor Chastened," in Wyatt-Brown, *The Shaping of Southern Culture*, 259.

⁸⁸ Dean, *Shook Over Hell*, 143; Wyatt-Brown, "Honor Chastened," 259; and Jeffrey W. McClurken, *Take Care of the Living: Reconstructing Confederate Veteran Families in Virginia* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009), 118.

⁸⁹ Dean, *Shook Over Hell*, 111 and McClurken, *Take Care of the Living*, 119.

⁹⁰ Dean, *Shook Over Hell*, 234.

the two hundred and eighty-seven inmates, were admitted because of “the war.” Most of these individuals suffered from “mania,” the majority of whom were released after less than one year of confinement.⁹¹ Such vague diagnoses were not uncommon, however, for Jeffrey McClurken found “The War” as cause for admission to Virginia’s Western Lunatic Asylum in his sample of veterans.⁹² Eric Dean’s research on Georgia’s asylum reveals a range of reactions to combat. One veteran, from the Sixty-third Georgia, came home from war chagrined and depressed, which resulted in alcoholism according to asylum authorities. Another man, James Taylor, had suffered from shell shock during the war—concussed from a bursting shell—which may have contributed to his 1872 attempt to slit his brother’s throat.⁹³ The stories of most institutionalized veterans will remain muted, but scattered evidence demonstrates that uncontrolled mania and unrestrained addiction could reach crisis proportions, which forced Southern families to institutionalize some Confederate veterans.⁹⁴

The very same forces that created breakdowns also forged bonds among Southern whites. The extraordinary experiences of war created a brotherhood of veterans—men who were willing to share their thoughts and feelings with former comrades.⁹⁵ Job Smith related to his friend Cadwallader “Wad” Jones his haunting

⁹¹ *Report of the Physician and Superintendent of the Insane Asylum of North Carolina, for the Year Ending November 1, 1866* (Raleigh: Wm. E. Pell, State Printer, 1866), 24 and chart insert.

⁹² McClurken, *Take Care of the Living*, 125.

⁹³ Sections of Dean’s research are related by Wyatt-Brown, “Honor Chastened,” 259-60.

⁹⁴ Dean, *Shook Over Hell*, 137-8.

⁹⁵ On wartime comradeship and its consequences, James M. McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades: Why Men Fought in the Civil War* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998). On the postwar Union veteran experience see, Stuart McConnell, *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992), *passim*.

returns to the battlefields. “Sometimes in my sleep,” he wrote, “my mind wanders to the sad Battlefield lying down in the line & thin as a chip, half frightened out of my wits, expecting any moment the Command of forward.”⁹⁶ Wartime experiences and battlefield horrors left Smith exposed and frightened—emotions he shared with friends who had experienced similar ordeals. He now took great solace in sharing these feelings through letters, or receiving letters from friends. Together, he imagined, they could “cheer” each other in life, and find peace during a period of “degradation” and “trouble.”⁹⁷ William Henry Tripp—commanding officer of Company B, 40th North Carolina Infantry—received numerous letters from former soldiers looking to discuss their old comrades and current dilemmas. T. E. Vann, for instance, wrote to his “old Captain” lamenting the great changes since the war, none of which “seem to bring better times.” Distress, he continued, “is an occupant of every home, or at least has been such in some families so long, that, they have become accustomed to such and no longer grieved.”⁹⁸ Clearly, the forbidding veneer a closed Southern culture had been partially shattered by war, and Southern men, forever changed by that conflict, sought out ways to express and examine their new emotions. Emerging from war defeated and reentering a shattered society, veterans turned to each other for support and for understanding. In exchanging letters and exposing concerns men created informal networks and extended communities. Questions and uncertainty defined their manhood as much now as

⁹⁶ Job B Smith to Wad [Cadwallader Jones], 11 February 1866, Folder 5, Box 1, Cadwallader Jones Papers, SHC.

⁹⁷ Smith to Wad, 11 February 1866, Folder 5, Box 1, Jones Papers, SHC.

⁹⁸ T. E. Vann to “old Captain” [W. H. Tripp], 4 March 1869, Folder 9, Box 2, William Henry Tripp and Araminta Guilford Tripp Papers, SHC.

ambition and rivalry once had. Such social expressions were filtered through personal experiences.

James B. Mitchell, from Glenville, Alabama, returned to the University of North Carolina in 1866 after having discontinued his studies in 1861 to join the Confederate army. In a revealing letter to his friend Ruffin H. Thomson—also a student from North Carolina who left in 1861 for military service—Mitchell laid bare his raw emotions. He was much pained to see his friend “so much disposed to melancholy,” but remained helpless for he, too, found himself “in the same condition” and unable to offer consolation. This dark depression cast a long shadow over Mitchell’s future. Not able to see “any light ahead,” he lost all faith in a once promised bright future. During the war, he recalled, “old wiseacres” had cried out, “‘Never mind Boys, keep a good heart. You know the darkest hour is just before day.’” These sentiments now disgusted Mitchell who believed that happiness could only be found in those who contented themselves with “the old aphorism that ‘whatever is, is right’ and endeavor to make the best of it.”⁹⁹ Steering between life’s extremes, wary of fanatical doctrines, Mitchell embraced a few simple truths. Among them was the enjoyment of life’s basic comforts. Deprived of basic necessities while in the army, Southern men enjoyed niceties but were now constantly reminded of just how fleeting such luxuries could be. By instilling deeper meaning into what was once meaningless, life appeared more enjoyable. Mitchell composed his letter comfortably seated by a warm fire. Outside, the ground was covered in sleet and snow. He could remember only a short time ago when it was different: “I had nought but the

⁹⁹ J. B. Mitchell to Ruffin H. Thomson, 20 December 1866, Box 1, Folder 10, Ruffin Thomson Papers, SHC. Mitchell’s quote comes from Alexander Pope’s *Essay on Man I*, x (1733). This particular letter is available in original and transcribed form at the University of North Carolina’s excellent Documenting the American South. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss06-16/mss06-16.html> [accessed, 6 July 2009].

ground for a bed and rocks for a pillow, and in this I perceive a blessing.” Taking Alexander Pope’s words to heart (“One truth is clear, whatever is, is right”), Mitchell stopped here.¹⁰⁰ For now, his “limited vision” was “incompetent to pierce the thick darkness further. The future of the South is to me a mysterious horror and I decline to contemplate it. My imagination has not even yet shaped my own future but awaits the development of events.”¹⁰¹ In strikingly similar tone, another Confederate veteran recalled “campaign privations” and pledged to his mother to never pass another such winter.¹⁰² Taking solace but always reminded of the past, former Confederates navigated an unsure future as they confronted Reconstruction.

By questioning the war’s outcome, Southerners were questioning war itself. As Louis Menand so compellingly demonstrates in his study of the lives and writings of Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey, ideas and principles and beliefs were brought “down to a human level” because these men “wished to avoid the violence they saw hidden in abstractions.”¹⁰³ Pragmatism and compromise emerged as important concepts that made it more difficult for people to be driven to violence by their beliefs.¹⁰⁴ While these ideas were most clearly articulated by elite Northern intellectuals, the principles themselves had wider resonance. South

¹⁰⁰ Alexander Pope’s *Essay on Man I*, x (1733).

¹⁰¹ J. B. Mitchell to Ruffin H. Thomson, 20 December 1866, Ruffin Thomson Papers, Folder 10, Box 1, SHC. For another reference to past military privations shaping present points of view, see C. Woodward Hutson to “Mother,” 31 March 1869, [Loose Papers], Box 1, Hutson Family Papers, Special Collections, Howard-Tilton Memorial Library, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA.

¹⁰² C. Woodward Hutson to Mother, 31 March 1869, Box 1, Loose Papers, Hutson Family Papers, Special Collections, Howard-Tilton Memorial Library, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA.

¹⁰³ Menand, *The Metaphysical Club*, quote on 440 but see also ix-xi.

¹⁰⁴ Menand, *The Metaphysical Club*, 440.

Carolina E. B. Richardson pronounced that they “who go forth to the wars, with high hopes and bounding hearts—who picture of their minds the glorious rewards of great achievements—should blind their eyes to the horrors and injustice of the cause they bleed for.”¹⁰⁵ Expectations never quite reached fulfillment and made facing reality all the more difficult.

Confederate veterans’ emotional constellation of anger, fear, aggression, and hatred cannot be divorced from men’s public acts, for culture is both the condition of being and action.¹⁰⁶ Men came to both embrace and disdain postbellum home life as they mourned lost comrades and struggled to determine the war’s meaning. Hopelessness and shame consumed many as unrelenting humiliation led many Southern whites to psychological ruin.¹⁰⁷ Nothing in antebellum culture had prepared whites for the shock of defeat and its lasting social and emotional consequences. Despondency and depression, while familiar emotions, are rooted in specific historical experiences.¹⁰⁸ The humiliation of defeat, the lingering terrors from war, and economic troubles shaped the emotional lives of Southern men. How these men felt not only directed their private and public perceptions but also influenced their actions in the postwar years. Feelings of inadequacy and depression shaped the white South’s

¹⁰⁵ E. B. Richardson to Ben, 10 July 1867, Box 1, Folder 1860-1869, Benjamin S. Williams Papers, Perkins Library, DU.

¹⁰⁶ Daniel Wickberg, “What Is the History of Sensibilities? On Cultural Histories, Old and New,” *American Historical Review* 112, no. 3 (June 2007): 674. An excellent discussion of war’s emotional and psychological consequences among veterans of the First World War is found in Antoine Prost, *In The Wake of War: Les Anciens Combattants and French society* (Providence: Berg, 1992), 3-24, especially.

¹⁰⁷ Wyatt-Brown, “Honor Chastened,” in *The Shaping of Southern Culture*, 256.

¹⁰⁸ On the historicization of emotions, *An Emotional History of the United States*, eds., Peter N. Stearns and Jan Lewis (New York and London: New York University Press, 1998), 1-12 and Rosenwein, “Worrying about Emotions in History.”

emotional landscape and compelled veterans to actively strive to reorder a world undone by war. Most turned within talking only to family or other veterans about their experiences. But emotions of depression also generated anger, for many Southerners connected their despondency to the advancement of African Americans and the federal government. The prospects of United States citizenship, then, became the final barrier Confederate veterans negotiated as they reestablished themselves and attempted to make sense of the war.

Ignominious Oaths and Contested Citizenship

Twenty-three-year old John Warwick Daniel returned to the University of Virginia in the fall of 1865. Grievously wounded at the Battle of the Wilderness, he now hobbled. After serving in Lee's army Daniel stayed in Virginia. He became a Democrat and a supporter of home rule.¹⁰⁹ In June, Daniel delivered an address before the members of the Jefferson Literary Society. He referred to the men as veterans, not students, and "members of a common brotherhood, 'whose hearts are a thousand, whose bosoms are one.'"¹¹⁰ The men before Daniel were survivors. Thousands of their comrades now rested "among the 'unreturning brave' on distant fields of honor." He therefore turned to those in whom "the fires of youthful ardor are still unchilled," hoping that they would "reenter the race course with unabated energy." As the young Virginians looked forward, Daniel stressed that though the battles were over and the great armies "no longer in motion," "every public place is a battle field of opinion—aye, that every home-fireside is a political arena." It was incumbent upon these men to now exercise their

¹⁰⁹ Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, 218.

¹¹⁰ John W. Daniel, 28 June 1866, "The People, An Address delivered before the Jefferson Literary Society, of the University of Virginia, in the Public Hall, June 28, 1866," Speeches Folder, Box 13, Papers of John W. Daniel and the Daniel Family, UVA. See also, Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, 218.

citizenship and support Virginia, and the “new direction in which society is bending its vast energies.”¹¹¹

As Daniel and the members of the Jefferson Literary Society anticipated the future of the postwar South, they had to balance their obligations to the present and memories of the past. Devotion to duty and strict discipline—traits learned as soldiers—would serve these men well in Virginia’s Reconstruction.¹¹² On this new campaign they would “raise the drooping and torn . . . standards” of their country, “and advance them in the nobler battle fields of thought.”¹¹³ These men were part of what Peter Carmichael has deemed the “last generation.” Educated young men, the last generation to grow up with slavery, came of age during the political and sectional crises of the late 1850s and early 1860s.¹¹⁴ Now, after the carnage of war, they sought to rebuild the South. This the final section will consider Southerners’ place in the postwar South through the lens of citizenship, comparing and contrasting the experiences of veterans across the region.¹¹⁵

¹¹¹ Daniel, 28 June 1866, “The People, An Address delivered before the Jefferson Literary Society, of the University of Virginia, in the Public Hall, June 28, 1866,” Speeches Folder, Box 13, Papers of John W. Daniel and the Daniel Family, UVA.

¹¹² Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, 218.

¹¹³ Daniel, 28 June 1866, “The People, An Address delivered before the Jefferson Literary Society, of the University of Virginia, in the Public Hall, June 28, 1866,” Speeches Folder, Box 13, Papers of John W. Daniel and the Daniel Family, UVA. See also, Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, 218.

¹¹⁴ Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, 6-7.

¹¹⁵ For my purposes, citizenship is being defined expansively, to encompass political, social, and cultural dimensions. As Charles Tilly writes, citizenship “is *relational* in the sense that it locates identities in connections among individuals and groups rather than in the minds of particular persons.” Further, it is *cultural* “in insisting that social identities rest on shared understandings,” and *historical* “in calling attention to the path-dependent accretion of memories, understandings and means of action.” Charles Tilly, “Citizenship, Identity and Social History,” in Charles Tilly, ed., *Citizenship, Identity and Social History* (Repr. ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 5.

The languages of citizenship, imagined and recorded, may be rooted in relation to the process of political definition and redefinition in American culture and society.¹¹⁶

The oath of allegiance and the contours of citizenship, as historian Anne Rubin argues, were understood by white Southern men through gendered terms. Honor and manliness were linked to loyalty.¹¹⁷ Outward commitments to southern masculinity often masked entrenched emotions, however. Southerners had to parse out these feelings as they looked forward to United States citizenship and backward to a Confederate past. By swearing an oath, Southern men obligated themselves to maintain a strict promise of loyalty. How they emotionally dealt with the repercussions of this decision largely directed Southerners' perceptions of their place and role in the reunited Union. Collectively, soldiers and civilians, suffered from a culture of defeat.¹¹⁸ Trauma and mourning produced doubt and confusion. Southern whites could not easily address or

¹¹⁶ This correlation suggests that symbolic aspects of social life are deeply entwined with material conditions. I am deeply invested in Pierre Bourdieu's formulations here. In his example of art, Bourdieu charges "that works of art exist as symbolic objects only if they are known and recognized, that is, socially instituted as works of art and received by spectators capable of knowing and recognizing them as such." Thus, the symbolic and the material are combined. Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, trans., Randal Johnson (1993; repr. and trans., Columbia University Press, 1993), 37. Imagination, while an abstract concept, has great consequences when involved with power as Elliott West has charged. It was during the Reconstruction years that the United States imagined itself whole. See Elliott West, *The Contested Plains: Indians, Goldseekers, and the Rush to Colorado* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1998), Introduction and 336-37. Perhaps the most effective, if contested, use of imagination is found in Benedict Anderson's masterful treatment, *Imagined Communities*. Anderson's communities are imagined "because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion." Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (1983; repr., London: Verso, 2002), 6.

¹¹⁷ Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*, 164-71.

¹¹⁸ Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery*, trans. Jefferson Chase (New York: Metropolitan, 2003), 10-19.

reverse these processes as many were left paralyzed and emotive. As Cornelia Phillips Spencer wrote: “I cannot think two consecutive thoughts—I can only feel!”¹¹⁹

By swearing allegiance to the United States, Southerners publicly repudiated the Confederacy and declared their personal political identity.¹²⁰ One man dissected the fate of many: “very soon the choice will be given us of taking the oath of allegiance to that hated government, or passing by an armed force and garrison maintained everywhere at the expense of the conquered people.”¹²¹ Anxiety over the future and strong devotion to the Confederacy produced varied reactions to United States citizenship and compelled many veterans to prolong the decision. Josiah Gorgas illustrated the response of many. “I have to-day taken the oath of amnesty before a federal officer,” he wrote, and “forwarded my petition for pardon!—pardon for having done my duty in a cause I deemed the best on earth! But the conquerors have a right to dictate terms and ours have not been magnanimous.”¹²² In a similar vein Sidney Andrews observed that former soldiers continued to mourn their defeat but also determined to do their duty as orderly citizens.¹²³ One northern newspaper agreed with Andrews’s sentiments maintaining that Confederate soldiers expressed “regret at the bitter necessity” of military surrender, but they accepted it as unavoidable. “Among the

¹¹⁹ Cornelia Phillips Spencer Diary, 30 April 1865, Spencer Volumes, Box 14, Volume 2, Cornelia Phillips Spencer Papers, SHC.

¹²⁰ Rubin, *A Shattered Nation*, 164-71.

¹²¹ Anonymous, letter fragment, 18 April [1865], [Loose Papers], Box 1, Hutson Family Papers, Special Collections, Howard-Tilton Memorial Library, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA.

¹²² Josiah Gorgas, 22 August [1865], in *The Journals of Josiah Gorgas, 1857-1878*, ed., Sarah Woolfolk Wiggins, 186.

¹²³ Sidney Andrews, *The South Since the War, as Shown by Fourteen Weeks of Travel and Observation in Georgia and the Carolinas* (1866; repr., Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971), 319.

officers, however, the sentiment of pertinacious resistance seems to be universal.”¹²⁴ On the other hand, many soldiers made brief notation only of their oath. South Carolina cavalymen Munson Monroe Buford quickly noted in his pocket diary on 27 July 1865: “Taken the oath of Allegiance to the United States.” Still, though, even Buford’s scant records suggest prolonged attachment to the Confederate cause. In an August entry he recorded his military designation: “M. M. Buford Co K 5th S.C. Cav Logans Brigade Butlers Division Hampton Corps Army Northern Virginia.” Perhaps more telling is a transcription intended, presumably, for future eyes: “When this you see remember me though far away from thee or layed under the Clay I may be very respectfully Munson M. Buford Formily of Robt E. Lees Army of Northern Virginia.”¹²⁵

As soldiers reluctantly confronted the realities of defeat they were thrown into personal turmoil. Revealing men’s emotional devotion to Confederate nationalism and the cutting pain of loss reveals lasting perceptions that shaped whites’ understanding of Reconstruction well past the initial traumas of defeat. Taking these feelings and responses seriously broadens our understanding of men who did not easily close their civil wars but were instead shaped by the conflict and its consequences for decades.¹²⁶ Suspended between realms, personal and political identities became bifurcated. As

¹²⁴ *Milwaukee Daily Sentinel*, “From Grant’s Army. The Process of Paroling—Sentiment of the Rebel Officers and Privates,” 25 April 1865. This quote suggests divisions along class lines. Aaron Sheehan-Dean posits that Virginians mounted an “evenly distributed and near-total mobilization” for the crisis. The logical extension to Sheehan-Dean’s excellent study would be a post-war account of southern sentiment across class lines. Aaron Sheehan-Dean, “Everyman’s War: Confederate Enlistment in Civil War Virginia,” *Civil War History* vol. L, no. 1 (2004): 11.

¹²⁵ Muson Monroe Buford Diary, 27 July 1865, August 1865, and November 1865, respectively, Box 1, Folder 1, Munson Monroe Buford Papers, SHC.

¹²⁶ Michael Keith Harris, *Old Soldier, New South: Confederate Veterans in a Reconciled Nation*, MA, thesis, University of Virginia, 2004; David H. Donald, “A Generation of Defeat,” reprinted in Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton, eds., *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 334-40; and Barney, *The Making of a Confederate*, 3-13 and 141-65.

men traversed this terrain their future obligations to and roles in society became apparent. Rather than easily embracing the momentous changes before them Southerners initially mourned. George Mercer took the President Johnson's amnesty oath in June of 1865, "a painful but necessary procedure." According to Mercer, Southerners' "hearts cannot change; but they are compelled to recognize the fact that they are overcome, and to yield, as gracefully as possible, obedience to a Government sufficiently powerful to enforce it."¹²⁷ Veterans were honor-bound to recognize the war's victors, but honor also directed continued fidelity to the Confederacy. Torn between two worlds, Southerners attempted to strike a painful balance. Former Confederate Brig. Gen. Martin Witherspoon Gary felt isolation and estrangement. He bemoaned his position as an "unfortunate son of the sunny South," and "the unfortunate representative of a lost cause." Forsaken, he stood alone, "without a country" in a foreign nation, "surrounded by desolation, and almost driven to despair. I have laid aside a sword, that has often flashed in the sunlight of victorious battle, to rust and decay."¹²⁸ Veterans such as Mercer and Gary devoted themselves completely to the South and to the Confederacy. Military surrender and federal occupation had, in essence, killed the nation as though it was once living and breathing. A profound emotional void followed. How they filled this void shaped their own reconstructions, while also influencing the South's future direction. Mercer maintained that Southerners had given up in "good faith given up their patriarchal system of African slavery as the result of the war; they are in good faith willing to maintain union under the Constitution." But, he powerfully wrote,

¹²⁷ George Anderson Mercer, 24 June 1865, George Anderson Mercer Diary, Box 1, Volume 5, George Anderson Mercer Papers, SHC.

¹²⁸ M W Gary to Miss Nannie, 12 Sept. 1866, Martin Witherspoon Gary Papers, MSS, Box 1, Folder 3 [16 Feb-20 Nov 1866], South Caroliniana Library, Columbia, SC.

“they have not consented to surrender their freedom and manhood.”¹²⁹ The pillars of manhood and independence, so vital to antebellum whites, would now serve and support them during a period of profound distress.

Military defeat compromised masculinity. The values underpinning antebellum men—honor, virtue, and sacrifice—had to be reconsidered and then resurrected to now serve as the building blocks for the reconstruction of manhood and facilitate the veterans’ shift from soldier to citizen. Southern women such as Cornelia Phillips Spencer tried to reassure the South’s defeated men. “My heart went out to these brave men,” she wrote, “who had risked all and lost all save honor.”¹³⁰ Spencer’s words captured a wider belief that justified the southern cause and attempted to uphold Confederate soldiers’ honor even in the wake of defeat. Personal liberties and ideals of manliness underpinned veterans’ self-identities during the Reconstruction era and, once considered in conjunction with racism, help explain their reactionary stand against the forces of federal control and the advancement of African Americans. Moreover, Confederate memory remained a physical and political presence throughout the South due to the efforts of white women as Caroline Janney as argued. Confederate nationalism had profound implications in the reconstruction of southern self-identity in the postwar period because of public celebrations, the creation of Confederate cemeteries, and Memorial Days.¹³¹

¹²⁹ Mercer Diary, 17 December 1865, Box 1, Volume 5, Mercer Papers, SHC.

¹³⁰ Cornelia Phillips Spencer, 17 April 1865, quoted in Hope Summerell Chamberlain, *Old Days in Chapel Hill: Being the Life and Letters of Cornelia Phillips Spencer* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1926), 87.

¹³¹ Janney, *Burying the Dead but not the Past*, 50-67. See also, Blair, *Cities of the Dead*, Chapters 3 and 4.

Though Southerners' pains indeed lessened over time, the consequences of this period echoed for decades. These men simply could not return to prewar society. The war's consequences were too varied, the sting of defeat too strong, and the forces of emancipation too monumental. In the end, the war's traumas, pains, and conclusions proved decisive in white Southerners' personal reconstructions. As whites looked toward their place as citizens the simultaneous traumas of defeat and emancipation shaped their emotional reactions to African Americans. David H. Donald deems these Confederates a defeated generation, and "segregation and disfranchisement should be viewed as the final public acts, the last bequests, of the Southern Civil War generation."¹³² In adjusting to postwar life southern whites freighted citizenship with whiteness. Southern men and women began to create an evolving discourse that consciously propounded their own righteousness and attempted to order society according to a patriarchal ethos.¹³³ Whites juxtaposed their honor with the shamelessness and shiftlessness of subordinated blacks.¹³⁴ Thus feelings of hatred and racism strongly shaped southerners' strides toward citizenship. Former Confederates tried to reinvigorate ideas about race, manhood, and society that the war destabilized. Through these processes the South was re-imagined as a new community and its polity

¹³² David H. Donald, "A Generation of Defeat," reprinted in Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton, eds., *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 334; see also 334-40.

¹³³ W. Scott Poole, *Never Surrender: Confederate Memory and Conservatism in the South Carolina Upcountry* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2004), 1-5.

¹³⁴ Wyatt-Brown, "Death of a Nation," in Wyatt-Brown, *The Shaping of Southern Culture*, 233.

voiced a language of citizenship that ensured the primacy of the “white race” despite the war’s racial and political leveling processes.¹³⁵

Southerners’ struggles to sustain and support themselves resulted in vitriolic reactions to the new social order. North Carolinian David Schenck tried to “raise something to live on” in the spring of 1865, as he had “no money and no exchangeable commodity.”¹³⁶ Before the Confederacy’s fall, Schenck enjoyed a successful law practice and held eight slaves.¹³⁷ Now, he and scores of southern men toiled in a countryside “laid waste” without the benefit of enslaved labor.¹³⁸ The miseries of war and famine could be tolerated by any southern “gentleman or master” Schenck maintained. But, to be leveled with an African American was “literally turning the slave, master and the master slave.”¹³⁹ Southern identity thus faced a double onslaught from both within and without.¹⁴⁰ Whites recognized blacks’ new place within the American polity, for they were equal United States citizens by law. But, as George Fredrickson writes, “[e]mancipation could not be carried to completion because it exceeded the capacity of white Americans [...] to think of blacks as genuine equals.”¹⁴¹ In the South, whites violently resisted black equality, and consciously constructed new hierarchies to ensure their superiority. Taking

¹³⁵ Benedict Anderson has offered the most compelling discussion of imagined communities to date. Anderson’s communities are imagined “because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.” Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (1983; repr., London: Verso, 2002), 6.

¹³⁶ Schenck, [Spring 1865], Schenck Diary, SHC.

¹³⁷ Escott, *Many Excellent People*, 42 and Schenck, [Spring 1865], Schenck Diary, SHC.

¹³⁸ Catherine Ann Battle Lewis to Emma Speight, 5 May 1865, Lewis Papers, SHC.

¹³⁹ Schenck, 14 June 1865, Schenck Diary, SHC.

¹⁴⁰ My thinking here has been influenced by Gail Bederman’s compelling discussion of manhood. See especially Bederman, *Manliness & Civilization*, 12-4.

¹⁴¹ Fredrickson, *Racism*, 81.

the oath of allegiance forced Southerners into submission, an unmanly gesture. In refashioning their lost cause as ultimately right, whites ensured their honor, which was critical to their manhood. Moreover, by publicly and privately striving to reorder society men assumed positions of prominence and reasserted mastery.

Conclusions

White Southerners' sentiments undergirded a broader discourse that articulated the primacy of mastery and white civilization. In the antebellum era slavery bolstered whites' belief in their own superiority and, according to historian Lacy K. Ford, Jr., "denied the viability of a biracial republic."¹⁴² Now, the framework of southern society had collapsed and the possibility of a multi-racial society emerged. Facing economic ruin, black emancipation, and federal occupation, Southerners had to reconstruct order—mentally and physically. White men regained control of their manliness and attempted to release their emotional burdens—even while often serving in dependent roles—by racializing African Americans as lazy non-contributors. If economic independence proved unattainable, recasting social hierarchies was possible.

The southern debate over black suffrage and property rights assumed national import in the spring and summer of 1867. For many black southerners their struggles were partly resolved with the implementation of the Military Reconstruction Acts. The federal government, Steven Hahn writes, was given "unprecedented power to reorganize the ex-Confederate South politically, imposed political disabilities on leaders of the rebellion, and, most stunning of all, extended the elective franchise to southern black males." The disfranchisement of whites and the simultaneous enfranchisement of

¹⁴² Lacy K. Ford, Jr., "Making the 'White Man's Country' White: Race, Slavery, and State-Building in the Jacksonian South," *Journal of the Early Republic*, vol. 19, no. 4 (Winter 1999): 713-737, quote on 715.

blacks, however, incited fierce white resistance as an extreme affront to whites' honor. As the next chapter details, Southern whites attempted to dismantle a federally ordered postwar state through varied measures with violence and terror serving as particularly effective tools.

CHAPTER 7 FALLEN CONFEDERACIES AND INVISIBLE EMPIRES

A cold, bitter drizzle fell through the long February night and into the next morning. Wyatt Outlaw and his family were safely ensconced at home—a building which served also as Wyatt's shop for carpentry and wagon repair. A veteran of the Civil War, president of the local Union League, and Graham town councilman, Outlaw was the most prominent African American in Alamance County, situated in North Carolina's Piedmont. The attack came quickly. Klansmen stormed into the shop and took Outlaw from his bedroom. As he was dragged away, half-dressed, one of his children screamed, "Oh, Daddy, Daddy."¹ The town square filled quickly with members of the White Brotherhood—one of North Carolina's three Klan orders.² Outlaw's hands were bound and Klansmen bludgeoned him down the street. The mob stopped at an elm tree. Picking a limb that pointed to the Court House, which stood some thirty yards away, the men hanged Wyatt Outlaw.³ The lifeless body suspended from the branch until eleven o'clock the following morning when Sheriff Murray removed it.⁴

¹ Carole Watterson Troxler, " 'To look more closely at the man': Wyatt Outlaw, a Nexus of National, Local, and Personal History," *North Carolina Historical Review* vol. LXXVII, no. 4 (October 2000): 404.

² For details on the White Brotherhood and North Carolina's other two orders, the Constitutional Union Guard and the Invisible Empire, see Allen W. Trelease, *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction* (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971), 68 and Steven Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003), 267.

³ Details for the above scene are drawn from the Testimony of James E. Boyd, 31 August [1870], Box 1, Folder Jan-Aug. 1870, Ku Klux Klan Papers, Special Collections Department, Duke University Library, hereinafter Klan Papers and DUL; Troxler, " 'To look more closely at the man,' " 403-32; Scott Reynolds Nelson, *Iron Confederacies: Southern Railways, Klan Violence, and Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 100-2, 112-3; and Allen W. Trelease, *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction* (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971), 205.

⁴ Horace W. Raper, *William W. Holden: North Carolina's Political Enigma* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 164.

Similar scenes of brutality were witnessed across the South between the years 1865 and 1877. White vigilantes' extensive campaigns of terror marked the years of Reconstruction as one of the most violent periods in American history. The Ku Klux Klan exemplified this violence spectacularly.⁵ The themes of extralegal violence, ritual, war memories, and emotions guide this chapter, which examines the hooded white men who terrorized the South between 1867 and 1872.⁶ I seek to understand what the Klan and its acts reveal about the gender identities and emotional lives of Southern white men. Actions are statements, which are patterned by culture.⁷ These "invisible empires" drew from the past and present in the ghoulish construction of their hate-based order. Understanding this *bricolage* reveals much about the reconstruction of white Southern men, for as the Ku Klux Klan remade the Reconstruction-era South so, too, were its members being remade.⁸ Vigilante violence was part of a transitional masculinity in whites' broader campaign of southern "redemption." Race played a prominent role in the establishment of this new white manhood, which operated through savagery. This mode

⁵ Trelease, *White Terror*, xxxiv.

⁶ This particular timeframe reflects the Ku Klux Klan's 1867 founding in the Carolinas and the federal government's extensive 1871-72 investigation into the order's crimes and atrocities, which resulted in its eventual demise. On the Klan's introduction into the Carolinas, Trelease, *White Terror*, 68-70. By emotionalism, I am referring to the study and historicization of feelings. As Jan Lewis and Peter N. Stearns posit, studies of emotion allow scholars to go beyond historians' traditional epistemology, which often creates explanations of knowledge and its production rooted in underlying assumptions that, in turn, lead to assumptions about the ways in which people behave. Jan Lewis and Peter N. Stearns, "Introduction," in *An Emotional History of the United States*, eds., Peter N. Stearns and Jan Lewis (New York and London: New York University Press, 1998).

⁷ Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia*, 324-5 and 339.

⁸ Claude Levi-Strauss, *The Savage Mind* (1962; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967), 16-33 and Bercaw, *Gendered Freedoms*, 87.

of behavior represented a distinctive “emotional community” composed of men who shared similar feelings of rage, anger, and fear rooted in the past and the present.⁹

The men under study—hooded midnight raiders who terrorized white Unionists, African Americans, and the socially marginalized—depended on anonymity. Their acts, while condoned by many whites, were legally condemned. This chapter unmasks these midnight raiders to reveal how Klan membership, especially the involvement of Confederate veterans, connected to white Southerners’ broader engagement in, and understanding of, the process of Reconstruction. The reclamation of white southern manhood was central to Reconstruction.¹⁰ As men strove to regain mastery over both self and society, they had also to confront the emotional and psychological consequences of civil war.¹¹ How men publicly and personally negotiated and responded to these forces shaped the reconstruction of manhood—a process that was neither uniform nor universal—and influenced their emotional lives. This chapter considers the Ku Klux Klan as one model of an outwardly aggressive, unrestrained

⁹ “Emotional community” is Barbara Rosenwein’s term. She conceives of it as something similar to social communities—i.e., families or neighborhoods. The researcher is searching for systems of feelings and how these communities define and assess such emotions. Barbara H. Rosenwein, “Worrying about Emotions in History,” *The American Historical Review*, vol. 107, no. 3 (June 2002): quote on 837; on “emotional communities, 842-3.

¹⁰ Michael Kimmel, *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (New York: Free Press, 1996), 95 and 124-5; Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *The Shaping of Southern Culture: Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1880s* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001), Chapters 8 and 9; LeeAnn Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender: Augusta, Georgia, 1860-1890* (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1995), 132-59; and Nancy D. Bercaw, *Gendered Freedoms: Race, Rights, and the Politics of Household in the Delta, 1861-1875* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2003), Chapter 3.

¹¹ Jeffrey W. McClurken, *Take Care of the Living: Reconstructing Confederate Veteran Families in Virginia* (Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 2009), 1-2 and 65-71, especially, and Bercaw, *Gendered Freedoms*, Chapter 3.

warrior-like masculinity used by some whites to “control” the socially marginalized, unravel black political gains, and restore authority.¹²

White Carolinians and Their Causes

The Carolinas witnessed severe, and extensive, Klan-based violence throughout the late 1860s and early 1870s. This region experienced massive political and economic change, which destabilized social relations. Violence ensued. Armed conflict between the Ku Klux Klan and state and federal governments in both North and South Carolina led to widespread arrests, the impeachment of North Carolina’s governor, and the Republican Party’s imperilment in the seaboard states.¹³ This region serves as an excellent venue for study as it illuminates vividly the Klan’s ferocity and the consequences of its presence. Yet, while the Klan’s presence in the Carolinas will focus this discussion, examples from the other southern states will be used to collaborate particular points and bolster specific claims.

A long history of works—both scholarly and popular—describe the Klan’s infamy. Sympathetic histories written in the nineteenth century produced an interpretative tradition that emphasized Klansmen’s supposedly understandable reaction to intolerable oppression.¹⁴ Scholars gradually revised such orthodoxy, resulting in two prominent

¹² As Gail Bederman has argued, manhood is a fluid term which has been “defined quite differently in different times, places, and contexts.” Gail Bederman, *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), quote on 5, see 5-10. On contrasting models of white masculinity during the Reconstruction-era, see Craig Thompson Friend, “From Southern Manhood to Southern Masculinities: An Introduction,” in *Southern Masculinity: Perspectives on Manhood in the South Since Reconstruction*, ed. Craig Thompson Friend (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2009).

¹³ Nelson, *Iron Confederacies*, 98.

¹⁴ On this narrative tradition see, Edward John Harcourt, “Who Were the Pale Faces? New Perspective on the Tennessee Ku Klux,” *Civil War History* vol. LI, no. 1 (2005): 29-34. Earliest works include J. C. Lester and D. L. Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan: Its Origin, Growth and Disbandment*, with Introduction and Notes

arguments. First, there are those historians who concluded that the Klan's inherent racism appealed to Southern whites.¹⁵ Second, scholars have contended that Klan violence connected to whites' broader campaigns of political insurgency.¹⁶ Scott Reynolds Nelson's revealing work entwines these strands positing that a potent mix of racism and politics drove whites into the ranks of the Ku Klux.¹⁷

Recent scholarship, especially that grounded in cultural history and gender studies, has broadened our understanding of the meaning behind the Ku Klux Klan, their purpose and their precedent. These historians have demonstrated that racism and political ideology *alone* do not adequately explain why the Klan targeted particular individuals (especially women and children), engaged in certain behavior (simulated sex acts), referenced and used popular cultural forms (carnival, costuming, ritual), or created a sense of corporate identity rooted in the ideology of the Lost Cause.¹⁸ As Hannah Rosen cautions: "Night rider violence was, in fact, so seemingly instrumental and so explicitly targeted for political ends that it is difficult to resist reducing its meaning

by Walter L. Fleming (1884; New York and Washington: The Neale Publishing Company, 1905) and "New Light on the Ku Klux Klan," *Century* 28 (July 1884).

¹⁵ See especially Allen W. Trelease, *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction* (New York and London: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971) and George C. Rable, *But There Was No Peace: The Role of Violence in the Politics of Reconstruction* (1984; reprint, Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 2007).

¹⁶ On this tradition see especially, Paul D. Escott, *Many Excellent People: Power and Privilege in North Carolina, 1850-1900* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1985) and Nicholas Lemann, *Redemption: The Last Battle of the Civil War* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006).

¹⁷ Scott Reynolds Nelson, *Iron Confederacies: Southern Railways, Klan Violence, and Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 97-9.

¹⁸ W. Scott Poole, *Never Surrender: Confederate Memory and Conservatism in the South Carolina Upcountry* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004), 78-9, especially; Elaine Frantz Parsons, "Midnight Rangers: Costume and Performance in the Reconstruction-Era Ku Klux Klan," *The Journal of American History* (December 2005): 811-36; and Hannah Rosen, *Terror in the Heart of Freedom: Citizenship, Sexual Violence, and the Meaning of Race in the Postemancipation South* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009), Chapters 5 and 6.

entirely to its apparent function. Yet this violence also took striking forms seemingly unrelated to function that were consistent across a wide region and over several years.”¹⁹ Scholars must therefore consider gender in conjunction with race and cultural forms as underpinning political practices.

This chapter, building on recent scholarship, argues that the reestablishment of white manhood and a potent constellation of emotions shaped the Klan’s actions, and indeed Reconstruction, as much as political commitments and entrenched racism. In understanding the Klan, it is crucial to understand how this organization, built upon foundations of extralegal violence, was used to resurrect positions of white mastery. A period of social and political crisis for Southern whites fostered the growth of an aggressive manliness rooted in violent reaction to perceived wrongs. The gendered emotions of Klan members—anger, excitement, loss, and despair—reflect a system of feelings which propelled white men as they employed terrorism to advance political, social, and sexual aims.²⁰ Positing these assertions does not undermine or diminish the effects of meta-forces such as race and politics and their horrific consequences. Rather, it widens the range of personal feelings, cultural mores, behavioral patterns, and historical memories that drove whites’ actions.²¹ Thus, by revealing how Southern men thought and felt during this appalling period, we witness how people mentally, morally,

¹⁹ Rosen, *Terror in the Heart of Freedom*, 181.

²⁰ Insights drawn from Geertz, “Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight,” in *The Interpretation of Cultures*, 448-53 and Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 128-35.

²¹ This array of forces composes what Daniel Wickberg calls “sensibility.” The study of sensibility seeks, in Wickberg’s words, to “dig beneath the social actions and apparent content of sources to the ground upon which those sources stand: the emotional, intellectual, aesthetic, and moral dispositions of the persons who created them.” Daniel Wickberg, “What Is the History of Sensibility? On Cultural Histories, Old and New,” *American Historical Review* (June 2007): 669.

and emotionally engaged life to advance an understanding of the Klan's cultural function. While the Ku Klux Klan was born during the Reconstruction era, the order's models for extralegal violence and the regulation of black life were grounded in the antebellum and Civil War eras.²² On the one hand, the Klan connected to "regulator" movements that sought to maintain social order or protect political rights.²³ Nineteenth-century Regulators, while sometimes behaving like their eighteenth-century counterparts, were influenced by, and reactive to, wartime conditions. During the Civil War and in its immediate aftermath, Regulators, often composed of army deserters and demobilized soldiers, formed bands that terrorized civilians, stole property, and tried to impose order through force. On the other hand, the Reconstruction-era Klan represented the resurrection of slave patrols, especially to African Americans.²⁴ In the antebellum era, bodies of men, often conscripted by state governments, were used to police and regulate black life. These bodies physically harmed blacks and intruded into

²² Postbellum extralegal violence is fruitfully connected to the antebellum era in Rosen, *Terror in the Heart of Freedom*, 183-94 and Mark L. Bradley, *Bluecoats & Tar Heels: Soldiers and Civilians in Reconstruction North Carolina* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2009), 100-2.

²³ The term "regulator" has seventeenth-century English roots. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, regulator means "a person who or thing which regulates or controls." Both South Carolina and North Carolina hosted widespread regulator movements in the eighteenth century that attempted to alleviate government corruption. At least one Klansman, North Carolinian Jacob Long, directly connected the Ku Klux Klan to Alamance County's involvement in the Regulation—both, in his view, reactions to intolerable oppression. Jacob Alson Long, N/D, Folder 1 of 1, Jacob Alson Long Recollections, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; hereinafter SHC. For the North Carolina Regulator movement, Marjoleine Kars, *Breaking Loose Together: The Regulator Rebellion in Pre-Revolutionary North Carolina* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002). On South Carolina's Regulation, Richard Maxwell Brown, *The South Carolina Regulators* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963) and Rachel N. Klein, *Unification of a Slave State: The Rise of the Planter Class in the South Carolina Backcountry, 1760-1808* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990). On unrest in popular culture more generally, E. P. Thompson, *Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture* (New York: The New Press, 1991).

²⁴ Sally E. Hadden, *Slave Patrols: Law and Violence in Virginia and the Carolinas* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), Chapter 6 and Epilogue. Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet*, 270. See also, Lemann, *Redemption* and William McKee Evans, *To Die Game: The Story of the Lowry Band, Indian Guerrillas of Reconstruction* (1971; repr., Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995), 60-1.

slave cabins. Richard Zuczek suggests that the antebellum system of slave patrols had fully reappeared in South Carolina by the late summer of 1865; Mark Bradley offers similar findings for sections of post-war North Carolina. The men who composed these organizations drew upon antebellum practices of discipline and control that shaped their self-conceptualization.²⁵

The Klan's roots of extralegal violence can be located in different types of organizations—Regulators, police forces, militias, Home Guards—formed between 1865 and 1866. In the Klan, whites' attempted to resurrect an antebellum culture that communicated private authority by public displays of power—a language that proved central in the formation and spread of the Ku Klux Klan.²⁶ Whites' successful regulatory measures were a critical part of a longer campaign in the public reestablishment of manhood and control. Traditions of extralegal violence reveal cultural forms that appealed to Southern whites. These performances engaged broader discourses about race, gender, and civilization, which invested the Klan with deeper meaning and fostered its growth.²⁷ How an individual comprehends and then constructs an understanding of a particular event, ritual, or custom is connected directly to his or her background and previous experience.²⁸

Regulators, guerrilla bands, and militias contributed to postwar tumult. The Confederacy's collapse initiated a period of intense disorder. Many southern

²⁵ Zuczek, *State of Rebellion*, 18 and Bradley, *Bluecoats & Tar Heels*, 79. See also Rosen, *Terror in the Heart of Freedom*, 183-4.

²⁶ Rosen, *Terror in the Heart of Freedom*; Edwards, *Gendered Strife and Confusion*; and Kantrowitz, *Ben Tillman and the Reconstruction of White Supremacy*.

²⁷ Parsons, "Midnight Rangers," 812-3.

²⁸ Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," in *The Interpretation of Cultures*, ed. Clifford Geertz (1973; reprint, New York: Basic Books, 2000), 9-11.

communities, temporarily devoid of government, plunged into chaos as both city and countryside were overrun by paroled veterans.²⁹ Men's visceral reactions—often rooted in lingering traumas from war and defeat—fed directly into violent encounters.³⁰ In the years following the Civil War the federal government and vigilante organizations vied for power as each sought to impose contrasting visions of justice.³¹ White Southerners publicly framed their actions as a response to “disorderly” blacks, social tumult, and the aftershock of war. Public action on the ground, while certainly in response to very real discord, was also a symbolic act. By visibly organizing themselves into armed bodies Southern men established imagined communities that privileged pugnacity and strength.³² Moreover, the establishment of these groups in 1865 set a precedent for armed intervention in the “policing” of the South, which the Ku Klux Klan fully realized.

²⁹ The most thorough treatments of violence in the spring of 1865 include: Carter, *When the War Was Over*, 6-23; Mark K. Greenough, “Aftermath at Appomattox: Federal Military Occupation of Appomattox County May—November 1865,” *Civil War History* 31, no. 1 (March 1985): 5-23; Mark L. Bradley, *This Astounding Close: The Road to Bennett Place* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000), *passim*; and Bertram Wyatt-Brown, “Death of a Nation,” in *The Shaping of Southern Culture: Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1880s* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 230-46. The mechanics of military demobilization are thoroughly explored in William B. Holberton, *Homeward Bound: The Demobilization of the Union and Confederate Armies, 1865-1866* (Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 2001). The best overall work on 1865 remains Stephen V. Ash, *A Year in the South: Four Lives in 1865* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

³⁰ Edward John Harcourt, “The Whipping of Richard Moore: Reading Emotion In Reconstruction America,” *Journal of Social History*, vol. 36, issue 2 (Winter 2002): 268.

³¹ Edward L. Ayers, *Vengeance and Justice: Crime and Punishment in the 19th-Century American South* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 151, especially, but for the broader discussion, 151-84. Historians have argued that post-Civil War violence represents the continuation of a longer tradition of southern violence. John Hope Franklin's *The Militant South* remains the most important statement of antebellum Southern militancy. John Hope Franklin, *The Militant South, 1800-1861* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956). See also, Edward Baptist, *Creating an Old South*.

³² Rosen, *Terror in the Heart of Freedom*, 183. Perhaps the most effective, if contested, use of imagination is found in Benedict Anderson's masterful treatment, *Imagined Communities*. Anderson's communities are imagined “because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.” Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (1983; repr., London: Verso, 2002), 6.

The Klan's connection to Regulators disrupts traditional interpretations that trace the order's conception to Pulaski, Tennessee. Sometime between May and June 1866, a group of young Confederate veterans organized themselves into a secret society. The men—hungering for amusement after the excitement of war had been replaced by the monotony of small-town life—banded together intending to play pranks for personal amusement.³³ Within a year the group's popularity grew and its purpose changed to something more sinister. Edward John Harcourt and Hannah Rosen have recently called this narrative tradition into question by noting the order's earlier origins.³⁴ By doing so these scholars have rightfully asserted that violence, not amusement, defined the Klan and its origins.³⁵ The emasculating effects of military defeat all but destroyed the political life of white Southern men. By joining armed bodies intended to assert control over the South's political, economic, and social life, whites were placed in direct positions of public authority that contributed to the reassertion of a powerful identity.³⁶

³³ Lester and Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan*, 52. For historians' acceptance of this origins narrative see especially, Trelease, *White Terror*, 3-4; Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877* (New York: Harper & Row), 342; and David Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 112.

³⁴ Harcourt, "Who Were the Pale Faces?" 25-34 and Rosen, *Terror in the Heart of Freedom*, Chapter 5. The prominent historian John Hope Franklin questioned this narrative tradition in his definitive account of Reconstruction. John Hope Franklin, *Reconstruction After the Civil War* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), 154. See also, Rable, *But There Was No Peace*, 92-3.

³⁵ Gladys-Marie Fry argues that the Klan, especially when posing as ghosts, was part of a broader tradition in which whites harassed African Americans through trickery and reference to the supernatural. Fry thus argues that amusement, of the most malevolent form, was central to the Klan's mission. Gladys-Marie Fry, *Night Riders in Black History* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1975), 110-4, especially.

³⁶ On whites gendered reaction to defeat, Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender*, 133-37 and 142-3; Anne Sarah Rubin, *A Shattered Nation: The Rise and Fall of the Confederacy, 1861-1868* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 135 and 141-47; Bertram Wyatt-Brown, "Death of a Nation," in *The Shaping of Southern Culture: Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1880s* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 230-46.

The bodies of men organized in Virginia, North and South Carolina, typically operated within the boundaries of law to reassert white control within local communities. These groups had a salutary effect in many areas but also set a threatening precedent. The wave of postwar militarization presaged the later, and widespread, rise of vigilante groups as domination, resistance, and violence continued to shape postbellum Southern culture. As Mitchell Snay has observed, “paramilitarism provided a basis for group cohesion, a means of conducting politics, and a possible foundation for a separate national identity.”³⁷ Thus, the postwar rise of Regulators fostered the growth of a militant masculinity, which privileged violence. The Ku Klux Klan’s connection to postwar white militancy is critical in understanding Confederate veterans’ transformation from soldier to citizen, and men’s emotional upheaval after the war. Veterans tenaciously clung to their manhood in the postwar period, reasserting their masculinity especially in the protection, or so they charged, of their families.³⁸ White Southerners used traditions of police or military action to mask and legitimize their illegal behavior, and then connected their practices to the South’s rich fraternal life.³⁹ But, ultimately, these acts represented an unwavering devotion to white supremacy and all its ugly trappings.

Rituals

³⁷ Mitchell Snay, *Fenians, Freedmen, and Southern Whites: Race and Nationality in the Era of Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007), 64. See also, Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet*, 266 and Richard Zuczek, “The Last Campaign of the Civil War: South Carolina and the Revolution of 1876,” *Civil War History* 42 (March 1996): 18-31.

³⁸ Sheehan-Dean, *Why Confederates Fought*, 192-5 and Marten, *Sing Not War*, 64-72.

³⁹ Bercaw, *Gendered Freedoms*, 87.

Most orders of the Ku Klux Klan had elaborate initiation rituals, though the form was different over time and place. These rites instilled the order with secrecy and monitored membership.⁴⁰ So, too, were initiations intended to evoke emotional reactions. Orchestrated performances created confusion, promoted fear, and elicited revulsion—symbolic communication that tested men’s mettle. While not all Klansmen went through direct rituals of initiation, those who did were admitted by standing members only. Initiates were required by oath to uphold the order’s secrets, assist distressed members, and ensure law and order (read: white social order). Failure to do so would result in death, or so many oaths decreed. Thus, the Ku Klux Klan was composed of oath-bound men who joined the order to become part of a self-protective brotherhood that defined itself against the revolutions of emancipation and war.⁴¹ As whites banded together they engaged in models of behavior exhibited during the antebellum and Civil War eras. Tightly knit, homosocial communities fostered the growth of a corporate identity and contributed to the embrace of specific models of masculinity. Like student riots or military units, Klansmen wielded power and acted aggressively to achieve positions of mastery.

Rather than a centralized organization, every state of the former Confederacy hosted dozens of unconnected “orders” or “dens” of the Ku Klux Klan. Nomenclatures

⁴⁰ For earliest initiations in Tennessee, Trelease, *White Terror*, 15-9; more general information, 59-60. Formalized Ku Klux oaths, constitutions, and structure are detailed in Lester and Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan*, 135-186.

⁴¹ On secrecy and brotherhood see, Lester and Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan*, 147, 170-73 and Randolph Shotwell, “Ku-Klux Chronicles: Captain Shotwell’s Story of the Klans,” clipping in Shotwell Scrapbook, Box 4, Folder 29, Shotwell Family Papers, SHC. On how these whites defined themselves against Reconstruction, Trelease, *White Terror*, Chapter 3 and Stephen Kantrowitz, *Ben Tillman & the Reconstruction of White Supremacy* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 1-9. On self-defense and protection: Testimony of Albertus Hope, 12 December 1871, *Klan Trials*, SC, 172. More Documentation here.

and organizational lines are confused and difficult to track. Reports of Klan activity in one geographic area often inspired the formation of new organizations. North Carolina featured the White Brotherhood, the Constitutional Union Guard, and the Invisible Empire, an order that appeared also in South Carolina in addition to the Chester Conservative Clan and others.⁴² Klan membership was diverse and included white men from every rank and class.⁴³ These men shared a generational legacy of military defeat and the Ku Klux Klan, however loosely constituted enforced domination.⁴⁴

Historian Mark Carnes posits that fraternal orders and the rituals practiced therein offered young Victorian men solace and psychological guidance during their difficult passage into manhood.⁴⁵ Conspiracies of worldwide Masonic domination notwithstanding, fraternal orders were generally benign, while the Ku Klux Klan was malevolent from its inception. Yet, Carnes' conclusions about fraternities' socio-cultural function prove useful when considering how Southern whites sought to regain manhood and reestablish "self" through secret societies such as the Klan, which mimicked fraternal orders. While the name "Ku Klux" has been given many derivations, the

⁴² Trelease, *White Terror*, 51, 68, and 72 and Shotwell, "Ku-Klux Chronicles: Captain Shotwell's Story of the Klans," Shotwell Papers, SHC.

⁴³ Trelease, *White Terror*, 51; Rable, *But There Was No Peace*, 94-5; and Randolph Shotwell, "Rutherford Ku Klux Reminiscence," 15 April 1878, newspaper clipping in Shotwell Scrapbook, Box 4, Folder 29, Shotwell Papers, SHC. Through a study of manuscript census records in Alamance County, North Carolina, Paul Escott concluded that recruitment "brought many neighbors whose farms adjoined each other into the Klan, and family relations were another channel through which membership spread." Escott, *Many Excellent People*, 158.

⁴⁴ Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet*, 268 and David H. Donald, "A Generation of Defeat," reprinted in *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader*, ed. Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton (New York: New York University Press, 2007).

⁴⁵ Carnes, *Secret Ritual and Manhood in Victorian America*, 14. On the Klan's connections to fraternal orders, see Harcourt, "Who Were the Pale Faces? New Perspective on the Tennessee Ku Klux," 54-55. Linkages between ritual and manhood are explored in Mark C. Carnes, *Secret Ritual and Manhood in Victorian America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). For the Klan's dependence on contemporary popular cultural forms, Parsons, "Midnight Rangers," 811-36.

corruption of the Greek word *kuklos*, meaning circle or band, is among the most convincing root explanations. Following this logic and several accounts of initiation rituals, Allen Trelease describes the Tennessee Klan as being similar to a college fraternity in initiation and structure.⁴⁶ North Carolinian Randolph Shotwell maintained that the methods of the Masons and other fraternities “were laid under contribution for the organic features of the White Brotherhood.”⁴⁷ By joining the Klan whites entered a deeply protective, highly secretive venue that fostered social cohesion similar to that shared by soldiers during war. Many of the cultural and social mechanisms that bound together antebellum men were also employed after the war to establish a sense of corporate identity among whites.

While initiation rites were performed unevenly and in different ways throughout the South, a number of similar features emerge.⁴⁸ Rituals left new members exposed emotionally, physically, and mentally only to be reborn into the order. Moreover, initiation procedures were symbolic performances composed of distinct phases that the novice had to successfully negotiate for final passage into the order. Randolph Shotwell’s thorough account of a rite of initiation, as used in North Carolina, illustrates the components of these ornate performances. A man seeking to join the Klan was given instructions to meet at a specific, remote location deep into the night—an

⁴⁶ Trelease, *White Terror*, 4-6 and Lester and Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan*, 55 and 60.

⁴⁷ Randolph Shotwell, “Ku-Klux Chronicles: Captain Shotwell’s Story of the Klans,” clipping in Shotwell Scrapbook, Box 4, Folder 29, Shotwell Family Papers, SHC. William R. Tickel, when questioned about his connection to the Klan, confessed to giving Jacob A. Long—a Klan chief in Alamance—a sign. After acknowledging the sign Long said: “You belong to the first degree. There is three other degrees of which you don’t know any thing. You will probably be initiated at some future time.” This suggested Masonic-like hierarchies and levels of organization. Testimony of William R. Tickel, 2 September 1870, Box 1, Folder Sept.-Dec. 1870, Klan Papers, DU.

⁴⁸ Testimony of William R. Tickel, 2 September 1870, Klan Papers, DU.

environment and situation “full of ghostly suggestions.”⁴⁹ Upon the man’s arrival disguised men descended from the woods. A series of signs and countersigns were offered before the man was guided forward. Now blindfolded, the inductee and his guides were asked a formalized series of questions before gaining entry into the outer-rim of the “Circle of Fraternity.” A large body of costumed men were already assembled. The men’s bandage was removed. Before him stood two tall looming figures wearing long red gowns. The men wore hideous masks, “two feet high, with eye-holes bound in black, and tall horns, formed of red flannel, stuffed with cotton.” Each man held a knife in one hand and a pistol in the other. One was pressed to the initiate’s head, the other at the breast as he took the oath.⁵⁰ Upon taking the oath men emerged from trees in all direction. “Swarms of white robed, ghostly figures, shaking their horns, and presenting pistols at the breast of the startled neophyte! Then, forming a circle,—still with pistols presented—they pronounced in low tones:— “DEATH! DEATH!! DEATH!!! *We have heard; and we will remember!*”⁵¹ Fellow North Carolinian James E. Boyd described similar practices in North Carolina’s White Brotherhood, though he himself had been admitted by only one member demonstrating great discrepancy in practice. According to Boyd, the inductee was placed in a large ring composed of disguised men. The man was brought into the circle’s center and then left alone. The crowd descended upon the initiate making “curious noises” and rubbing him with their horns. Boyd noted that these acts were intended to frighten the neophyte as much as possible before the administering of an oath. As in Shotwell’s description, the oath prescribed a penalty of

⁴⁹ Shotwell, *Papers*, 372.

⁵⁰ Shotwell, *Papers*, 373.

⁵¹ Shotwell, *Papers*, 374. Italics in original quote.

death.⁵² Other documented rites in North Carolina symbolically communicated death through the use of a rope. A new member would have a rope tied around his neck, which was tightened until the inductee was asphyxiated slightly—a procedure loosely reminiscent of a Masonic ritual.⁵³

Klan rituals were intended to evoke emotional and behavioral reactions, thus serving a larger cultural function. As in fraternal societies, Klan rituals were both concealing and revealing.⁵⁴ Initiations marked the passage from one social status to another. New members moved through formalized spaces and underwent personal trials before gaining final acceptance.⁵⁵ In the ceremony's beginning, the blindfolded inductee probably felt great anxiety and curiosity as he was brought before the order. Once unmasked, the man did not meet known faces but rather disguised men—further obfuscation. Many Klansmen wore elaborate masks that recombined familiar elements—tongues, horns, eyes—into grotesque forms thus rendering the natural, unnatural.⁵⁶ Depending on the specific ritual the inductee was either ritualistically attacked by the crowd before taking an oath; or took an oath before the symbolic assault. The attack signaled the display of a rugged, competitive masculinity.⁵⁷ The

⁵² Testimony of James E. Boyd, 31 August [1870], Box 1, Folder Jan-Aug. 1870, Klan Papers, DU.

⁵³ Nelson, *Iron Confederacies*, 111 and Malcolm C. Duncan, *Duncan's Masonic Ritual and Monitor or Guide to the Three Symbolic Degrees of the Ancient York Rite and to the Degrees of Mark Master, Past Master, Most Excellent Master, and the Royal Arch* (New York: Crown Publishers, N/D), 28.

⁵⁴ Carnes, *Secret Ritual and Manhood in Victorian America*, 34-6.

⁵⁵ Victor Turner, *Process, Performance and Pilgrimage* (New Delhi: Concept, 1979), 17-8.

⁵⁶ Turner, *Process, Performance and Pilgrimage*, 20.

⁵⁷ The Ku Klux Klan represents a specific, and fleeting, venue in which white Southern men displayed a rugged masculinity. For a broader discussion of male aggressiveness, Ted Ownby, *Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, & Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990).

inductee surely felt fear as the large, disguised crowd came upon him brandishing weapons, making strange noises, and assaulting his person. But, the neophyte had to withstand this attack, publicly displaying his manliness. With the successful navigation of these trials—an experience shared, presumably, by most standing members—the inductee now had access to the secrets, passwords, and protection of the Ku Klux Klan.

Threats of death, the presence of weapons, ghastly figures, and the use of skulls and skeletons (real or depicted) made death an important feature in rites of initiation. Violence and death became normative through ritualistic devices and physical actions. New members' bravado and self-control established their willingness to embrace a savage, but directed, masculinity. Representations of death reminded members of the consequences of betrayal but also emblematically communicated their rebirth into a secret order.⁵⁸ The feelings conjured during the initiation process—fear, anxiety, confusion, anger—were the same emotions felt by Southern white men during the personal and political crises of Reconstruction. Moreover, the presence of weapons, the use of bleached bones, and the threat of attack were features experienced repeatedly on Civil War battlefields, at least among those Klansmen who were also veterans. The order offered not only an avenue to express these feelings, however unconsciously, but also presented a powerful vehicle for the reestablishment of a familiar social order.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Numerous insights were garnered from Carnes' discussion of death symbolism in Masonic rituals, Carnes, *Secret Ritual and Manhood in Victorian America*, 54-63. As anthropologists have argued, symbolic meaning is connected to cultural context. If we follow the logic of Clifford Geertz, cultural form can be treated as text. Excitement, despair, loss, and risk are not only the emotional results of Klan ceremonies but are also reflective of feelings which that particular society valued. Geertz, "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight," in *The Interpretation of Cultures*, 448-53. See also, Turner, *Process, Performance and Pilgrimage*.

⁵⁹ For connections between performance and social realities see, Geertz, "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight." For the Klan's cultural function, Nelson, *Iron Confederacies* and Parsons, "Midnight Rangers."

Oath-bound men, bonded through rite and ritual, operated in concert within the confines of an extended “brotherhood.” If a fellow Klansmen was engaged in a fight he made a distress signal; other “brothers” were bound to go to his assistance.⁶⁰ A Klansman from Gaston County, North Carolina, was told upon joining: “My Brother, you are one of our number. You . . . now belong to the K. K. K’s and are entitled to all the benefits of protection and otherwise which belong to the order.”⁶¹ Speaking of the Georgia Klan specifically, but offering more general comments about the group’s social function, former Confederate General John B. Gordon remarked, “it was an organization, a brotherhood of the property-holders, the peaceable, law-abiding citizens of the State, for self-defense.” Self-protection, he maintained, guided the members who felt a “sense of insecurity and danger, particularly in those neighborhoods where the Negro population largely predominated.”⁶² Gordon’s remarks were couched in the language of white supremacy, a worldview shared by the members of the Ku Klux. Southern white men steeled themselves against the revolutionary consequences of civil war by joining extended networks—invisible empires—that directly confronted

⁶⁰ Testimony of James E. Boyd, 31 August [1870], Klan Papers, DUL. Mitchell Snay explores the brotherhood of the Klan through comparative perspective with Union Leagues and Fenians, arguing that the Civil War era was a period of intense nationalism. He includes an excellent description of the military characteristics and means of bonding of each order. Snay, *Fenians, Freedmen, and Southern Whites*, Chapter 2.

⁶¹ “To Capt R. A. Shotwell,” N/D, Box 4, Folder 28 [undated], Shotwell Family Papers, SHC.

⁶² John B. Gordon, quoted in Katharine Du Pre Lumpkin, *The Making of a Southerner* (1946; reprint with a forward by Darlene Clark Hine, Athens: Brown Thrasher Book by the University of Georgia Press, 1991), 89.

challenges to white authority. The Ku Klux Klan functioned as a powerful vehicle to build solidarity and enforce white social hierarchies through extralegal violence.⁶³

While politics is largely absent from my discussion of the Klan because of the extensive efforts undertaken by other scholars in that area, it remains essential to understand how the Ku Klux Klan's rituals, rites, and decrees connected manhood and politics.⁶⁴ The performative elements of the Klan created avenues for the construction and dissemination of a particular brand of political ideology that supported the Democratic party and white supremacist doctrine.⁶⁵ Klan dens provided a venue for the articulation of these ideas among like-minded men, thus fostering the growth of a masculinity predicated upon violence for political advancement.⁶⁶

White southern manhood remained in flux during the Reconstruction-era. Klansmen used ritual and decree to communicate their liminal position but also to reify whiteness and manhood. Two documents from South Carolina demonstrate the gendered dimensions of Klan politics. The first is an anonymous initiation ritual from 1870 that, while not definitively attributed to the Klan, contains many features of other Ku Klux materials.⁶⁷ In the antebellum era armed collective action upheld white men's

⁶³ As Stephen Kantrowitz has argued, the "counterrevolutionary mobilization against Reconstruction emerged piecemeal between 1868 and 1876 as elite white men pursued mutually supporting strategies to regain control." Kantrowitz, *Ben Tillman and the Reconstruction of White Supremacy*, 53.

⁶⁴ On the Klan and politics see especially, Rable, *But There Was No Peace*; Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet*, 265-313; Foner, *Reconstruction*, 425-44; Kantrowitz, *Ben Tillman and the Reconstruction of White Supremacy*.

⁶⁵ Foner, *Reconstruction*, 425-6.

⁶⁶ Rable, *But There Was No Peace*, 94-5. The purpose of the Ku Klux Klan has been heavily contested by scholars. The most overtly political readings of the Klan's function is found in Zuczek, *State of Rebellion*, 55-61, especially.

⁶⁷ This first document is rather curious and could be from any number of fraternal orders. But, its explicitly political message and its timeframe of circa 1870 are suggestive that this is a document from an order of the Klan. Moreover, sections of this document have distinctive correlations to the Ku Klux "Obligation" or

mastery over the public and private spheres. The revolutions of Reconstruction undercut white authority and challenged the construction of coalitions.⁶⁸ Secret orders perceived these changes as an affront to the South's "natural" social order. As recorded in the initiation rite, a ranked officer would present this narrative to a new member. The officer announced: "When ignorant depraved men—adventurers whose aim is plunder, fanatics whose influence over the ignorant masses is exerted to carry out their nefarious designs—are illegally and unjustly forced upon a people as rulers . . . it is the duty of the people thus oppressed and threatened to oppose this monstrous wrong." To reestablish order and resurrect white manhood the officer recommended action. He continued: "You must know that there now exists a necessity for organization to prevent the evils threatened [.] Having confidence on you we have invited you to meet us and now ask your active cooperation." The inductee symbolically knelt throughout this speech with one gloved hand tied behind his back as he took an oath very similar to those administered by Klansmen in Tennessee and North Carolina. His passive position reflected not only the same one held by past "brothers" during their initiation but also placed him "in the same position individually that we are all in politically."⁶⁹ Ritualistic submission made tangible white men's emasculation. But, once men joined together in

oath detailed in Wilson and Lester's *Ku Klux Klan*. See Wilson and Lester, *Ku Klux Klan*, 147. The document itself is found in the Artemus Darby Goodwyn Papers, Folder 8, Box 1, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; hereinafter SCL.

⁶⁸ Kantrowitz, "One Man's Mob Is Another Man's Militia," 67-8 and Kantrowitz, *Ben Tillman and the Reconstruction of White Supremacy*, 50-60. On South Carolina's antebellum white men, Lacy K. Ford, Jr., *Origins of Southern Radicalism: The South Carolina Upcountry, 1800-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988) and Stephanie McCurry, *Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, and the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

⁶⁹ Anonymous/ND document, Goodwyn Papers, SCL. For other references to kneeling during initiation see, Testimony of Kirkland L. Gunn, 12 December 1871, *Klan Trials*, SC, 174 and Testimony of Sam Ferguson, 13 December 1871, *Klan Trials*, SC, 271.

concerted action, they had recourse to rectify perceived wrongs. Through decree and ritual this South Carolina secret society articulated the politics of white manhood.

The second document, an order from the “Grand Cyclops” of one of South Carolina’s dens (most likely the Chester Conservative Club), recognized that collective strength wielded power most effectively.⁷⁰ The Grand Cyclops ordered: “Whenever it may be necessary to act, let us do it deliberately, firmly, with concentrated power and strength, demoralizing our opponents by the overwhelming display of our strength and with an eye single to the good of our Cause and Country.” The cause’s righteousness was upheld through surgical attacks, the men’s deportment, and the group’s ideological underpinnings. It was further decreed that “No Klan or members of this organization (unless in very urgent cases not admitting of delay) will undertake to redress grievances of a general character or act in any manner calculated to produce a breach of the peace without orders from these Hd Qrs.”⁷¹ This call, while not always heeded, was essential for upholding the moral high-ground according to Southern whites. Representations of legitimate authority became key in South Carolina’s contests over Reconstruction.⁷² White manhood could only be restored through “respectable” authority and properly channeled aggression. Of course, as Stephen Kantrowitz remarks, this spurious analysis “masked the white leadership’s straightforward but constitutionally unacceptable intention: to restore as much as possible of the world they had lost.”⁷³

⁷⁰ The second document, well established to be from the Klan, is “Head Quarters Genl Orders! No 1,” ca. Oct 1868, Oversized Folder (1868-1913), Iredell Jones Papers, SCL.

⁷¹ “Head Quarters Genl Orders! No 1,” ca. Oct 1868, Jones Papers, SCL.

⁷² Kantrowitz, “One Man’s Mob Is Another Man’s Militia.”

⁷³ Kantrowitz, “One Man’s Mob Is Another Man’s Militia,” 67.

The elaborate rites and rituals of the Ku Klux Klan, while drawn from the practices of antebellum fraternal orders, symbolically reflected Southern white men's liminal position in the postwar era. The dichotomies in normative society between the sacred and the profane, the living and the dead, were temporarily suspended during ritualistic initiations. These rites turned the social world upside down thus symbolically communicating to inductees and standing members their current social position. By constructing this emblematic dream world men not only exorcised the legacy of military defeat but shaped a path for resolution. With their rebirth into the Ku Klux Klan men could indulge in sexual and violent behavior typically deemed inappropriate.⁷⁴ Thus, performance, symbol, and ritual within the Klan defamiliarized the familiar but did so to teach about the value of being disorderly. While the model of manhood crafted through the Ku Klux Klan would never become normative, it served as a crucial means in whites' broader campaign for the reestablishment of a social and political "self."⁷⁵

Ghosts of the Confederacy

Thus far this chapter has largely considered the antebellum origins of the Ku Klux Klan. This the third section directly engages how white Southerners' experiences in, and memories of, the Civil War contributed to the character, organization, and symbolism of the Klan. By linking the Confederacy to the South's Invisible Empire, Klansmen resurrected their failed nationalist project and ensured that its warriors did not die in

⁷⁴ Parsons, "Midnight Rangers," 830.

⁷⁵ This interpretation relied heavily upon anthropological reading of rituals. See, Turner, *Process, Performance and Pilgrimage*; Geertz, "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight;" and Rhys Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (1982; repr., Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1999), especially, "A Discourse on the Method."

vain. Confederate dead were ideal figures to revive the antebellum South's racial and social order, for these men had given their lives for its preservation.⁷⁶ The Ku Klux Klan symbolically invoked the white South's fallen warriors to once again walk among the living and transform the unrelenting humiliation that came with military defeat into revenge, hatred, and anger.⁷⁷

In the early years of violence especially (1867-9), Klansmen would often claim to their victims that they were ghosts of Confederate soldiers.⁷⁸ Historians have nearly universally noted the Klan's spectral qualities and its claims on the dead. Yet, few scholars have considered why the Klan chose to invoke Confederate ghosts or how this related to their broader campaigns of terror. Spectral disguises may have been used to intimidate supposedly superstitious African Americans, but they also reflected white Southerners' engagement with a burgeoning Lost Cause mythology.⁷⁹ The ghosts, rather than deified heroes, were restless spirits from hell who wrought havoc among the living. By invoking the Confederate dead and inverting the land of the living, the Ku Klux Klan were deliberately creating a symbolic world. White Southerners' involvement in these terror-based groups reveals much about veterans' continued confrontation with

⁷⁶ Whites, "Stand By Your Man," in *Gender Matters*, 92.

⁷⁷ Wyatt-Brown, "Honor Chastened," 255-8.

⁷⁸ Confederate ghosts were just one of several identities used by the Klan. Raiders also pretended to be foreigners from other countries, from the moon, or acted to mimic animals.

⁷⁹ On antebellum tactics, Fry, *Night Riders in Black Folk History*, 66-81. For the Klan's postwar meaning: Charles Reagan Wilson argues counter to my assertion and proposes that the Ku Klux Klan had direct Confederate connections that made it part of the religion of the Lost Cause. Charles Reagan Wilson, *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1980), 112-3. So, too, does W. Scott Poole maintain that the Klan's Confederate imagery reinforced the Lost Cause as he envisions "the spirits of vengeful Confederate soldiers as an act of pious remembrance." Poole, *Never Surrender*, 111. On the other hand, Gaines Foster contends that the Klan did very little to shape the postwar Confederate tradition. Gaines M. Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865 to 1913* (1985; repr., New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 48.

defeat. Vengeful Confederate soldiers, once thwarted in war, now sought the reclamation of their manhood through acts of terrorism intended to “protect” white womanhood and resurrect a “proper” social order.⁸⁰ But these ends were achieved through actions neither honorable nor gentlemanly.⁸¹ Thus, the resurrection of the dead specifically became a mechanism to both inextricably link the Klan to the Confederacy and distance the order from the chivalrous ideals of southern gentlemen. Beyond the Klan’s ghoulish allusions to the fallen Confederacy were direct connections to the war. In a compelling case study of Alamance County, North Carolina, Scott Reynolds Nelson found that former Confederates in Companies F and K of the Sixth North Carolina were among the important leaders called “Chiefs.”⁸² Chiefs chose victims to be tortured and issued privates orders to be followed.⁸³ The foot soldiers of the Confederacy became the shock troops of the Ku Klux.⁸⁴ Prominent Confederate officers once again led southern men. Nathan Bedford Forrest—the tenacious wartime cavalryman—served as the first and only Grand Wizard, while famed general John B. Gordon acted as Grand

⁸⁰ Poole, *Never Surrender*, 111. See also LeeAnn Whites, “Reconstruction of Southern White Manhood,” in *Gender Matters: Civil War, Reconstruction, and the Making of the New South*, ed. LeeAnn Whites (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 92-4.

⁸¹ Parsons, “Midnight Rangers,” 831.

⁸² Nelson, *Iron Confederacies*, 109-10. See also Otto H. Olsen, “North Carolina: An Incongruous Presence,” in *Reconstruction and Redemption in the South*, ed. Otto H. Olsen (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1980), 179.

⁸³ Nelson, *Iron Confederacies*, 111. The elaborate hierarchy envisioned by the Klan, if never fully realized, is detailed in Lester and Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan*, 155-70. A version of the Constitution and By-laws, likewise detailing structures of command, is found in *Ku Klux Trials*, SC, presented during the Testimony of Kirkland L. Gunn, 12 December 1871, 175-8.

⁸⁴ Testimony of Charles W. Foster, 12 December 1871, *Klan Trials*, SC, 207. See also, Wilson, *Baptized in Blood*, 112.

Dragon of the Georgia Klan. Confederate links thus became central to the organization of the Ku Klux Klan.⁸⁵

Klansmen's former military lives directly shaped protocol and order. Sentinels guarded secluded meetings and required signs and countersigns for entry.⁸⁶ Raids were often conducted in military-like fashion. Whistles were used to coordinate movements, convey messages, and foster anonymity.⁸⁷ Disguised men were often assigned numbers and referenced only by that conferred identity.⁸⁸ Rally cries and distress signals often recalled the war. One member of North Carolina's White Brotherhood testified that they used the word "Shiloh" to mobilize comrades.⁸⁹ These measures not only bolstered the Klan's effectiveness but also reaffirmed the martial identity of its members. Quasi-military campaigns regenerated white manhood and attempted to resurrect antebellum racial hierarchies.⁹⁰

The starched white robes emblazoned with an encircled cross, seared into public consciousness by the Klan's hateful acts in the twentieth century, little resembles the motley assortment of costumes and regalia worn in the Reconstruction-era. Long robes of red, yellow, black, brown, and white were seen in together in some orders, while

⁸⁵ Wilson, *Baptized in Blood*, 112. See also, Fry, *Night Riders in Black Folk History*, 145-7.

⁸⁶ Testimony of James E. Boyd, 31 August [1870], Klan Papers, DU.

⁸⁷ Testimony of Kirkland L. Gunn, 12 December 1871, *Klan Trials*, SC, 181; Lester and Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan*, 59; and Nelson, *Iron Confederacies*, 110.

⁸⁸ Testimony of Kirkland L. Gunn, 12 December 1871, *Klan Trials*, SC, 182 and Testimony of Gadsden Steel, 12 December 1871, *Klan Trials*, SC, 233.

⁸⁹ Testimony of James E. Boyd, 31 August [1870], Klan Papers, DU. See also, Testimony of William Tickel, 1 April 1870, Klan Papers, DU.

⁹⁰ Lisa Cardyn, "Sexual Terror in the Reconstruction South," in *Battle Scars: Gender and Sexuality in the American Civil War*, eds., Catherine Clinton and Nina Silber (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 153-4.

others were barely costumed. Some orders wore elaborately constructed headpieces, which included beards, horns, and exaggerated tongues, while others wore crudely constructed hoods.⁹¹ White North Carolina conservative David Schenck commented that the Ku Klux dressed in white, moved noiselessly at night, and carried skulls and skeletons, thereby giving “themselves an unnatural character.”⁹² Costuming, masks and hoods in particular, concealed one identity and constructed another.⁹³ Disguised men indulged in inappropriate behavior.⁹⁴ In a fascinating reading of the Thomas Dixon trilogy, literary scholar Judith Jackson Fossett questions the performative function of Klan costuming. She writes: “Dixon’s narratives unwittingly call into question the authenticity of white male privilege. If authentic whiteness can be derived only from the wearing of white cloth, does that cloth in fact cover or rather hide a real, but ultimately inferior and flawed white skin?”⁹⁵ Fossett’s questions confront whites’ use of disguise in their quest for social control. Yet, southern men used masking as an essential element in the construction of their worldview. Figurative and literal masks conferred power. Only by unmasking these men would they lose power.⁹⁶

The Ku Klux Klan used a variety of tactics to announce their arrival either within a community or at a specific household. References to the military and the supernatural

⁹¹ Trelease, *White Terror*, 53. On the cultural significance of Klan costuming, Parsons, “Midnight Rangers.” On clothing description: Testimony of John Caldwell, 13 December 1871, *Ku Klux Trials*, SC, 246.

⁹² David Schenck Diary, 12 April 1868, Box 2, Folder 7, Volume 6, Schenck Papers, SHC.

⁹³ Carnes, *Secret Ritual and Manhood in Victorian America*, 34.

⁹⁴ Parsons, “Midnight Rangers,” 830.

⁹⁵ Fossett, “(K)night Riders in (K)night Gowns,” 41.

⁹⁶ Kenneth S. Greenberg, *Honor & Slavery: Lies, Duels, Noses, Masks, Dressing As a Woman, Gifts, Strangers, Humanitarianism, Death, Slave Rebellions, the Proslavery Argument, Baseball, Hunting, and Gambling in the Old South* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996), 24-31.

abound. The broadest campaigns involved the sudden appearance of written notices or public parades, not the burning crosses emblematic of the twentieth-century K.K.K.⁹⁷ South Carolina's Conservative *Yorkville Enquirer* printed this notice, similar to ones issued throughout the South: "REMEMBER the hour appointed by our Most Excellent Grand Captain-General. The dismal hour draws nigh for the meeting of our mystic Circle. The Shrouded-Knight will come with pick and spade; the Grand Chaplain will come with the ritual of the dead. The grave yawneeth, the lightnings flash athwart the heavens, the thunders roll, but the Past Grand Knight of the Sepulcher will recoil not."⁹⁸ A combination of the nonsensical and the fantastic, such advertisements were intended to instill fear in local blacks and rally white supporters.⁹⁹ But the advertisement's phrasing also had another function. By claiming to be ghosts, acting during the night only, and weaving mystery through printed materials, the Ku Klux were attempting to fictionalize themselves and their order. It was essential to popular representations that the Klan's existence remained in doubt. And, indeed, the effectiveness of such tactics can be seen throughout newspapers and diaries that questioned the order's existence.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷ Schenck Diary, 12 April 1868, Folder 7, Volume 6, Box 2, David Schenck Papers, SHC; J. P. Green, *Recollections of the Inhabitants...*, 139-40; Trelease, *White Terror*, 54-5; and Fry, *Night Riders in Black Folk History*, 145.

⁹⁸ *Yorkville Enquirer*, 2 April 1868. See also Trelease, *White Terror*, 71. Similar advertisements were reprinted in Lester and Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan*, 189-96.

⁹⁹ On the broadest processes of early Klan mobilization see, Trelease, *White Terror*, 49-56.

¹⁰⁰ An extensive collection of newspaper clippings from 1867-76 is found Ellison Summerfield Keitt's Reconstruction-era Scrapbook. Keitt's sympathy to the Klan obviously directed what clippings he found interesting but the stories may an invaluable marker for Klan deception. Reconstruction-era Scrapbook, 1867-76, Ellison Summerfield Keitt Papers, SCL, USC. On Klan rumors and mystery, Schenck Diary, 18 December 1869, Folder 7, Volume 6, Box 2, David Schenck Papers, SHC. See also, Parsons, "Midnight Rangers," 817.

Paper propaganda often worked in conjunction with parades. These performances presented the Klan as a spectacle to be witnessed, and served as overt demonstrations of power.¹⁰¹ J. C. Lester and D. L. Wilson recorded in their sympathetic history of the Klan that Tennessee whites agreed to stage a series of parades on the night of July 4, 1867. Drawing from events in Pulaski the authors' described the scene. That morning, papers announcing the parade were spread throughout town. By evening, the men "donned their robes and disguises and put covers of gaudy materials on their horses." After a signal the "different companies met and passed each other on the public square in perfect silence; the discipline appeared to be admirable." By marching and countermarching the Klan created an appearance of vast numbers.¹⁰² Witnesses in Alabama (who at first mistook the men as the advance for a circus company) and Mississippi spoke of similar events, whereas Randolph Shotwell—self-styled nineteenth-century historian of the Klan—complained of "similar societies" that assumed "Ku-Klux colors to mystify the public, and marched into villages in masked processions, with stuffed elephants and other grotesque animals. Even circuses burlesqued Ku-Klux Klans by extravagant performances."¹⁰³ These tactics awed and intimidated audiences before the use of coercive force. Ultimately, though, orders of the Klan were too fragmented, hierarchies too dispersed, to arrange parades with any

¹⁰¹ Parsons, "Midnight Rangers," 817-8 and Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*, 85-90.

¹⁰² Lester and Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan*, 93.

¹⁰³ Testimony of John H. Wager, 14 October 1871, *Klan Reports*, AL, vol. II, 933; Testimony of Austin Pollard, 16 November 1871, *Klan Reports*, Mississippi, vol. II, 1109; Shotwell, "Ku-Klux Chronicles," Shotwell Scrapbook, Box 4, Folder 29, Shotwell Papers, SHC; and Parsons, "Midnight Rangers," 817-8. Mark L. Bradley documents the successful intervention of a Freedmen's Bureau officer in Salisbury, North Carolina, who stopped a planned night time parade of the White Man's Club and "Fantastics," or Ku Klux, before elections. Bradley, *Bluecoats & Tar Heels*, 183.

frequency. Instead, the vast majority of African Americans and whites encountered the Klan intimately, under the cloak of darkness.

The dirt roadways of the South, once under cover of darkness, became deadly arteries canvassed by hooded men searching out African Americans and white radicals for the purposes of intimidation or violence. Upon nearing the victim's home Klansmen announced their presence through loud commotion, house attacks, and demands of entry. Often the attackers proclaimed themselves Confederate dead from hell. Approaching the home of black South Carolinian Andy Tims, Klansmen cried out, "Here we come—we are the Ku Klux. Here we come, right from hell."¹⁰⁴ Dick Wilson testified that after inquires into his son's location, he responded politely to the "gentlemen" stating that he did not know his son's whereabouts. One man snapped back, "don't call me any gentleman; we are just from hell fire; we haven't been in this country since Manassas."¹⁰⁵ Sometimes the Klan would pose one of their members as a fallen hero from the battlefield. In one instance, the ghost was called "Stevens." The Klan summoned one African American after another for questioning. They asked, "Was this one of your murderers, Stevens?" He responded yes. "And they would say, 'Well, take him off,' and another would be brought out, and he would answer, 'Yes,' and they would take him off."¹⁰⁶ These elaborate performances and assigned identities resurrected the Confederacy and restored, if temporarily, an antebellum social order dominated by southern whites.

¹⁰⁴ Testimony of Andy Tims, 12 December 1871, *Klan Trials*, SC, 222.

¹⁰⁵ Testimony of Dick Wilson, 13 December 1871, *Klan Trails*, SC, 283.

¹⁰⁶ Testimony of Simpson Bobo, 13 July 1871, *Klan Reports*, SC, vol II, 803.

Elaborate tricks were practiced to advance ghastly identities further. Quite often, as Katharine Du Pre Lumpkin—a writer and sociologist reared in the Lost Cause—recalled from stories of her father’s own involvement in the Georgia Klan, a body of disguised men would ride to the home of an African American who had either voted Republican or been “insufferably impudent” to a white man or woman. As the black man approached, the hooded crowd talked of former exploits during the Civil War. One might describe “how he had died at Gettysburg or some other battle and how thirsty he got in hell.” The men would then ask the African American for multiple buckets of water which were quickly consumed, or so it appeared through trickery, until the man supposedly trembled in fear at the supernatural occurrence.¹⁰⁷ So, too, would Klansmen use constructed devices to augment height, sometimes appearing to be over twelve feet tall. Or, others developed internal framework beneath their costuming that supported a false head or a fake arm, which could be removed in the presence of an African American.¹⁰⁸ Grotesque figures and whites’ chicanery created confusion during raids and further mystified the Ku Klux Klan.

Ultimately, Southern blacks quickly unraveled the Klan’s performances and recognized their deliberate subterfuge.¹⁰⁹ Many blacks, rather than scared into believing that they were among ghosts, tried to uncover the curious specters before them. One North Carolinian related: “They always said in my country that a man could not kill a Ku-

¹⁰⁷ Katharine Du Pre Lumpkin, *The Making of a Southerner* (1946; reprint with a forward by Darlene Clark Hine, Athens: Brown Thrasher Book by the University of Georgia Press, 1991), 91. See also, J. E. Robuck, *My Own Personal Experience and Observation as a Soldier in the Confederate Army During the Civil War, 1861-1865 also During the Period of Reconstruction* (Memphis: Burke's Book Store, [1978?]), 91 and 126; Trelease, *White Terror*, 58-9; and, Parsons, “Midnight Rangers,” 813.

¹⁰⁸ Trelease, *White Terror*, 56.

¹⁰⁹ On African Americans’ resistance to the Klan, Rosen, *Terror in the Heart of Freedom*, 188-9. See also, Pierson, *Black Legacy*, 142-4.

Klux; they said that they could not be hit; that if they were, the ball would bounce back and kill you. I thought though that I would try it, and see if my gun would hit one.”¹¹⁰

Another man, well versed in Klan appearances, actively interrogated the situation upon the Klan’s arrival. He wrote, “they said they had risen from the dead; I wanted to see what sort of men they was; I went a purpose to see who they were; whether they were spirits, or whether they were human; but when I came to find out, they was men like me.”¹¹¹ By unmasking the Klan and questioning their tactics, African Americans deduced the Klan’s real character. In the words of black South Carolinian J. P. Green, they “wore masks to conceal their cowardly faces.”¹¹²

The question remains, however: Why did the Klan pose as Confederate dead? Early histories of the order commonly asserted that whites used ghost disguises to trick and scare blacks who they disparagingly described as naive and overly superstitious.¹¹³ Recent scholarship has revised the jaundiced perspective of these historians by locating African Americans’ reactions to Klan raids.¹¹⁴ Indeed, as many of the above accounts relate, armed African Americans were more than willing to test the mettle of the undead.

¹¹⁰ Testimony of Essic Harris, 1 July 1871, *Condition of Affairs in the Southern States, North Carolina*, p. 89-90.

¹¹¹ Testimony of Dick Wilson, 13 December 1871, *Ku Klux Trials*, 287.

¹¹² J. P. Green, *Recollections of the Inhabitants...*, 136.

¹¹³ Walter Henry Cook, “Secret Political Societies in the South during the Period of Reconstruction, An Address before the Faculty and Friends of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio” (Evangelical Publishing House: Cleveland, [1914.]), 21-4; Walter Lynwood Fleming, *The Sequel of Appomattox: A Chronicle of the Reunion of the States* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919), 252-3; Susan L. Davis, *Authentic History Ku Klux Klan, 1865-1877* (New York: American Library Service, 1924), 8; Lester and Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan*, 98; and Stanley F. Horn, *Invisible Empire: The Story of the Ku Klux Klan, 1866-1871* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1939), 18-9. For the historical perspective on white attitudes toward African American’s intelligence, Winthrop Jordan, 187-90.

¹¹⁴ See especially: H. Grady McWhiney and Francis B. Simkins, “The Ghostly Legend of the Ku-Klux Klan,” *Negro History Bulletin* 14 (Feb., 1951): 109-12; Trelease, *White Terror*, 56-8; Fry, *Night Riders in Black Folk History*, 69-80; William D. Piersen, *Black Legacy: America’s Hidden Heritage* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1993), 142-4; and Parsons, “Midnight Rangers,” 813.

Moreover, to suggest that blacks were frightened by grotesque disguises proves nothing. Fear and caution are sensible attitudes for anyone confronting gangs of armed, masked men arriving in the dead of night and behaving in a curious manner.¹¹⁵ This all suggests that the Klan's personification of the Confederate dead was more symbolic than literal. As Elaine Parsons has so convincingly argued, the Ku Klux Klan must be located within the context of minstrel traditions, carnival, Mardi Gras, and other inversion performances.¹¹⁶ So, too, however, did the ghosts of the Confederacy recall and manipulate memories of the war, while also revealing whites' shifting social status.

By acting as ghosts Klansmen were engaged in symbolic performance. On the one hand, disguises and assumed personas created purposeful theatrics that attempted to bolster whites' position. Klansmen temporally controlled a public stage and conferred an idealized portrait of the South's social and political landscape. This portrait looked backward to the Confederacy and the antebellum era, periods devoid, at least in whites' minds, of politicized African Americans and white radicals. Moreover, such deception attempted to conceal white Southerners' political impotence and embattled position, while bolstering their strides at social control.¹¹⁷ On the other hand, by portraying the dead among the living whites conveyed, however unconsciously, their ambiguous position. Such figures, suspended between realms, wanted revenge to redeem a lost social order. Southern men may have been "dead" to the social world, but they were

¹¹⁵ Piersen, *Black Legacy*, 142.

¹¹⁶ Parsons, "Midnight Rangers."

¹¹⁷ James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990), 50.

alive to the asocial world.¹¹⁸ Klan warnings often describe the passage of ghosts from one realm to another.¹¹⁹ The Confederate dead, once among the living, could seek revenge.¹²⁰ While the Klan's acts were dishonorable, they chose to create a "Shadowed Brotherhood" of "Murdered heroes" to make right what was now wrong, and by so doing both recall and help create a heroic, idealized vision of southern manhood.¹²¹

Landscapes of Terror

Violence and resistance shaped antebellum southern culture. Whites believed that a combination of moderation, domination, and outright threat sustained the plantation complex and maintained their power—forces which African Americans actively resisted.¹²² Emancipation and civil war collapsed the white South's social order. Yet military defeat neither extinguished whites' drive for control, nor quelled violence. Many historians have argued that Reconstruction-era tumult demonstrates continuity with the Civil War, even if the means and intensity changed over time.¹²³ But it can also

¹¹⁸ Turner, *Process, Performance and Pilgrimage*, 19.

¹¹⁹ Lester and Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan*, 190.

¹²⁰ Lester and Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan*, 190.

¹²¹ "General Orders No. 3," Lester and Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan*, 192. On southern manhood, Zuczek, *State of Rebellion*, 56-7 and Nelson, *Iron Confederacies*, 111.

¹²² On slavery and violence, Walter Johnson, *Soul by Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1999), 22-3. The violence of the plantation South is powerfully articulated by Thavolia Glymph, *Out of the House of Bondage: The Transformation of the Plantation Household* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008). White Southerners' racism directly shaped this social order. According to George Fredrickson, racism "either directly sustains or proposes to establish a *racial order*, a permanent group hierarchy that is believed to reflect the laws of nature or the decrees of God." George M. Fredrickson, *Racism: A Short History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 6. On nineteenth-century Southern violence more broadly, Edward L. Ayers, *Vengeance and Justice: Crime and Punishment in the 19th-Century American South* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), Chapter One.

¹²³ Richard Zuczek, *State of Rebellion: Reconstruction in South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996) and James K. Hogue, *Uncivil War: Five New Orleans Street Battles and the Rise and Fall of Radical Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006). The classic statement on Reconstruction-era violence remains, George C. Rable, *But There Was No Peace: The*

be charged that whites' postbellum campaigns of terror—fully realized in the Ku Klux Klan—were of a character more gruesome, more systematic, and more public than found in the antebellum era. The war's end created an explosive atmosphere in which armed bodies of organized ex-Confederates acted out their perverse desires quickly resorting to violence.¹²⁴ White vigilantes became, in Edward Ayers' words, "a crucial element of Southern 'crime' control, political conflict, and economic relationships."¹²⁵

The final section of the chapter will reconsider Klansmen's actions through the lens of emotionalism, seeking to interrogate the interaction between emotional styles and contests for power.¹²⁶ Specifically, I am interested in intimate personal attacks, for this violence, while often directed toward political or social ends, evoked immediate strong emotional reactions. A deadly combination of uncontrolled anger, personal loss, and intense hatred became physically manifest in violent actions, which created landscapes of terror meant to intimate and control. Men's visceral reactions fed directly into these encounters and southern whites' broader campaigns of terror.¹²⁷ But the Klan also represented more than white supremacy, it revealed whites' fears and even

Role of Violence in the Politics of Reconstruction (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1984). See also, Nicholas Lemann, *Redemption: The Last Battle of the Civil War* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2006).

¹²⁴ T. J. Stiles posits that the "deeper revolution wrought by the war and the Oath" created an explosive culture of hatred, personal firearms, and political alienation." T. J. Stiles, *Jesse James: Last Rebel of the Civil War* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003), 161.

¹²⁵ Ayers, *Vengeance and Justice*, 142.

¹²⁶ Dolores Janiewski, "The Reign of Passion: White Supremacy and the Clash between Passionate and Progressive Emotional Styles in the New South," in *An Emotional History of the United States*, eds. Peter N. Stearns and Jan Lewis (New York and London: New York University Press, 1998), 126.

¹²⁷ Harcourt, "The Whipping of Richard Moore," 268.

confusion.¹²⁸ J. C. Lester, a member of the Pulaski, Tennessee, Klan, maintained that the Ku Klux Klan illustrated “how men, by circumstances and conditions, in part of their own creation, may be carried away from their moorings and drifted along in a course against which reason and judgment protest.”¹²⁹ While Lester’s sentiments clearly reveal a man seeking to be remembered kindly despite his reprehensible actions, his words also illuminate how a particular set of feelings propelled these men into action—emotions that must be historicized. Ultimately, African American resistance and the federal government’s investigation into the Klan’s crimes and atrocities destroyed the order’s sundry incarnations throughout the former states of the Confederacy, thereby holding Southern white men accountable for their actions and forcing them to define and assess their emotional reactions, however grudgingly.

Reconstruction-era violence elicited shock and revulsion. Strong reactions promoted censure. For those who had experienced civil war the Klan’s reign of terror evoked memories of and comparisons to the war. Long-time Georgia resident and former United States Attorney General Amos T. Akerman, after reading Ambrose Spencer’s *A Narrative of Andersonville*, maintained that the “temper which induced those atrocities is now active in Ku Kluxery.”¹³⁰ In Akerman’s comparison, cruelty, anger, and monstrosity governed southern white men and resulted in barbarous acts.

¹²⁸ Ayers, *Vengeance and Justice*, 159. For the emotional consequences of Confederate defeat see Wyatt-Brown, “Death of a Nation” and “Honor Chastened,” in *The Shaping of Southern Culture*. Jackson Lears isolates a pervasive sense of doubt that shaped postwar life despite a public optimism, which he partially roots in the presence of Civil War veterans. T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920* (New York: Pantheon, 1981). In a later work Lears describes this as the “long shadow of Appomattox.” Jackson Lears, *Rebirth of a Nation: The Making of Modern America, 1877-1920* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2009).

¹²⁹ Lester and Wilson, *Ku Klux Klan*, 49.

¹³⁰ A. T. Akerman to “Sir,” 1 Jan. [1872], Letterbook 1871-76, Amos Akerman Papers, Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia; hereinafter UVA.

Reverdy Johnson, engaged by the government during the prosecution of the Ku Klux Klan trials in South Carolina, found the testimony stupefying. At one point he intervened during the hearings to pronounce: “I have listened with unmixed horror to some of the testimony which has been brought before you. The outrages proved are shocking to humanity; they admit of neither excuse nor justification; they violate every obligation which law and nature impose upon men: they show that the parties engaged were brutes, insensible to the obligations of humanity and religion.”¹³¹ The words of Akerman and Johnson reflect the stinging visceral reactions produced by Klan violence. The cruelty displayed in such inhumanity connected to the temperament and disposition of Southern whites. As Albion Tourgée argued, the “blood and torture” of the Ku Klux were grounded in “slavery’s barbarity,” thus connecting white men’s postwar cruelties to their prewar lives.¹³²

Few Klansmen themselves reflected on their actions in any meaningful way. Explanations for Ku Kluxery were often only generalized expressions of disgust over the politics of Reconstruction and fear over freed blacks. Jacob A. Long—a Chief in North Carolina’s White Brotherhood—offered rare insights into why men behaved as they did. In Long’s mind, the war’s horrors connected to the Klan’s savagery. “War is a fearful thing,” he wrote, and many Klansmen were “fresh then from the scenes of carnage and blood upon the soil of Virginia.”¹³³ The battlefield’s butchery and wartime destruction created, at least to Long, a worldview tainted by blood. His explanation should not be

¹³¹ Reverdy Johnson, 31 December 1871, quoted in Green, “Recollections,” 143.

¹³² Albion Winegar Tourgée, *The Invisible Empire*, introduction and notes by Otto H. Olsen (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1989), 141.

¹³³ Jacob Alson Long Recollections [typed copy], Jacob Alson Long Papers, SHC.

read as justification, though clearly that was his intention. Instead we must use Long's words to understand the complex range of emotions and experiences that contributed to the brutality unleashed by the Ku Klux Klan. The deep revolutions wrought by war and emancipation created an explosive postwar atmosphere propelled by hatred, political alienation, and fear.¹³⁴ Survivors of the Civil War—swayed by strong feelings and memories—had to now make meaning of the conflict. For many southern whites the death and mutilation brought with war required a reaffirmation of the conflict's causes and a reassertion of Confederate identity.¹³⁵

Masculinity was central to Reconstruction-era conflict. White men, in trying to establish their own dominance, attempted to subvert blacks' strides to fulfill their own manhood. While circumstantial, Essic Harris related the story of Anthony Davis, a "mighty man" who talked "about his manhood."¹³⁶ Davis had heard stories of the abuse of black women and said that he would "hate to see a man come and butcher up his wife like he had heard tell of their butchering other people." The Ku Klux Klan "got hold of that and came there."¹³⁷ J. B. Eaves related that Aaron Biggerstaff was beaten for, "he is a very bold man, and talks more than he ought to; he is this kind of a man; he will very often make threats."¹³⁸ Southern whites hoped to assuage their humiliation, alleviate the pains of defeat, and channel their emotional tumult by reconstructing the post-war South in their own vision and by so doing reconstruct their own manhood.

¹³⁴ Harcourt, "The Whipping of Richard Moore," 268 and Stiles, *Jesse James*, 161.

¹³⁵ Faust, *This Republic of Suffering*, 266-71.

¹³⁶ Testimony of Essic Harris, 1 July 1871, *Condition of Affairs in the Southern States, North Carolina*, 95.

¹³⁷ Testimony of Essic Harris, 1 July 1871, *Condition of Affairs in the Southern States, North Carolina*, 95.

¹³⁸ Testimony of J. B. Eaves, 12 July 1871, *Condition of Affairs in the Southern States, North Carolina*, 170.

Southerners employed an array of political strategies to undo northern rule but tactics of terrorism proved the most effective, and became the most infamous.

Violence and restraint were the two faces of the nineteenth-century Southern master class.¹³⁹ The Ku Klux Klan governed through violence only, which shaped the construction of an aggressively outward masculinity swayed more by emotion than self-control. A frightening constellation of racism and hatred aligned as the Klan devised strategies of governance. North Carolina conservative and sometime Klansmen David Schenck articulated the thoughts of many whites when he wrote: “fear is the only avenue to a negroes conscience_ it is worth all the kindness.” He continued, positing that blacks could be ruled with severity only, “nothing else will answer the purpose.”¹⁴⁰ These beliefs created larger systems of behavior that attempted to manipulate the feelings of African Americans. Ultimately, whites use of fear contributed to the construction of ritualistic attacks, which served to bolster whites’ beliefs in their own moral and cultural superiority.¹⁴¹

Bound by blood oath, the Ku Klux Klan projected outward their feelings of hatred and desires for control making public displays of power. Establishing a strong visual presence proved central. “It has become no unusual thing” one North Carolina witness described, “to see groups of 40 to 50...Ku Klux rowdying up and down though the

¹³⁹ Stephen Kantrowitz, “The Two Faces of Domination in North Carolina, 1800-1898,” in *Democracy Betrayed: The Wilmington Race Riot of 1898 and Its Legacy*, eds. David S. Cecelski and Timothy B. Tyson (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 96.

¹⁴⁰ Schenck Diary, [N/D, Winter 1868-9], Folder 7, Volume 6, Box 2, David Schenck Papers, SHC

¹⁴¹ Trudier Harris, *Exorcising Blackness: Historical and Literary Lynching and Burning Rituals* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 18-9.

streets of this village [Chapel Hill].”¹⁴² James Boyd testified to the Ku Klux’s prolonged rides through the countryside. Roaming bodies of costumed men created an atmosphere of uncertainty for southern blacks and white radicals. Whites hoped such anxiety kept the socially verboten fearful.¹⁴³

During active periods in Klan violence whites nightly tortured black bodies.¹⁴⁴ Attacks were intended to inflict physical and psychological harm but also leave outward reminders of the Klan’s presence. A North Carolina Republican reported that he had “seen several pistol-shot wounds” and “quite a number of colored men with their backs severely lashed.” He also related the “mangled appearance” of one man’s body. “On his breast,” he remarked, “were two marks or wounds, which he said had been produced in this way: They jabbed him with the muzzle of a double-barreled gun, and his breast exhibited two small circular wounds.” Furthermore, his body was badly bruised.¹⁴⁵ As during the antebellum era, whites deemed scarred black bodies as signifiers of “disruptive” or “unruly” men and women.¹⁴⁶ African Americans who embraced radicalism, voted Republican, or conducted themselves in any way that Southern whites found disagreeable were terrorized.¹⁴⁷ By so doing whites reinvented antebellum

¹⁴² James B. Mason to William W. Holden, 22 September 1869, quoted in Trelease, 196.

¹⁴³ Fry, *Night Riders in Black Folk History*, 86-9.

¹⁴⁴ See, for example, Trelease’s vivid description of terror in Alamance County, North Carolina. Trelease, *White Terror*, Chapter 12.

¹⁴⁵ Testimony of James M. Justice, 3 July 1871, *Condition of Affairs in the Southern States, North Carolina*, 103.

¹⁴⁶ Johnson, *Soul by Soul*, 145-6 and Harcourt, “The Whipping of Richard Moore,” 271.

¹⁴⁷ See, for instance, Testimony of Charles W. Foster, 12 December 1871, *Ku Klux Trials*, SC, 204-5 and Argument of Attorney General D. H. Chamberlain, 22 December 1871, 593-4. *Expand citations here.*

techniques of control and punishment—efforts aimed at the maintenance of white male supremacy—that also reflected their fears over political and social displacement.

Whippings were a common occurrence. J. P. Green described the bull-whip and raw-hide as “instruments of . . . torture, and made to produce arguments which non dared refute.”¹⁴⁸ African-American farmer Essic Harris of Chatham County, NC, recalled that at the height of Klan violence, blacks were whipped weekly. Deep, agonizing pain afflicted not only victims but also black communities. As Harris further related, “A good many that they have whipped—a heap of them—have gone off.”¹⁴⁹ Night raids inflicted terror and were aimed at controlling behavior. James Boyd related that the Klan would “whip a little, and go about the houses of the negroes and tell them if they went to election they would meet them on the way. It was understood that on the night before election the KuKluks would turn out enmasse, and visit the houses of the colored people.”¹⁵⁰ These tactics constructed a rhetoric of power and symbolically enacted social and racial norms.¹⁵¹ The Klan intended to remake the South by constructing landscapes controlled by fear and governed by hate. Brutal lashings were dispensed to men, women, and children of all ages, and intended to shame victims into submission.¹⁵² Blacks’ assertion of personal dignity became a mortal risk.¹⁵³ Often,

¹⁴⁸ Green, “Recollections,” 136.

¹⁴⁹ Testimony of Essic Harris, 1 July 1871, *Condition of Affairs in the Southern States, North Carolina*, 98-9. See also, Schenck Diary, 20 March 1870 and 10 June 1870, Folder 7, Volume 6, Box 2, David Schenck Papers, SHC

¹⁵⁰ Testimony of James E. Boyd, 31 August [1870], Klan Papers, DU.

¹⁵¹ Rosen, *Terror in the Heart of Freedom*, 181.

¹⁵² Cardyn, “Sexual Terror in the Reconstruction South,” 143-5.

¹⁵³ Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*, 37.

attackers would represent their violence as retribution for blacks' conduct. Participation in the Union League, military service, and economic success, for instance, were considered flagrant violations.¹⁵⁴ Whites' attacks were perverse performances intended to unravel African American's economic, social, and political advancements. Of course, such torture, dispensed by disguised men, also revealed whites' imperiled position.¹⁵⁵

Attacks came quickly, under the cloak of darkness. James M. Justice testified that the Klan "usually commit their depredations about midnight, between midnight and daylight."¹⁵⁶ Hidden by night skies and arrayed in ghoulish disguises, Ku Kluxers inflicted mental and physical terror upon their victims. Black North Carolinian Daniel Jordan experienced what might be considered a typical raid. A party of some nine or ten disguised men formed and went to home of Daniel Jordan, a man accused of stealing. They arrived somewhere between 9 and 10 o'clock in the evening. The party broke down Jordan's door, and advanced to his bed. Clothed in only his drawers and a shirt, they led him outside. Jordan escaped once but was returned. The men took turns hitting him, sometimes striking two or three times. Greatly frightened, Jordan was hit some forty or fifty times with switches of a "tolerable size."¹⁵⁷ Such attacks sought to reaffirm white manhood at the expense of black southerners. Often the Klan tried to cow their victims by aggressive behavior. Disguised men led Gadsden Steel into his yard where they locked arms with him, grabbed his collar, and put a gun against him marching to

¹⁵⁴ Rosen, *Terror in the Heart of Freedom*, 189.

¹⁵⁵ Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 27-8.

¹⁵⁶ Testimony of James M. Justice, 3 July 1871, 103, Klan Trials.

¹⁵⁷ For the incident see, Testimony of William Tickel, 1 September 1870, Folder Sept.-Dec. 1870, Box , Klan Papers, and Testimony of Daniel Whitesell, N/D, Box 1, Klan Papers, DU.

meet on the disguised men, referred to as number 6. Sitting upon a horse, 6 bowed his head and asked Steel, “How do you do.” He then “horned me in the breast with his horns . . . I jumped back from him, and they punched me, and said ‘Stand up to him, G—d d—n you, and talk to him.’”¹⁵⁸

Humiliation often came with physical abuse, thereby contributing further to blacks’ dread. Victims were often stripped of their clothing and debased.¹⁵⁹ One woman from North Carolina, after being stripped, was whipped with a board. The men then burned the hair around her genitals and cut her with a knife.¹⁶⁰ Such brutality was not atypical. After whipping Nathan Trollinger, his attackers made him take out his penis and stabbed it with a knife.¹⁶¹ Acts of sexual terror had no overtly political purpose. Instead, these actions reflected the sadistic desires and uncontrolled emotions of the Ku Klux Klan.¹⁶² Such unleashed fury had horrendous consequences. Aaron Biggerstaff, taken from his home around midnight, was whipped so badly that “he was helpless the next day, his back, from his shoulders down, was almost raw; you could hardly lay your hand upon a spot that had not been hit.”¹⁶³ Historian Lisa Cardyn has argued that the

¹⁵⁸ Testimony of Gadsden Steel, 12 December 1871, *Ku Klux Trials*, SC, 233.

¹⁵⁹ Testimony of J. B. Eaves, 12 July 1871, *Condition of Affairs in the Southern States, North Carolina*, 167.

¹⁶⁰ Testimony of A. Webster Shaffer, 15 June 1871, *Condition of Affairs in the Southern States, North Carolina*, 36-7.

¹⁶¹ Testimony of John W. Long, Klan Papers, DU.

¹⁶² Cardyn, “Sexual Terror in the Reconstruction South,” in *Battle Scars*, eds. Clinton and Silber, 150-51.

¹⁶³ Testimony of J. B. Eaves, 12 July 1871, *Condition of Affairs in the Southern States, North Carolina*, 170.

“imprint of Klan terror has persisted in collective memory,” contributing to lasting gender and racial subordination.¹⁶⁴

The Ku Klux Klan did not typically ambush victims in roadways or meet out punishment publicly in villages. Instead, intimate attacks occurred in domestic spaces. Essic Harris, an African American farmer from Chatham County, recounted a visit from the Klan during the Christmas season of 1870 in which his gun, shot, and powder were seized. Sometime later—perhaps a week or two he recollected—Harris and his wife were awoken in the night by their dog’s barking. Harris leaped out of bed and ran to his door only to see a yard full of men. He quickly closed and fastened the door, doused the fire, and retrieved a firearm. Quickly thereafter Harris’ window was knocked open and shots poured into the room. The white man for whom Harris worked, Ned Finch, entered the crowd and begged them not harm Harris or his wife as he was “a hard-working nigger, and don’t bother anybody.”¹⁶⁵ Despite the continued pleas of Finch and his sister Sally, the Klan continued shooting with bullets coming down like rain. Harris estimated that fifty guns were aimed at his house, and for “an hour and a half, and there was not five minutes when they were not shooting.”¹⁶⁶ Harris shot and wounded two men, which led to the party’s eventual dispersal. Harris himself was hit nine times—his wife and children survived unharmed, though perhaps his inability to protect his family

¹⁶⁴ Cardyn, “Sexual Terror in the Reconstruction South,” in *Battle Scars*, eds. Clinton and Silber, 142.

¹⁶⁵ Testimony of Essic Harris, 1 July 1871, *Klan Trails*, 88.

¹⁶⁶ Harris, 90.

was more harmful than his physical wounds.¹⁶⁷ Several Klansmen were arrested for this incident, but were discharged after providing alibis.¹⁶⁸

Emotions and their expression are constructed by the social setting in which they operate.¹⁶⁹ The Ku Klux Klan represented a distinct, and short-lived, emotional community of terror, fear, and anger. The emotive forces behind the Klan's actions and the feelings produced by their acts are central to the broader narrative of Reconstruction. Visceral reactions, lingering traumas, and burning hostility fed directly into the hundreds of violent encounters that reshaped the postwar South.¹⁷⁰ Not all whites engaged in this behavior or condoned such practices. Moreover, the feelings expressed and the actions exhibited by disguised men under the mask of darkness were but one part of a broader range of emotions.¹⁷¹ It is essential, however, not to undermine or diminish these monstrous displays and their very real consequences. The Ku Klux Klan's expressions of hatred, anger, and racism projected a distinct image as to what shape the changing South should take. Emotional reactions and potent feelings were used to achieve these ends.

Conclusions

Whites cobbled together elements of their past—traditions of extralegal violence and ritual life—with their more immediate experiences—the memories and consequences of civil war—in the ghoulish construction of the Ku Klux Klan. These

¹⁶⁷ Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*, 37.

¹⁶⁸ Trelease, 386.

¹⁶⁹ Barbara H. Rosenwein, "Worrying about Emotions in History," *The American Historical Review*, vol. 107, no. 3 (June 2002): quote on 837; on "emotional communities," 842-3.

¹⁷⁰ Harcourt, "The Whipping of Richard Moore," 268.

¹⁷¹ On the transfer and display of emotions, Rosenwein, "Worrying about Emotions in History," 842.

cultural materials proved so effective because they were so familiar to southern white men. Ultimately, then, this chapter is a cultural reading of the Ku Klux Klan. A quest to reestablish white manhood and a potent emotional universe shaped the Klan's actions, and indeed Reconstruction. This epoch represented but one phase in white men's broader transformation. During this period, anger, excitement, loss, and despair propelled southerners as they employed terrorism to advance political, social, and sexual aims.¹⁷² As demonstrated through behavior and experience, the Klan starkly revealed whites' continued confrontation with the experiences of civil war and military defeat. Instead of dwelling on feelings of loss, however, whites actively manipulated the past to recreate the present.

¹⁷² Insights drawn from Geertz, "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight," in *The Interpretation of Cultures*, 448-53 and Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 128-35.

CHAPTER 8 PAPER SOLDIERS

In 1882, former Virginia artilleryman Carlton McCarthy published *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia, 1861-1865*, an account which first appeared as a series of “sketches of soldier life” in the *Southern Historical Society Papers* between 1876 and 1879.¹ The book began by acknowledging the public’s awareness of the deeds and names of great generals, but stated concern over the general ignorance “of the habits and characteristics of the individuals who composed the rank and file of the ‘grand armies’ of 1861-65.” McCarthy’s account intended to correct this lacuna by both recounting and heralding the average Confederate foot soldier.² Above all else, McCarthy sought remembrance of a war that he feared was being forgotten. During a period of national reunion and reconciliation he telling wrote: “When we fill up, hurriedly, the bloody chasm opened by war, we should be careful that we do not bury therein many noble deeds, some tender memories, some grand examples, and some hearty promises washed with tears.”³

By resurrecting Southerners’ “noble deeds,” McCarthy sought a context for the presentation and remembrance of veterans and their cause. In doing so he, like scores of old Confederates, ensured personal honor and bolstered the soldier’s legacy. “A long time after a war,” McCarthy wrote, “people begin to find out, as they read, that the deadly struggle marked a grand period in their history!”⁴ As McCarthy recorded these

¹ Brian S. Wills, “Introduction,” to Carlton McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia, 1861-1865* (1882; repr., Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), xii.

² McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia, 1861-1865*, 1.

³ McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia, 1861-1865*, 9.

⁴ McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia*, 193.

words, however, he was giving the war as much personal as public meaning. The memoir he produced, its narrative and its stories, marked a crucial component of his personal reconstruction. Most memoirs, recorded years after the conflict from memory and scattered notes, ordered past events to create meaningful accounts for present-day lives. Indeed, as Paul Fussell remarks, a world of “conversions, metamorphoses, and rebirths is a world of reinvigorated myth.”⁵ Perhaps no society was more desperate for a story of rebirth than the defeated South. How veterans recorded their memoirs and continued to discuss the Confederacy reflected how they came to conceive of the Civil War and their role in it. Furthermore, their reconstructions of the war marked the resurrection of the martial manhood they once embraced. Southerners’ stories, their narratives and their discussions, reveal the war’s enduring impact.

In the postbellum era Civil War soldiers, North and South, turned to paper to recount the triumphs and tribulations of their youth. It was not until around the year 1880, Gerald Linderman contends, that Americans revived their interest in martial matters.⁶ David Blight rightly questions Linderman’s strict dichotomy between “hibernation” (1865-80) and “revival” (post-1880) as too schematic.⁷ Blight instead finds a more fluid periodization. In the first fifteen years after the war, he posits, “ex-soldiers groped for ways to express the trauma of their personal experience as well as its larger legacies.” By 1880, American culture welcomed soldiers’ stories, certainly, but the war

⁵ Paul Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (1974; repr., New York and London: Sterling Publishing Co., Inc., 2009), 140.

⁶ Linderman, *Embattled Courage*, 275, see 266-97.

⁷ David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001), 149-50.

had already started making its way into the books.⁸ Writers' contorted the conflict and its legacies to advance the cause of national reconciliation but in doing so overwhelmed issues of race and emancipation. This dissertation's final chapter departs from the traditional narrative charting veterans' public disclosure of their wartime experiences in the 1880s by positioning both public and private records into a broader continuum of expression. By the late 1870s and early 1880s, Confederates had turned to private writings and to public record to recount their civil wars. Extralegal violence and political compromise between North and South solidified white Southern home rule by the late 1870s.⁹ Southerners' aggressive masculinity advanced the cause of white supremacy and reshaped southern society along racial divides. White political resolution during the Reconstruction era did not give all veterans a sense of closure, though. The same impulse for written expression—exhibited in the antebellum and Civil War eras—drove men to recapture and close their civil wars. Thus, as the nation moved toward reunion veterans' accounts both paralleled and contradicted the war's public face.

Memoirs, letters between veterans, and discussions with family members formed prominent veins of expression that undergirded an evolving public discourse. Published books and articles, acts of celebration and commemoration marked dramatic departures in Southerners' disclosures and create a portrait of unified strides toward national reconciliation. Strides toward stability, shared social suffering, and individual heroism masked any references to fragile minds and unsettled lives. In recollecting the war,

⁸ Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 170.

⁹ For an explanation of this political process, see C. Vann Woodward, *Origins of the New South: 1877-1913* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951), 29-65. For the narrative of extralegal violence, see George C. Rable, *But There Was No Peace: The Role of Violence in the Politics of Reconstruction* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984).

personal written materials moved from the immediacy of the daily diary or letter to something more figurative and fictional.¹⁰ But to suggest that these public accounts explain Southerners' private responses is misleading, for public words were not private thoughts and feelings. The public accounts and private letters of the postbellum era became the final records of white Southerners' perceptions of the war, its meanings and its emotional toll. Once proud men became paper soldiers. The sanitized version of the war so often present in published accounts masked the lingering traumas and uncertainties first experienced in war; but the process of writing reopened these old wounds. A veteran's audience and intention in writing ultimately shaped the degree of personal revelation, thus creating a more varied landscape of words and memories. The old veterans living in the postbellum era watched as a new generation defined the South's future.¹¹ As the multitudes of this generation began diminishing in numbers, an increasing number turned to public venues and to their families to reveal their civil wars. Time, distance from actual events, and age significantly altered content, and old soldiers never fully released their inner demons. But examining ex-Confederates' continued correspondence, published accounts, and postwar memoirs offers an important lens to understanding Southerners' private wars and personal strides toward reconstruction.

Wars Remembered

In the fall of 1887, Hillsborough, North Carolina resident Anna Alexander Cameron wrote to her cousin Alfred Moore Waddell—a Confederate veteran and state

¹⁰ Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory*, 299.

¹¹ See especially Paul M. Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study of Southern Mythmaking* (1970; repr., Montgomery, AL: NewSouth Books, 2002) and Edward Ayers, *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

political figure—congratulating his recent address to the veterans of the Army of Northern Virginia. The “majority of Southern men, old soldiers I mean,” she remarked, “think & feel as they did twenty years ago,” but only a “minority of them who think it but to say so. If they speak at all it is in carefully turned sentences, that cannot possibly offend the north. The South has been making apologies to the north for twenty two years & therefore, like ‘Uncle Edinboro’ we rest our minds’ on the man who makes no apology & who never did, who is as true & brave today as he was during the war & has no appetite for, or intention of, eating humble pie!”¹² Cameron’s observations provide a range of insights into the Civil War’s legacy some twenty plus years after the conflict. Although anecdotal, Anna’s letter suggests a certain continuity in mindset and emotion among veterans, men subdued in voice but still quietly dedicated to, or at least defined by, a cause long lost.

Suggesting that white Southerners either embraced reunion or remained recalcitrant misses the complexities of postwar self-identities. The pains of battle dimmed over time, but emotional traumas were not easily forgotten. Nor were sectional animosities buried completely.¹³ Instead, veterans maintained antebellum beliefs, adapted to the postwar social order, and embraced economic modernity to varying degrees. Postwar southern masculinity demanded flexibility and fluidity, as men continued to honor the Confederate tradition but also participate in the New South. North Carolinian Robert Philip Howell demonstrates the spectrum of beliefs held by one

¹² Anna Alexander Cameron to [A M W], 5 Nov 1887, Box 1, Folder 1, Alfred Moore Waddell Papers, SHC.

¹³ Gaines Foster acknowledges the war’s dramatic impact but asserts that pragmatic responses dictated Southerners’ responses and strides toward reconciliation; yet, many private accounts suggest that the public portrait of reunion is an incomplete picture, see Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 70-1, 89.

man, though representative of many. Recalling the road to war, Howell maintained: “I was a States-rights, pro-slavery, and secession Democrat, and fully believed then, as I do now, that he justly merited the death he died [John Brown]. I have never been able to understand why the Northern people should canonize the old scoundrel and I can never be ‘thoroughly reconstructed’ as long as they sing ‘Old John Brown’s body.’” Yet, he also held: “Looking back at it now, I can easily see what a fatal mistake the South made. We should have given Lincoln a loyal support. He would have proven a friend, I verily believe.”¹⁴ To forsake the Confederacy entirely or to suggest that the South was wrong would be a deadly blow to men’s sense of self. In mobilizing for war and fighting for home veterans fulfilled prescribed social roles, which emphasized manliness and mastery. To now renounce the war and its causes would, in essence, negate the foundations that made Southern men.

How the war was remembered and by whom powerfully shaped its presentation. A rich body of literature details the activities of men and women in preserving Confederate memory. Commemorations were the most public and overt displays of remembrance and celebration. As scholars such as Caroline Janney, LeeAnn Whites, and William Blair have shown, the celebrations of the 1880s were built on the rich foundations laid by white Southern women. Beginning in the war’s immediate aftermath and continuing into the twentieth century, middle- and upper- class women, especially, shaped the public rites of Confederate memory.¹⁵ The Confederacy thus continued in

¹⁴ Robert Philip Howell Memoir, [N/D], Robert Philip Howell Memoirs, SHC.

¹⁵ Caroline E. Janney, *Burying the Dead but Not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007); William A. Blair, *Cities of the Dead: Contesting the Memory of the Civil War in the South, 1865-1914* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004) Chapter 4; and Whites, *Civil War as a Crisis in Gender*, 160-98.

different forms well past the war's conclusion, and women continued defining southern masculinities. Yet these carefully articulated performances formed only one component of a broader, more intimate discussion of the war.

As evidenced earlier in this work, many veterans remained mute to friends and family about their wartime experiences. Some chose to never recall the war again, whereas others spoke only with other veterans. Veterans' reticence was grounded in the fear of disappointing families, the pain of recalling the past, and divisions between the past and the present. Henry Theodore Bahnson, for instance, recorded his "Recollections of the War" late in life. Beginning his account he noted: "You have often begged me [talking to his family] to tell you about the war, and doubtless you have wondered why I nearly always refused. The truth is, I have tried for nearly thirty years to forget the part I took in it. I feared too to disappoint your expectations."¹⁶ Former artilleryman E. Porter Alexander put pen to paper only at the urging of his children but must have reveled in writing given his levels of productivity.¹⁷ Others recorded their recollections for personal enjoyment. Julius Lineback made no apologies for idiosyncrasies and an imperfect record, for "The following pages have been written principally for my own pleasure, and not with the expectation that they would be read by any one save those few persons directly interested in the parties concerned in the narrative."¹⁸ While Lineback derived pleasure from his writing Robert Philip Howell was transported back, at points, to very painful memories. "Never shall I forget my feelings"

¹⁶ Henry Theodore Bahnson, "Recollections of the War," [N/D], Henry Theodore Bahnson Papers, SHC.

¹⁷ Gary W. Gallagher, "Introduction," in Alexander, *Fighting for the Confederacy*, xv.

¹⁸ Julius A. Lineback, "The 26th Regimental Band. Being a History of Life in Military Band Attached to the 26th Regiment No. Ca. Troops, Pettigrew's Brigade, Heth's Division, Hill's Corps, Army of Northern Virginia. 1862-1865," [N/D manuscript], Box 1, Volume 2, Folder 2-A, Julius A. Lineback Papers, SHC.

at the moment of the surrender he wrote. "I wept like a child and said I was sorry I had not been killed in the war. After a lapse of thirty-five years it wrings my heart to write about it."¹⁹

Cadwallader "Cad" Jones, formerly a Confederate captain, received questions about the war from his younger brother. Cad had remained silent on the subject for decades, at least among family, and only responded to his brother's request because he held him in such esteem. He was the only man in the world, Cad wrote, that "could have gotten me to write them [the letters referencing the war]. I have lived a life time, without writing any to you, and now that the end is so fast approaching, I feel most near to you, and am induced to try to make up so much lost time, while a few years is left to me."²⁰ Like many veterans, Cad had little inclination to relive his wartime experiences in any explicit way with family. But as he considered his own death, a desire for immortality compelled him to write to the person with whom he felt the closest.

Private recollections and unpublished memoirs were stories about past deeds filtered through the lens of the present. Cad offered a rich series of letters to his brother, which reveal many of the forces underpinning veterans' recollections. The letters discussed the story of his wounding, the action in and around Petersburg, Virginia, and the ferocious fighting at Spotsylvania.²¹ By serving in the army ably and taming his fears, Jones had embodied, or at least later reconstructed, a vision of heroic, martial

¹⁹ Howell Memoirs, [N/D], SHC. Howell may not have been unusual among veterans, for, as Barbara Gannon charges, many postwar accounts by Union soldiers included traumatic memories, see Barbara A. Gannon, *The Won Cause: Black and White Comradeship in the Grand Army of the Republic* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011), 123-30.

²⁰ Genl Jones [Cad Jones] to Brother, 20 September 1922, Box 1, Folder 6, Cadwallader Jones Papers, SHC.

²¹ See, Genl Jones [Cad Jones] to Brother, 20 September, 3 October, and 11 October 1922, Box 1, Folder 6, Jones Papers, SHC.

manhood. During the war, his young brother Allen eventually joined the Confederate ranks and Cad's recollection of his wounding illuminates the broader ethos shaping his recollection. Having been through several battles himself and become "accustomed to it," Jones shifted his concerns to his little brother. But, "he stood it like a man" eventually being hit in the arm, which removed him from service to Cad's great relief.²² After achieving mastery over himself on the battlefield, Jones sought also to fulfill his role as family protector. His brother's honorable service and battlefield wounding assured Cad that Allen had, in his words, behaved like a "man." Such claims on manhood were absolutely vital for the self-worth of white Southern men during a period of political emasculation in the wake of military defeat.

So, too, though had war exposed Southern men evoking a range of painful feelings remembered years after the contest. Henry Theodore Bahnson who, it may be recalled, "tried for nearly thirty years to forget the part" he took in the struggle recalled his encounter with federal troops in April 1865. Strange thought processes and conflicted emotions must have surely gripped the minds and hearts of soldiers who, having engaged in civil strife, now looked upon each other as civic neighbors. Years after Appomattox, as Bahnson penned his "Recollections of the War" for his children, a range of feelings overwhelmed him.²³ In one of the final conflicts of the war Bahnson recalled capturing a group of black Union soldiers. He vividly recalled the "boyish, beardless face," of one prisoner whose "strong stare" and "reproachful eyes" stayed

²² Genl Jones [Cad Jones] to Brother, 20 September 1922, Box 1, Folder 6, Jones Papers, SHC.

²³ Bahnson, "Recollections of the War," Bahnson Papers, SHC. Anything written after the fact must be viewed with skepticism. Surely, while vivid, Bahnson's account contains errors. Yet, the serious of events recounted seem plausible and Bahnson's details align well with sources written at the war's close—he recounts, for example, that his federal guards were from the 5th Corps, federal men who occupied Appomattox County and were involved in the surrender ceremonies.

indelibly etched in the writer's mind for years, always begging the same question: "Why did I hate and in hatred, kill a fellow being when I had never seen, and who had never done me any injury?"²⁴ Later, as a surrendered Confederate soldier under Federal guard, Bahnson "met a colored [Union] soldier" on the roads near Appomattox. He "foolishly replied to some" of the taunts offered by the African-American soldier who, "without...warning" leveled a gun at his head. Bahnson remembered "looking into that gun barrel," and closing his eyes in the expectation of death. However, his guard spoiled the black soldier's "aim by cutting his head open with a sabre, and the charge passed harmlessly over" Bahnson's shoulder. Thus a black man fell in blood at the hands of a fellow federal soldier in the defense of a former rebel. And from this episode Bahnson learned the "advisability of being civil to a darky behind a gun."²⁵

Bahnson's account, written so long after the war, juxtaposed two images—the tender human face of an African American foe and the jeering taunts of an armed "darky." On the one hand, Bahnson questioned the implications of war and sorrowfully wondered how he struck down another person in battle. These philosophical musings were triggered by a shared sense of humanity he felt toward others and the many years he had to ponder his youthful battles. On the other hand, Bahnson took a dim view toward an armed African American soldier and quickly fell back on racism to explain away a complex episode of miscommunication that ended in an explosive act of violence. With just a few strokes of the pen, Bahnson conveyed, perhaps

²⁴ Bahnson, "Recollections of the War," Bahnson Papers, SHC.

²⁵ Bahnson, "Recollections of the War," Bahnson Papers, SHC. Two versions of this manuscript exist. This particular episode was deleted from the final version. Chandra Manning has an excellent discussion of Confederate attitudes toward black soldiers, especially in 1864. See Manning, 169-70. Manning also recounts the brutal slaying of African American prisoners of war in April 1864, at the hands of Confederate soldiers. Manning, *What This Cruel War Was Over*, 175-6.

unconsciously, the myriad complexities of racial attitudes and race relations in the wake of Appomattox. Unsettling questions about race would largely shape the direction of postwar life—Bahnsen's statements years after the conflict suggest continued ambiguity.

The South's martial tradition had great bearing on conceptions of southern masculinity, and remembrance solidified reputation. In the twilight years of his life, a staid and reserved George Mercer delivered a speech regarding the "Georgia Volunteer." Mercer realized the importance of military service.²⁶ He indicated in his 1893 speech "that the war is long since over, and that it is not always in good taste" to recall its memories. "But this is one of the occasions where they cannot be forgotten for they constitute much of the heritage and inspiration of this Corps." Insisting that the current volunteers never forget the "trials and glories" of the past, Mercer recalled deeds of "constancy and courage."²⁷ Mercer recognized the great importance of military service, which directed outside perceptions. As he and other veterans recalled their service they continued to construct a strong vision of southern masculinity.

Confederate's military records followed them throughout the course of their lives. In discussing the creation of military parks and battlefield monuments, James Marten writes, "Gallons of ink were spilled in veterans' publications, in private correspondence, and in the records of the commissions charged with approving monuments in debates over just how far a regiment advanced, exactly where it turned the enemy's flank, the

²⁶ Mercer Diary, 17 December 1865, Box 1, Volume 5, Mercer Papers, SHC and Robert Manson Myers, *The Children of Pride: A True Story of Georgia and the Civil War* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972), 1623.

²⁷ George Anderson Mercer, "The Georgia Volunteer," 17 March 1893, Box 1, Volume 5, Speeches, Mercer Papers, SHC.

spot on which a general was wounded.”²⁸ Men’s concern over such details demonstrates the war’s lingering social importance, of course, but also its overwhelming impact on the individual. To a significant degree in southern society, a man’s wartime service shaped his postwar interactions and public portrayal. For instance, the prominent South Carolinian Martin Witherspoon Gary was heralded in 1878 through two lenses: his political activism and his military service. “Gary has manifested great ability and sagacity. He is as honest, bold and uncompromising in his political views as he was brave and daring in battle, and to no one are we more indebted for success in the last election than to him.”²⁹ And, indeed, Gary viewed South Carolina’s Red Shirt campaign (part of the broader “Redemption” campaign) as a continuation of his wartime services. In one speech he noted: “I believed that the South had sufficient cause to go to war with the North. I was in favor of throwing off the authority of the government of the United States, and I desired to accomplish it by revolution. I drew my sword not to maintain the right of secession; not to defend or perpetuate African slavery in the South; but to defend and preserve the greatest blessing yet given to man—Constitutional Liberty.”³⁰ In fundamental ways campaigns for white supremacy, such as South Carolina’s, undid the gains of Civil War and offered former Confederates a chance to claim victory over a cause once lost. Veterans recalled the glories of their wartime service in their political fights of the 1870s and 1880s.

In recalling the Civil War, Southerners were validating the trials of their youth and ensuring “proper” remembrance. But the war was cast and recast for different purposes

²⁸ Marten, *Sing Not War*, 137.

²⁹ *Marion Star*, 23 January 1878, clipping in Box 1, Folder 35, Martin Witherspoon Gary Papers, USC.

³⁰ *Edgefield Advertiser*, 19 October 1876, Box 1, Folder 34, Gary Papers, USC.

by different men. The flinty Martin Witherspoon Gary continued to embrace a vision of aggressive, martial manhood, never backing down from a fight—as was true of his participation in student rebellions during his youth. His Civil War continued during South Carolina’s fight for “Redemption.” Yet, these were complex men with complicated views, and one model of manhood was not embraced universally. David French Boyd—the first head of the modern-day Louisiana State University—rushed to secession in 1861 and served in both the eastern and western theaters of war. Before the conflict he was great friends with William Tecumseh Sherman (LSU’s superintendent) while he served as a professor of Latin and English; he continued a correspondence with the Union general deep into the postbellum era. Boyd still embraced the cause of his youth but recalled the war in different terms. He called for the old flags to be furled at reunions; events “right and proper” to “keep alive our dear memories” but no longer proper venues for the display of Confederate banners. Boyd instead combined the old with the new refashioning the Confederacy’s role in the reunited nation. “The Confederate soldier who would now cry ‘peccari!’ _ who would now regret that he was a Confederate, is beneath our contempt. His heart was never right, nor his head ever comprehend the spirit of the struggle . . . We were but doing our duty as we saw it. We were instruments in the hands of Providence, to work out a better result.” The war was to be celebrated and remembered but not refought, for the struggle had ended with defeat. Boyd maintained, or at least projected, that “There is no more war-feeling now in the Confederate breast than there is fire and heat in a burnt-out volcano. And now to wear

the gray and . . . wave our old St. Andrew's Battle Cross would be meaningless_ empty, idle, foolish, vain."³¹

David Boyd's war ended in 1865 but his life continued. He made Louisiana State University his project, which became, in many ways, another lost cause. Struggling against a devastating fire, overwhelming poverty, and growing hostility he managed to keep the institution afloat.³² In these struggles we learn much about why Boyd buried his war, for moderation would ensure the institution's survival. His wartime remembrance was thus deeply shaped by the demands of the present. In the immediate postwar years, LSU, like many southern schools, was populated by former Confederates—soldiers or their sons made up the student body, four former Confederate majors were on the academic staff, and Raphael Semmes, former naval officer, taught moral philosophy. Radical newspapers saw the institution as a veritable hotbed of secession; Boyd's conciliatory stance may have been grounded in his desire to ensure LSU's future.³³ So, too, though were Boyd's sentiments and stances connected to his worldview. Clearly imbibing the broader southern ethos of honor, Boyd held that "good character is the index of an honorable and upright man." Men could be

³¹ David F. Boyd, Untitled manuscript [N/D], Box 12, Folder 208, David F. Boyd Letters, LSU.

³² Germaine M. Reed, *David French Boyd: Founder of Louisiana State University* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), xiv. See also, D. F. Boyd to "The Editor," *Springfield Republican*, 20 August 1877, Box 4, Folder 57, Boyd Letters, LSU.

³³ Reed, *David French Boyd*, 62-3. Michael Keith Harris charges that "reconciliation may have represented an effort to secure financial autonomy for a region that had once been pegged as a commercial center. The rumblings of sectional hostility resonating from the core of so-called reconciliationist groups may have been more significant than previously considered. Many UCV members who pushed for national reconciliation may have cared less about embracing former enemies, regardless of the mystical celebration of soldiers' valor, than in securing their financial positions." This provocative argument does advance an understanding of seemingly contradictory impulses. Michael Keith Harris, *Old Soldier, New South: Confederate Veterans in a Reconciled Nation*, MA thesis, University of Virginia, 2004.

“wild and reckless, and still honorable & well esteemed; but let him be guilty of a dishonorable act, and the finger of scorn will be pointed at him, his companions, who once cherished him so highly, will forsake him.”³⁴ This great fear of dishonor, then, offers explanation of Boyd’s models of remembrance, which were entwined with his models of manhood. To disavow the Confederate cause for which so many had fought and died was beneath contempt. But to continue fighting for a cause lost was empty and idle, an unmanly gesture. For Boyd, then, the southern man had to defend the actions of his youth but also bend to the demands of the present.

The careful mingling of the present with the past was no small matter. Uniquely, it defined the self-identities of former Confederates in the postwar South. Southerners were a conquered people and forced to confront the bitterness of defeat, which made them unique among Americans.³⁵ In John W. Daniel’s 1877 address to the Literary Societies of the University of Virginia, he prefaced his remarks by speaking to his crowd’s experiences. “I speak to-day,” he stated, “to a people, and to the rising generation of a people, who have known the bitterness of the conquered; who have seen their riches take wings and fly away; their beloved slain in battle; and the principles which they cherished trodden under foot by their conquerors.”³⁶ Wanting to universalize Southerners’ subdued position, Daniel sought to connect their trials to that of the “human family” offering an overview of conquest and conquered peoples throughout history. So, too, did Daniel posit the benefits of defeat charging that “Never did a people

³⁴ David F. Boyd, Misc. Writing [1873 and N/D], Box 11, Folder 189, Boyd Letters, LSU.

³⁵ Woodward, *The Burden of Southern History*.

³⁶ John W. Daniel, “Conquered Nations,” An address delivered before the Literary Societies of the University of Virginia in the Public Hall, 27 June 1877, in *Speeches and Orations of John Warwick Daniel*, ed., Edward M. Daniel (Lynchburg, VA: J. P. Bell Company, Inc., Printers, 1911), 106.

display more adaptability of character, or more endurance or heroism and valor.”³⁷ With these admirable characteristics Daniel hoped that his audience might look toward the future and devote their energies to the South’s reconstruction. A heroic reinterpretation of the Confederacy without a consideration of the future would be disastrous in his estimation—the southern cause was lost.³⁸ But Daniel still clearly struggled with defeat and Northern conquest. In magnanimity Southerners must forgive, but let no American citizen, he uttered, “ever *forget* the doer, or fail to *execrate* or *denounce* the unjust deed.”³⁹ Daniel called for an embrace of the present but insisted on a remembrance of the past.

The complex interplay between causes lost, remembered, and fought reveals contrasting interpretations of the war. Gaines Foster maintains that, by the 1880s, reconciliation and postwar rebirth (as emphasized in Daniel’s speech) represented emerging new themes in the Confederate tradition.⁴⁰ And, indeed, men like Daniel helped shape, and then embraced, this tradition. But he also still felt anger over the North’s actions and insisted on the justness of the South’s cause, lost or otherwise. In the spectrum of recalcitrant rebels, though, Daniel was a moderate. Former Confederate Jefferson Davis congratulated Daniel on his speech, asserting that the two men were bound to “each other by common efforts in the past, and hopes in the future.” But Davis took issue with Daniel’s description of “the Southern Cause as irretrievably

³⁷ Daniel, “Conquered Nations,” in *Speeches and Orations of John Warwick Daniel*, 147.

³⁸ On Daniel’s vision of the postwar South, see Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, 220-1.

³⁹ Daniel, “Conquered Nations,” in *Speeches and Orations of John Warwick Daniel*, 143.

⁴⁰ Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 88-9. See also, Whites, *Civil War as a Crisis in Gender*, 162-4.

lost, and the state right of Secession as submitted to the 'arbitrament of Battle.'"⁴¹ Davis concluded that, though "robbed" of their rights, Southerners should not surrender them. Still recalcitrant over ten years after the Confederacy's political end, Davis's reaction demonstrate the lingering hatred of some, especially those so thoroughly emasculated and defeated in war.

Prominent Confederate figures such as Jefferson Davis spent much of their postwar careers defending their wartime actions. E. Porter Alexander contended that all wars were fought for two prizes: political principle and military reputation. White Southerners failed in the former and therefore focused on the latter. We "gained the second prize by courage & constancy which could only be fully brought out & exemplified under extreme tests."⁴² In boosting his own reputation through postwar accounts, though, Alexander dampened the remembrance of others, or so charged James B. Walton, former colonel of the Washington Artillery and a veteran of the Mexican-American War. During the war Walton's commanding officer James Longstreet had held him in great esteem, but Robert E. Lee questioned his abilities charging that his knowledge of artillery science was limited and his grasp of topography defective.⁴³ Although both Walton and Alexander served throughout the war, Gettysburg became an important point of remembrance because of their involvement in the massive artillery bombardment preceding Pickett's Charge on July third.

⁴¹ Jefferson Davis to John W. Daniel, 19 July 1877, Box 3, Folder 1872-77, Papers of John W. Daniel and the Daniel Family, UVA.

⁴² Alexander, *Fighting for the Confederacy*, 434.

⁴³ Glatthaar, *General Lee's Army*, 345-6.

Walton and Alexander soldiered together during the war as both men were high ranking officers of artillery in Longstreet's corps. Walton, after prolonged service, was appointed corps artillery chief at the rank of brigadier general.⁴⁴ But Alexander, a battalion commander in Longstreet's artillery reserve, was placed in charge of the artillery bombardment on 3 July. The two men had been friendly before Gettysburg, at least according to Alexander, though inflated egos created tensions.⁴⁵ During the Gettysburg Campaign, for instance, Walton's Washington Artillery successively led the line of march, though custom dictated that different commands took the lead on alternating days. Although Alexander never complained he "had an ample revenge at Gettysburg."⁴⁶ As these small contests demonstrate, both men's self-worth was largely defined by chains of command and perceived slights. Events culminated during what some consider the most important day in southern history, July 3, 1863.⁴⁷

In Alexander's account of the Battle of Gettysburg, which appeared in newspapers and memoirs, Longstreet directed him to "take command of all the artillery on the field, for the attack But he told me to leave the Washington Arty. in bivouac where they were." Alexander immediately recognized the importance of this decision

⁴⁴ Glatthaar, *General Lee's Army*, 345-6.

⁴⁵ Alexander, *Fighting for the Confederacy*, 224.

⁴⁶ Alexander, *Fighting for the Confederacy*, 224.

⁴⁷ William Faulkner famously recounted this day and its lingering impact in *Intruder in the Dust* (1948). As he wrote: "For every Southern boy fourteen years old, not once but whenever he wants it, there is the instant when it's still not yet two o'clock on that July afternoon in 1863, the brigades are in position behind the rail fence, the guns are laid and ready in the woods and the furled flags are already loosened to break out and Pickett himself with his long oiled ringlets and his hat in one hand probably and his sword in the other looking up the hill waiting for Longstreet to give the word and it's all in the balance, it hasn't happened yet, it hasn't even begun yet, it not only hasn't begun yet but there is still time for it not to begin against that position and those circumstances which made more men than Garnett and Kemper and Armstead and Wilcox look grave yet it's going to begin, we all know that, we have come too far with too much at stake and that moment doesn't need even a fourteen-year old boy to think this time. Maybe this time."

and felt as though Walton felt “overslaughed,” which he surely did judging by postwar accounts.⁴⁸ Longstreet, too, offered accounts of the campaign and in an article for the *Philadelphia Weekly Times* imprecisely worded the command structure on the battlefield drawing Walton’s attention.

Recalling the Gettysburg campaign in 1877, Walton returned to those days in early July and tried to affirm his position. Writing to Longstreet he charged, “I am not well disposed to be placed in the ‘ambiguous’ position . . . which I am to occupy as Chief of Artillery under Alexander’s Statement” that he was on the field of Gettysburg placed by Longstreet, “as his Chief of Artillery for the Action.” Walton wondered, “If I was your Chief of Artillery and Commdg the Artillery of the First Corps – and I certainly was – before the battle, on the march, during the during the engagement and long after Gettysburg as may be abundantly shown by original documents and orders in my possession, how can it be stated by any one that I was retired and that one of my subordinates, a Commander of a Battalion of my Reserves, was placed in command on that grand occasion ‘as Chief of Artillery,’ in command of all of Genl Longstreets Artillery.”⁴⁹ Longstreet may well have expected such a reaction for he had written Walton weeks earlier proclaiming: “I find in my account of Gettysburg, just published, ambiguous remarks about our Artillery officers . . . I beg leave to assure you that the idea of interfering with your prerogatives or authority or fitness for position did not enter my mind.”⁵⁰ Of course, Walton felt that his actions had indeed been misrepresented by

⁴⁸ Alexander, *Fighting for the Confederacy*, 235.

⁴⁹ J. B. Walton to James Longstreet, 23 November 1877, Series I., Folder 62, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, HNO.

⁵⁰ James Longstreet to Col. J. B. Walton, 6 November 1877, Series I., Folder 62, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, HNO.

both Alexander and Longstreet and asked that Longstreet correct the mistakes. “It would be much better that it should come from you rather than from myself,” he wrote, and “I desire to say to you in all kindness & with the recollection of the kind relations that every have been held between us – that I think you owe it to me and to my character as your officer so long in your service & confidence, to vindicate me from the reflection, which in the minds of many men, would seem to convey the idea or the fact of my being incompetent and hence I was superseded and my subordinate placed in command even although I was then & there upon the field.”⁵¹ Personal reputation, past performance in battle, and issues of honor were all entwined with Walton’s concern and formed the bedrock of his masculinity. By being subordinated in the accounts of Longstreet and Alexander, Walton felt reduced as a man. He now sought the “proper” remembrance of the day and a proper ordering of the command structure. Only then, with a public explanation from old commanding officer, would his manhood and memory be restored.

A myriad of memories uttered by scores of Southern men and women invigorated a rich discourse about the Civil War’s meaning. Old soldiers refought battles, white women contributed to the memory of lost causes, and weary veterans were reduced to tears by the deeds of their youth. As white Southern men exchanged letters, published accounts, and gave speeches they continued on the personal journeys initiated with the call to arms in 1861. For some, remembrance offered closure. Others awoke old ghosts as they recounted a past that they had hoped to forget. For all men, their roles in the Civil War continued to shape and reshape their self-identities and personal expressions.

⁵¹ J. B. Walton to James Longstreet, 23 November 1877, Series I., Folder 62, Walton-Glenny Family Papers, HNO.

Confederacies Continued

In late March 1885, South Carolinian Munson Monroe Buford wrote to famed wartime general and now prominent political figure Wade Hampton. Buford had served for the war's duration in the South Carolina cavalry, and he now required his old commander's help. Munson was "desirous of obtaining one of the appointments as Deputy Collector from this section of the State," and asked that Hampton speak on his behalf.⁵² (Munson only later would hold public office as sheriff of Newberry County, a post which he held from 1896-1913). Muson's simple letter is significant on several levels. First, some twenty years after the conflict's end he still maintained that his wartime service granted certain privileges, allowed for particular compensations. Muson served with Hampton both during the war and after in the Redemption campaign, but it was his military service with which he started his letter, for it served as an enduring connection between the two men. Second, wartime connections and friendships could be deployed in the postbellum era to advance social, political, and economic ends. Soldiers relied on both informal and formalized networks of support. Finally, a long passed struggle continued to be discussed, recounted, and remembered for the duration of participants' lives—the war and its legacy cast a long shadow over its survivors.

As Confederate veterans grew into old men they continued to affiliate with, write to, and think about their wartime friends. Soldiers' homes and Confederate reunions served as prominent venues for public association or celebration as scholars have so

⁵² M. M. Buford to Gen Wade Hampton, 28 March 1885, Box 2, Folder 7, Munson Monroe Buford Papers, SHC.

ably documented.⁵³ Yet, a rich and thriving private discourse undergirded these more public interactions. Some men would encounter each other years after the conflict as long lost friends, whereas others were thrown together because of unresolved issues from the past or the demands of the present. Most veterans embraced each other—either physically or through letters—as intimate comrades in arms, though this was not always the case. Two illustrative examples illuminate the range of encounters and demonstrate the many ways in which the Civil War continued to shape Southern men. A desperate W. C. Fraley looked to his old commanding general Bryan Grimes in an 1880 letter recalling an incident from the war in which Fraley charged Grimes with taking a lady's brass pin he possessed. Fraley was now writing to the general some fifteen plus years after the incident because he was "very hard up." He rather grandly charged: "i think nothing more than right you aught to eather send me the pin or pay me for it for i stuck to you 4 long years threw think & thin from Gariesburg till we had to Surrender at Apomatox court house VA."⁵⁴ Thus, an impoverished soldier turned to his old officer to rectify a wrong and receive some relief. Conversely, J. B. Lindsey read with great "interest and pleasure" Randolph A. Shotwell's work, *Three Years in Battles And Three in Federal Prisons*. Himself a prisoner of war at Fort Delaware like Shotwell, Lindsey felt connected to the writer because of the experience he endured and because he, too, was a chronicler of the war.⁵⁵ Thus, on different terms for different reasons were these

⁵³ See most notably, R. B. Rosenberg, *Living Monuments: Confederate Soldiers' Homes in the New South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993); Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 104-8 and 112-4.

⁵⁴ W. C. Fraley to General Grimes, 9 February 1880, Correspondence, 1880-1921, Grimes-Bryan Papers, East Carolina University, J. Y. Joyner Library, Greenville, North Carolina; hereinafter ECU.

⁵⁵ J. B. Lindsey to R. A. Shotwell, 13 May 1880, Box 4, Folder 27, Shotwell Family Papers, SHC.

men reconnected in the postbellum years. Such interactions were fleeting, while others proved more enduring; regardless, comradeship and the Confederacy connected these men well past the war's close.

By the end of the nineteenth century some 350,000 Confederates still survived; even the most youthful soldiers were now wizened.⁵⁶ Some of these men remained vivacious and engaged, whereas others, suffering from age and infirmities, were reduced to poverty. Many veterans, concerned for the welfare of their old comrades, agitated on their behalf. Of course, scores of Southerners received the continued support of family and community.⁵⁷ But others required institutional assistance, facilities in desperate need of money.⁵⁸ North Carolinian Julian Shakespeare Carr—president of Blackwell's Durham Tobacco Company and active in veteran affairs—expressed the sentiments of many in a letter to the *News and Observer*. Discussing pension laws and veteran relief, Carr wrote “It was now thirty years since the end of the war. The brave old soldiers were “no longer able” to support themselves as they once had. Moreover, he continued, “many had reopened wounds, others had lost by death or removal the friends who had been their staunch help and support.” Carr, having served as the president of the Confederate Veterans Association of North Carolina, was proud to see the enactment of “the best and most liberal pension law ever enacted was passed by

⁵⁶ Logue, *To Appomattox and Beyond*, 129.

⁵⁷ McClurken, *Take Care of the Living*.

⁵⁸ The best overall treatment of soldiers' homes remains, Rosenberg, *Living Monuments*. See also, Rusty Williams, *My Old Confederate Home: A Respectable Place for Civil War Veterans* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2010).

the legislature.”⁵⁹ Similarly, in one of a series of letters to the South Carolina legislature, Munson Buford asked for the relief of “Confederate Survivors,” a matter about which he felt deeply. At the time of the letter’s composition Munson himself was nearing his eighty-fourth birthday and had been “shut in for several years.” Old and infirm, he returned to his youth in striking terms. “My thoughts go back to the days in which I followed Lee, Beauregard, and Hampton, and was with Johnston at Durham North Carolina, when he surrendered to Sherman, and I can’t help urging relief for my old comrades in arms. Many of whom are older than I am.”⁶⁰

Munson, Carr, and other white Southerners pleaded for former Confederates’ relief because they cared deeply for these men and the cause for which they fought. To see men fall into poverty was dishonorable not only to the Cause but to its inheritors. In petitioning for old comrades, veterans reinforced the brotherhood of soldiers while performing the manly duty of supporting others.

Wartime comradeships and the Confederacy continued to define veterans such as Munson Buford who was described by one twentieth-century observer as the “personification of the Confederacy.”⁶¹ Enlisting in the South Carolina cavalry at the age of sixteen in 1862, Buford served in the Department of SC, GA and FL before being transferred to Virginia in 1864. In Virginia the troopers saw action, notably, at the Wilderness and Cold Harbor. Later, during the Carolinas campaign, Buford accompanied Col. J. Rawlins Lowndes, Hampton's Chief of Staff, when he delivered the

⁵⁹ Julian Shakespeare Carr to Editor News and Observer, Sept 1902, Box 1, Folder 2, 1901-07, Julian Shakespeare Carr Papers, SHC.

⁶⁰ M. M. Buford to the Members of the Legislature [N/D], Box 2, Folder 7, Buford Papers, SHC.

⁶¹ P. D. Johnson to John G. Barrett, 3 October 1957, Box 2, Folder 7, Buford Papers, SHC.

last dispatches, which made the arrangements for the surrender of General Joseph E. Johnston to Union forces. After the war Munson continued to fight for the principles which drove him to the front in 1862. He commanded a company of Red Shirts, was a member of the Ku Klux Klan (becoming the only man who was ever brought to trial for it from Newberry County, South Carolina in a U. S. Court), and late in life joined the United Confederate Veterans. Munson, in the company of other townspeople from Cromer, went so far as to advance the case for the erection of a monument to Dick Roberts, “colored, who remained faithful” to the Democrats until he died. The group projected an inscription to read: ‘Through all the troublous years of Reconstruction he remained true to the people among whom he was born and with whom he was reared.’⁶² Munson defined himself against the revolutions of war and emancipation by positing an antebellum social order based on racial hierarchy; those who adhered to this order were rewarded.

Munson’s political conservatism and continued embrace of the Confederacy suggest a man unwilling to relinquish the principles of his youth, albeit under different circumstances. His political beliefs shaped his social activities. Maintaining diaries between 1865 and his death, Munson left an extensive rendering of his social calendar between 1877 and 1881. During this period he attended Masonic meetings, participated in activities related to the Grange, and actively served in a militia.⁶³ Although few specific names are mentioned in these diaries, we may presume (given the extent of southern wartime mobilization) that scores of his postwar associates had participated in

⁶² “Monument to Colored Democrat,” [N/D clipping], Box 2, Folder 9, Buford Papers, SHC.

⁶³ Locate significance and context of all these historical events.

the Confederate cause in some capacity. More explicit, are his references to veteran- and war- related activities and celebrations. For instance, on 4 September 1879 he attended a “Survivors reunion and Barbecue of the 3rd S. C. Regiment,” and in June of 1880 “Went to Newberry to attend the unveiling of the monument in honor of the dead from Newberry County who was killed & died while in the late Confederate Army.”⁶⁴ Surrounding himself among former Confederates and recounting the deeds of the Civil War, the conflict and its participants held sway over Munson.

A host of masculine activities—militia musters, Masonic rituals, and Grange meetings—shaped veterans’ sense of self and fostered extended emotional support. Many of the men upon whom veterans relied during the war provided support afterward. Reunions, musters, and meetings bolstered a sense of belonging and reinforced a broader corporate identity.⁶⁵ These gatherings also served as opportunities to reinforce specific narratives about the war’s meaning. Julian Carr pronounced in one address Confederate’s unparalleled bravery. “A citizen soldiery,” he spoke, “that was unexcelled for courage, for patient endurance of hardships and effectiveness in the face of appalling odds, unequalled then or since by any troops of any time, in any war.”⁶⁶ Similarly, fellow North Carolinian Henry T. Bahnson offered approbation for the private soldier, without whom wars could not be fought. Understated and unheralded, Bahnson maintained that privates were given short shrift by officers and non-participants whose

⁶⁴ Munson Monroe Buford Diary, 4 September 1879 and 30 June 1880 respectively, Box 1, Folder 3, Buford Papers, SHC.

⁶⁵ Logue, *To Appomattox and Beyond*, 122.

⁶⁶ “Forsyth’s Troops in Civil War. Address Delivered by Gen. J. S. Carr, of Durham, at the Annual Picnic of the Confederate Veterans of Forsyth County, at Nissen Park, Aug. 6th,” in “North Carolina State Reunion” 7-8 August 1912, Winston-Salem, NC, found in Box 1, Volume 2, Folder 2-P, Julius A. Lineback Papers, SHC.

“glowing account of battles and campaigns” failed to mention the great importance of foot soldier’s participation. Carr applauded Bahnson’s words calling him gallant.⁶⁷

Veterans’ words cultivated an enduring sense of self-identity that was then suffused to outside audiences.⁶⁸ Moreover, emphasizing soldiers’ bravery, effectiveness, and endurance not only reinforced the bonds among men of the rank and file but also continued to create and bolster a strong vision of white southern masculinity.

Veterans’ perceptions and conceptions of the war were continually shaped and reshaped by their associations with other old soldiers. Carlton McCarthy recounted that in the army, “the young man learned to value men for what they were . . . and so his attachments, when formed, were sincere and durable, and he learned what constitutes a man and a desirable and reliable friend.”⁶⁹ Having passed through the trial of war together many of these men continued their friendships well past military service. Munson Monroe Buford was greatly excited, for instance, to receive a letter from William G. Austin, “an old dear Army friend.” Buford hoped that the two men could plan a visit soon to “talk and fight our old Battles over.”⁷⁰ Julius A. Lineback—a former North Carolina regimental musician—felt “drawn, during and since the war,” to Daniel T. Crouse, a member of his regiment.⁷¹ On the one hand, soldiers engaged each other

⁶⁷ Henry T. Bahnson, quoted in “Forsyth’s Troops in Civil War. Address Delivered by Gen. J. S. Carr, of Durham, at the Annual Picnic of the Confederate Veterans of Forsyth County, at Nissen Park, Aug. 6th,” in “North Carolina State Reunion” 7-8 August 1912, Winston-Salem, NC, found in Box 1, Volume 2, Folder 2-P, Lineback Papers, SHC.

⁶⁸ Jill Lepore’s book *The Name of War* offers a thoughtful examination of the origins of American identity as formed through the cultivation of words and language and influenced this thinking, see Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip’s War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York: Vintage Books, 1999).

⁶⁹ McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life*, 209.

⁷⁰ M. M. Buford to Trick [Wm G. Austin], 22 Nov 1896, Box 2, Folder 7, Buford Papers, SHC.

⁷¹ Julius A. Lineback Diary, 27 Feb 1904, Box 1, Volume 2, Folder 2-A, Julius A. Lineback Papers, SHC.

because of prolonged familiarity. Having lived together in war, many continued to enjoy geographic proximity in the postbellum era. More deeply, only another soldier could relate fully to combat's emotional toll, the rigors of prolonged outdoor living, and, when applicable, the physical pain from old wounds. On the other hand, though, veterans sought each other out because white Southern men continued to struggle over their identities, both personal and public. Performative statements, comforting words, and public rituals explained, indeed constructed, a particular reality that heralded the Civil War and its lasting legacy.⁷² This look backward was especially vital during a period when many veterans had become infirm, were suffering from poverty, or were no longer in positions of power.⁷³ Although veterans had relied upon their army veterans throughout the 1860s, corporate identity became increasingly urgent in the late 1870s and beyond as comrades and confederacies became prominent vehicles to personal reconstructions.

Civil Wars Closed

Recalling his experiences after General Robert E. Lee's surrender, Carlton McCarthy described the veterans' place as a "neutral ground between war and peace,—neither soldiers nor citizens." McCarthy rooted his marginal position in the war's prolonged conclusion. "A real good hearty war" like the American Civil War he wrote, "dies hard"—a prescient remark indeed.⁷⁴ As this work has earlier recounted, Confederate soldiers' ambiguous position after military surrender was resolved neither

⁷² Pierre Bourdieu, *Language & Symbolic Power*, trans., Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (1982; repr., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003), 223-6.

⁷³ Logue, *To Appomattox and Beyond*, 121-9.

⁷⁴ McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia*, all quotes on 192-3.

easily nor quickly. Instead, veterans struggled with themselves and their families as they attempted to carve out a role in the South's new social order. This period came to define how soldiers were transformed into citizens once more. Veterans reexamined this crucial period again in the 1870s and beyond as they concluded their recollections and memoirs of the conflict. How the war was now closed reflected men seeking mastery over a period of confusion and remembrance for their role in helping to restore the white South's social order. The final pages of these memoirs, dedicated to the Civil War's close, denoted Southerners' public strides toward inner order. Writing offered men the control and release of the once uncontrollable and chaotic. Powerful statements of sustained white masculinity emerge from these portraits of a time when military defeat, political collapse, and economic ruin had once proven so emasculating.

The men who mobilized into action in the spring and summer of 1865 organized themselves into bands of regulators or vigilantes (some government sanctioned, others not). Although the vast majority of Civil War memoirs end with Confederate military surrender, a smattering of widely circulated and now quite famous volumes continue into the beginnings of the postbellum era. Yet, the chaotic close to the Civil War, replete with violence and destruction, seldom appears. Instead, veterans articulated a vision of their reconstructed manhood during a period of impotency—a vision which posited their role in the restoration of a “proper” social order.

W. W. Blackford's recounting of his years in the Virginia cavalry closes when he, like many, took the law into his own hands “for the preservation of society.”⁷⁵ Blackford described two episodes in which his action achieved, in his eyes, law and order. Most

⁷⁵ Blackford, *War Years with Jeb Stuart*, 301-2.

telling is the encounter with “bands of negroes passing through the country going down to Tennessee for work.”⁷⁶ These parties, he claimed, were disturbing the peace and plundering personal property. Still in his Confederate uniform and armed with a “big army revolver,” Blackford gained a warrant from a man who had been a Confederate magistrate and organized a party of men to chase down the African Americans. Blackford assumed command in military fashion, tracked down the party, and charged the group resulting in “a perfect fox chase.” Blackford maintained that the “effect of this affair . . . was most salutary both on itinerant negroes and those of the country.”⁷⁷ With these words Blackford closed his memoir with an idealized social order resurrected by the men just defeated in war.

Blackford’s account—likely grounded in some reality—conflates his military persona with his postwar life. Clad in Confederate uniform, ordering his men to charge down “unruly” freedpeople, Blackford refashioned elements from antebellum and military life into a heroic martial masculinity. A model of manhood that would ensure the protection of white Southerners, the suppression of African Americans, and the continuation of elements of prewar life. In Blackford’s closing of the Civil War he gained control over a world thrust into chaos. Of course, he confronted an uncertain landscape at the war’s close. He and others certainly organized into bands for the protection of Southern whites. But Blackford filtered these experiences producing a triumphal narrative of southern redemption from the hands of freedpeople emboldened by Union

⁷⁶ Blackford, *War Years with Jeb Stuart*, 303.

⁷⁷ Blackford, *War Years with Jeb Stuart*, 304-5.

victory. Blackford's record of his wartime experiences would close as it began with an assertion of white supremacy and an affirmation of the justness of southern society.⁷⁸

Whereas Blackford's account emphasized military matters, George Eggleston's immensely popular *A Rebel's Recollections* served as "an epitaph for a land he loved," in David Donald's words.⁷⁹ Closing his memoir with "The End, and After," Eggleston narrated his encounters with postwar lawlessness. The overall account was written with careful design to both explain the South to outside audiences and contribute to the spirit of national reconciliation. These factors surely influenced Eggleston's final chapter as he emphasized cooperation between ex-Confederates and Federal forces during the war's conclusion. He wrote, "It is with a good deal of pleasure that I bear witness to the uniform disposition shown by such Federal officers as I came in contact with at this time, to protect all quiet citizens, to restore order, and to forward the interests of the community they were called upon to govern."⁸⁰ The widespread publication of such an account from Southern eyes advanced the cause of reunion and eased the lingering tensions of war. Eggleston's portraits of Southerners' honor-bound self defense and shared wartime suffering asked for readers sympathy. But his account ultimately insisted on reconciliation on Southern ideological terms.⁸¹ This is evinced especially in his final pages in which he offers a sketch of the "character" of African Americans in starkly paternalist and condescending terms. *A Rebel's Recollections* depicts loyal

⁷⁸ Although Blackford concedes that his children were better without slaves, he also charges "that never before were labor and capital brought together under circumstances more advantageous to the development of the laborer." Blackford, *War Years with Jeb Stuart*, 12.

⁷⁹ David Donald, "Introduction," in Eggleston, *A Rebel's Recollections*, 10. On this account, see also Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 160-1.

⁸⁰ Eggleston, *A Rebel's Recollections*, 182.

⁸¹ Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 161.

slaves remaining faithful after freedom and freedpeople remaining on the plantations on which they were born.⁸²

Both Blackford and Eggleston generated accounts of southern redemption in the immediate postwar period. Confederates' heroic actions could not stem the march of time, however, and the South of the 1880s little resembled that of the 1850s and 1860s.⁸³ Looking back toward these lost years veterans set a record for Southerners' timeless qualities of endurance and manliness. Furthermore, through the very act of writing and publishing former Confederates influenced the South's new order and its conceptions of the past, while providing for themselves a mechanism for control and closure. Yet, so too did wartime account reignite old wounds. Carlton McCarthy painfully recalled the war's end capturing the mindset of many rebels when we wrote, "Bitter grief for the past, which seemed to be forever lost, and present humiliation, could not long suppress the anxious thought and question, 'What now?'"⁸⁴ Gradually, whites mentally reordered their worlds to gain mastery over both self and society. But how these processes were then reconstructed reinvested the Confederacy's collapse with new meaning.

In the years after Appomattox, whites envisioned an idealized civilization that upheld Southerners' virtue despite the Confederacy's destruction.⁸⁵ The abstract belief

⁸² Eggleston, *A Rebel's Recollections*, 186-7.

⁸³ As Paul Gaston asserts, Southerners "expressed reverence for the civilization that had existed in the South, but conceded that it had passed irrevocably into history, had become an "Old South" that must now be superseded by a new order." Paul M. Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study of Southern Mythmaking* (1970; repr., Montgomery, AL: NewSouth Books, 2002), 25.

⁸⁴ McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia*, 159.

⁸⁵ Rather than a history of thought, an analysis of the discursive field seeks to, in Foucault's words, "grasp the statement in the exact specificity of its occurrence," and to "determine its conditions of existence, fix at least its limits, establish its correlations with other statements that may be connected with it, and show

honor-based system became concrete through the sacrifice of war—something saved when all else was lost. Soldiers' defense of home and family from invading armies earned them acceptance as men. Whites created an evolving discourse that consciously propounded southern righteousness and attempted to order society according to a patriarchal ethos.⁸⁶ As Bertram Wyatt-Brown argues, white honor juxtaposed with “the attribution of shamelessness—and shiftlessness—assigned to the subordinated, stigmatized race” in the postwar South.⁸⁷ Southerners, therefore, started to reinvigorate ideas about race, manhood, and society that the war destabilized. Through these processes the South was re-imagined as a new community and its polity voiced a language of citizenship that ensured the primacy of the “white race” despite the war’s racial and political leveling processes.⁸⁸

The fundamental components of prewar manhood—individual autonomy and white liberty—were now but distant memories. Many men, once independent farmers or self-sufficient wage earners, experienced profound reversals with the fortunes of war. Republican independence, the height of antebellum southern mastery, proved difficult to

what other forms of statement it excludes.” Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans., A. M. Sheridan Smith (1969; repr. and trans., New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 28; see also 32-5 and 130-31. An excellent distillation of Foucault’s ideas on discourse is found in Gail Bederman, *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), 24-6.

⁸⁶ W. Scott Poole, *Never Surrender: Confederate Memory and Conservatism in the South Carolina Upcountry* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2004), 1-5.

⁸⁷ Wyatt-Brown, “Death of a Nation,” in Wyatt-Brown, *The Shaping of Southern Culture*, 233.

⁸⁸ Benedict Anderson has offered the most compelling discussion of imagined communities to date. Anderson’s communities are imagined “because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.” Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (1983; repr., London: Verso, 2002), 6.

sustain in the postwar period.⁸⁹ Carlton McCarthy's travails after the war, as he later recounted, described the great difficulty soldiers confronted in finding employment. A self-described town man, McCarthy lacked employment for months following the war. Eventually finding a job as a farm laborer outside of Richmond, Virginia, his work was "an almost superhuman task." As McCarthy labored in the fields on-looking "negro men and women in the neighborhood" raised his ire. The African Americans, he charged, had "no thought of doing any work" and had come to see—he wrote derisively in black dialect—"dem dar white folks wuckin."⁹⁰ Laborers such as McCarthy consciously constructed their self-image by redefining themselves, even as dependent workers, against a "slothful" black population. McCarthy described his farming experiences as "'foraging' on the neutral ground between war and peace."⁹¹ His own transformation was not complete until he returned to the city, took his oath, and resumed a more familiar model of life.

In recounting this tumultuous and painful period at the end of *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia*, McCarthy closed his account of the war by starkly demonstrating a world undone by emancipation and federal occupation. Steeling themselves against these forces, white Southern men forged ahead working for themselves and no longer dependent upon the labor of those they once enslaved. Describing blacks as shiftless laborers or unruly vagabonds allowed mastery over what was once uncontrolled. Memoirs served as powerful vehicles for veterans to rectify past

⁸⁹ Laura Edwards, *Gendered Strife and Confusion: The Political Culture of Reconstruction* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 68-79.

⁹⁰ Carlton McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia, 1861-1865* (1882, repr., Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), 178.

⁹¹ McCarthy, *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia*, 192.

wrongs. Southerners' postbellum politics actively shaped their wartime accounts. J. E. Robuck's robust narrative of the war's end, for instance, advanced the Cause to the formation of the Ku Klux Klan. Robuck—wounded at Chickamauga and experiencing economic hardships in the twentieth century—fought against the leveling processes of emancipation and federal control by joining extralegal organizations, the subject with which he closes his wartime account. Like many other veterans, Robuck posited blacks' continued loyalty, but maintained that many had become "deluded" by "Yankee tricks." Of course, he charged, "these impostors would tell the negroes that all Southern people were their enemies, and the negroes would believe them."⁹² The equilibrium of the antebellum era, Robuck charged, was profoundly disrupted by "radical carpet-bag rule" only to be restored by the Klan's ghost courts.⁹³

Robuck composed his recollections in the first decade of the twentieth century, deep into the era of the New South during a period of experienced unprecedented economic growth and industrialization.⁹⁴ Robuck filtered these changes through his wartime experiences. Closing his reminiscences he wrote, "Her battle fields have been converted into building lots. Tall factories now smoke where once a holocaust flamed. And where the cannon once roared you hear today the tinkle of the school bell."⁹⁵ With all the transformations and changes, though, Robuck still looked back to the war's

⁹² J. E. Robuck, *My Own Personal Experience and Observation as a Soldier in the Confederate Army During the Civil War, 1861-1865, Also During the Period of Reconstruction* (1911; repr., Memphis, TN: Burke's Book Store, N/D), 74, see also 95-6.

⁹³ Robuck, *My Own Personal Experience and Observation as a Soldier in the Confederate Army During the Civil War, 1861-1865*, 95-6.

⁹⁴ Edward L. Ayers, *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 102-23.

⁹⁵ Robuck, *My Own Personal Experience and Observation as a Soldier in the Confederate Army During the Civil War, 1861-1865*, 97.

meaning contending that the time had still not come for an “impartial” history. When that time passed, “it will be written that SECESSION WAS NOT REBELLION.”⁹⁶ Still seeking vindication for the cause of his youth, Robuck took solace in the present. He had joined the cause of southern redemption and now marked the South’s progress.

As Confederate veterans recorded their recollections of the Civil War they were offered both time and perspective for reflection. How they closed their works demonstrated, both deliberately and unconsciously, the war’s personal legacy and their lasting perceptions of the conflict. For many, writing awoke old ghosts. As Sam Watkins mournfully wrote toward the end of his recollection, “Our country is gone, our cause is lost.”⁹⁷ Watkins had fought and lost the great contest of his generation but now, through his writing, Watkins returned to the scenes of his youth. “In imagination,” he wrote, “I am young again tonight. I feel the flush and vigor of my manhood.”⁹⁸ Watkins’ memories of the war remained strong and his account vivid. But veterans’ postwar memoirs could never fully rectify wrongs, retrieve those lost in battle, or win a cause lost. Instead, memoirs and recollections offered white Southerners a powerful vehicle to shape the public’s understanding of the war and determine by what means they would close their personal struggles. Many of the aforementioned accounts close not with military surrender but look instead to the beginnings of the postwar South, especially that society’s racial order. Frye Jacobson’s contention that race “resides not in nature but in

⁹⁶ Robuck, *My Own Personal Experience and Observation as a Soldier in the Confederate Army During the Civil War, 1861-1865*, 97.

⁹⁷ Sam R. Watkins, “Co. Aytch”: *The Classic Memoir of the Civil War by a Confederate Soldier* (New York: Collier Books, 1962), 242.

⁹⁸ Watkins, “Co. Aytch”, 245.

politics and culture” clearly illuminates the social dynamics of the postwar South.⁹⁹ Southerners’ racialized portrayal of African Americans was the product of a struggle for power after a devastating war. To regain mastery, to secure hold of the uncontrolled, white Southerners in a period of economic crisis used racial stereotypes such as inborn “laziness” to dispossess blacks of economic opportunities. These charges were connected to whites’ threatened republican independence. By inscribing divisions and hierarchies to a theoretically equal populace, Southerners quickly reorganized the South’s citizenry along racial lines.¹⁰⁰ The racial boundaries and social institutions that supported the South’s antebellum society folded in the spring of 1865, but were partially reconstructed in veterans’ accounts from the 1870s and beyond.¹⁰¹

Conclusions

Civil War soldiers were remade into citizens after the war’s end. So, too, did veterans shift their self perceptions; for the discourse of citizenship revolved around the notions of race, manhood, identity, and politics. Scholars such as David Blight and Gaines Foster have admirably shown that a sanitized version of the war emerged in the 1880s. As former Virginia soldier Robert Taylor Scott told a northern veteran at Gettysburg: “we meet as citizens, co-equal citizens, of our common country.”¹⁰² And, indeed, this rhetoric shaped the terms of the public discourse in the last two decades of

⁹⁹ Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 9.

¹⁰⁰ Jacobson’s study demonstrates that the forces in 1865 were produced and reproduced in three crucial moments of American history, thereby suggesting the supreme importance of race and class. Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 20-1.

¹⁰¹ John Hope Franklin, *Reconstruction after the Civil War*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994), Chapter 1.

¹⁰² Robert Taylor Scott, Address at the Unveiling of the Monument, quoted in Carmichael, *The Last Generation*, 231.

the nineteenth century as white southerners achieved full citizenship. Yet, a more varied private discourse undergirded such public discussions. Indeed, historians Charles J. Holden and W. Scott Poole have argued for the persistence of southern conservatism, thereby suggesting a national reunion on vastly more complicated than previously portrayed.¹⁰³ Veterans' internality of personal reconstructions serves as an important lens to better understand the terms of this discourse and how it operated in different forms both publicly and privately.

¹⁰³ Charles J. Holden, *In the Great Maelstrom: Conservatives in Post-Civil War South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2002) and Poole, *Never Surrender*.

CHAPTER 9 RECONSTRUCTING SOUTHERN MEN

In June of 1885, George Anderson Mercer, after his wife's death, once again turned to his diary. As he grew older, after scores of careful entries since boyhood, Mercer wrote less frequently. This traumatic event, though, drew him back to the pages where he had made sense out of life. Deeply pained, he wrote: "Now what I set down is written with the lacerated and bleeding edges of my heart. At ten minutes past seven o'clock on the morning of Tuesday last the 16th inst., my darling wife passed peacefully from time into eternity." The night before, he sat with his wife as she lay dying. With "breaking heart," he recalled "our long years of mutual confidence, trust, and love, and her unstinted devotion and affection as wife and mother." The experience pushed Mercer to the limits of his endurance. "I did not realize in advance that my nature was hard enough to live through such an ordeal, but great grief stuns and stupefies rather than destroys. The bruises sooner or later disappear from the surface, where they are seen, and sink into the soul, where they are felt."¹ As a broken man no longer with the women he loved, Mercer drifted until meeting his own end in 1907.

Civil War veterans remained a living presence until the 1950s. In that decade, as the last of them passed away, an epoch ended. But their influence had been waning long before. During the rise of the "New South" a new generation of Southerners, too young to have participated in the war, shaped society. Paul Gaston's definitive study of this group defines the transformation. Southerners "expressed reverence for the civilization that had existed in the South, but conceded that it had passed irrevocably

¹ Mercer Diary, 21 June 1885, Vol. 5, Mercer Papers, SHC.

into history, had become an 'Old South' that must now be superseded by a new order."² As nineteenth-century Americans moved toward the cause of national reunion in the 1870s and beyond, vigorous public celebrations and a rich body of literature created a portrait of the Civil War in which romance and sentimental remembrance triumphed over reality.³ Northerners and Southerners buried the war's varied meanings and lingering traumas for the causes of reconciliation, reunion, and white supremacy.⁴

The war's public face never fully obscured the lives, experiences, and emotions of the former Confederates who had fought and lost the great contest of their generation. George Anderson Mercer expressed on paper his poignant emotions, but the personal contours of his private life, like those of most white Southerners, received little public disclosure. These contrasts were compounded by the unique position Confederate veterans came to occupy in the years after the Civil War. Southerners maintained, writes James Marten, "an almost mystic regard for Confederate veterans."⁵ The image of honorable, unsullied heroes overshadowed the personal pains and struggles that gripped so many men. In the immediate postwar period few soldiers

² Paul M. Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study of Southern Mythmaking* (Montgomery, AL: NewSouth Books, 2002), 25.

³ David Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001), 4. The New South's rise marked a departure from an antebellum social order; yet, instead of abandoning old values New South advocates emphasized the "Southernness" of their movement and romanticized the past out of which it came, see Paul Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study of Southern Mythmaking* (1972; repr., Montgomery, AL: NewSouth Books, 2002), 25-7 and 168-9.

On the creation of collective or historical memory, see W. Fitzhugh Brundage, *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005) and Bruce E. Baker, *What Reconstruction Meant: Historical Memory in the American South* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007).

⁴ Edward Blum, *Reforging the White Republic: Race, Religion, and American Nationalism, 1865-1898* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007) and Blight, *Race and Reunion*.

⁵ Marten, *Sing Not War*, 203.

readily wrote about the conflicted feelings affecting so many, publicly at least.⁶ Failure and defeat emasculated Southern whites. The psychological strains produced by these forces rendered men incapable of action and unable to communicate. Confederate veterans' published and unpublished memoirs, along with letters and diaries, provided private expressions that organized their lives and reconstructed their manhood, while also undergirding an evolving public discourse. Public portraits that emphasized strides toward stability, shared social suffering, and individual heroism masked the aimlessness, confusion, and sadness that privately consumed many men. The disassociation between public order and private disorder suggests a more complicated narrative of reconstruction and reunion. Many veterans turned inward, communicating to family or other former soldiers about their experiences and creating a disjuncture in our understanding of Southern whites' postwar lives. Sharp divisions between war and peace do not accurately reflect the personal ambiguities of this period or the experiences of its participants.

This project has sought to recover and to reconstruct white Southerners' lived experiences, as revealed in the intersection of gender identity and emotional expression. In the antebellum era an internal compass guided these men's public lives which required competitive displays of manliness. But, whites embraced a fluid masculinity that also demonstrated tenderness and affection as reflected in diary entries and family interactions. The Civil War redirected men's compasses, collapsing norms that discouraged public disclosure. In the postwar era, these white men embraced the

⁶ It was not until around the year 1880, Gerald Linderman contends, that Americans revived their interest in martial matters, see Gerald Linderman, *Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat in the American Civil War* (New York: Free Press, 1989), 275, see 266-97. David Blight rightly questions Linderman's strict dichotomy between "hibernation" (1865-80) and "revival" (post-1880) as too schematic and suggests instead a more fluid periodization, see Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 142, 149-50, 170.

exhibition and exchange of emotions. These connections facilitated the transitions between civilian and military masculinities; the transformation from soldier to citizen became a prolonged, difficult process.⁷ Extralegal violence and reactionary political stands against the federal government and African Americans demonstrated just how tumultuous these shifts proved. Charting such momentous personal changes requires a broadened view of southern history. Although Civil War and Reconstruction redefined the American South, the extent and scope of these changes can only be understood through individual's personal and cultural responses to such meta-forces.

⁷ Robert A. Nye has written a brilliant historiography on civilian and military masculinities in the nineteenth- and twentieth- century, which focuses primarily on Europe, but acknowledges what work has focused on the American experience. Nye observes: "much in modern history has depended on a nation's ability to manage this transition between civilian and military masculinities in ways that neither jeopardized the efficient conduct of warfare nor troubled civilian peace." Robert A. Nye, "Western Masculinities in War and Peace," *The American Historical Review*, vol. 112, no. 2 (April 2007): 417. Moreover, two recent studies take seriously the issue of how soldiers reintegrated themselves back into civilian life, see Jeffrey W. McClurken, *Take Care of the Living: Reconstructing Confederate Veteran Families in Virginia* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009) and Marten, *Sing Not War*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Historic New Orleans Collection, Williams Research Center, New Orleans, LA

Frank A. Barlett Family Papers
David F. Boyd Letters
Confederate Scrapbook
Edwin T. Merrick Papers
Murphy Family Papers
Walton-Glenny Family Papers

Howard-Tilton Memorial Library, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA

Charles E. Kennon Papers
Herron Family Correspondence
Hutson Family Papers
John M. Galbraith Papers
Joseph Jones Papers
Frederick Nash Ogden Papers

Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Collections, Special Collections, Hill Memorial Library, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA

Samuel Bonner Papers
Charles Boothby Papers
David F. Boyd Papers
Louis A. Bringier Papers
William H. Ellis Papers
Joseph Jones Papers
Josiah Knighton and Family Papers
Jeptha McKinney Papers
Robert A. Newell Papers
Henry Brown Richardson and Family Papers
James C. Wise Papers

Duke University Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library, Durham, NC

Asa Biggs Papers
Bryan Grimes Papers
Ku Klux Klan Papers
Samuel Hoey Walkup Papers
Benjamin S. Williams Papers

J.Y. Joyner Library, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC

Grimes-Bryan Papers
Hunter-Wills Family Papers
Richard Porson Paddison Papers

Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC

Charles H. Andrews Papers
Henry Theodore Bahnson
Daniel H. Baldwin Papers
Rufus Barringer Papers
Munson Monroe Buford Papers
Tod R. Caldwell Papers
Julian Shakespeare Carr Papers
Kena King Chapman Papers
William J. Clarke Papers
Elizabeth Collier Papers
Thomas Devereux Papers
Jacob Doll Diaries
James E. Green Papers
Josiah Gorgas Papers
William Alexander Hoke Papers
Robert Philip Howell Memoirs
Cadwallader Jones Papers
Julius A. Lineback Papers
Jacob Alson Long Papers
A. J. McIntire Papers
John Burgwyn MacRae Papers
George Anderson Mercer Papers
James S. Milling Papers
John R. Peacock Papers
Benjamin F. Perry Papers
Leonidas L. Polk Papers
Nimrod Porter Papers
Andrew Jackson Rike Papers
David Schenck Papers
Shotwell Family Papers
Anne Linebarger Snuggs Papers
Thomas Sparrow Papers
Cornelia Phillips Spencer Papers
Edmund Kirby Smith Papers
Theodore O. Stark Papers
Ruffin Thomson Papers
William Henry Tripp and Araminta Guilford Tripp Papers
Robert J. Turnbull Papers

Josiah Turner Papers
Alfred Moore Waddell Papers
Wallace-Gage Family Papers
Joseph Frederick Waring Papers
Edward Wasmuth Diary
J.E. Whitehorn Papers
Jonathan Worth Papers
John Taylor Wood Papers
Trist Wood Papers

University of North Carolina, *Documenting the American South*

Brown, Hugh T. "Have Men of Action Been More Beneficial to the World Than Men of Thought?" Debate Speech of Hugh T. Brown for the Dialectic Society. [1857]. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss05-13/mss05-13.html> [accessed 1 October 2010].

Coleman, William M. "Have Men of Action Been More Beneficial to the World Than Men of Thought?" Debate Speech of William M. Coleman for the Dialectic Society [1857]. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss05-13/mss05-13.html>. [accessed 1 October 2010].

Dowd, Clement, William Bingham, and Stuart White, "Letter from the Dialectic Society Members to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, 18 April 1856." [http:// docsouth.unc.edu/unc/unc06-128/unc06-128.html](http://docsouth.unc.edu/unc/unc06-128/unc06-128.html) [accessed 12 May 2011].

Dusenbery, James L. "Diary." 7 August 1841. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/dusenbery/journal/#jld-p087> [accessed 20 September 2010].

Fuller, Bartholomew. "The Dangers of a College Life," Class Composition, 1848]. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss04-19/mss04-19.html>. [accessed 27 August 2010].

Mason, Thomas W. "The Journal of a Day," Class Composition, [1856]. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss05-09/mss05-09.html>. [accessed 26 August 2010].

Means, Paul B. "Inaugural Address of Paul B. Means for the Dialectic Society." [1868]. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss06-19/mss06-19.html>. [accessed 13 May 2011].

Mullins, William Sidney. "Letter to P. Henry Winston," 23 September 1840. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/unc/unc06-51/unc06-51.html> [accessed 30 September 2010].

Preston H. Sessoms to Penelope E. White, 27 September 1861.

<http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/mss06-09/mss06-09.html> [accessed, 8 March 2011].

South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC

David Wyatt Aiken Papers
Ellison Capers Papers
Robert Means Davis Papers
Black Oak Democratic Club Papers
Martin Witherspoon Gary Papers
Artemus Darby Goodwyn Papers
James Earle Hagood Papers
Joshua Hilary Hudson Papers
James F. Izlar Papers
Iredell Jones Papers
Ellison Summerfield Keitt Papers
Benjamin Franklin Perry Papers
Richland Democratic Club Papers
Robert Wallace Shand Papers
Edward M. Stoeber Papers
James F. Sloan Papers

**Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia,
Charlottesville, VA**

Amos T. Akerman Papers
John W. Daniel and the Daniel Family Papers
William B. Grove Papers
Robert G. H. Kean Papers
Thomas Lafayette Rosser Papers
George W. White Papers

Fredericksburg-Spotsylvania National Military Park, Fredericksburg, VA

Reminiscences of Augustus A. Dean

Printed Primary Sources

- Alexander, Edward Porter. *Fighting for the Confederacy: The Personal Recollections of General Edward Porter Alexander*. Edited by Gary W. Gallagher. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989.
- Andrews, Sidney. *The South Since the War, as Shown by Fourteen Weeks of Travel and Observation in Georgia and the Carolinas*. 1866. Reprint, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971.
- Blackford, W.W. *War Years with Jeb Stuart*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945.
- Browning, Meschach. *Forty-Four Years of the Life of a Hunter; Being Reminiscences of Meshach Browning, a Maryland Hunter*. Revised and illustrated by E. Stabler. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1859.
- Byrd, William. *Histories of the Dividing Line Betwixt Virginia and North Carolina*. 1728. Edited by William K. Boyd. New York: Dover Publisher, Inc., 1967.
- Chamberlayne, John Hampden. *Ham Chamberlayne—Virginian: Letters and Papers of an Artillery Officer in the War for Southern Independence, 1861-1865*. Edited by C.G. Chamberlayne. Richmond: Press of the Dietz Printing Company, 1932.
- Clemson, Floride. *A Rebel Came Home: The Diary and Letters of Floride Clemson, 1863-1866*. Edited by Charles M. McGee, Jr. and Ernest M. Lander, Jr. 1961. Revised, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989.
- Clark, Walter. *The Papers of Walter Clark*. Vol. 1. Edited by Aubrey Lee Brooks and Hugh Talmage Lefler. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948.
- Cook, Walter Henry. "Secret Political Societies in the South During the Period of Reconstruction, An Address before the Faculty and Friends of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio." Cleveland: Evangelical Publishing House, [1914].
- Crow, Terrell Armistead and Mary Moulton Barden, eds. *Live Your Own Life: The Family Papers of Mary Bayard Clarke, 1854-1886*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2003.
- Daniel, John W. *Speeches and Orations of John Warwick Daniel*. Edited by Edward M. Daniel. Lynchburg: J.P. Bell, 1911.
- Davis, Jefferson. *The Papers of Jefferson Davis*. Vol II. Edited by Lynda L. Crist, Barbara J. Rozek, and Kenneth H. Williams. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003.

- Dooley, John. *John Dooley Confederate Soldier and His War Journal*. Edited by Joseph T. Durkin. Notre Dame, IL: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963.
- Duncan, Malcolm C. *Duncan's Masonic Ritual and Monitor or Guide to the Three Symbolic Degrees of the Ancient York Rite and to the Degrees of Mark Master, Past Master, Most Excellent Master, and the Royal Arch*. New York: Crown Publishers, nd.
- Eggleston, George Cary. *A Rebel's Recollections*. 1874. Reprint, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959.
- Eggleston, George Cary. "A Rebel's Recollections," *The Atlantic Monthly* 34, issue 206 (December 1874).
- Fitzpatrick, Marion Hill. *Letters to Amanda: The Civil War Letters of Marion Hill Fitzpatrick, Army of Northern Virginia*. Edited by Jeffrey C. Lowe and Sam Hodges. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Franklin, Benjamin. *Autobiography and Other Writings*. Edited by Ormond Seavey, New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Gorgas, Josiah. *The Journals of Josiah Gorgas*. Edited by Sarah Woolfolk Wiggins. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1995.
- Green, John Patterson. *Recollections of the Inhabitants, Localities, Superstitions, and Ku Klux Outrages of the Carolinas*. [Cleveland], 1880.
- Hooper, William. "The Discipline of the Heart, to be Connected with the Culture of the Mind; a Discourse on Education, Delivered to the Students of the College, at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, August 22, 1830, and Published by their Request." New York: Sleight and Robinson, Printers, 1830.
- Lawson, John. *A New Voyage to Carolina*. 1714. Edited by Hugh Talmage Lefler. Reprint, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1967.
- McCarthy, Carlton. *Detailed Minutiae of Soldier Life in the Army of Northern Virginia, 1861-1865*. 1882. Reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993.
- Merrill, Samuel H. *The Campaigns of the First Main and First District of Columbia Cavalry*. Portland, ME: Bailey and Noyes, 1866.
- Regulations for the Army of the Confederate States, 1863*. Richmond: J.W. Randolph, 1863.
- Report of the Physician and Superintendent of the Insane Asylum of North Carolina, for the Year Ending November 1, 1866*. Raleigh: Wm. E. Pell, State Printer, 1866.

- Robuck, J.E. *My Own Personal Experience and Observation as a Soldier in the Confederate Army During the Civil War, 1861-1865 also During the Period of Reconstruction*. 1911. Reprint, Memphis: Burke's Book Store, nd.
- Shotwell, Randolph Abbott. *The Papers of Randolph Abbott Shotwell*. 2 vols. Edited by J. G. DeRoulhac Hamilton. Raleigh: North Carolina Historical Commission, 1931.
- Simpson, Richard Wright. *'Far, Far From Home: The Wartime Letters of Dick and Tally Simpson, Third South Carolina Volunteers*. Edited by Guy R. Everson and Edward H. Simpson, Jr. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- St. John de Crevèvoeur, J. Hector. *Letters From an American Farmer*. 1782. Reprint, New York: Fox, Duffield, and Company, 1904.
- Tourgée, Albion Winegar. *The Invisible Empire*. Edited by Otto H. Olsen. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989.
- Wagstaff, H.M., ed. *The James A. Graham Papers, 1861-1884*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1928.
- Watkins, Sam R. *'Co. Aytch: The Classic Memoir of the Civil War by a Confederate Soldier*. New York: Collier Books, 1962.
- University of Virginia, "The Code of Honor." University of Virginia. <http://www.virginia.edu/uvatours/shorthistory/code.html> [accessed 24 July 2011].
- U. S. Congress. Joint Select Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States. *Testimony Taken by the Joint Select Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States*, vols. 1-13. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1872.
- U. S. War Department. *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*. 128 vols. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1880-1901 [OR].

Newspapers and Periodicals

Century

DeBow's Review

Greensboro Patriot

The Macon Daily Telegraph

Milwaukee Daily Sentinel

The Philadelphia Inquirer

Yorkville Enquirer

Secondary Sources

- Adler, Jeffrey S. "Murder, North and South: Violence in Early-Twentieth-Century Chicago and New Orleans," *The Journal of Southern History* 74 (May 2008): 297-324.
- Albright, James W. *Greensboro, 1808-1904*. Greensboro, NC: Jos. J. Stone, 1904.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. 1983. Reprint, London: Verso, 2002.
- "Army Organization in the Civil War," Gettysburg National Military Park. <http://www.nps.gov/archive/gett/getttour/armorg.htm> [accessed 26 December 2010].
- Ashe, Stephen V. *A Year in the South: Four Lives in 1865*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Ayers, Edward L. *Vengeance and Justice: Crime and Punishment in the 19th-Century American South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Ayers, Edward L. *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Ayers, Edward L. "Worrying About the Civil War," in *Moral Problems in American Life: New Perspectives on Cultural History*, ed. Karen Halttunen and Lewis Perry, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- Baptist, Edward E. *Creating an Old South: Middle Florida's Plantation Frontier Before the Civil War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Baptist, Edward E., Stephen Berry, Orville Vernon Burton, Kenneth S. Greenberg, and Mark M. Smith, "Looking Back on Bertram Wyatt-Brown's *Southern Honor*: A Roundtable," *Historically Speaking: the Bulletin of the Historical Society* IX (July/August 2008): 13-18.
- Ballard, Michael B. *A Long Shadow: Jefferson Davis and the Final Days of the Confederacy*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1986.
- Barney, William L. *The Making of a Confederate: Walter Lenoir's Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

- Barrett, John G. *The Civil War in North Carolina*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1963.
- Baumgaren, Linda R. "Leather Stockings and Hunting Shirts," in *American Material Culture: The Shape of the Field*, ed. Ann Smart Martin and J. Ritchie Garrison. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997.
- Bederman, Gail. *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Bercaw, Nancy D. *Gendered Freedoms: Race, Rights, and the Politics of Household in the Delta, 1861-1875*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003.
- Berry, Stephen W, II. *All that Makes a Man: Love and Ambition in the Civil War South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Beverley, Robert. *The History and Present State of Virginia*. Edited by Louis B. Wright. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947.
- Blair, William. *Cities of the Dead: Contesting the Memory of the Civil War in the South, 1865-1914*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Blight, David. *Race and Reunion: the Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Translated by Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbol Power*. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. 1982. Reprint, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Bradley, Mark. *This Astounding Close: The Road to Bennett Place*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Bradley, Mark. *Bluecoats and Tar Heels: Soldiers and Civilians in Reconstruction North Carolina*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2009.
- Brown, Richard Maxwell. *The South Carolina Regulators*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Brown, Russell K. "Post-Civil War Violence in Augusta, Georgia," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 90 (Summer 2009): 196-213.
- Brown, Thomas J. Introduction to *Reconstructions: New Perspectives on the Postbellum United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

- Brubaker, Rogers and Frederick Cooper, "Beyond 'Identity,'" *Theory and Society* 29 (February 200): 1-47.
- Bruce, Dickson D., Jr. *Violence and Culture in the Antebellum South*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979.
- Bruce, Philip Alexander. *History of the University of Virginia, 1819-1919: The Lengthened Shadow of One Man*. 5 vols. Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1907.
- Butler, Leslie. "Reconstructions in Intellectual and Cultural Life," in *Reconstructions: New Perspectives on the Postbellum United States*, ed. Thomas J. Brown. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Cabell, Nathaniel Francis, ed. *Early History of the University of Virginia, as Contained in the Letters of Thomas Jefferson and Joseph C. Cabell*. Richmond: J.W. Randolph, 1856.
- Calkins, Chris M. *The Final Bivouac: The Surrender Parade at Appomattox and the Disbanding of the Armies, April 10-May 20, 1865*. Lynchburg: H.E. Howard, Inc., 1988.
- Cantwell, Robert. *Ethnomimesis: Folklife and the Representation of Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993.
- Cardyn, Lisa. "Sexual Terror in the Reconstruction South," in *Battle Scars: Gender and Sexuality in the American Civil War*, edited by Catherine Clinton and Nina Silber. New York: Oxford University Press, 1006.
- Carmichael, Peter S. *The Last Generation: Young Virginians in Peace, War, and Reunion*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.
- Carnes, Mark C. *Secret Ritual and Manhood in Victorian America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Carter, Dan T. *When the War Was Over: The Failure of Self-Reconstruction in the South, 1865-1867*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985.
- Cash, W.J. *The Mind of the South*. 1941. Reprint, New York: Vintage Books, 1991.
- Cauble, Frank P. *The Surrender Proceedings, April 9th, 1865 Appomattox Court House*. Lynchburg, VA: H.E. Howard, 1987.
- Chamberlain, Hope Summerell. *Old Days in Chapel Hill: Being the Life and Letters of Cornelia Phillips Spencer*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1926.

- Cobb, James C. *Away Down South: A History of Southern Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Davis, Susan L. *Authentic History Ku Klux Klan, 1865-1877*. New York: American Library Service, 1924.
- Dean, Eric T., Jr. *Shook Over Hell: Post-Traumatic Stress, Vietnam, and the Civil War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Debow, J.D.B. "Home Education and Schools." *Debow's Review* 29 (December 1860), 716-721.
- Dening, Greg, "Texts of Self," in *Through a Glass Darkly: Reflections on Personal Identity in Early America*. Edited by Hoffman, Ronald, Mechal Sobel, and Fredrika J. Teute. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, the University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Denton, William. *Poems for Reformers*. Dayton, Ohio: William and Elizabeth M.F. Denton, 1856.
- Denton, William. *Radical Rhymes*. 1871. Reprint, Wellesley, Mass.: Denton Publishing Company, 1881.
- Donald, David Herbert. "A Generation of Defeat." in *From the Old South to the New: Essays on the Transitional South*, edited by Walter Fraser, Jr. and Winfred B. Moore, Jr., 3-20. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1981.
- Edwards, Laura. *Gendered Strife and Confusion: The Political Culture of Reconstruction*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997.
- Elliot, William. *Carolina Sports by Land and Water, including Devil-Fishing, Wild-Cat, Dear, and Bear Hunting, etc.*, 1846. Reprint, Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1994.
- Ely, Melvin Patrick. *Israel on the Appomattox: A Southern Experiment in Black Freedom from the 1790s Through the Civil War*. New York: Vintage Books, 2004.
- Escott, Paul D. *Many Excellent People: Power and Privilege in North Carolina, 1850-1900*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985.
- Evans, William McKee. *Ballots and Fence Rails: Reconstruction on the Lower Cape Fear*. 1966. Reprint, Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995.
- Evans, William McKee. *To Die Game: The Story of the Lowry Band, Indian Guerrillas of Reconstruction*. 1971. Reprint, Syracuse University Press, 1995.

- Faulkner, William. *Intruder in the Dust*. New York: Random House, 1948.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. "Christian Soldiers: The Meaning and Revivalism in the Confederate Army," *The Journal of Southern History* 53 (February 1987): 63-90.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1996.
- Feis, William B., "Jefferson Davis and the 'Guerrilla Option,'" in *The Collapse of the Confederacy*. Edited by Mark Grimsley and Brooks D. Simpson, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.
- Fleming, Walter Lynwood. *The Sequel of Appomattox: A Chronicle of the Reunion of the States*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919.
- Fletcher, William A. *Rebel Private: Front and Rear, Memoirs of a Confederate Soldier*. New York: Dutton Books, 1995.
- Flynn, Thomas. *Sartre, Foucault, and Historic Reason: Toward an Existentialist Theory of History*. 2 vols. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Ford, Lacy K., Jr. *Origins of Southern Radicalism: The South Carolina Upcountry, 1800-1860*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Ford, Lacy K., Jr. "Making the 'White Man's Country' White: Race, Slavery, and State-Building in the Jacksonian South," *Journal of the Early Republic* 19 (Winter 1999): 713-737.
- Fossett, Judith Jackson. "(K)night Riders in (K)night Gowns: The Ku Klux Klan, Race, and Constructions of Masculinity," in *Race Consciousness: African American Studies for the New Century*. Edited by Judith Jackson Fossett and Jeffrey A. Tucker. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Foster, Gaines M. *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865 to 1913*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Translated by A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.

- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. "The Anxiety of History: The Southern Confrontation with Modernity," *Southern Cultures* Inaugural Issue (1993): 65-82.
- Franklin, John Hope. *Reconstruction after the Civil War*. 2nd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Franklin, John Hope. *The Militant South, 1800-1861*. 1956. Reprint, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002.
- Fredrickson, George M. *Racism: A Short History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Friend, Craig Thompson, ed. Introduction to *Southern Masculinity: Perspectives on Manhood in the South Since Reconstruction*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2009.
- Friend, Craig Thompson and Lorri Glover, eds. *Southern Sons: Becoming Men in the New Nation*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- Fry, Gladys-Marie. *Night Riders in Black History*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1975.
- Fussell, Paul. *Uniforms: Why We are What We Wear*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2005.
- Fussell, Paul. *The Great War and Modern Memory*. 1974. Reprint, New York: Sterling Publishing, 2009.
- Gaines, W. Craig. *The Confederate Cherokees: John Drew's Regiment of Mounted Rifles*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989.
- Gallagher, Gary W., ed. *Two Witnesses at Gettysburg: The Personal Accounts of Whitelaw Reid and A.J.L. Fremantle*, St. James, NY: Brandywine Press, 1994.
- Gallagher, Gary W. *The Confederate War: How Popular Will, Nationalism, and Military Strategy Could Not Have Stave Off Defeat*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Gannon, Barbara A. *The Won Cause: Black and White Comradeship in the Grand Army of the Republic*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011.
- Gaston, Paul M. *The New South Creed: A Study of Southern Mythmaking*. 1970. Reprint, Montgomery, AL: NewSouth Books, 2002.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. 1973. Reprint, New York: Basic Books, 2000.

- Genovese, Eugene D. *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*. 1972. Reprint, New York: Vintage Books, 1976.
- Glatthaar, Joseph T. *General Lee's Army: From Victory to Collapse*. 2008. New York: Free Press, 2009.
- Glover, Lorri. "Let Us Manufacture Men." *Southern Masculinity: Perspectives on Manhood in the South Since Reconstruction*. Edited by Craig Thompson Friend. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2009.
- Glover, Lorri. *Southern Sons: Becoming Men in the New Nation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- Glymph, Thavolia. *Out of the House of Bondage: The Transformation of the Plantation Household*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Greenberg, Kenneth S. *Honor and Slavery: Lies, Duels, Noses, Masks, Dressing as a Woman, Gifts, Strangers, Humanitarianism, Death, Slave Rebellions, the Proslavery Argument, Baseball, Hunting, and Gambling in the Old South*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Greenough, "Aftermath at Appomattox: Federal Military Occupation of Appomattox County May-November 1865," *Civil War History* 31 (March 1985): 5-23.
- Guterl, Matthew Pratt. *American Mediterranean: Southern Slaveholders in the Age of Emancipation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Hackney, Sheldon. "Southern Violence," *American Historical Review* 74 (February 1969): 906-925.
- Hadden, Sally E. *Slave Patrols: Law and Violence in Virginia and the Carolinas*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Hahn, Steven. *The Roots of Southern Populism: Yeoman Farmers and the Transformation of the Georgia Upcountry, 1850-1890*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Hahn, Steven. *A Nation under Our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Hain, Pamela Chase, ed. *A Confederate Chronicle: The Life of a Civil War Survivor*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005.
- Harcourt, Edward John. "The Whipping of Richard Moore: Reading Emotion in Reconstruction America," *Journal of Social History* 36 (Winter 2002): 261-282.

- Harcourt, Edward John. "Who Were the Pale Faces? New Perspective on the Tennessee Ku Klux," *Civil War History* 51 (2005): 29-34.
- Hardee, W.J. *Rifle and Light Infantry Tactics; for the Exercise and Maneuvers of Troops When Acting as Light Infantry or Rifleman*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1861.
- Harris, Michael Keith. *Old Soldier, New South: Confederate Veterans in a Reconciled Nation*. MA thesis. University of Virginia. 2004.
- Harris, Trudier. *Exorcising Blackness: Historical and Literary Lynching and Burning Rituals*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- Hoffman, Ronald, Mechal Sobel, and Fredrika J. Teute, eds. *Through a Glass Darkly: Reflections on Personal Identity in Early America*. Chapel Hill and London: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia by the University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Hogue, James K. *Uncivil War: Five New Orleans Street Battle and the Rise and Fall of Radical Reconstruction*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006.
- Holberton, William B. *Homeward Bound: The Demobilization of the Union and Confederate Armies, 1865-1866*. Mechanicsburg: Stackpole Books, 2001.
- Hollis, Daniel Walker. *University of South Carolina, Volume I: South Carolina College*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1951.
- Holt, Michael F. *The Fate of Their Country: Politicians, Slavery Extensions, and the Coming of the Civil War* New York: Hill and Wang, 2004.
- Horn, Stanley F. *Invisible Empire: The Story of the Ku Klux Klan, 1866-1871*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1939.
- Hundley, Daniel Robinson. *Social Relations in Our Southern States*. New York: Henry B. Price Publisher, 1860.
- Isaac, Rhys. *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790*. 1982. Reprint, Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- Isaac, Rhys. *Landon Carter's Uneasy Kingdom: Revolution and Rebellion*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

- Janiewski, Dolores. "The Reign of Passion: White Supremacy and the Clash between Passionate and Progressive Emotional Styles in the New South," in *An Emotional History of the United States*. Edited by Peter N. Stearns and Jan Lewis. New York: New York University Press, 1998.
- Janney, Caroline E. *Burying the Dead but Not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2007
- Jensen, Leslie D. "A Survey of Confederate Central Government Quartermaster Issue Jackets," Part I, *The Military Collector and Historian* (Fall/Winter, 1989), online edition <http://www.militaryhistorians.org/company/journal/confederate/confederate-1.htm> [accessed 5 March 2011].
- Johnson, Walter. *Soul by Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Kantrowitz, Stephen. "The Two Faces of Domination in North Carolina, 1800-1898," in *Democracy Betrayed: The Wilmington Race Riot of 1898 and Its Legacy*. Eds. David S. Cecelski and Timothy B. Tyson. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- Kantrowitz, Stephen. *Ben Tillman and the Reconstruction of White Supremacy*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Kars, Marjoleine. *Breaking Loose Together: The Regulator Rebellion in Pre-Revolutionary North Carolina*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Katz, Jonathan Ned. *Love Stories: Sex Between Men Before Homosexuality* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Kerber, Linda K. *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- Kerby, Robert L. *Kirby Smith's Confederacy: The Trans-Mississippi South, 1863-1865*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972.
- Kett, Joseph F. *Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America 1790 to Present*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977.
- Kimball, Bruce. *Orators and Philosophers: A History of the Idea of Liberal Education*. New York and London: Teachers College Press, 1986.
- Kimmel, Michael. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* New York: Free Press, 1996.

- Klein, Rachel N. *Unification of a Slave State: The Rise of the Planter Class in the South Carolina Backcountry, 1760-1808*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.
- Kleinman, Arthur, Veena Das, and Margaret Lock, eds. *Social Suffering*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Lears, T.J. Jackson. *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920*. New York: Pantheon, 1981.
- Lears, T.J. Jackson. *Rebirth of a Nation: The Making of Modern America, 1877-1920*. New York: Harper Collins, 2009.
- Lemann, Nicholas. *Redemption: The Last Battle of the Civil War*. New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 2006.
- Lepore, Jill. *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity*. New York: Vintage Books, 1999.
- Lester, J.C. and D.L. Wilson. *Ku Klux Klan: Its Origin, Growth, and Disbandment*. 1884. Reprint with new introduction by Walter L. Fleming. New York: Neale Publishing Company, 1905.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. *The Savage Mind*. 1962. Reprint. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Lewis, Jan. *The Pursuit of Happiness: Family and Values in Jefferson's Virginia*. 1983. Reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Lewis, Jan and Peter N. Stearns, eds. *An Emotional History of the United States*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.
- Lindemann, Erika, "The Debating Societies," *True and Candid Compositions: The Lives and Writings of Antebellum Students at the University of North Carolina*, found in *Documenting the American South*, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/chapter/chp05-02/chp05-02.html> [access 12 May 2011].
- Linderman, Gerald F. *Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat in the American Civil War*. New York: The Free Press, 1987.
- Logue, Larry M. *To Appomattox and Beyond: The Civil War Soldier in War and Peace*. Chicago: I.R. Dee, 1996.
- Lumpkin, Katharine Du Pre. *The Making of a Southerner*. 1946. Reprint, Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1991.

- McClurken, Jeffrey W. *Take Care of the Living: Reconstruction Confederate Veteran Families in Virginia*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009.
- McConnell, Stuart. *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- McCurry, Stephanie. *Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, and the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low County*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- McPherson, James M. *For Cause and Comrades: Why Men Fought in the Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- McWhiney, H. Grady and Francis B. Simkins. "The Ghostly Legend of the Ku-Klux Klan," *Negro History Bulletin* 14 (February 1951): 109-112.
- Maddex, Jack P. *The Reconstruction of Edward A. Pollard: A Rebel's Conversion to Postbellum Unionism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1974.
- Manning, Chandra. *What This Cruel War Was Over: Soldiers, Slavery, and the Civil War*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007.
- Marten, James. *Sing Not War: The Lives of Union and Confederate Veterans in Gilded Age America*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011.
- Martin, Brian Joseph. *Napoleonic Friendships: Military Fraternity, Intimacy, and Sexuality in Nineteenth-Century France*. Hanover: University Press, of New England, 2011.
- Martin, David G. *Gettysburg July 1*. Conshohocken, Penn.: Combined Books, 1996.
- Mast, Greg. *State Troops and Volunteers: A Photographic Records of North Carolina's Civil War Soldiers*. Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, Division of Archives and History, 1995.
- Melville, Herman. *Moby Dick*. Edited by Tony Tanner. 1851. Reprint, New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Menand, Louis. *The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2001.
- Mitchell, Reid. *The Vacant Chair: The Northern Soldier Leaves Home*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Mitchell, Reid. *Civil War Soldiers: Their Expectations and their Experiences*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1998.

- Mullins, Jeffrey A. "Honorable Violence: Youth Culture, Masculinity, and Contested Authority in Liberal Education in the Early Republic," *American Transcendental Quarterly* 17 (September 2003).
- Morsman, Amy Feely. *The Big House After Slavery: Virginia Plantation Families and their Postbellum Domestic Experiment*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010.
- Myers, Robert Manson. *The Children of Pride: A True Story of Georgia and the Civil War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Nelson, Scott Reynolds. *Iron Confederacies: Southern Railways, Klan Violence, and Reconstruction*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- Nye, Robert A. "Western Masculinities in War and Peace," *The American Historical Review* 112 (April 2007): 417-438.
- O'Brien, Michael. *Rethinking the South: Essays in Intellectual History*. 1988. Reprint, Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993.
- Olsen, Otto H, ed. *Reconstruction and Redemption in the South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1980.
- Ownby, Ted. *Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, and Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.
- Paludan, Phillip Shaw. *Victims: A True Story of the Civil War*. 1981. Reprint, Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2004.
- Parratt, Cartriona M. "Athletic 'Womanhood': Exploring Sources for Female Sport in Victorians and Edwardian England," *Journal of Sport History* 16 (Summer 1989): 140-157.
- Parrish, Susan Scott. *American Curiosity: Cultures of Natural History in the Colonial British Atlantic World*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Parsons, Elaine Frantz. "Midnight Rangers: Costume and Performance in the Reconstruction-Ear Ku Klux Klan," *Journal of American History* (December 2005): 811-836.
- Pierson, William D. *Black Legacy: America's Hidden Heritage*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993.
- Phillips, Jason. *Diehard Rebels: The Confederate Culture of Invincibility*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2007.

- Poole, W. Scott. *Never Surrender: Confederate Memory and Conservatism in the South Carolina Upcountry*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004.
- Poole, W. Scott. "Religion, Gender, and the Lost Cause in South Carolina's 1876 Governor's Race," *Journal of Southern History* 68 (August 2002): 573-598.
- Power, J. Tracy. *Lee's Miserables: Life in the Army of Northern Virginia from the Wilderness to Appomattox*. Chapel Hill University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- Proctor, Nicholas W. *Bathed in Blood: Hunting and Mastery in the Old South*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2002.
- Prost, Antoine. *In the Wake of War: 'Les Anciens Combattants' and French Society, 1914-1939*. Translated by Helen McPhail. Providence: Berg Publishers, 1992.
- Rable, George C. *But There Was No Peace: The Role of Violence in the Politics of Reconstruction*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984.
- Raper, Horace W. *William W. Holden: North Carolina's Political Enigma*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985.
- Reddy, William M. *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Reed, Germain M. *David French Boyd: Founder of Louisiana State University*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977.
- Reid, Whitelaw. *After the War: A Tour of the Southern States, 1865-1866*. 1866. Edited by C. Vann Woodward. Reprint. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Richardson, Heather Cox, "North and West of Reconstruction: Studies in Political Economy," in *Reconstructions: New Perspectives on the Postbellum United States*. Edited by Thomas J. Brown, 66-90. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Rister, Carl Coke. "Carlota, A Confederate Colony in Mexico," *The Journal of Southern History* 11 (February 1945): 33-50.
- Roach, Mary Ellen and Joanna B. Eicher. *The Visible Self*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1973.
- Roark, James L. *Masters Without Slaves: Southern Planters in the Civil War and Reconstruction*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1977.
- Rolle, Andrew F. *The Lost Cause: The Confederate Exodus to Mexico*. 1965. Reprint, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992.

- Rose, Anne C. *Victorian America and the Civil War*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Rosen, Hannah. *Terror in the Heart of Freedom: Citizenship, Sexual Violence, and the Meaning of Race in the Postemancipation South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.
- Rosenburg, R.B. *Living Monuments: Confederate Soldiers' Homes in the New South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H. "Worrying About Emotions in History" *American Historical Review* 107 (June 2002): 812-845.
- Rubin, Anne Sarah. *A Shattered Nation: The Rise and Fall of the Confederacy, 1861-1868*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.
- Ruffin, Mrs. Kirkland, ed. "School-Boy Letters of Edmund Ruffin, Jr.," *North Carolina Historical Review* 10 (January-October 1933): 299-313.
- Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Schivelbusch, Wolfgang. *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery*. Translated by Jefferson Chase. New York: Metropolitan, 2003.
- Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Sheehan-Dean, Aaron. "Everyman's War: Confederate Enlistment in Civil War Virginia," *Civil War History* 50 (March 2004): 5-26.
- Sheehan-Dean, Aaron. *Why Confederates Fought: Family and Nation in Civil War Virginia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Silber, Nina. *Gender and the Sectional Conflict*. Chapel Hill University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Singal, Daniel Joseph. *The War Within: From Victorian to Modernist Thought in the South, 1919-1945*. Chapel Hill University of North Carolina Press, 1982.
- Snay, Mitchell. *Fenians, Freedman, and Southern Whites: Race and Nationality in the Era of Reconstruction*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007.
- Stearns, Peter N. and Carol Z. Stearns. "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards," *American Historical Review* 90 (October 1985): 813-836.

- Stiles, T.J. *Jesse James: Last Rebel of the Civil War*. New York: Vintage Books, 2003.
- Struna, Nancy L. "Beyond Mapping Experience: The Need for Understanding in the History of American Women's Sports," *Journal of Sport History* 11 (Spring 1984): 120-133.
- Styple, William B., ed. *Writing and Fighting in the Army of Northern Virginia*, Kearney, NJ: Belle Grove Publishing, 2003.
- Sutherland, Donald E. "Exiles, Emigrants, and Sojourners: The Post-Civil War Confederate Exodus in Perspective," *Civil War History* 31 (September 1985): 237-256.
- Taylor, Karen. "Reconstructing Men in Savannah, Georgia, 1865-1876," in *Southern Masculinity: Perspectives on Manhood in the South since Reconstruction*. Edited by Craig Thompson Friend.
- Thompson, E.P. *Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture*. New York: New Press, 1991.
- Tilly, Charles, ed. *Citizenship, Identity, and Social History*. Reprinted, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Trelease, Allen W. *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction*. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Tripp, Steven E. *Yankee Town, Southern City: Race and Class Relations in Civil War Lynchburg*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.
- Troxler, Carole Watterson. "To look more closely at the man: Wyatt Outlaw, a Nexus of National, Local, and Personal History," *North Carolina Historical Review* 77 (October 2000): 403-433.
- Trudeau, Noah Andre. *Out of the Storm: The End of the Civil War, April-June 1865*. Boston: Little, Brown: 1994.
- Turner, Victor. *Process, Performance, and Pilgrimage*. New Delhi: Concept, 1979.
- Turner, Victor. *The Anthropology of Performance*. New York: PAJ Publication, 1988.
- Ulrich, Laurel Thacher. *A Midwife's Tale: Martha Ballard from Her Diary, 1785-1812*. New York: Vintage, 1990.
- Varon, Elizabeth R. *Disunion! The Coming of the American Civil War, 1780-1859*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

- Watson, Samuel J. "Religion and Combat Motivation in the Confederate Armies," *Journal of Military History* 58 (January 1994): 29-55.
- Weaver, Blanche H.C. "Confederate Emigration to Brazil," *Journal of Southern History* 27 (February 1961): 33-53.
- West, Elliott. *The Contested Plains: Indians, Goldseekers, and the Rush to Colorado*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998.
- Whites, LeeAnn. *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender: Augusta, Georgia, 1860-1890*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995.
- Whites, LeeAnn. *Gender Matters: Civil War, Reconstruction, and the Making of the New South*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Wickberg, Daniel. "What is the History of Sensibilities? On Cultural Histories, Old and New," *American Historical Review* 112 (June 2007): 1656-1657.
- Wiley, Bell I. *The Life of Johnny Reb*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1943.
- Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Williams, Raymond. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. 1976. Reprint, New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Williams, Rusty. *My Old Confederate Home: A Respectable Place for Civil War Veterans*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2010.
- Wilson, Charles Reagan. *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980.
- Winik, Jay. *April 1865: The Month that Saved America*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2001.
- Winter, Hans-Gerd. "Brutal Heroes, Human Marionettes, and Men with Bitter Knowledge: On the New Formulation of Masculinity in the Literature of the 'Young Generation' after 1945," in *Conceptions of Postwar German Masculinity*. Edited by Roy Jerome. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.
- Woodward, C. Vann. *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel*. 1938. Reprint, New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Woodward, C. Vann. *The Burden of Southern History*. Rev. ed. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1991.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *The Shaping of Southern Culture: Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1890s*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *Hearts of Darkness: Wellspring of a Southern Literary Tradition*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003.

Zuczek, Richard. *State of Rebellion: Reconstruction in South Carolina*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996.

Zuczek, Richard. "The Last Campaign of the Civil War: South Carolina and the Revolution of 1876," *Civil War History* 42 (March 1996): 18-31.

Dissertations and Unpublished Papers

Cooper, Clay. "No Oath Registered in Heaven: Identity, Erudition, and Gender in the East Tennessee Secession Crisis." University of Florida, master's paper, 2010.

Gorman, Kathleen Lynn. "When Johnny Came Marching Home Again: Confederate Veterans in the New South." University of California-Riverside, diss., 1994.

Williams, Timothy J. "Intellectual Manhood: Becoming Men of the Republic at a Southern University, 1795-1861." University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, diss., 2010.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

James Joseph Broomall was born in Raleigh, North Carolina, and lived in Pennsylvania, Nevada, and Maryland before his family settled in Newark, Delaware. Attending the University of Delaware, James received a Bachelor of Arts in history with a concentration in American History. After working at public history sites and in the film industry, he attended the University of North Carolina, Greensboro where he received a Master of Arts in history with a concentration in Museum Studies. James then pursued a Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Florida working under the direction of the Richard J. Milbaur Chair, Professor William A. Link. James has taught at the University of Florida, Virginia Tech, and the University of North Florida. This dissertation is the realization of his deep passion for southern history and the American Civil War.