

“Knights and Their Ladies Fair”: Reenacting the
Civil War

by

Emma Teitelman
Class of 2010

A thesis submitted to the
faculty of Wesleyan University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts
with Departmental Honors in History

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Introduction	4
Chapter One “Grand Love Feasts”: Confederate Veterans’ Reunions	18
Chapter Two “A Splendid Example of Sterling Womanhood”: The Costumed Orations of Mildred Lewis Rutherford	49
Chapter Three “To Keep Their Memories Alive”: History, Gender and Contemporary Civil War Reenactment	73
Conclusion “Popular Historymakers”	101
Bibliography	107

Acknowledgements

I must first extend my deep gratitude to my thesis advisor, Patricia Hill, whose guidance, extensive knowledge and apt suggestions were indispensable throughout this process, and whose encouragement and soothing demeanor were especially helpful during its early phases of development. I also thank Judith Brown, Joshua Chambers-Letson, and my academic advisor, Demetrius Eudell, for their input at various stages of this project.

I am indebted to the librarians within the Interlibrary Loan Department of Olin Library, and to the librarians at Butler Library of Columbia University, who allowed me to acquire texts vital to my research. In addition, I thank Jim Phillips, for selling me the last remaining copy of his self-published book, and the Civil War reenactors of the 14th Connecticut Volunteer Infantry at the Connecticut Historical Society, who fielded my questions with kindness and candor.

I am grateful to Katie Boyce-Jacino and Jeremy Isard for their helpful editorial contributions, and to my mother and father, whose unyielding devotion rivals that of mythologized Confederate women.

Finally, I thank my friends, for their moral support and their humor.

Introduction

In August of 1989, Lauren Cook Burgess attended a Civil War reenactment at the Antietam National Battlefield Park as a male soldier from the 21st Georgia infantry. This was not her first reenactment; she and her husband, Fred Burgess, had previously enjoyed others in which they marched together dressed in meticulously-researched period garb. At this particular event, however, Burgess was approached by two park rangers, Ted Alexander and Paul Chiles, who apparently discovered her cross-dressing after observing her trip to the women's restroom. According to the park's spokesman, Duncan Morrow, Burgess's portrayal did not meet the Park Service's "serious commitment to authenticity"; consequently, Alexander and Chiles reportedly demanded that she "take the uniform off or leave the park."¹ In February, 1991, Burgess filed a sex discrimination lawsuit against the National Park Service. In 1993, the United States District Court ruled that "the policy of categorically barring women from portraying male soldiers...constitutes unconstitutional discrimination against women."² Although she won her case, she inspired hostility in many male reenactors who believed she had no place on the faux battlefield. The implications of Burgess's case and the debate that it provoked raise questions about the practice of Civil War reenactment as a mostly male-driven activity; however, the recently popular hobby has not yet inspired a thorough investigation of how gender plays out in this imagined social world.

¹ Lynda Robinson, "It's a Man's Job: A Woman's Fight to Be a Civil War 'Soldier,'" *The San Francisco Chronicle*, October 13, 1991, 2.

² *Cook v. Babbitt*, Civ. No. 91—0338 (D.D.C. 1993).

Civil War reenactment has become an increasingly popular pursuit throughout the country; scholars and reenactors alike have noted it as a modern phenomenon that boasts nearly 40,000 participants.³ There has been no comprehensive study that explores the practice's demographics; however, scholars have conducted small-scale investigations to consider possible motivations to reenact. Focusing mostly on tacitly racist behavior, they suggest that reenactment provides a venue to express whiteness in the post-Civil Rights movement era.⁴ They have noted that some reenactors promote a Lost Cause, "Reconciliationist"-style memory of the war, ignoring race as central to the war's meaning and instead emphasizing the Confederacy's defense of states' rights.⁵ This interpretation of the war also dominated previous examples in history of large-scale, widely-viewed Civil War battle reenactments, the first of which took place during the fiftieth anniversary of the war.

On July 3rd, 1913, at around three o'clock in the afternoon, approximately 53,000 Civil War veterans attended a reenactment of Pickett's Charge at Gettysburg to commemorate the semi-centennial of the war.⁶ They watched as five hundred veterans from both the Union and Confederate armies donned their uniforms once more to march in double columns and shake hands across the stone wall at the site of

³ This estimation is James McPherson's. See James McPherson, *Drawn With the Sword: Reflections on the American Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 243.

⁴ See Mitchell D. Straus, "Identity Construction Among Confederate Civil War Reenactors: a Study of Dress, Stage Props, and Discourse," *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal* 21, no. 4 (January, 2003): 149-161; James O. Farmer, "Playing Rebels: Reenactment as Nostalgia and Defense of Confederacy in the Battle of Aiken," *Southern Cultures* 11, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 46-73; Rory Turner, "Bloodless Battles," *The Drama Review* 34, no. 4 (Winter 1990): especially 129; Tony Horwitz, *Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches from the Unfinished Civil War* (New York: Vintage Departures, 1998), especially 6-18.

⁵ David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001), 326.

⁶ Blight, 386.

their former bloody struggles.⁷ In 1913, this federally-funded battle reenactment was the most large-scale to date and solidified, as David Blight has argued, a “Reconciliationist” memory of the war. This narrative, constructed in the decades following the war, told the story of a tragic conflict between mutually devoted brothers whose valor and sacrifice warranted respect and veneration without regard to regional affiliation. In this memory of the war, slavery and race were overlooked as vital to the causes of the war and accordingly, neither side was morally wrong; they simply held differing political ideals regarding federal sovereignty. In the end, the North had prevailed only due to superior resources, and while the bloodshed of the war was regrettable, it cemented the union between North and South, paving the way for the nation to become a world power. This understanding of the war accepted and nationalized the southern Lost Cause mythology which voided southern culpability and sentimentally depicted the Old South as a harmonious lost haven of honorable whites and faithful slaves.⁸ White national unity at the expense of black Americans was encapsulated in the veterans’ handshakes at their 1913 reenactment, in which blacks were ignored as soldiers contributing to the Union’s cause and instead served as laborers who distributed amenities to white spectators.⁹

The tradition of simulating a commemorative battle was revived for the war’s centennial. The Civil War Centennial Commission (CWCC), a Congressionally-sanctioned committee which began its planning in the mid-1950s, seemed destined to promote an interpretation of the war similar to the one that had dominated the semi-

⁷ Carol Reardon, *Pickett’s Charge in History and Memory* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 192-193.

⁸ Blight, 189-190, 264-266; Robert J. Cook, *Troubled Commemoration: The American Civil War Centennial, 1961-1965* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007), 5-7.

⁹ Blight, 385.

centennial. The Commission was chaired by Ulysses S. Grant III, descendant of the Union general, and directed by businessman Karl Betts, who had ties with white segregationists and defined the Commission's mission as "not emphasizing Emancipation" but rather marking "the beginning of a new America."¹⁰ These men believed that a simulated battle would garner widespread interest in the four-year-long commemoration. Under their auspices, on July 22, 1961, approximately 2,000 civilian reenactors dressed in Civil War uniforms to perform the Third Battle of Bull Run at the Manassas National Military Park in front of 70,000 spectators.¹¹ While the reenactment was popular with its audience, it also received grave criticism. *The New York Times*, in particular, condemned its glorification of violence and trivialization of the war's meaning, and found the enthusiastic support shown for the Confederate side particularly problematic.¹² This criticism was evidence that while Grant and Betts had counted upon preserving a Reconciliationist interpretation of the war, an increasing number of Americans, inspired by the developing Civil Rights Movement, were beginning to question this version of history. In the wake of such criticism, a coalition of politicians and historians pressed for Grant's and Betts's resignations, which transpired on August 30, 1961.¹³

The new chairman of the CWCC, historian Allan Nevins, shifted the tone of the commemoration. He approached it with an emphasis on critical historical understanding rather than popular participation, and although he was not a civil rights activist, he understood that the political climate necessitated addressing race as an

¹⁰ Karl Betts, quoted in Cook, 42.

¹¹ Cook, 127-129.

¹² Jenny Thompson, *War Games: Inside the World of Twentieth-Century War Reenactors* (Washington: Smithsonian Books, 2004), 31.

¹³ Cook, 138.

element of the war.¹⁴ The new Commission acknowledged the black Americans who fought, in Nevins's words, "for the achievement of freedom and human equality."¹⁵ Civil War centennial commemorations, then, began to reflect a growing consensus that questioned the Reconciliationist vision of the war and that understood its violence as a struggle for racial justice whose goal had yet to be realized. As a staunch critic of the Bull Run reenactment, Nevins declared that the new Commission would not allow any ceremonies that he considered to be "cheap and tawdry."¹⁶ His position against federally-sanctioned reenactments and his more inclusive revisionist interpretation of the war met opposition from those who desired to preserve a conservative memory, and by extension, their white supremacy. Following the Commission's disavowal of reenactments, a number of locally-organized simulated battles were performed by volunteers who insisted upon producing a supposedly "nonpolitical" commemoration of the war.¹⁷

These locally-organized Civil War centennial mock battles have been cited as sparking the modern reenactment movement.¹⁸ The rupture, in particular, between Nevins's historical revisionism and reactionary campaigns is cited by reenactors, many of whom consider academic scholarship to be inaccessible and elitist.¹⁹ In the context of the centennial's historical precedent and reenactors' maintenance of debated Lost Cause ideologies, scholars' studies of reenactment have logically

¹⁴ Nevins was considered to present a "middle-of-the-road position" between traditional historians who disregarded slavery as a significant to the war's meaning and emerging revisionist schools that emphasized its centrality. Thomas N. Bonner, "Civil War Historians and the 'Needless War' Doctrine," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 17, no.2 (April 1956): 213.

¹⁵ Nevins, quoted in Cook, 147.

¹⁶ Nevins, quoted in Cook, 147.

¹⁷ Cook, 202-203.

¹⁸ Thompson, 37.

¹⁹ R. Lee Hadden, *Reliving the Civil War: A Reenactor's Handbook* (Mechanicsburg: Stackpole Books, 1999), 6.

emphasized its racial undertones. While these scholars have made compelling cases for the latent racism of many reenactors, they have produced a somewhat monolithic representation of the practice. As the case of Lauren Cook Burgess suggests, gender plays an important and largely overlooked role in reenactment.

With the intention of producing a more nuanced interpretation of Civil War reenactment, I have used Lauren Burgess's case as an entry-point to consider how certain gendered narratives are reinforced in this practice. Instead of further exploring the racially-charged historical antecedents of the semi-centennial and centennial reenactments, my thesis considers other lesser-known performances of the war to provide a historical framework for my reading of the gendered narratives in contemporary reenactment. These more subtle "reenactments" illuminate how past actors have used historical simulations to define themselves in relation to romanticized gendered wartime narratives which they understood as threatened by societal change.

In Chapter One, I explore reenactments performed by Confederate veterans at their reunions in the decades following the war. At these frequent reunions, veterans enthusiastically recounted gruesome battle scenes and sang beloved wartime songs around the campfire. In addition, they re-donned their tattered uniforms, marched between locations, and revisited specific sites on battlefields where they had sustained debilitating injuries or had seen their friends perish. From the narratives of these reunions emerges a gendered motif in which southern ideals of manhood, including martial virtue and chivalrous protection of women, were affirmed, while emasculating forces of defeat and post-war southern transformations were masked. These

affirmations relied upon complementary reenactments by southern white women, who performed ideals of devotion, vulnerability and gratitude rather than their actual experiences of wartime independence, deprivation and frustration. Reunions, then, provided therapeutic havens for defeated Confederates and white southern women to negate threats to their idealized gender roles.²⁰

Chapter Two considers a more obscure gendered performance of the Civil War era in the example of Mildred Lewis Rutherford, historian general of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. A prominent educator and proponent of the Lost Cause in the first quarter of the twentieth century, Rutherford was celebrated for theatrical orations which she performed costumed in the anachronistic gown of a traditional antebellum plantation mistress. Much like Confederate veterans, Rutherford expounded a romanticized narrative of idealized antebellum gender roles in which southern men's martial eminence was supported by properly subordinated southern women. Her embodiment of the ideal woman similarly responded to anxieties that the glorified antebellum era was being displaced by societal change.

For both Rutherford and Confederate veterans, sentimentalized recollections of the Civil War era were inextricably linked to narratives in which martial men courageously fought to protect vulnerable and devoted white southern women. As these narratives were undermined by defeat and postwar transformations, performances of these roles provided private havens to sooth anxieties and defy social

²⁰ As Stuart McConnell has demonstrated, Union veterans' reunions did not assume the same kind of excruciating physical reminiscence; although they similarly reunited and sometimes re-created war-like campfires, they did not tend to specifically recall battles and instead more generally emphasized their roles as the nation's saviors. Stuart McConnell, *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press), especially 180-182. Confederate veterans were unique in their laborious efforts to re-create their war experiences despite their military defeat.

change. Their performances of a romanticized past, an invented tradition, offer a new perspective from which to consider gender-related functions of contemporary Civil War reenactment, which I explore in Chapter Three. While contemporary gendered motivations are subtle and veiled in claims of historical authenticity and pedagogy, similar roles of martial men and devoted women re-emerge in reenactment practices in ways that suggest the romanticized gendered ideals strongly associated with the antebellum South still resonate in contemporary consciousness. Like their historical predecessors, present-day Civil War reenactors seem to find solace in performing these gendered narratives and attempt to shield the haven of reenactment from peripheral threats.

In sum, my thesis is divided into three thematically-linked chapters which illuminate the personally-restorative powers of performing an imagined past with particular attention to gendered dimensions. These performances provide insights into the role of personal urgency within broader constructions and transmissions of collective memories. I conclude with a reflection on the enduring appeal of these southern-constructed memories, which manifests itself in historical battles between popular and professional historians.

Sources and Methodology

My analysis of motivations for re-creating an imagined history organized around idealized gender roles has relied mostly on the documented words of actors and on written descriptions of their behaviors. I recovered Confederate veterans' nostalgic performances from their rhetoric at reunions, found in their associations' widely-circulated publication, *Confederate Veteran*, in an 1895 souvenir album of

reunions, and in newspapers' reports. Although I attempted to survey a variety of southern newspapers, *The Atlanta Constitution*, one of the leading newspapers of the postbellum South, provided the most detailed accounts. In order to understand the costumed performances of Mildred Lewis Rutherford, I closely read her publications and speeches; these texts, together with published comments about her speeches, helped to tease out the latent meanings of her unusual dress choice. In conjunction with these documents, I drew upon dress theory to consider her clothing as a form of symbolic evidence.

My assessment of contemporary Civil War reenactments relies heavily on reenactors' words as recorded in *Reenacting... Why?*, a published compilation of approximately seventy-five interviews. These interviews were conducted by a fellow reenactor over the course of two years; while this sample may not be entirely representative, it nonetheless reveals the presence of gendered themes. These themes emerged in the interviews of both southern and northern reenactors, Union and Confederate impersonators, to suggest a consistency that transcends regional affiliation. They were also corroborated in a reenactors' handbook, *Reliving the Civil War*, in their monthly magazine, *The Camp Chase Gazette*, and in my own conversations with reenactors staging an encampment at the Connecticut Historical Society in October, 2009.

Although my study is fully grounded in traditional text-based sources, it is indebted to certain analytical paradigms generated by performance studies and gender theory. Throughout my investigation, I have considered these re-creations of history as kinds of performances. In the emerging field of performance studies,

‘performance’ may denote an extremely wide variety of behaviors, from dance to ritual to conventional enactments of daily life.²¹ The definition of performance most helpful for understanding the phenomena investigated in this thesis is perhaps Richard Schechner’s characterization of performance as “twice-behaved behavior,” or behavior repeated “for the second to the *n*th time,” where each repeated behavior can never exactly resemble its antecedent.²² Indeed, the behaviors of Confederate veterans, Rutherford and Civil War reenactors may be considered repetitious in their frequency of enactment, and more broadly, in their reiterations of prescribed narratives. They replicate more traditional notions of performance in the theatrical quality of their behaviors which includes elaborate costuming, carefully staged settings, and playing to audiences.

Within the field of performance studies, Joseph Roach has offered a particularly compelling model. Roach’s study of circum-Atlantic performances is predicated upon his theory of “surrogation,” which he defines as the process by which a community attempts to reproduce its culture in the face of perceived losses.²³ Surrogation occurs when “into the cavities created by loss through death or other forms of departure, survivors attempt to fit satisfactory alternatives.”²⁴ Inevitably, these replications selectively remember or erase certain realities. Performances of

²¹ Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 6.

²² Richard Schechner, *Between Theater and Anthropology* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 36.

²³ Joseph Roach, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 2.

²⁴ Roach, 2.

cultural memories, then, may serve to “blur the obvious discontinuities, misalliances and ruptures.”²⁵

The historical actors and present reenactors I have examined have indeed attempted to reproduce gendered narratives via performance in the face of their perceived losses. While Roach is interested in how embodied memories are publicly transmitted to either enforce or subvert a group’s cultural dominance, I have understood these performances as deeply personal for actors. I have considered their intimate functions by examining them in conjunction with palpable anxieties related to changes that they considered disorienting.²⁶ The privately-meaningful and subjectively-experienced quality of these performances highlights the importance of individuals’ conditions and concerns within the broader construction and transmission of cultural traditions.

Also pertinent to the fundamental theoretical framework of this study are understandings of gender’s performativity. As Judith Butler has argued, gender’s lack of a true ontological basis constitutes it a “fantasy instituted and inscribed on the surface of bodies.”²⁷ Gender, then, is a cultural system that changes over time and demands historical contextualization. Inspired by scholars who have traced shifting definitions of American manhood and womanhood, this study uncovers the ways that Civil War re-creations have served to reaffirm or retrieve certain hegemonic gendered ideals of the past. More specifically, it makes use of historians’ scholarship on the

²⁵ Roach, 3.

²⁶ Roach aims to uncover cultural memories that have been seemingly suppressed by dominant groups, or masked by a prioritization of textual evidence. He, and others agree, suggests that because performances enable transmissions of cultural knowledge via embodied behaviors, they present opportunities for deeper historical understandings that have been cloaked in western-biased, colonial-constructed histories, Roach, 7-13. See also Taylor, 16.

²⁷ Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 174.

idealized antebellum southern gendered order, which these actors exaggeratedly displayed to counter and suppress threats to that gender system. Their exaggerated presentations of these ideals somewhat ironically elucidate notions of gender as imitated and performed.

In addition to borrowing from theories of performance studies, this investigation is predicated upon an understanding of the constructed nature of personal and collective memory. As scholars have suggested, memories do not present facsimiles of the past; rather, as people construct memories, they “reshape, omit, distort, recombine, and reorganize the details of the past in an active and subjective way.”²⁸ Scholars who address collective memory explore how a group negotiates what is emphasized, what is forgotten, and what purposes this selective remembering serves for their present-day concerns. Often, these memories provide a group with a shared identity, which can become highly political as alternative pasts are erased from the dominant social consciousness.²⁹ Hegemonic historical memories, then, generally reflect those with access to power, and are mobilized to assure authority and legitimacy, frequently as a form of resistance to social change.³⁰ The sanction of this constructed past provides a sense of security to those who identify with and claim ownership over these invented traditions.

As David Blight has shown, theories of cultural memory have been invaluable to studies of the Civil War’s legacy. Following the war, Reconciliationist

²⁸ David Thelen, “Memory and American History,” *The Journal of American History* 75, no. 4 (March, 1989): 1120.

²⁹ Marianne Hirsch and Valerie Smith, “Feminism and Cultural Memory: An Introduction,” *Signs* 28, no. 1 (Fall 2002): 5; Michael Kammen, *In the Past Lane: Historical Perspectives on American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 199-200.

³⁰Thelen, 1125-1126.

constructions of the war's meaning as unrelated to race became the dominant white collective historical memory; it pervaded all forms of popular culture and was even institutionalized by the "scientific" methodology of Ranke-style professional historians, most notably Columbia professor William A. Dunning. The revered "Dunning School" taught a generation of historians about the tragic mistake of Reconstruction, an interpretation that officially sanctioned a nationally-imagined Old South.³¹ This cultural myth rendered white southern men, and especially Confederate veterans, admirable gentlemen whose chivalry protected vulnerable white women and whose contented slaves reaped the benefits of their rightful subordination.

The construction of this idealized memory of the antebellum South and of a just southern war was a product of collective white fears of post-war social change and racial upheaval. And while it is easy to think of the architects of these memories as "disembodied agencies," it is important to understand the individual and intimate concerns of those who constructed and disseminated these myths.³² The historical actors I have investigated reveal an inextricable link between these collective memories and their gendered self-conceptions, as evidenced in their personalized embodied re-creations.

Academic historians, beginning with Nevins's generation, have scrutinized and revised these once-widely accepted understandings of southern righteousness and the glorified Old South. However, as scholars have noted, mythologized southern

³¹ David Blight, *Beyond the Battlefield: Race, Memory and the Civil War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 246-247.

³² Stephanie E. Yuhl, "Rich and Tender Remembering: Elite White Women and an Aesthetic Sense of Place in Charleston, 1920s and 1930s," in *Where These Memories Grow: History, Memory and Southern Identity*, ed. W. Fitzhugh Brundage. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 242-243.

tropes re-emerge in various contemporary forms to suggest that these ideas remain buried within a national imagination.³³ Indeed, the idealized gendered narratives of this cultural memory subtly re-appear in the practices and rhetoric of contemporary Civil War reenactors. This continuity raises questions about reenactors' personal relationships to these enduring cultural memories. Their attitude towards Civil War history is revealing: reenactors do not acknowledge the presence of cultural narratives or history's subjective construction. Instead, they understand historical "truths" as immutable and unwavering. Their steadfast demand for maintaining "authenticity," which justifies their condemnation of female reenactors' divergence from the imagined roles of devoted women, eschews critical historical revision and perpetuates the narratives that Confederate veterans and Rutherford embodied in their performances. Claims of authenticity sanction these memories as true and unchangeable, and accordingly naturalize the gender system of an idealized past.

Ultimately, however, contemporary Civil War reenactment, Mildred Lewis Rutherford's oratorical reproductions, and Confederate veterans' martial re-creations all suffer from a fundamental flaw: it is impossible to produce an exact historical replication, either in the abstract imagination or in the physical realm. Despite all these actors' attempts to preserve versions of the past, the present inevitably imposed itself to expose the constructed nature of these performances and their mythologized gendered narratives.

³³ See, for example, Tara McPherson, *Reconstructing Dixie: Race, Gender and Nostalgia in the Imagined South* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003); Gary W. Gallagher, *Causes Won, Lost and Forgotten: How Hollywood and Popular Art Shape What We Know about the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008); Jack Temple Kirby, *Media-Made Dixie: The South in the American Imagination* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986).

Chapter One

“Grand Love Feasts”: Confederate Veterans’ Reunions

In July of 1886, P.F. Moore joined his fellow Confederate veterans at a reunion of the 42nd Georgia regiment. As he and his former comrades reminisced about the war, he stood from his seat, and with his one remaining arm, pointed to a nearby hilltop. “I lost this arm there,” he announced. As he brushed over his stub, a tear fell from his eye, and he continued, “it was scary times around here, but, thank God there were no cowards in our company.”³⁴ This emotional meeting of former Confederate soldiers in which Moore remembered the moment of his violent injury was one of many reunions which took place for decades following the war. Once a year, and sometimes more frequently than that, groups of Confederate veterans returned to bloodied battlefields, disintegrating uniforms, and fellow comrades. Their extreme recollections of life in combat verged on a kind of reenactment of the war; this peculiar desire to resurrect their experiences and revisit a violent, painful and potentially shameful war raises questions about the functions of these reunions for veterans. Their fixation with re-living violence despite defeat suggests that reunions provided arenas to safely construct and perform memories in which they successfully acted as ideal martial men.

The tendency of former Confederates to re-create violent experiences at reunions has not yet received a thorough analysis in historical inquiry; however, scholars have approached the subject of Civil War veterans’ reunions in other ways.

³⁴ “The Soldier Boys,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 23, 1886, 5.

David Blight, for example, has examined the role of postbellum reunions between Union and Confederate forces in constructing and solidifying the nation's Reconciliationist memory of the war. Blight's analysis, while astute and insightful, does not consider the functions and specificities of local reunions. A study of northern reunions is provided in Stuart McConnell's *Glorious Contentment*;³⁵ McConnell's detailed investigation of the workings and functions of Union reunions reveals their dissimilarities from Confederate gatherings. While McConnell notes the quasi-military quality of some of these reunions, which sometimes mimicked wartime campfires, he also describes Union veterans' tendencies to "not portray battles," and to focus more abstractly on veterans' roles as the nation's saviors.³⁶ Indeed, McConnell even describes a Union veterans' lodge as "a fraternal space that happened to carry with it some military trappings."³⁷ Therefore, McConnell's meticulous analysis of Union reunions illuminates the distinctiveness of Confederate veterans who more strenuously and literally resurrected violent wartime experiences.³⁸ However, historians have not yet provided a detail-oriented analysis of southern reunions equal in caliber to McConnell's northern-focused investigation.

Keith Bohannon's essay, "These Few Gray-Haired, Battle-Scarred Veterans," has begun to uncover the particulars of Confederate reunions.³⁹ However, his

³⁵ Stuart McConnell, *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992).

³⁶ McConnell, 180-181.

³⁷ McConnell, 100.

³⁸ It is worth noting that perhaps northern reunions differed so dramatically from southern ones because former Confederates were able to reconvene on the site of past battles, which were fought on their domestic turf. Yet this distinction does not adequately explain Confederate veterans' desires to revive their martial experiences.

³⁹ Keith S. Bohannon, "'These Few Gray-Haired, Battle-Scarred Veterans': Confederate Army Reunions in Georgia, 1885-1895," in *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History*, eds. Gary W. Gallagher and Alan T. Nolan. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000), 89-111.

investigation of reunions in Georgia in the 1880s and 1890s focuses more broadly on their roles in disseminating southern-constructed memories of the war and does not consider the personal significance of veterans' rituals; furthermore, the overall brevity of his investigation does not allow for a complex or expansive argument. Gaines Foster's *Ghosts of the Confederacy* argues more thoroughly about the role of Confederate reunions in constructing and disseminating southern memories of the war. Foster explains veterans' reunions mostly in terms of their festive and celebratory qualities, with an emphasis on the customary parade as the reunion's central event. He argues that reunions helped to instill a cultural memory of the glorified Confederacy, centered around veterans' heroism, primarily to foster social solidarity among white southerners. The race-based unification that the Confederate celebration provided, he argues, eased a difficult transition into the New South.⁴⁰

Foster's study of Confederate reunions identifies a central dynamic in these events; however, it does not interpret the more nuanced behaviors and themes which were also important aspects of reunions. In apprehending their memorial functions for the collective white South, Foster tends to ignore veterans' subtle rituals and the personal memories that they evoked. More specifically, his argument overlooks detailed accounts of these reunions that reveal persistent tendencies to re-live the war's violence, both through vivid verbal recollection and through physically reviving aspects of veterans' lives in combat. In order to recapture and analyze the personal dimensions of veterans' desires to re-live the war, it is necessary to first understand their identities in relation to a shared concept of white southern manhood.

⁴⁰ Gaines M. Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South: 1865-1913* (New York: The Oxford University Press, 1987), 135-140.

This idealized manhood, notions of which persistently emerged in veterans' romanticized recollections, was rooted in social traditions of the antebellum South. It was predicated upon notions of violence, honor, and mastery.

In historical scholarship on the American South, the tenets of honor and mastery have provided the mainstay for most analytical understandings of white southern manhood. Bertram Wyatt-Brown's seminal study has shown that white men's personal honor was of the utmost importance and depended on assessment and confirmation by the external community. These evaluations were made according to a man's ability to defend his integrity, property, and family, and this defense often justified violence.⁴¹ White southern men's ritual of dueling exemplified this honor-bound, violence-prone manhood: duels usually originated in some form of personal insult and resulted in the public shaming, or even death, of the defeated participant.⁴² These violent inclinations led John Hope Franklin to reflect that the Old South had "bestowed on [violence] an aura of respectability."⁴³

In addition to honor, ideals of white southern manhood relied upon social domination. This mastery was achieved by owning slaves and/or asserting authority over women, both of which inspired aggression in white southern men. Slavery was imposed with excruciating violence, and the constant possibility of rebellion necessitated a persistent alacrity of aggression. Violence also dictated notions of a white man's relationship to women, as tenets of chivalry demanded that he be ready

⁴¹ Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics & Behavior in the South* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 14, 34.

⁴² Kenneth S. Greenberg, *Honor and Slavery: Lies, Duels, Noses, Masks, Dressing As A Woman, Gifts, Strangers, Death, Humanitarianism, Slave Rebellions, the Pro-Slavery Argument, Baseball, Hunting and Gambling in the Old South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 8-9.

⁴³ John Hope Franklin, *The Militant South, 1800-1861* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1970), vii.

to defend white womanhood from threat, specifically from slaves. Thus, violence was inextricably linked to conceptions of the southern white male, who was thought to have supreme martial abilities.⁴⁴ These ideals of martial virtue, honor and mastery, have led historians to consider the distinct place of antebellum southern men within the historical narrative of American manhood.⁴⁵ From this perspective, white southern men in the Old South retained more traditional ideals of manhood at a time when northern ideals were undergoing significant transformations.

As scholars of American manhood have suggested, northern manly ideals during the nineteenth century significantly shifted as a result of the changing economic landscape. E. Antony Rotundo argues that before the forces of industrialization began to shape ideals of manhood, dominant colonial ideology emphasized a “communal manhood,” in which “a man’s identity was inseparable from the duties he owed to his community.”⁴⁶ Michael Kimmel corroborates these theories with his definition of the “Genteel Patriarch,” whose individual achievement and economic success were subordinate to his status as the household head.⁴⁷ These ideals shifted in response to economic development, and by the middle of the nineteenth century, the “Self-Made Man,” more interested in individual profit than

⁴⁴ Craig Thompson Friend and Lorri Grover, “Rethinking Southern Masculinity: An Introduction,” in *Southern Manhood: Perspectives on Masculinity in the Old South*, ed. Craig Thompson Friend and Lorri Grover. (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2004), ix-xiv.

⁴⁵ As Craig Thompson Friend and Lorri Grover note, while these were the dominant ideals of manhood for white southerners, they certainly did not reflect all southern male identities; slave ownership, in particular, was beyond the means of most antebellum southerners. Craig Thompson Friend and Lorri Grover, “Rethinking Southern Masculinity: An Introduction,” in *Southern Manhood: Perspectives on Masculinity in the Old South*, ed. Craig Thompson Friend and Lorri Grover. (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2004), x-xi.

⁴⁶ E. Anthony Rotundo, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1993), 2.

⁴⁷ Michael Kimmel, *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (New York: Free Press, 1996), 16-17.

public stature, became a predominant model. According to this narrative, the Self-Made Man was the hegemonic northern ideal upon the eve of the Civil War.⁴⁸

Using this northern-centric history of nineteenth-century American manhood, Craig Thompson Friend has suggested that as northerners became more involved in industrialization and values of self-discipline, southern men sustained an earlier form of communal manhood. As the southern economy remained slave-based and agrarian, antebellum white male identity stayed tied to their communities, public reputations, and patriarchal dominance; economic wealth and advancement were not considered markers of manly virtue. Therefore, the relatively stagnant slave-based southern economy implanted the honor-bound, violence-prone model of white manhood deeply into the southern cultural milieu.⁴⁹ Scholars have noted antagonisms between these regional conceptions of manhood in which northerners portrayed southern men as lazy and crude, while southerners scoffed at northern men's lack of martial abilities.⁵⁰

It is worth noting that these generalized phases of manhood were certainly not representative of all men, nor are they fully agreed upon by historians.⁵¹ For example, Amy Greenberg has argued that a southern-esque model of "martial manhood," concerned with aggressive domination, lingered in the North despite industrialization. She finds evidence of this persistent model in northern men who

⁴⁸ Rotundo, 3-6; Kimmel, 17.

⁴⁹ 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: University of Georgia Press, 2009), viii-xi.

⁵⁰ Nina Silber, *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 22.

⁵¹ A hegemonic model of masculinity has been defined as the "culturally idealized form of masculine character" which, however, may not be "the usual form of masculinity at all." R. Connell, quoted in Mike Donaldson, "What Is Hegemonic Masculinity?" *Theory and Society* 22, no. 5 (October 1993), 646-647.

argued for forceful westward expansion in the 1850s up until the Civil War.⁵² While Greenberg's conclusions about phases of manhood differ from others, she agrees with historians about the significant impact of the war on idealized visions of manhood. She argues that the war shattered romantic notions of violence and resulted in the failure of martial manhood.⁵³

Southern-idealized martial manhood was, indeed, deeply undermined by the Civil War, and specifically by the Confederacy's defeat. Defeat called into question the justness of Confederate soldiers, their integrity and their righteousness; thus, it fundamentally challenged their honor. In addition, emancipation erased slave-owning as an essential source of white men's patriarchal manhood. Confederates' emasculation was epitomized by the popular northern myth about Jefferson Davis's capture. Although the veracity of this tale is unconfirmed, reports emerged following Appomattox that Davis had disguised himself in his wife's clothing in an attempt to escape Union forces. His scheme failed, and upon capture, his attire rendered him the butt of northern jokes which subverted southern men's claims to superior manhood.⁵⁴ This story functions metaphorically to signify the emasculated and vulnerable state of typically proud southern men following the war.

The story of Davis's capture was perhaps particularly unnerving to defeated Confederates given the war's impact on the southern gender system. Drew Gilpin Faust and LeeAnn Whites have suggested that the Confederacy's demise shook the core of southern manhood by threatening southern male patriarchy. This system was

⁵² Amy S. Greenberg, *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 11-14.

⁵³ Greenberg, 11-12, 271-275.

⁵⁴ Silber, 29-38.

predicated upon notions of male chivalry which obliged men to protect and defend white women, who, in turn, were supposed to accept their subordination. Faust and Whites have both suggested that the Confederacy's downfall resulted in—and from—the perceived failure of male chivalry.⁵⁵ While early in the war, white female devotion to the Confederacy seemed steadfast, as the war progressed, many women became increasingly frustrated with the sacrifices they were forced to make. They were fearful and resentful of their new roles as plantation supervisors, and they grew wary of sending more of their men to die or be wounded on the battlefield. While antebellum patriarchy dictated that their sacrifices would grant them reciprocal protection, their hardships went unrewarded. Faust has suggested that some began to undermine the war's cause; they demanded compensation for their efforts and even wrote to Jefferson Davis to insist that he pardon a last remaining son from enlistment.⁵⁶ Not only did white women's disillusionment suggest the failure of southern men's chivalry, but the indispensability of women's efforts implied that southern men were, in fact, dependent on women's public participation. Furthermore, their indispensable roles during the war raised questions about how their prescribed social positions might change after its close. Confederate defeat, therefore, destabilized antebellum gender roles and questioned the reliability of southern men's chivalry.

⁵⁵ Drew Gilpin Faust, *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 137; LeeAnn Whites, "Stand By Your Man: The Ladies Memorial Association and the Reconstruction of Southern White Manhood," in *Women of the American South: A Multicultural Reader*, ed. Christie Anne Farnham. (New York: New York University Press, 1997), 142.

⁵⁶ Drew Gilpin Faust, "Altars of Sacrifice: Confederate Women and the Narratives of War," *The Journal of American History* 76, no. 4 (March, 1990): 1223.

Given these traumatic subversions to deeply-entrenched idealizations of southern manhood, historians have considered various ways that Confederate veterans responded to the war and defeat. Jeffrey McClurken has suggested that the trauma of the war was beyond Confederate soldiers' abilities to cope; he has examined veteran admittances to a Virginia mental institution to suggest that some displayed symptoms now associated with post traumatic stress disorder.⁵⁷ As he readily notes, though, most veterans did not enter mental institutions; rather, they responded in other ways. Scholars have thoroughly explored one salient strategy, which was to reassert white dominance over freedmen in order to preserve racial mastery despite emancipation. Violent demonstrations of white supremacy, particularly public lynching rituals, provided one kind of reinforcement for southern white men's race-based manly ideals.⁵⁸

When emancipation forced defeated Confederates to confront questions of their race-based conceptions of manhood, many turned to their dominant positions in the southern gender hierarchy. LeeAnn Whites has argued that some veterans took solace in their domestic lives following the war because it provided a secure space to reclaim their mastery.⁵⁹ They accordingly constructed a memory of the war in which its purpose was to protect women and their domestic lives from aggressive intrusion. According to this narrative, although the Confederates were defeated, their chivalrous loyalty saved the lives of thousands of women, and to this extent, they were

⁵⁷ Jeffrey W. McClurken, *Taking Care of the Living: Reconstructing Confederate Veteran Families in Virginia* (Charlotte: University of Virginia Press, 2009), 132-133.

⁵⁸ Kris DuRocher, "Violent Masculinity: Learning Ritual and Performance in Southern Lynchings," in *Southern Masculinity: Perspectives on Manhood in the South since Reconstruction*, ed. Craig Thompson Friend. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2009), 46-64.

⁵⁹ LeeAnn Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995), 144.

successful.⁶⁰ In conjunction with this memory, they constructed a “legend of female sacrifice” which erased women’s wartime frustrations and independence and remembered them as unyieldingly devoted to their brave men.⁶¹ This narrative of the war, therefore, negated the failure of chivalry by providing veterans with restorative memories of their successful endeavors as protectors.

This constructed memory of Confederate veterans’ successful chivalry was a facet of the larger post-war southern-constructed myth of the Lost Cause, which insisted upon the righteousness of the Confederacy’s political principles. According to the Lost Cause, southerners had “lost” the war only due to fatigue and inadequate resources to counter the oppressive northern army; however, they had “won” in fighting for a just cause with undying devotion. Lost Cause proponents vehemently denied that they had fought for slavery; instead, they argued that they had defended their constitutionally-granted freedom to secede. Therefore, despite military defeat, they maintained a “war of ideas” which refused to admit wrongness of principle.⁶² In effect, the Lost Cause vindicated Confederate veterans, and confirmed their manly honor for having rightfully and “successfully” maintained their convictions.⁶³

Confederate veterans’ reunions played a vital role in the post-Civil War southern construction of the Lost Cause mythology. They were mostly organized by the United Confederate Veterans, a survivors’ association devoted to maintaining veterans’ relationships and commemorating fallen soldiers. According to

⁶⁰ Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender*, 168.

⁶¹ Faust, “Altars of Sacrifice,” 1203.

⁶² Edward Alfred Pollard, *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates* (New York: E.B. Treat, 1890), 742.

⁶³ Foster, 5; Charles Reagan Wilson, *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980), 28-29.

Confederate Veteran, the association's official monthly magazine, the UCV constitution mandated one annual large-scale reunion of all camps within the UCV, as well as an annual local reunion for each individual participating regiment.⁶⁴ As Gaines Foster has suggested, these reunions provided ritual occasions for the collective white South to disseminate the Lost Cause. A speaker at one reunion in Nashville encapsulated this outlook when he preached that "it was the cause of liberty" for which southern soldiers had fought, and that "the valor of the Confederate armies was not at fault."⁶⁵

Although reunions were certainly charged with a Lost Cause ethos, they did not function solely to promote this larger cultural memory for the general white public. A nuanced analysis of veterans' complex behaviors at reunions suggests that they also provided private spaces to construct personally-restorative memories for disoriented and possibly traumatized veterans. In fact, while Lost Cause proponents outside of reunions might have passionately discussed the constitutionality of secession, reunions were not primarily spaces to discuss the politics of the war. More frequently, veterans recalled excruciating yet glorified memories of battles; their emphasis was on personally-experienced violence rather than abstract debates of principle. Thus, veterans' recollections suggest that reunions allowed them to construct personal memories which reaffirmed their destabilized identities as able soldiers.

Confederate veterans' revivals of their idealized soldierhood took form in fervent recollections of the war. The motif of reminiscence permeated almost all

⁶⁴ *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 5 (May 1896), 169.

⁶⁵ *Confederate Veteran* 12, no. 1 (January 1905), 10.

aspects of reunions, and seemed to be the topic of most conversations. At an 1893 reunion in Georgia, the *Atlanta Constitution* reported that “the spirit of anecdote and reminiscence was rampant.”⁶⁶ Indeed, one veteran described his pleasure at “discussing the events of more than thirty years ago,” and another delighted that “the past looms up before me!”⁶⁷ The subject matter of their reminiscence was usually of specific battles, as veterans were keen to “refresh their memories over scenes and incidents of war times.”⁶⁸ Their eagerness to recall the battles indicates their desire to re-inhabit their roles as soldiers at war, this time within the safe confines of carefully staged reunions.

Within these secure spaces, veterans did not shy away from recalling the war’s gore. Their detailed and graphic reminiscences described those who “languished in hospitals—who agonized, wounded and deserted on battlefields.”⁶⁹ They remembered wounds so dire that they were “still suppurating” and ones where one could “see through [the] body.”⁷⁰ Their recollections did not obscure the horrors of the war; rather, they demonstrated an enduring preoccupation with the violence they had encountered. Instead of recoiling from these memories, veterans seemed almost consumed by them.

Veterans’ eagerness to fixate on violent memories was evident in the tone of their reminiscences. These memories seemed to be simultaneously painful and exhilarating. One speaker exemplified this dialectical memory of the war when he

⁶⁶ “Cobb and Phillips: The Reunion of Two Legions at Great Park Yesterday,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 25, 1893, 7.

⁶⁷ *Confederate Veteran* 12, no. 1 (January 1905), 22.

⁶⁸ *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 9 (September 1896), 284, 335.

⁶⁹ “Shall We Forget the War,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, June 28, 1886, 4.

⁷⁰ “The Soldier Boys,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 23, 1886, 5; *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 9 (September 1896), 284.

deemed it the most “terrible but glorious years of strife.”⁷¹ While they “fought and starved,” they also “laughed and prayed”; they “thrilled amid battle.”⁷² They rejoiced in remembering the “martial feeling with which we were inspired.”⁷³ Some of them even seemed to miss their lives of combat; one veteran exclaimed that “I dream of the army, I hear their martial tread,” while another said he “wished another war would come on so he could go for to be a soldier.”⁷⁴ For veterans who reveled in memories of combat, reunions provided “the happiest day the vets had since they once found pleasure in the very hardships they endured,”⁷⁵ and only at reunions were they in “martial ecstasy.”⁷⁶ In keeping with this penchant for combat, accounts of reunions sometimes boasted of the injuries of attending veterans. At one reunion, there were “over one hundred wounded soldiers present”; at another, seven veterans with amputated limbs “revived all the horrors of the war.”⁷⁷ Thus, reunions provided sheltered spaces to construct romanticized memories of the war which were free of physical pain and rampant with glorifications of self-sacrificing devotion. These proud recollections of violence and injury suggest these veterans’ enduring connections to traditional ideals of martial manhood.

That Confederate veterans equated the war’s violence with their manhood was at times quite explicit. For example, one speaker at a reunion told veterans that “the

⁷¹ *Confederate Veteran* 12, no. 1 (January 1905), 10.

⁷² “Shall We Forget the War,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, June 28, 1886, 4.

⁷³ “In Camp Two Days” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 21, 1894, 9; *Confederate Veteran* 3, no. 7 (July 1895), 219.

⁷⁴ *Confederate Veteran* 12, no. 1 (January 1905), 10; *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 6, 1883, 1.

⁷⁵ “Lee’s Old Army,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, April 22, 1894, 17.

⁷⁶ “Louisiana To Have a Fair Sponsor at the Confederate Veteran Reunion in Nashville,” *The Daily Picayune*, January 4, 1897, 12.

⁷⁷ “The Veterans,” *Charlotte News*, January 25, 1889, 4; “The Reunion,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 2, 1883, 7.

wounds and scars you bear...attest your manhood.”⁷⁸ Another declared that “it is in the trenches that the nation makes its supreme test for mastery.” Veterans’ revivals of violence, then, affirmed their martial manhood and masked the war’s outcome. In the absence of military victory, they broadcast graphic injuries as affirmative markers of manhood to overshadow the possibility that their debilitating struggles had been for naught.

Not only did veterans’ recollections at reunions silence questions of their martial aptitude, but they also functioned to resist threats posed by postbellum economic changes. Veterans who opposed the impact of industrialization on traditional ideals of manhood used reunions to channel their concerns. The correlation between a changing economy and shifting idealizations was encapsulated by one “deeply concerned” general who claimed that the “radical change in our industrial system has resulted necessarily in a corresponding change in the habits of our people.”⁷⁹ Another veteran similarly worried that “our people are fast departing in this materialistic age,”⁸⁰ and a third described reunions as occasions for “discussing the events of more than thirty years ago, and then cussing the present hard times.”⁸¹ Thus, in the face of their changing society, veterans escaped to the violent past in which martial manhood was still a hegemonic ideal unthreatened by post-war transformations.

Veterans’ resistance to change and their wistfulness for life in combat was also entangled in their nostalgia for youth. As the veterans aged, accounts of their

⁷⁸ “The Soldier Boys,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 23, 1886, 5.

⁷⁹ “Reunions of Southern Soldiers,” *The Sun*, July, 27, 1875, 1.

⁸⁰ *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 6 (June 1896), 176.

⁸¹ *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 9 (September 1896), 335.

reunions were replete with descriptions of gray-haired old soldiers whose steps had grown slow over time.⁸² In order to accommodate these men, the UCV attempted to “provide means for the aged and infirm to attend.”⁸³ Their deteriorating physical strength contrasted with recollections of the violence that they had once enacted. Confederate veterans’ age, in addition to the rise of a business-oriented generation, distanced them from youthful martial ideals. They therefore took solace in memories of “the war in which their young manhood was aroused.”⁸⁴ Although Confederate veterans could not escape their present realities completely, they could maintain a semblance of their martial identities “once every year [when] the civilian becomes a soldier.”⁸⁵ The desire to become a soldier once more was fulfilled not only by verbal recollection, but also by more literally embodying a soldierly persona; veterans’ physical re-creations of soldierhood afforded tangible, embodied revivals of their glorified martial experiences.

Reunions were organized to physically simulate a romanticized version of the war so that veterans might truly rehabilitate their soldierly identities. For example, to emulate the many nights spent in camp between battles, veterans’ evenings were “happily spent around the campfire.”⁸⁶ The physical environment of the campfire was intended to complement and awaken veterans’ memories, as apparently the glare of the fire helped veterans to “recall many an incident that has long been overshadowed in the background of memory.”⁸⁷ In addition to recalling stories

⁸² See, for example, *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 6, (June 1896), 173.

⁸³ “They Will Go Into Camp,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 26, 1893, 2. For an example of an advertisement for reduced rates for veterans, see *Confederate Veteran* 3, no. 4 (April 1895), 126.

⁸⁴ “The Boys in the Trenches,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 22, 1898, 6.

⁸⁵ “The Boys in the Trenches,” 6.

⁸⁶ “They Will Go Into Camp,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 26, 1893, 2.

⁸⁷ “They Will Go Into Camp,” 2.

around the fire, veterans would sing songs from the war such that “it sounded much like the echoes of the camps.”⁸⁸ The re-creation of war’s downtime provided an embodied supplement to their glorified verbal reminiscences.

In addition to sitting by the campfire, veterans engaged in other activities which re-created a war-like atmosphere. Marching, for example, was their preferred means of traveling. While veterans certainly enjoyed marching in public parades, they also marched as they journeyed to the reunion. For example, to reach the reunion site, small groups of veterans from a Georgia regiment reunion marched “over several miles of country” in order to “make it all the more like the war days.”⁸⁹ These small-scale private marches illuminate the intimate quality of these nostalgic re-creations. When veterans reached their destination, they sometimes set up tents “as they did in the days of yore.”⁹⁰ Although they did not always camp out like this, they were often known to slumber in tents and cots provided by the federal government;⁹¹ this furthered the experience of enacting sentimental memories of the war.

In addition to marching and tenting, reunions allowed veterans to revisit the battlefields where they had fought and many of their peers had died. For example, at a Georgia reunion held in the path of Sherman’s March, it was deemed wholly fitting for veterans to return to the site of “stirring scenes” and “bloody fighting.”⁹² For some, battlefields were appealing because they provided opportunities to retrace

⁸⁸ “Once More In Line,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 24, 1894, 8.

⁸⁹ “In Camp Two Days,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 21, 1894, 9.

⁹⁰ “In Camp Two Days,” 9.

⁹¹ “Evacuation of Macon Complete: Gray-Clad Veterans Depart and Decorations Coming Down,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, May 11, 1912, 3.

⁹² “In Camp Two Days,” 9.

battle logistics. On one battlefield, veterans attempted to “perfect the location of their lines” from past skirmishes.⁹³ At another reunion, a veteran missed his opportunity to address the group of veterans because he was “off locating places in the battle.”⁹⁴ This man’s departure from the group reveals that sometimes, veterans preferred to reminisce wholly in private, which further illuminates reunions’ personal dimensions.

Revisiting the sites of their original experiences especially helped to evoke martial memories. The battlefield reminded one veteran of his regiment’s dangerous flight; he reported that after “looking over the field now, it seems incredible that any should have escaped.”⁹⁵ For another, the battlefield recalled personal trauma; as he approached the battlefield where he lay wounded thirty-four years earlier, his memories “came trooping up and tears flowed momentarily.”⁹⁶ The often-emotional return to battlefields provided a physical stage to perform martial recollections. These cathartic encounters, which seemed to inspire varying reactions in veterans, illuminate the seemingly therapeutic functions of reunions’ revivals.

The simulation of a war-like atmosphere was further enhanced by the UCV’s regulations. Its constitution mandated that veterans refer to one another as comrades, an admonition which reunion-goers followed dutifully. In addition, officials within the UCV were assigned titles that mimicked army language; there were officers, lieutenant generals, major generals and brigadier generals.⁹⁷ In order to maintain this soldierly air, comrades were urged to wear a badge indicating their regiment at

⁹³ “Annual Reunion at Chattanooga,” *The Knoxville Journal*, June 25, 1889, 1.

⁹⁴ *Confederate Veteran* 3, no. 4 (April 1895), 104.

⁹⁵ *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 11 (November 1896), 363.

⁹⁶ *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 9 (September 1896), 284.

⁹⁷ *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 5 (May 1896), 169.

reunions.⁹⁸ Many veterans, such as Dr. A.H. Sneed, whose “torn and tattered pants, frayed around the feet, told of weary dragging steps on many a march,”⁹⁹ chose to wear their actual uniforms to reunions. Some camps even “required their men to wear the gray uniform at their meetings.”¹⁰⁰ If veterans no longer had their uniforms, or if they were too damaged to wear, some had newer approximations made.¹⁰¹ Re-wearing uniforms allowed veterans to complete their enactments of soldierhood.

The spirit of re-creating a martial atmosphere prompted some to use war-like metaphors to describe even the most banal details. One veteran joked that the diligence involved in planning for a reunion required “sharp shooting to make it a success.”¹⁰² In another instance, one captain’s task of enrolling each veteran by age, rank, and enlistment evoked the comment that “with the same fortitude that he bore the hardships and perils of the war, he discharged his duties until he had enrolled one hundred and thirteen names.”¹⁰³ Even the gusto with which veterans approached a barbecue was described as a “grand charge made without swords.”¹⁰⁴ These metaphors reveal the ways that veterans’ martial memories permeated their states of mind and infiltrated even their ordinary behaviors.

Reunions served veterans’ escapes to the past not only because they allowed them to re-visit uniforms, battlefields, and martial memories, but also because they provided a support system of other veterans who had similar experiences and similar needs. Veterans expressed great pleasure in reuniting with fellow comrades.

⁹⁸ *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 6 (June 1896), 173.

⁹⁹ *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 6, 1883, 1.

¹⁰⁰ “Lee’s Old Army,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, April 22, 1894, 17.

¹⁰¹ *Confederate Veteran* 9, no. 3 (March 1901), 143.

¹⁰² *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 9 (September 1896), 338.

¹⁰³ “The Reunion,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 2, 1883, 7.

¹⁰⁴ “The Reunion of Harris’ Brigade,” *Vicksburg Daily Commercial*, November 22, 1879, 2.

Accounts of reunions often referred to the opportunity to “renew the pleasures of old comradeship.”¹⁰⁵ Veterans compared their bonds to kinship, calling their meetings “reunion[s] of a company family” organized in order to “perpetuate a brotherhood”;¹⁰⁶ a reunion was a “grand love feast” in which “all were as brothers.”¹⁰⁷ Certainly these close bonds were a product of having experienced the horrors and struggles of the war together, as their difficult trials “brought men very near to each other”;¹⁰⁸ when they met “their arms [went] about each other’s necks, and the eager memories [came] thronging to their lips.”¹⁰⁹ Not only did they take solace in their common experiences and abilities to evoke each other’s memories, but they also provided reciprocal validation for one another’s martial eminence. At reunions, they were able to exhibit “the qualities which make them worthy of mutual respect and esteem.”¹¹⁰ Thus, their martial performances required communal validation from fellow comrades who corroborated these memories and provided an audience for each other’s displays. Reunions, then, allowed veterans opportunities for both martial demonstration and for the external validation that their idealized manly identities required.

Veterans’ martial displays similarly could not exist without the audience and complementary performances of white women. At reunions, displays of idealized womanhood provided essential affirmations of postbellum southern white men’s

¹⁰⁵ *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 11 (November 1896), 363.

¹⁰⁶ *Confederate Veteran* 3, no. 7 (July 1895), 219.

¹⁰⁷ *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 9 (September 1896), 284.

¹⁰⁸ “The Soldier Boys,” *The Atlanta Constitution* July 23, 1886, 5.

¹⁰⁹ *The Atlanta Constitution* June 26, 1886, 4.

¹¹⁰ “The Soldier Boys,” 4.

mastery.¹¹¹ To fulfill this essential counterpart, white girls were invited to reunions as “sponsors” who symbolized feminine subordination. Sponsors were young, unmarried and reportedly beautiful white girls who had some kinship to Confederate veterans.¹¹² They attended reunions as state representatives, and provided eclectic entertainment to demonstrate their gratitude for and dependence on soldierly white men. These young sponsors vouched for veterans’ memories of themselves as successful martial heroes.

The tradition of selecting sponsors to attend reunions developed from veterans’ collective elevation of Winnie Davis. Veterans revered Winnie, who was born at the end of the war in the Confederate White House to Jefferson Davis, whom they praised as the ultimate example of southern manhood.¹¹³ Her infancy at the war’s violent close meant that she was utterly helpless and her survival was wholly dependent upon the martial defense of southern soldiers. Her survival, then, symbolically implied that their chivalry had prevailed, and her public role following the war sustained this sentiment. She became an avid proponent of the Lost Cause and attended veterans’ reunions to bow, shake hands and demonstrate her gratitude for the soldiers, who were usually “struggling to get near enough to pat her hand and weeping as they touched it.”¹¹⁴ Veterans’ emotional responses to Davis at reunions inspired the tradition of inviting other young white southern girls to serve as sponsors.

¹¹¹ Racial dominance was much more difficult to physically perform at reunions because few freedmen attended. On rare occasions, there were reports of former slaves who accompanied their masters to the meetings. See, for example, “Cobb and Phillips: the Reunion of Two Legions at Great Park Yesterday,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 25, 1893, 7; “The Soldier Boys,” *The Atlanta Constitution* July 23, 1886, 5.

¹¹² William Bledsoe Philpott, *The Sponsor Souvenir Album and the History of United Confederate Veterans’ Reunion, 1895* (Houston: Sponsor Souvenir Company, 1895), 12.

¹¹³ Foster, 97.

¹¹⁴ Philpot, 56.

Sponsors' presentations for veterans varied, but usually involved a recitation. They would make a speech, prepare a poem, or sing a song. Sometimes the pieces were original, and sometimes they were old southern favorites which usually emphasized soldierly attributes. For example, Miss Annie Gorman, representing Alabama, sang the popular "The Bonnie Blue Flag" at one 1895 reunion; she delighted veterans with her cheer for "our Confederacy, strong we are and brave."¹¹⁵ Their performances also implied that soldiers had fought in defense of women's livelihood, as when Miss M. Ferguson's poetic tribute thanked veterans for "fighting our homes to save."¹¹⁶ These tributes could sometimes be dramatic: Miss Lydia Kirk, apparently overcome with emotion, abandoned her prepared presentation to a veteran and "threw her arms around the old man's neck, kissed him and melted down in tears."¹¹⁷ These theatrical displays emphasized sponsors' gratitude and vulnerability, thus affirming the necessity of veterans' martial defense; as one reunion speaker told veterans, they functioned to "reward [their] scars."¹¹⁸

Veterans received sponsors' tributes with great enthusiasm. They were described with a particular fondness as "the most interesting feature of the reunion," and the sponsors themselves were called "the pets of the army of old soldiers."¹¹⁹ They evoked overflowing emotion in veterans, who responded like a "gang of blubbering old fools."¹²⁰ At one reunion, they were described as "bringing tears to a

¹¹⁵ Philpott, 178-9.

¹¹⁶ *Confederate Veteran* 1, no. 6 (June 1893), 165.

¹¹⁷ Philpott, 59.

¹¹⁸ "Mr. Lucian L. Knight Introduces Sponsors," *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 22, 1898, 8.

¹¹⁹ "Widows of Confederates and Daughters of South," *Lexington Herald*, May 24, 1913, 8; "Lee's Old Army," *The Atlanta Constitution*, April 22, 1894, 17.

¹²⁰ Philpott, 59.

thousand eyes and causing them to rise and yell.”¹²¹ In addition to their performances of devotion, veterans appreciated the opportunity to “recount in the presence of [their] wives...the thrilling incidents of [their] eventful soldiering.”¹²² These comments suggest that veterans required a feminine audience for their re-creations of combat, which they found in the presence of women and in sponsors who symbolized the necessity of martial chivalry.

The responsibility of selecting sponsors fell upon UCV officials. One criterion was that they be of Confederate kinship in order to represent the generation of women for whom veterans had fought.¹²³ Another deciding factor seemed to be their appearance; physical descriptions of sponsors at reunions suggest that sponsors were necessarily beautiful. They were sometimes portrayed exclusively in terms of their looks: Miss Adah Vinson had a “perfect complexion and rich auburn hair,” while Miss Annie MacDougal was “slender and exceedingly graceful.”¹²⁴ The absence of detail about other qualities suggests that veterans required an idyllic femininity to offset their own idealized manly rituals. This complementary relationship between veterans’ martial manhood and sponsors’ femininity was subtly evident in their rhetoric, which paired descriptions of sponsors with references to southern gentlemen. For example, one speaker declared that their “fair sisterhood attest the love in which they hold...the knights in gray.”¹²⁵ In another instance, a young sponsor was selected by a “chivalrous general.”¹²⁶ These rhetorical

¹²¹ “Georgia Woman Made Address,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, May 9, 1901, 3.

¹²² “On the Ground: The Dinner and the Speeches in the Afternoon,” *Wheeling West Virginia*, September 24, 1886, 4.

¹²³ “Widows of Confederates and Daughters of South,” *Lexington Herald*, May 24, 1913, 8.

¹²⁴ “Lee’s Old Army,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, April 22, 1894, 17.

¹²⁵ “Mr. Lucian L. Knight Introduces Sponsors,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 22, 1898, 8.

¹²⁶ Philpott, 262.

associations reiterate the reciprocal connection between veterans' identities as martial men and sponsors' corresponding womanhood.

One sponsor's affirmation of her father's strength at an 1895 reunion in Houston is especially telling of the personal affirmation veterans gleaned from these symbolic performances. General Wheeler, whose regiment was defeated by Sherman's troops, attended the reunion with his daughter, Annie. In a theatrical recreation of his capture, General Wheeler, "accompanied by his daughter, marched in front of fellow veterans for two hours." He was "captured at last by his old Texas rangers," and his daughter "felt proud, indeed."¹²⁷ Although Wheeler's performance recalled his military defeat, his daughter still celebrated his soldierly bearing. Her presence, then, helped to construct a personal memory of the war in which his chivalrous soldierhood had successfully protected his vulnerable dependents. Her accompaniment thus symbolized her gratitude for and endorsement of his martial virtue despite defeat.

If sponsors represented veterans' constructed memories in which their chivalry prevailed, they effectively erased memories of white women's struggles during the war. Sponsors did not recall their own mothers' hardships; the emphasis of their presentations was on the trials and bravery of veterans. Reunions' references to the southern woman's war experience adhered closely to constructed narratives of female devotion that recalled "deeds of sympathy, mercy and loving kindness."¹²⁸ Any mention of their suffering did not compare to the kind of gory detail given to veterans' wartime remembrances, and sponsors did not offer presentations that

¹²⁷ Philpott, 31.

¹²⁸ Philpott, 4.

recalled female disillusionment during the war. The absence of such representations allowed for a narrative in which Confederate veterans' martial manhood succeeded without the help of independent women. It was fitting that sponsors were often teenagers; this meant that they had little or no personal experience of the difficulties that white women had faced during the war. They represented a generation that lacked memories of failed chivalry and provided martial manhood with a ringing endorsement.

On a few occasions, women's wartime struggles were recalled. If reunion speakers referred to women's hardships at all, it was always in relation to their devotion to soldiers. If they "starved at home," it was in order to "send their scanty food to the army."¹²⁹ At one reunion, sponsors acted in a historical tableaux of the war in which they "were seen working busily for the soldiers." This portrayal was deemed "exceedingly pathetic," implying regret that women had been forced to depart from their idealized roles.¹³⁰ No mention was made of women's disillusionment or their efforts to undermine the southern front, and therefore there was little hint of notions of veterans' shortcomings.

The starving struggles of white women during the war were rewritten in another ritual of the reunion, which was the requisite barbecue. Descriptions of veterans' meals were often interspersed in accounts of reunions, with an emphasis on their lavishness. One reunion's "prodigal spread" was so abundant that even after everyone had eaten, "a thousand more could have been fed."¹³¹ Another account

¹²⁹ Philpott, 218.

¹³⁰ "Lee's Old Army," *The Atlanta Constitution*, April 22, 1894, 17.

¹³¹ "A Great Day at Cordele," *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 6, 1896, 3.

made note of the “sixty carcasses” prepared for veterans.¹³² These extravagant meals perhaps compensated for the starvation that both veterans and women at home had suffered during the war. Many of the feasts were prepared by the wives and daughters of veterans, and the abundance of food was juxtaposed to the near starvation they had once experienced. Therefore, in the reunions’ version of the war, veterans could provide and nobody would go hungry.

The presence of women at reunions was necessary to support veterans’ martial self-fashioning, but it also perhaps added an air of moral integrity. Religious morality and white southern manhood had a complex relationship, but evangelicalism was significant to many veterans who had experienced religious awakenings during the war in the face of overwhelming death and disease.¹³³ Traditionally, however, nineteenth-century southern religious ideals contradicted displays of manhood; evangelicalism’s values of self-control, humility, and sobriety opposed white southern men’s propensity for aggression and assertiveness, which notoriously emerged in their drunken leisure.¹³⁴ Gradually, evangelicalism and southern manhood found ways of accommodating one another. For example, to appeal to southern men, preachers began to frame spreading the gospel as a type of spiritual warfare, and conceded that fighting was acceptable in cases of self-defense.¹³⁵ Though tensions persisted, evangelicalism amongst white southern men increased in the latter half of the nineteenth century, in part as a result of soldiers’ revivals.

¹³² “Face to Face,” *The Atlantic Constitution*, July 27, 1886, 2.

¹³³ Drew Gilpin Faust, “Christian Soldiers: The Meaning of Revivalism in the Confederate Army,” *Journal of Southern History* 53, no.1 (February, 1987): 63-90; Ted Ownby, *Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, and Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press), ix.

¹³⁴ Ownby, 12.

¹³⁵ Christine Leigh Heyrman, *Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 206-252.

Women's relationship to evangelicalism, on the other hand, was less contentious; their domesticity made them seemingly less sinful than men, and the church provided one of the first arenas for their public participation.¹³⁶ Women's presence at reunions perhaps validated the view that veterans' martial displays were not akin to other sinful recreations, but had profound meanings.

The desire to invoke divine approbation was clear in reunions' rituals. Reunion events usually commenced with a prayer, performed either by a veteran or by a chaplain. The forty-fourth Georgia regiment's 1892 reunion, for example, began with a rendition of "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name," and another speaker at an 1895 reunion addressed veterans as "Christian knights."¹³⁷ Veterans also maintained the Christian moral air of reunions by broadcasting their sobriety. Accounts of reunions often specifically noted an absence of drunkenness, as when it was reported that "no beer or any intoxicating stimulants of any kind were seen on the grounds."¹³⁸ Such assertions of morality negated the possibility of equating veterans' reunions with other kinds of immoral manly recreations and confirmed that their martial expressions had "sacred purposes."¹³⁹ Furthermore, these religious components recalled the wartime evangelical revivals which had provided soldiers with comfort in the face of immense hardship. Religion at reunions, then, contributed to veterans' favorable memories of the war, and provided moral legitimacy to their martial manhood.

¹³⁶ Heyrman, 161-167.

¹³⁷ "The Forty-Fourth Georgia," *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 18, 1892, 3; Philpott, 48.

¹³⁸ "Cobb and Phillips: The Reunion of Two Legions At Great Park Yesterday," *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 25, 1893, 7.

¹³⁹ *Confederate Veteran* 3, no. 4 (April 1895), 97.

The opportunity to enact “sacred” memories of their idealized martial identities, if just for a weekend, untarnished by defeat, failure, or socioeconomic change, was treasured by Confederate veterans. As one speaker described, “their pleasures...were few, and a reunion was a supreme pleasure.”¹⁴⁰ Veterans looked forward to these reunions with great anticipation. They took solace “that each year may flash the sunshine of pleasant anticipation of the coming one”;¹⁴¹ they approached them with “heart elated and filled with dream of pleasure.”¹⁴² These were “the most joyous days of [their] lives.”¹⁴³ However, as much as these veterans loved reunions’ reaffirmation of past ideals, they were not immune to contemporary processes. Changes in the South inevitably penetrated their reunions to suggest the impossibility of truly reproducing their romanticized version of the past.

Although they may not have acknowledged it, veterans’ reunions were not unaffected by external changes in the economy. Emerging businesses realized that these popular reunions had potential for profit and began to produce reunion-related products. They provided mock uniforms for veterans whose ensembles had worn out, and badges made to order for veterans who wished to distinguish themselves from other regiments.¹⁴⁴ Railroad companies also attempted to profit from Confederate reunions; for example, the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway boasted that its route passed by “that portion of Virginia where the exciting scenes of the early sixties transpired on the battlefields.” The company even created a map that located the

¹⁴⁰ “Louisiana To Have a Fair Sponsor at the Confederate Veteran Reunion in Nashville,” *The Daily Picayune*, January 4, 1897, 12.

¹⁴¹ *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 9 (September 1896), 335.

¹⁴² *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 9 (September 1896), 284.

¹⁴³ *Confederate Veteran* 3, no. 7 (April 1895), 219.

¹⁴⁴ J.F. Shipp, for example, was a prominent company to reproduce approximations of Confederate uniforms. *Confederate Veteran* 9, no. 3 (March 1900), 143.

battlefields it passed, and alleged that it was the most “authentic one in existence.”¹⁴⁵ The qualification of this map as “authentic” is especially indicative of the external forces affecting reunions. The idea of “authenticity” at reunions is seemingly inappropriate; veterans did not need to validate their authenticity as Civil War soldiers because they had actually been Civil War soldiers. The notion of authenticity, in fact, reflected ideas from the emerging industrial economy: concerns of authenticity at the end of the nineteenth century were linked to anxieties about the anonymity of modernity and the mass-production of industrialization.¹⁴⁶ Therefore, the economic changes which threatened martial manhood’s hegemony inevitably infiltrated the spaces veterans had carved out to securely perform their ideals.

Subtle details such as a railroad’s claims to authentic maps reveal the impossibility of reproducing the antebellum social order in the face of a changing social and economic landscape. Veterans’ re-creations were inevitably products of the present, much like their idealized war memories. While they could not successfully preserve antebellum southern manhood intact, ideals of martial virtue persevered in other ways. In fact, at the end of the nineteenth century, these ideals received a resurrection nation-wide: as historians of manhood have suggested, America’s increasingly industrialized landscape which had once inspired the idealized Self-Made Man soon produced a disillusioned reaction. As machines replaced bodies and men’s domestic dominance was perceptibly diminished by long hours spent in the workplace, a “crisis of manhood” inspired a shift of ideals which

¹⁴⁵ *Confederate Veteran* 4, no. 6 (June 1896), 196.

¹⁴⁶ Miles Orville, *The Real Thing: Imitation and Authenticity in American Culture, 1880-1940* (Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 155.

emphasized virile physicality in addition to Self-Made virtues.¹⁴⁷ Whereas northern men had once scoffed at southerners' crudeness, they now revitalized images of the martial southern man, whose virtues were revived by southern soldiers' competent participation in the Spanish-American War.¹⁴⁸ This endorsement of southern manhood was accompanied by a new-found reverence for the idealized southern woman, whose appealing femininity was represented in contrast to northern women's increased rejection of Victorian ideals of womanhood.¹⁴⁹ Therefore, while the chivalrous, honor-bound, and communal-based ideals of martial antebellum southern manhood may not have persisted in their full-fledged forms, they were by no means erased from the nation's cultural consciousness.

In 1915, a different performance of the Civil War provided an endorsement of southern aggressive masculinity and cemented veterans' personal memories deeply within the public imagination. D.W. Griffith's *The Birth of a Nation*, a film which encapsulated white national unity at the expense of blacks and depicted Reconstruction as a regrettable mistake, put Lost Cause ideology at the center of a powerful tale of national origins.¹⁵⁰ Griffith's technically-innovative film, based on Thomas Dixon's novel, *The Clansman*, tells the story of two families, the northern Stonemans and the southern Camerons, who become tragically pitted against one another in the war. The war's violence is depicted in great detail, as Griffith was

¹⁴⁷ Kimmel, 169-170; Gail Bederman, *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), 14-15. T.J. Jackson Lears has similarly considered this period as defined by a "martial antimodernism." See T.J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994), 137.

¹⁴⁸ Silber, 12.

¹⁴⁹ Silber, 86-87.

¹⁵⁰ *The Birth of the Nation*, DVD. Directed by D.W. Griffith. 1915, Big Bear Lake, California: David W. Griffith Corp and Epoch Producing Corporation.

reportedly obsessed with attaining complete historical accuracy and even invoked the expert opinions of Civil War veterans to provide official stamps of approval.¹⁵¹ One of the most stirring battle scenes portrays southerner Ben Cameron, offering water to his fallen northern “brother” before succeeding in his struggle to raise a war-torn Confederate flag.¹⁵² In this depiction, the war’s overall violence is personalized and romanticized in the bravery and compassion of this southern soldier.

In its depiction of Reconstruction and the postbellum South, *The Birth of a Nation* glorified southern white men’s violence as heroic and necessary. Following the war, black southerners emerge as crazed devils, drunk on their own freedom and terrorizing white southern women. Ben’s heroism triumphs once more when he leads the “white knights” of the Ku Klux Klan in violently eradicating dangerous blacks and saving white women, and in particular his love, Elsie, from their aggressors. Thus, much like Confederate veterans’ reunions, this hugely popular film provided a performance in which southern martial virtue was necessitated by white women’s vulnerability. Its popularity transcended regional boundaries; it was most commercially successful in northern and western cities.¹⁵³ In addition, its revised version of history was deemed astoundingly accurate by academic historians, including President Woodrow Wilson, whose *A History of the American People* is referenced in one scene.¹⁵⁴ Thus, *The Birth of a Nation* cemented a nation-wide idealized image of the martial and heroic eminence of southern white men. Its

¹⁵¹ Brian Steel Will, *Gone with the Glory: The Civil War in Cinema* (Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2007), 13.

¹⁵² Jenny Barrett, *Shooting the Civil War: Cinema, History and American National Identity* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2009), 133.

¹⁵³ Gary W. Gallagher, *Causes Won, Lost and Forgotten: How Hollywood & Popular Art Shape What We Know about the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 43.

¹⁵⁴ Gallagher, 116.

premiere, which coincided with the war's semi-centennial and its Reconciliationist battle reenactment, helped to transform southern veterans' personally-restorative memories of the war into an officially-sanctioned and nationally-accepted historical narrative.

Chapter Two
“A Splendid Example of Sterling Womanhood”: The Costumed Orations of
Mildred Lewis Rutherford

On February 12, 1914, Mildred Lewis Rutherford stood in the chancel of an Atlanta, Georgia chapel to deliver her latest speech, “Georgia: The Empire State of the South.” In this lecture, she extolled the martial virtue and chivalry of Confederate veterans with “undisputed authority,” and was welcomed with applause from her audience.¹⁵⁵ Rutherford was accustomed to this kind of response; as historian general of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, she was treated with great respect and admired for her many publications and speeches which glorified the Old South. She was especially celebrated for the theatricality of her presentations: she had the habit of orating in the anachronistic costume of an antebellum plantation mistress. This exhibitionist costume marked her speeches as a kind of dramatic reenactment of a romanticized past, whose ideals she feared were being displaced by lamentable postbellum southern changes. Her emphatic warnings about fading ideals indicated personal anxieties about social change akin to those of Confederate veterans. Like veterans’ therapeutic simulations of martial manhood, Rutherford’s costumed orations afforded a personally-restorative vehicle to connect her identity to romanticized memories of the antebellum South. The personal significance of her self-fashioning becomes clear within the context of the ideological content articulated in her speeches and publications.

As historian general of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, Rutherford produced a plethora of addresses and pamphlets which contributed to the

¹⁵⁵ “Georgia’s Great Historian,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, June 6, 1915, A4.

dissemination of the Lost Cause versions of the war and the antebellum South. The UDC, founded in 1894, played a central role in the construction of this myth, in part by venerating Confederate veterans, decorating soldiers' gravestones, and erecting monuments to honor the Confederacy and its defenders.¹⁵⁶ The UDC's agenda, which built upon the efforts of local ladies' memorial associations, transformed the landscape of the South from one of desolate post-war destruction to a topography of tributes to fallen heroes.¹⁵⁷ The UDC further established a collective memory for white southerners by educating younger generations about the righteousness of the Confederacy and the 'true' history of the South. They sought to ensure youth's deference to Confederate veterans by displaying portraits of Robert E. Lee and Jefferson Davis throughout southern schools, and were involved in producing textbooks that broadcast Lost Cause tenets.¹⁵⁸ Rutherford led the UDC in writing acceptable textbooks, creating Children of the Confederacy chapters, and sponsoring youth essay contests about the glory of the Confederacy.¹⁵⁹

Rutherford's overarching goal was to educate southerners about their 'true' history, which she broadcast as one of unflinching eminence. This project was, in part, a response to her perception that the younger generation did not exhibit loyalty to the Confederacy. In a 1915 speech, Rutherford painfully recalled a boy who approached

¹⁵⁶ Karen L. Cox, *The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2003), especially 49-72, 93-117.

¹⁵⁷ The UDC's predecessor, the Ladies' Memorial Association, was responsible for collecting fallen Confederate soldiers, giving them proper burials, and creating an annual Confederate memorial day. See Caroline E. Janney, *Burying the Dead But Not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 2-4, 57-60, 127.

¹⁵⁸ James McPherson, "Long-Legged Yankee Lies: The Southern Textbook Crusade," in *The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture*, eds. Alice Fahs and Joan Waugh. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press), 64-79; Charles Reagan Wilson, *Baptized in Blood: the Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920*. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980), 25.

¹⁵⁹ Fred Arthur Bailey, "Mildred Lewis Rutherford and the Patrician Cult of the Old South." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 78, no. 3 (Fall 1994): 521.

her and suggested that his deceased Confederate father “would have regretted having fought on the wrong side,” to which she responded that it was more likely that he “would regret having a son so disloyal to the principles for which he was willing to die.”¹⁶⁰ According to Rutherford, southern youth’s treachery was a product of northern education; the northern monopoly on textbook production and the tendency to send “Southern boys to Harvard” was generating an ignorant and ungrateful youth that threatened the older generation’s efforts to construct a sentimentalized memory of the antebellum South.¹⁶¹ Rutherford’s prolific pen and her regular speechmaking were efforts to rectify this crime, and she urged her fellow UDC members to aid her in promoting a favorable southern history.¹⁶²

Rutherford constructed a history of the South that closely followed a Lost Cause narrative of the Confederacy’s righteousness: Rutherford’s 1914 “Wrongs of History Righted” thoroughly outlines the prelude to the war and portrays the South as diplomatic in the face of an increasingly aggressive North. According to this history, although the federal government passed tariff acts that unfairly favored the North over the South, the South peacefully acquiesced. Although the Compromise of 1850 unconstitutionally violated states’ rights, the South “passed it in the interest of peace.”¹⁶³ After repeated constitutional violations, Abraham Lincoln’s presidential ‘steal’ finally forced the South to “peacefully withdraw and form a government which

¹⁶⁰ Mildred Lewis Rutherford, “Historical Sins of Omission and Commission,” (originally delivered on October 22, 1915), in *Four Addresses* (Birmingham: The Mildred Lewis Rutherford Historical Circle, 1916), 114.

¹⁶¹ Rutherford, “The South in the Building of the Nation,” (originally delivered on November 14, 1912), in *Four Addresses*, 3; Rutherford, “Wrongs of History Righted,” (originally delivered on November 13, 1914), in *Four Addresses*, 49. Rutherford’s complaints were grounded in some truth; before 1900, nine out of ten leading United States history textbooks were produced in the North. See McPherson, “Long-Legged Yankee Lies,” 67.

¹⁶² Rutherford, “The South in the Building of the Nation,” 4.

¹⁶³ Rutherford, “Wrongs of History Righted,” 55.

would respect their rights.”¹⁶⁴ This thorough outline presented a proud history in which veterans fought for a just and righteous cause.

Although Rutherford’s summary of the prelude to the Civil War reiterated Lost Cause ideology, she denounced the label as fallacious. She lectured that “the cause for which the Confederate soldier fought was in no sense a ‘Lost Cause,’ but a great VICTORY which will go sounding down the ages”;¹⁶⁵ not only was the South righteous in its cause, but it was ultimately victorious for having defended it. As proof of victory, Rutherford pointed out that “monuments are not usually erected to the defeated.”¹⁶⁶ Her narrative constructed the Confederacy as triumphant despite its actual defeat and preserved a memory of southern honor.

Rutherford did not claim such literal victory in all of her speeches; yet even when she referred to Confederate defeat, she silenced notions of shame or humiliation. Emphasizing enormous disparities in numbers between North and South, she recounted, for example, how “it took a naval fleet and 15,000 men to advance upon 100 Confederates at Fort Henry.”¹⁶⁷ Therefore, it was the logistical impossibility of victory, and not the fault of southern soldiers that led to defeat. The true greatness of these soldiers stemmed from the fact that despite impossible odds, no other army “in the annals of history...recorded such devotion to duty and principles.” They persevered through storms without proper clothes, and through thorns without proper shoes. Finally, they were forced to “surrender like heroes.”¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁴ Rutherford, “Wrongs of History Righted,” 57.

¹⁶⁵ Rutherford, “The Civilization of the Old South: What Made It: What Destroyed It: What Has Replaced It,” originally delivered on November 9, 1916. (Athens: The McGregor Co. Printers, 1916), 45.

¹⁶⁶ Rutherford, “The Civilization of the Old South,” 45.

¹⁶⁷ Rutherford, “The South in the Building of the Nation,” 13.

¹⁶⁸ Rutherford, “The South in the Building of the Nation,” 13.

Yet despite surrender, she boasted that the Confederate veteran was “the highest type of patriot” for having “saved [his] country’s honor.”¹⁶⁹ In Rutherford’s version of history, Confederate veterans starred as heroes for their unyielding devotion to principle.

Rutherford’s tale of southern eminence was ascribed to southern men throughout history. In “Thirteen Periods of United States History,” she provided a thorough study of southerners who played significant roles in America’s origins. The list of important men is seemingly endless: it was a southern man who “organized the first troops for American independence...who proposed that Congress be divided...who wrote the Constitution.”¹⁷⁰ She proudly described how the country had expanded during the presidencies of southern men, including Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, Polk and Taylor, and how southerners comprised two-thirds of the troops who fought in the Mexican War.¹⁷¹ In Rutherford’s comprehensive historical narrative, southern men were responsible for the development of the United States. This historical revision far exceeded that of the Lost Cause to suggest that not only were southern veterans heroic in their devotion to duty, but they descended from a line of remarkable men.

Rutherford’s construction of the South’s historical eminence similarly silenced doubts about southern righteousness. Furthermore, she argued that despite any hardships faced during and following the war, southern greatness had prevailed. She pointed to the restorative power of the Spanish-American war, which allowed

¹⁶⁹ Rutherford, “The South in the Building of the Nation,” 6, 40.

¹⁷⁰ Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods of United States History,” (originally delivered November 21, 1912), in *Four Addresses*, 25-28.

¹⁷¹ Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods,” 33.

“the South to realize her own powers.”¹⁷² In her typical oratorical style, Rutherford listed the accomplishments of southern men in this more recent war: it was a southern man who “fired the first shot of the war...who shed the first blood...who was the first to fall in battle.”¹⁷³ The record of these men demonstrated that the “boys of the South equaled in courage and heroism the boys of the North.”¹⁷⁴ Thus, the glorified ideals of southern men’s martial valor were perpetuated in Rutherford’s history of the Spanish-American war.¹⁷⁵

Rutherford’s glorification of traditional martial ideals was complemented by her sentimentalized memory of the white antebellum southern lifestyle. She recalled the Old South as a “picture of contentment,” and often went into great detail about past luxuries (“I can taste those waffles now. My, how delicious they were!”).¹⁷⁶ She described hunting parties, charades, tournaments and balls, and invited veterans to join in reliving these glorious days by asking, “veterans, didn’t we have a good time when hog killing time came!”¹⁷⁷ Just as Rutherford silenced memories of a shameful defeat in the war, she similarly erased any contentious history in her romanticized descriptions of a lifestyle that was, in fact, a reality for a minority of southerners. This selective memory was possible due to the privileged social position that she inherited.

Rutherford was born into the southern slave-holding elite; her grandfather had owned approximately two hundred slaves, and her uncles, Thomas and Howell

¹⁷² Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods,” 41.

¹⁷³ Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods,” 41-2.

¹⁷⁴ Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods,” 42.

¹⁷⁵ This comparison was especially pertinent given the traditional antagonism between idealizations of northern and southern manhood, as exemplified in northern newspapers’ representations of a hoop-skirted Jefferson Davis.

¹⁷⁶ Rutherford, “The Civilization of the Old South,” 7-12.

¹⁷⁷ Rutherford, “The Civilization of the Old South,” 14.

Cobb, were prominent Confederate leaders.¹⁷⁸ The South that she recalled was romantic and worry-free, especially for southern white women. Rutherford's personal model for ideal womanhood was her mother, who devoted herself to 'the Cause' by sewing Confederate uniforms and dutifully offering her son as a soldier. In addition, following the war, her mother became president of the Ladies' Memorial Association in Athens, Georgia.¹⁷⁹ Her experiences seemed to epitomize the Confederate "legend of female sacrifice" that sponsors at reunions performed for veterans' validation.¹⁸⁰ Rutherford was influenced by her mother's emblematic womanhood, as evidenced by her childhood war efforts to knit, sew, and make bandages for Confederate soldiers.¹⁸¹

The importance of traditional southern womanhood was a recurring theme in Rutherford's speeches. For Rutherford, the southern woman's social position was yet another quality that rendered the South superior. Just as veterans' valor and ancestry signified preeminence, Rutherford taught that "deference to woman has always heretofore been a distinguishing characteristic of the Southern people." As young sponsors exemplified at reunions, this southern womanhood was supported by male chivalry; Rutherford prized chivalry as "that which sweetened Southern life," and

¹⁷⁸ Sarah H. Case, "The Historical Ideology of Mildred Lewis Rutherford: A Confederate Historian's New South Creed," *Journal of Southern History* 67, no. 3 (August 2002): 604; Virginia Pettigrew Clare, *Thunder and Stars* (Georgia: Oglethorpe University Press, 1941), 80.

¹⁷⁹ Clare, 71, 114.

¹⁸⁰ As noted in the first chapter, this narrative served to veil the discontent of southern women, many of whom attempted to undermine the Confederate cause in order to end the war. It thus negated the failure of southern male chivalry. Drew Gilpin Faust, "Altars of Sacrifice: Confederate Women and the Narratives of War," *Journal of American History* 76, no. 4 (March 1990): 1203; Faust, *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 234-248.

¹⁸¹ Clare, 74.

described how southern men were the “champions of the women.”¹⁸² Her rhetorical reminders of old southern chivalry, coupled with her exaltations of Confederate martial success, offered a narrative of the war similar to the one that emerged at reunions: in fighting the war, veterans had upheld male chivalry and fulfilled their vital roles as women’s champions.

Alongside her emphasis on male chivalry, Rutherford upheld the myth of female devotion that apparently reciprocated veterans’ struggles. Recalling the efforts of women like her mother, she described southern women’s allegiance to returning soldiers. When dejected veterans returned from the war, their women lovingly assured them that “it was better that you fought, even if you did not win, than never to have fought at all. The South is going to come out all right.”¹⁸³

Rutherford also boasted that when veterans could not legally participate in commemorating the Confederacy immediately following the war, women undertook the task of erecting monuments throughout the South.¹⁸⁴ Thus, while southern men were responsible for women’s protection, women were responsible for pledging their continued devotion in order to maintain men’s morale and the idyllic gender system of the Old South. Much like performances at reunions, Rutherford’s narrative erased past realities of female discontent with wartime hardships.

Rutherford’s pining for sentimentalized old southern gender dynamics was inextricably linked to her nostalgia for slavery. True to dominant white supremacist memories of the mythologized Old South, the picture she painted of slavery was one of joyous slaves and benevolent slaveholders. She argued that slavery had vastly

¹⁸² Rutherford, “The Civilization of the Old South,” 42, 20.

¹⁸³ Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods,” 37-38.

¹⁸⁴ Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods,” 38.

benefited slaves by both Christianizing them and offering them material comfort. According to Rutherford, slaveholders had ensured that “all was done in regard to health, neatness, cleanliness, and comfort” and that “the negro under the civilization of the Old South has been greatly blessed.”¹⁸⁵ She described slaves as perfectly content people whose “joyous laughter resounded far and near.”¹⁸⁶ According to this romanticized description, the slave “adored the master, his wife and their children and they returned this love.”¹⁸⁷ Masters’ benevolent care for slaves “found them greatly in debt on account of liberality to their slaves.”¹⁸⁸ She even went so far as to say that “under the institution of slavery the negro was the free man and the slaveholder was the slave.”¹⁸⁹ In return for this benevolence, she asserted that blacks “owe[d] the slaveholders a debt of gratitude.”¹⁹⁰ In this harmonious depiction of slavery, slaves’ contented dependence on their masters reaffirmed the righteousness of white southern men’s racial mastery.

Rutherford’s prime example of the ideal southern man was Jefferson Davis. She extolled his martial abilities by calling him a “brave soldier” who had proven himself in the Mexican-American War.¹⁹¹ She applauded his moral uprightness, saying that he cared graciously for his slaves, who “were devoted to him...even after they were free.”¹⁹² For Rutherford, his character was revealed in the quality of his relationships with women. As a husband, he was “thoughtful, loving, never omitting

¹⁸⁵ Rutherford, “What Has the Negro Meant to the South? What Has the South Meant to the Negro?” *Miss Rutherford’s Scrapbook* 3 (October 1925), 1 and 7.

¹⁸⁶ Rutherford, “What Has the Negro Meant to the South?” 3.

¹⁸⁷ Rutherford, “What Has the Negro Meant to the South?” 4.

¹⁸⁸ Rutherford, “Civilization of the Old South,” 18 and 20.

¹⁸⁹ Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods,” 34.

¹⁹⁰ Rutherford, “What Has the Negro Meant to the South?” 1.

¹⁹¹ Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods,” 66.

¹⁹² Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods,” 66.

the little courtesies of life, never unjust, ungentlemanly or rude.”¹⁹³ In addition, he had a “loving, devoted Christian mother,” who had raised him to harbor pious instincts.¹⁹⁴ Indeed, his mother had fulfilled her proper role as an example of morality to produce a “true follower of Christ whom he acknowledged publicly as his savior.”¹⁹⁵ Thus, for Rutherford, Davis’s perfected embodiment of martial, pious and masterful southern manhood necessarily existed in correlation to dutiful womanhood.

As a foil for Davis’s perfect manhood, Rutherford described the shortcomings of Abraham Lincoln: he was dishonest, inhumane and, in fact, he “hated the negroes and the negroes hated him.”¹⁹⁶ His unseemliness was exemplified by his impiety: Lincoln was an “unbeliever” who “had no Christian faith to sustain him.”¹⁹⁷ His sacrilege could be traced to his upbringing; because his mother died when he was young, he had nobody to “show him the instincts of a true gentleman.”¹⁹⁸ His “unpleasant” relationship to his wife also indicated his crudeness, as did his tendency to tell “vulgar jokes in the presence of ladies.”¹⁹⁹ This portrayal of Lincoln’s unmanly inadequacies subverted his posthumous glorification and conversely elevated southern men and their dedicated women.

Rutherford’s condemnation of Lincoln was paralleled by her scathing critique of northern treatment of former slaveholders following the war. According to Rutherford, the North’s gravest infraction was forced and immediate emancipation.

¹⁹³ Rutherford, “Contrasted Lives of Jefferson Davis and Abraham Lincoln,” *Miss Rutherford’s Historical Notes, Formerly Scrapbook* 6 (June 1927), 2.

¹⁹⁴ Rutherford, “Contrasted Lives,” 65.

¹⁹⁵ Rutherford, “Contrasted Lives,” 1. As seen at reunions, piety was another quality that idealized southern men boasted; because it was commonly believed that men were more susceptible to sin than women, good women were thought to be responsible for setting a Christian example.

¹⁹⁶ Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods,” 67.

¹⁹⁷ Rutherford, “Contrasted Lives,” 3; Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods,” 66.

¹⁹⁸ Rutherford, “Contrasted Lives,” 3.

¹⁹⁹ Rutherford, “Contrasted Lives,” 8.

Despite her depictions of slavery as a beneficent institution, she argued that the South had had plans for gradual emancipation. Had slaves been freed gradually, the South would have had “no race problems to adjust.”²⁰⁰ However, northern-imposed emancipation and Reconstruction had created deep antagonisms. She argued that they were unconstitutional and humiliating to the South, and that slaveholders should have been compensated for their post-emancipation economic losses. Despite this apparent injustice, Rutherford proclaimed that former slaveholders had ultimately prospered, which proved “what an incubus slavery was upon the slaveholder.”²⁰¹ Although she ultimately deemed former slaveholders better off financially, she still lamented post-war southern cultural developments.

Rutherford claimed that unlike white slaveholders, freedmen had become morally, physically, and religiously weaker after emancipation.²⁰² Under “false advisers” from the North, they had become resentful of white southerners, and the “more education the negro receive[d] the more ungrateful he [became].”²⁰³ She alleged that racial turmoil was truly a product of northern interference because most freedmen did not desire social equality. Under slavery, they had been “the happiest set of people on the face of the globe.” However, immediate freedom had transformed them into violent and crazy drunks, as portrayed in *The Birth of a Nation*.²⁰⁴ Furthermore, the effects of emancipation not only harmed freedmen, but more generally disrupted the antebellum South’s white social utopia.

²⁰⁰ Rutherford, “Civilization of the Old South,” 10.

²⁰¹ Rutherford, “Civilization of the Old South,” 11.

²⁰² Rutherford, “Civilization of the Old South,” 11.

²⁰³ Rutherford, “Civilization of the Old South,” 31; Rutherford, “What Has the Negro Meant to the South?” 7.

²⁰⁴ Rutherford, “Wrongs of History,” 62.

One of the most lamentable changes that emancipation brought was a disruption of white southern women's idealized lifestyles. Whereas slavery provided a comfortable lifestyle for white plantation mistresses and "gave leisure" to their daily lives, postbellum women had to take on new responsibilities.²⁰⁵ Rutherford did not acknowledge that such responsibilities had been a pre-war reality for most southern women who did not have the kind of opulent privileges that Rutherford described. Rather, she bemoaned the fact that white women were "forced then to learn, not only to cook, to wash and iron, but to do the most menial forms of household drudgery" that had once been the responsibility of slaves. The old southern hospitality of the elite slaveholding class, she lamented, was impossible.²⁰⁶ Emancipation, then, contributed to larger deplorable shifts in the southern social order.

Emancipation and the disruption of the white woman's lifestyle translated to a general reordering of southern gender relations. While slavery had allowed for the kind of white leisure that "made gentlemen and gentlewomen," the industrializing New South valued a fast-paced grind that eschewed social manners, courtesy and chivalry. Rutherford feared that southern men and women were becoming morally stunted, and especially bemoaned the behavior of a younger generation. She warned that southern youth displayed too much "familiarity between the sexes."²⁰⁷ While southern boys were "lacking in old time chivalry," southern girls were "growing bolder and less modest."²⁰⁸ Although she worried that southern chivalry was becoming obsolete, she was hopeful that it could persist. She told a story she

²⁰⁵ Rutherford, "Civilization of the Old South," 20.

²⁰⁶ Rutherford, "Civilization of the Old South," 37.

²⁰⁷ Rutherford, "Civilization of the Old South," 40.

²⁰⁸ Rutherford, "Civilization of the Old South," 40.

witnessed of a boy who offered an old Confederate veteran a free jitney ride. The young boy loyally exempted the veteran from paying, saying that he had already paid his fare in the war.²⁰⁹ In this anecdote, the transcendent chivalry of a Confederate veteran compelled a southern youth to behave properly. Therefore, while southern social custom was in a state of peril, the presence of veterans provided youth with reminders of profound sacrifices made in the name of chivalry.

Aging veterans could not provide gentlemanly examples forever; however, pretenses for chivalry were revitalized in the postbellum South as a response to the perceived dangers of freed blacks. The mythical protection of white women was needed with a newfound urgency which reaffirmed white male patriarchy and black subjugation.²¹⁰ In her speeches, Rutherford broadcast these threats to southern womanhood and reemphasized the enormous importance of southern manhood. According to Rutherford, when slavery was abolished, the southern woman had to “act more circumspectly to defend herself from insult and injustice.” She even alleged that the South had become “far worse than is pictured in ‘The Birth of a Nation.’”²¹¹ In this dangerous time for southern women, the Ku Klux Klan was “an absolute necessity.”²¹² Due to their efforts to protect white women, she deemed Klansmen the “flower of Southern manhood.”²¹³ In applauding southern men for their postbellum chivalry, Rutherford affirmed and preserved traditions of southern manhood and the traditional southern gender system.

²⁰⁹ Rutherford, “Civilization of the Old South,” 40.

²¹⁰ Timothy B. Tyson, “Dynamite and ‘The Silent South’: A Story from the Second Reconstruction in South Carolina,” in *Jumpin’ Jim Crow: Southern Politics from Civil War to Civil Rights*, eds. Jane Dailey, Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore and Bryant Simon. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 284-285.

²¹¹ Rutherford, “Civilization of the Old South,” 31.

²¹² Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods,” 39.

²¹³ Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods,” 39.

The mission of the KKK was predicated on a social world which assumed women's subordinate roles. As principal at the Lucy Cobb Institute for girls, Rutherford attempted to instill in her pupils the importance of adhering to these roles.²¹⁴ An anti-suffragette, she taught her students that women had no place in politics. She told them that women's power was "at the fireside";²¹⁵ the southern woman's influence in the home was adequate political participation. She linked postbellum southern immorality in part to women's failures: in the Old South, corruption was nonexistent because "mothers taught their boys to think as men, to act as men, and to be men."²¹⁶ Thus, she urged her students to remain in the domestic sphere in order to preserve the integrity of southern men. The model she set was apparently compelling; at a Lucy Cobb commencement ceremony, one graduate proclaimed that Rutherford was "a splendid example of sterling womanhood."²¹⁷ Although her own students appeared to accept Rutherford's message, the younger generation certainly presented threats to her ideals. She cringed at young girls' "short dresses" which she saw as an indication of unwomanly immodesty, and feared their impact upon her imagined southern utopia.²¹⁸ Her bold, floor-length, hoop-skirted plantation-style "costume of the Sixties" provided a stark contrast to the immodest girls whose dress she bemoaned.²¹⁹

The theatrical costume which Rutherford donned as she condemned changes to her vision of the South's utopian past transformed her emphatic speeches into full-

²¹⁴ "Celebrating Seney," *The Atlanta Constitution*, May 16, 1882, 2.

²¹⁵ Clare, 173.

²¹⁶ Rutherford, "What Has the Negro Meant to the South?" 10.

²¹⁷ Clare, 219.

²¹⁸ Rutherford, "Civilization of the Old South," 14.

²¹⁹ Clare, 211.

blown reenactments which were extremely well-received. One newspaper account asked, “[W]hat picture could be more inspiring, more beautiful than Miss Millie dressed in ante-bellum costume and giving one of her patriotic lectures?”²²⁰ Another remarked that her “picturesque ball dress worn fifty years ago by a southern grande dame was a brilliant success.”²²¹ Veterans listened with approval at war commemorations as Rutherford’s presentations mirrored their own nostalgic displays.²²² Indeed, the spectacle of her dress was clearly part of her attraction.

The few historians who have written about Rutherford have paid little attention to her costume, noting only in passing that her dress complemented her commanding presence.²²³ Rutherford, herself, did not provide an explanation for her choice, with the one exception of an occasion when she described herself as “loyal enough to old Georgia to wear tonight a velvet dress woven on a Georgia loom.”²²⁴ However, historians’ neglect of her unique self-fashioning does not mean that it was frivolous or without meaning. As historian Roger Griffin has argued, historical actors’ clothes “invest their acts with significance” and they “can take the historian to the core of complex social and political processes of...conformism and challenge to

²²⁰ “Mildred Lewis Rutherford,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, June 25, 1922, B7.

²²¹ “Southern People Entertain in New York,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, December 29, 1911, 6.

²²² Rutherford’s biographer includes an anecdote in which a Confederate veteran compliments a costumed Rutherford on her beauty, Clare, 195.

²²³ See Bailey, 518, and Grace Elizabeth Hale, “‘Some Women Have Never Been Reconstructed:’ Mildred Lewis Rutherford, Lucy M. Stanton, and the Racial Politics of White Southern Womanhood, 1900-1930” in *Georgia in Black and White: Explorations in the Race Relations of a Southern State, 1865-1950*, ed. John C. Insoe. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994), 174. Sarah H. Case’s “The Historical Ideology of Mildred Lewis Rutherford: A Confederate Historian’s New South Creed” does not refer to her costume at all.

²²⁴ Rutherford, “The South in the Building of the Nation,” 11.

the status quo.”²²⁵ Rutherford’s bold costume deserves a full consideration of its symbolic significance.

A methodological approach which values dress as symbolic evidence has proven a useful complement to historical analyses of some of Rutherford’s contemporaries. Wendy Parkins, for example, examined the relationship between the fashions and political demands of the British suffragettes at the beginning of the twentieth century; she suggests that in wearing feminine dresses while demanding suffrage, they consciously highlighted the female body in order to challenge normative associations between citizenship and manhood.²²⁶ Carol Mattingly similarly analyzed the self-fashioning of Sarah and Angelina Grimké, two prominent abolitionists and women’s rights proponents, who deliberately spoke in Quaker attire in order to achieve moral credibility and further their causes; their insistence on donning this dress even after their break from the church demonstrated their awareness of its symbolic impact.²²⁷ Drew Faust’s analysis of southern women during the war also utilizes dress as historical evidence; she describes disillusioned white women who fantasized about donning breeches to escape their difficult situations caused by feminine restrictions. Ultimately, their abandonment of cross-dressing as impractical suggested their desires to maintain the patriarchal status

²²⁵ Roger Griffin, “Afterthought: Redressing the Balance in Historiography,” in *Fashioning the Body Politic: Dress, Gender, Citizenship* ed. Wendy Parkins. (New York: Berg Publishers, 2002), 225. Using dress to understand multiple meanings is an emerging practice in historiography. Many historians before the 1980s understood dress as decorative, and overlooked it as a serious type of evidence. Scholars have criticized this neglect as a product of historicism’s bias towards written documentation, which has ignored other forms of symbolic evidence to produce an incomplete historical understanding. See Christine Boydell, “Review Article: Fashioning Identities: Gender, Class and the Self,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 39, no. 1 (2004): 137-138.

²²⁶ Wendy Parkins, “The Epidemic of Purple, White and Green: Fashion and the Suffragette Movement in Britain 1908-1914,” in *Fashioning the Body Politic: Dress, Gender, Citizenship*, ed. Wendy Parkins. (New York: Berg Publishers, 2002), 97-124.

²²⁷ Carol Mattingly, *Appropriate[ing] Dress: Women’s Rhetorical Style in Nineteenth-Century America* (Carbondale: The Southern Illinois University Press, 2002), 26-27, 31.

quo.²²⁸ These studies of Rutherford's contemporaries display the possibilities of considering dress as a form of historical evidence which should be explored for more nuanced understandings of its wearers' intentions.

Rutherford's dress ostensibly provided a visual embodiment of the idealized antebellum memory that she promoted. Her plantation-era style derived directly from a sensationalized representation of a southern plantation mistress and all that she encompassed. Rutherford's retrieval of the hoop skirt was particularly significant. The hoop skirt's opulent use of material and its inconvenience to its wearer alluded to the luxury and leisure that Rutherford fondly recalled. Furthermore, much like her verbalized memories, it erased southern women's experiences of want during the war, as scarcity of resources had forced them to abandon this luxurious style.²²⁹ Rutherford's reclamation of the style, then, provided a subtle reminder of the devotion and sacrifices of white southern women during the war, and simultaneously revived the pre-war lifestyle that she sought to preserve. Thus, her costume symbolically contributed to her pursuit of making this imagined white southern utopia appear worthy of preservation.

Although Rutherford's costume certainly contributed to her public transmission of a glorified past, it is also worth considering the private meanings of her deliberate self-fashioning. As veterans' performances at reunions suggest, embodiments of the past may serve personally-restorative functions. Interpreting veterans' therapeutic performances of the past required contextualizing them with their strained relationship, in the aftermath of southern defeat, to ideals of southern

²²⁸ Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 231-233.

²²⁹ Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 223-225.

manhood. Similarly, in order to hypothesize the personal meanings of Rutherford's costumed performances, it is helpful to consider how her actual experiences related to her sentimentalized imagination of the perfect southern woman.

Rutherford rarely spoke about her own relationship to the idealized southern woman; this is perhaps because she so drastically diverged from her professed ideals. While Rutherford condemned girls who deviated from their prescribed roles, her life departed starkly from her own prescriptions. She urged women to remain in the domestic sphere, and yet spent her own life preaching publicly; she even spoke in front of Congress on one occasion.²³⁰ She glorified women's sacred roles as wives and mothers of southern men, and yet she never married. Although she extolled a lifestyle of womanly leisure, she worked tirelessly to publish and traveled frequently to give her speeches. She also had a lifelong career as a professional educator. Therefore, while she urged a lifestyle of traditional womanly domesticity and dependence, she lived publicly and independently. Her failure to acknowledge this inconsistency presents a historical quandary as to how she perceived her life's course.

Historians have debated similar predicaments more generally about postbellum women and their relationship to their traditional antebellum roles. Some have argued that the necessity of women's work during and after the war compelled them to reject paternalistic restrictions and seize more public roles, while others have posited that the war had little actual impact upon postbellum gender roles.²³¹ Some historians have suggested that while postbellum white women assumed more public

²³⁰ Case, 607.

²³¹ Anna Firor Scott, *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), especially x, 105-133; George C. Rable, *Civil Wars: Women and the Crisis of Southern Nationalism* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989), especially 268-274.

roles, they deliberately maintained a patriarchal social structure which preserved white supremacy and their claims to privileged status.²³² Based on Rutherford's glorification of the old South, she would seemingly fall into this last category of postbellum southern women.²³³ While her lifestyle might seem to place her among women who seized the opportunity to play more public roles, her deliberate costume choice offers historical evidence that she understood herself as a traditional woman.

Like other southern women who sought to maintain their privileged standing within the southern social system, Rutherford's costume signified her desires to cling to this imagined figure and a patriarchal hierarchy. Her embodiment of the plantation mistress restricted her freedom, both literally and figuratively, and thus subverted her own independence. It denied her public persona, making it seem as if she had momentarily stepped away from her genteel lifestyle to deliver her speech and would soon return to domesticity. It drew attention to her physicality rather than her intellect, recalling Victorian ideologies which defined women by their bodies and men by their minds.²³⁴ Thus, Rutherford's extraordinarily independent role demanded an extraordinary display of womanly subordination in order to silence her departure from a model of traditional womanhood and to maintain the gender hierarchy that she romanticized.

²³² For example, LeeAnn Whites argues that while memorial organizations propelled women into the public sphere, their tendency to relegate certain tasks, such as financing monuments, to men demonstrated their efforts to maintain a traditional patriarchal system. LeeAnn Whites, "Stand by Your Man: The Ladies Memorial Association and the Reconstruction of Southern White Manhood," in *Women of the American South: A Multicultural Reader*, ed. Christie Anne Farnham. (New York: New York University Press, 1997), 141; See also Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 7.

²³³ Sarah Case and Grace Elizabeth Hale have made similar arguments about Rutherford's self-interested maintenance of white supremacy but have not considered the importance of her costume as symbolic evidence. See Case, 616-619; Hale, 183-184.

²³⁴ Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 263.

Rutherford's embodiment of idealized southern womanhood both atoned for her masculine lifestyle and more broadly related to anxieties about the shifting southern gendered order. The act of physically embodying these glorified ideals spoke to her intense desire to control the southern social landscape and avoid change. Much like veterans' enactments of martial and chivalric manhood, Rutherford's performances of the southern mistress proposed the soothing notion that these older gendered ideals could be sustained in the present.

While Rutherford's change-resistant performances were similar to those of veterans, there was an important distinction. Unlike veterans who drew upon lived martial experiences to shape and perform these narratives, Rutherford had had limited personal contact with the lifestyle of the antebellum slave-holding mistress. Despite her vivid recollections of this past, Rutherford's reminiscences could not have been based on her own memories: born in 1851, she was only ten years old when the war began and had probably been too young to attend the grand balls which she nostalgically evoked. Therefore, the war prevented Rutherford from assuming the role of a care-free pre-war southern lady and from enjoying her leisurely lifestyle. Thus, Rutherford defined herself in relation to memories which were not her own. Although she did not have the lived experiences, her performances afforded a way to feign a relationship to this mythologized southern character in order to fulfill her idealized self-identity.

Just as Rutherford's feigned memories distorted her personal history, her costumed simulations subtly pointed to the impossibility of truly re-creating the past. Although she proudly donned a plantation-era hoop skirt, she somewhat ironically

revealed that the fabric had been produced in Georgia. This explanation exposed her “inauthenticity” as a product of the New South, where abolition had necessitated the growth in industry, and notably in the textile industry, that allowed her dress to be produced in Georgia.²³⁵ Therefore, just as veterans could not immunize their constructed havens from external transformations, Rutherford’s description reflected her inextricable link to concurrent socioeconomic change. This subtle detail exposed the impossibility of producing a facsimile of the past and signaled that her historical reproductions, like her feigned memories, were constructions of the present.

Rutherford’s inadvertent revelation of the constructed nature of her enacted narratives did not ostensibly detract from her extravagant displays, and her audiences seemed to join her in identifying with these glorified southern characters. The public’s general approval of her sentimental tales was confirmed when, eleven years after her death, her imagined version of the Old South garnered widespread popularity with the 1939 premiere of *Gone with the Wind*.²³⁶ The film translated Margaret Mitchell’s 1936 bestseller into a cinematic reenactment that reflected and further established these enduring cultural memories. Had Rutherford been alive to see *Gone with the Wind*, she undoubtedly would have been pleased with its idyllic portrayal of the antebellum South.

True to her Lost Cause-style descriptions of a romantic gendered society, the film introduces the Old South as “a land of Cavaliers and Cotton Fields” in which

²³⁵ Georgia, specifically, saw an exceptional increase in textile mills at the beginning of the twentieth century. See Vista Anne Mahan, “Textiles: Who Made Them and Who Used Them,” in *Georgia Quilts: Piecing Together a History*, ed. Anita Zaleski Weinraub. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2006), 134.

²³⁶ *Gone With the Wind*, DVD. Directed by Victor Fleming, 1939. Agoura Hills, CA: Selznick International Pictures.

resided “Knights and their Ladies Fair.”²³⁷ In this depiction of the Old South, perfectly content slaves enable the decorative and even frivolous lifestyles of white women, who are beautiful and dainty. When war comes, the women of *Gone with the Wind* generally exhibit the kind of womanly, selfless patriotic devotion that Rutherford celebrated. The epitome of this southern woman is Melanie Wilkes, who serves as a Confederate nurse and even relinquishes her wedding ring to aid the cause. The main character, Scarlett O’Hara, has a more complicated relationship to the idealized southern woman, much as Rutherford did. Although Scarlett desires to be a conventional southern lady, she also assumes a public, masculine role in the lumber business. However, as Tara McPherson argues, Scarlett’s divergence from prescribed femininity ultimately remains within a paradigm that deeply romanticizes old southern patriarchy; in the end, Scarlett remains tied to the plantation, where her story concludes.²³⁸ Similarly, Scarlett’s male counterpart, Rhett Butler, presents both older ideals and new southern values; he exhibits manly martial and chivalric virtue as a Confederate soldier, yet also transforms into a new southern businessman following the war. Thus, *Gone with the Wind* inscribes the post-war South with the Lost Cause’s idealized gender system and helped to cement the longevity of this myth.²³⁹

Gone with the Wind’s success meant that the cultural memories with which Rutherford strongly identified reached mass audiences and were reinforced within the

²³⁷ *Gone With the Wind*, DVD. Directed by Victor Fleming, 1939.

²³⁸ Tara McPherson, *Reconstructing Dixie: Race, Gender, and Nostalgia in the Imagined South* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 53-54.

²³⁹ For more in depth analyses of *Gone with the Wind*’s historical constructions, see Simone Bachofner, *Hollywood Film and the Cultural Memory of the Civil War South: How America’s Memory of the Civil War Is Reflected in Films Like “Gone With the Wind” and “Cold Mountain”* (Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller, 2008), 32-59, Bruce Chadwick, *The Reel Civil War: Mythmaking in American Film*. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2001), 183-212.

public consciousness. This success was a product both of its subject's appeal, and of its technological novelty; like *The Birth of a Nation*, *Gone with the Wind* marked a cultural milestone. It was costlier than any movie previously filmed, and was one of the first movies to experiment with Technicolor. This innovation paid off: it made sixty million dollars in ticket sales, and by 1945, an estimated one-hundred and twenty million Americans had seen it.²⁴⁰ Its success meant that nation-wide, Americans were exposed to a nostalgic, costume drama reenactment of the Old South akin to Rutherford's performances.

Although *Gone with the Wind* and *The Birth of a Nation* both reached unprecedented levels of success and presented southern-biased versions of the war, *Gone with the Wind*'s portrayal of the South took on a decidedly different tone. *The Birth of a Nation* was deliberately designed to be viewed as an "authentic" historical representation. Publicity about Griffin's exacting methodology and Woodrow Wilson's emphatic approval validated its historicity, and thus sanctioned a white supremacist, southern-influenced interpretation of the war for the general public.

Gone with the Wind, however, did not approach the war's history so assertively. Although the war provides an important background for the storyline, it is primarily a romantic love story, embraced in 1939 as an escapist costume drama by economically depressed Americans. By 1939, the Lost Cause interpretation of the war was well-established within the American imagination; it had been professionally institutionalized in academic history and had even inspired its own literary genre. Indicative of this broad acceptance are the films' quite different portrayals of black Americans: while *The Birth of the Nation* portrayed aggressive and dangerous blacks

²⁴⁰ Chadwick, 187.

to effectively mobilize their violent oppression, by 1939, post-war white supremacy was an accepted fact and did not require the same kind of propaganda. Thus, Lost Cause mythology, replete with contented and docile black servants, could serve as the backdrop for Scarlett and Rhett's passionate drama without the need for explicit historical argument and persuasion.

Gone with the Wind's ability to take for granted this myth's acceptance as history was reflected in its production: Hollywood's famous Clark Gable, who played Rhett Butler, was born in the North and refused to even attempt a southern accent for the role, while Scarlett O'Hara was played by Vivien Leigh, whose British nationality enraged the United Daughters of the Confederacy.²⁴¹ Therefore, unlike *The Birth of the Nation's* recruitment of veterans' recollections to provide a historic and authentic stamp of approval, *Gone with the Wind's* success did not require gimmicks to persuade the public of the veracity of its version of history. The enduring popularity of this myth indicated that there was still comfort to be found in re-living, albeit vicariously, the life of the southern belle and her slaveholding leisure. While the invented traditions represented in both films have been thoroughly dissected in academic analyses and revisionist historical scholarship has debunked the Lost Cause, narratives crafted by Rutherford and other Lost Cause historians subtly re-emerge in contemporary culture, specifically in the performances of contemporary Civil War reenactors, to suggest a continued public identification with these romanticized southern tropes.

²⁴¹ Chadwick, 184.

Chapter Three
“To Keep Their Memories Alive”: History, Gender and
Contemporary Civil War Reenactment

“I think I do a far better job than a lot of the men out there,” Lauren Cook Burgess told the *New York Times*, in reference to her meticulously-researched male soldier impression which she showcased at a 1989 Civil War reenactment at the Antietam National Battlefield.²⁴² In Burgess’s efforts to accurately portray a nineteenth-century soldier, she had assembled a period uniform by “consult[ing] military historians...and bore the expense of custom tailoring.”²⁴³ In addition, she attempted to hide traits that might indicate her sex by binding her breasts and wearing her hair short.²⁴⁴ Yet Burgess’s diligence did not deter the National Park Service (NPS) from mandating that she remove her soldier’s uniform: apparently, her sex rendered her historical representation “inauthentic.” In addition to filing a successful lawsuit against the NPS, Burgess responded by proving that her participation as a cross-dressing soldier was, in fact, historically truthful. Following her ordeal, she gathered documentation of four hundred women who disguised themselves as soldiers during the war, and helped to publish two books that told their stories.²⁴⁵ Yet Burgess’s research did not quiet opposition from some male reenactors who preferred

²⁴² “Women Sues Over Exclusion From Events at National Park,” *The New York Times*, February 25, 1991, A7.

²⁴³ *Cook v. Babbitt*, II A.

²⁴⁴ Eugene L. Meyer, “A Civil War of the Sexes; Park Service Wanted Male Cast at Antietam,” *The Washington Post*, June 9, 1992, A1.

²⁴⁵ Burgess’s publications include Sarah Rossetta Wakeman, *An Uncommon Soldier: the Civil War Letters of Sarah Rossetta Wakeman, alias Pvt. Lyons Wakeman, 153rd Regiment, New York State Volunteers, 1862-1864*, ed. Lauren Cook Burgess. (Pasadena: The Minerva Center, 1994) and Lauren M. Cook and DeAnne Blanton, *They Fought Like Demons: Women Soldiers in the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002). As historian James McPherson notes in the preface to Burgess’s first book, there were undoubtedly even more than these four hundred women who succeeded in never being discovered and who left little documentation of enlistment. See James M. McPherson, Forward to *An Uncommon Soldier*, xii.

to preserve apparently “authentic” period roles. Thus, in contemporary reenactment, issues of gender, historical revision and “authenticity” clash to raise questions about the functions of these revived performances of the Civil War.

Lauren Cook Burgess is one of approximately 40,000 contemporary Civil War reenactors who, since the centennial commemoration of the 1960s, have preserved and escalated traditions of performing memories of this war.²⁴⁶ These reenactors, or ‘living historians,’ periodically convene throughout the country for weekend-long retreats to inhabit the identity of a historically-researched Civil War era figure. In addition to reproducing military battles and drills replete with precisely-replicated uniforms and weapons, reenactors construct temporary historical worlds that replicate an imagined nineteenth-century cultural milieu. They employ period etiquette, diction, and, as Burgess’s case illuminates, imagined social roles.

In this predominantly male hobby, discussions of gender do not often explicitly surface. However, Burgess’s case introduces the possibility that the latent importance of gendered roles in reenactment should be considered alongside maintenance of white racial dominance as part of the explanation for the popularity of this hobby. Careful research reveals that certain gendered narratives which subtly echo Lost Cause-influenced memories of martial men and devoted women emerge in these contemporary practices. Thus, like historical actors before them, Civil War reenactors use performances of an imagined past to retrieve certain southern-influenced gendered narratives. These narratives, however, remain veiled in the

²⁴⁶ James McPherson, *Drawn With the Sword: Reflections on the American Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 243.

reenactment discourse, which negates any notion of cultural memories or their subjective construction and steadfastly claims historical “authenticity.”

The details of Burgess’s case provide an entry point to examine the workings of Civil War reenactment. The crux of the NPS’s defense of forbidding Burgess’s impression relied upon its strict pursuit of historical “authenticity.”²⁴⁷ According to NPS regulations, park officials who invited private volunteers for educational reenactments were to use discretion to “achieve the greatest degree of historical accuracy that is reasonably practicable.”²⁴⁸ Alexander and Chiles admitted that they routinely approached unit commanders, rather than individual soldier reenactors, if an impression did not meet NPS standards. However, they apparently felt strongly enough about Burgess’s portrayal to directly confront her to express concerns that the historically inaccurate “presence of a woman in uniform would mislead the public.”²⁴⁹ The superintendent of the Antietam National Battlefield, Richard Rambur, fully supported their decision, saying that prohibiting Burgess was necessary “to portray an accurate picture” and gratuitously adding that he made no apologies for their actions.²⁵⁰

The NPS’s mandate offended Burgess on several fronts. On the one hand, she designated the prohibition of women from reenactment an affront and “a matter of principle.”²⁵¹ She was additionally offended by the assumption that she was unknowledgeable about Civil War history. As Burgess’s efforts to produce her faux

²⁴⁷ Although Civil War reenactors’ regiments are private organizations, they often work in cooperation with the National Park Service, whose authorities provide “interpretive guidelines” for volunteers like Burgess. See *Cook v. Babbitt*, IA.

²⁴⁸ *Cook v. Babbitt*, IA.

²⁴⁹ *Cook v. Babbitt*, IIC.

²⁵⁰ “Woman Sues Over Exclusion From Events At National Park,” *The New York Times*, February 25, 1991, A7.

²⁵¹ “Women Sues Over Exclusion From Events at National Park,” A7.

uniform suggested, she was devoted to researching her male impression, and like many reenactors, prided herself in her familiarity with minute period details. She even owned a nineteenth-century sword.²⁵² Furthermore, in her endeavor to prove her historically-rightful place in performed battle, she found evidence to suggest that some women who disguised themselves to fight in the war gained the support and respect of male comrades, who helped conceal their identities from higher officials.²⁵³ Unlike these past soldiers, however, contemporary reenactors refused to accept Burgess. In light of Burgess's illuminative research, their continued opposition casts doubts upon reenactors' supposedly neutral pursuit of historical authenticity.

Authenticity, as Burgess's case illustrates, is a central concern among Civil War reenactors. Although there are varying degrees of strictness among different groups, a discourse of authenticity filters reenactors' interactions and dictates nearly every material aspect of the practice, including but not limited to proper dress, equipment, food, mannerisms and diction. Reenactors urge one another to observe extraordinarily minute details; for example, R. Lee Hadden's popular handbook prescribes desirable fabric for clothing ("cotton or wool") and forbids modern fasteners, such as "plastic, snaps, zippers and Velcro."²⁵⁴ In order to encourage this pursuit, *The Camp Chase Gazette*, the monthly publication written by and for reenactors, includes a column in each issue entitled "The Watchdog," which is devoted to illuminating new ways for reenactors to commit to authenticity. In one

²⁵² Eugene L. Meyer, "A Civil War of the Sexes; Park Service Wanted Male Cast at Antietam," *The Washington Post*, June 9, 1992, A1.

²⁵³ Amy Dockser Marcus, "When Janie Came Marching Home: Women Fought in the Civil War," *The New York Times*, March 23, 2002, B7.

²⁵⁴ R. Lee Hadden, *Reliving the Civil War: A Reenactor's Handbook* (Mechanicsburg: Stackpole Books, 1999), 174-5.

issue, for example, “The Watchdog” outlines historically accurate hairstyles for reenactors, forbidding both shaved heads and long hair. It also provides a recipe for period pomade that calls for hog lard and castor oil.²⁵⁵ This fixation with authenticity has even inspired its own vernacular: “authentic” define reenactors who take seriously their commitment to material authenticity, while “farbs” are actors who are relatively less zealous. “BOB” refers to those who are “better off bowling” because “they don’t have a clue about authenticity.”²⁵⁶ Like the NPS officials who interfered with Burgess’s impression, many reenactors claim that strict standards of authenticity is essential to teach both themselves and audiences “more about the time period than any books.”²⁵⁷

Insistence upon authenticity for educational purposes points to one of reenactors’ claimed intentions, which is to fulfill a perceived void in contemporary historical scholarship. Many reenactors describe an interest in the past that is unsatisfied by academic history, which they consider to be elitist. They criticize Civil War historiography for not considering the experience of the common soldier. Reenactors, who research a specific historical actor as the basis for their ‘impression,’ claim that they successfully fill this void. They also assert that the multi-sensory experience of re-creating historical scenes provides a deeper understanding of the past than reading academic texts for both reenactors and audiences. Audiences, they

²⁵⁵ Craig L. Barry, “The Watchdog: Civil War Hair,” *The Camp Chase Gazette* 35, no. 7 (June 2008), 28.

²⁵⁶ Hadden, 217-219.

²⁵⁷ Hadden, 36. The most “hardcore” reenactors do not endorse public reenactment and prefer to re-create encampments rather than battles because they believe this affords greater authenticity. See Tony Horwitz, *Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches from the Unfinished Civil War*, (New York: Vintage Departures, 1998), 7. My investigation reflects the attitudes of those who engage in public reenactments and who contribute to producing reenactors’ handbooks and newsletters; this less “hardcore” approach seems to be more common.

boast, are more attracted to the spectacle of reenactment than to traditional academic history; therefore, reenactment provides a pedagogical method to combat a public disinterest in conventional historical scholarship.²⁵⁸

Interestingly, some professional historians agree that there is a general waning interest in traditional history. At a conference sponsored by the Indiana Association of History, David Thelen suggested that this disinterest is a reaction to the way history is traditionally taught, with an emphasis on broad structural institutions and movements. He believes that this pedagogical approach tends to overlook individual agency and results in students' inability to relate to historical actors as decisive drivers of change. He argues that the personal quality of reenactment, either via direct participation or by viewing others, may help students relate to history and see it as a product of past human actions.²⁵⁹

The perceived public disinterest in conventional historical inquiry, coupled with the increasing popularity of Civil War reenactment since the 1960s, has prompted some historians to seriously consider reenactors' claims. Scholars have generally treated Civil War simulation as part of a larger movement of historical reenactment, performed by 'living historians.'²⁶⁰ Historians like Thelen have suggested that viewing or even participating in this practice might help to clarify the difficult conceptual problem of understanding human agency as a part of broad

²⁵⁸ Hadden, 6.

²⁵⁹ David Thelen, "Learning from the Past: Individual Experience and Re-enactment," *Indiana Magazine of History* 99, no. 2 (June 2003): 155–71. Thelen's conclusions are based upon a national survey to gauge public opinions of history that he and Roy Rosenzweig implemented in 1994; they published their findings in 1998. See David Thelen and Roy Rosenzweig, *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998).

²⁶⁰ The first investigation of this phenomenon is the work of Jay Anderson, himself a living historian, who describes reenactors' practice as a legitimate historical discipline to gain insights into the past. See Jay Anderson, *Time Machines: The World of Living History* (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1984).

historical processes.²⁶¹ To this end, historians have evoked R. G. Collingwood's philosophy of history which argues that all historical research requires a certain type of reenactment. Collingwood used the term 'reenactment' to mean that the historian must envisage himself in the mindset of an historical actor in order to obtain complete historical knowledge. His type of reenactment was an intellectual one, which was reliant upon reading historical documents and did not involve dressing up like someone from the past.²⁶² Still, historians have appropriated Collingwood's endorsement of intellectual reenactment to provide a perspective on physical reenactment. Some agree with the potential value, however idealistic, of inhabiting the mental world of historical agents. Historian Alexander Cook has suggested that physical reenactment might similarly inspire some to see historical agents as something beyond "passive vehicles for the self-articulation of discourse."²⁶³ In addition, Cook posits that experiencing material constraints provides a nuanced perspective on physicality as an important historical factor.

Although Cook and others have made attempts to appreciate the merits claimed for historical reenactment, they have also noted the considerable limitations this practice presents for historical understanding. Reenactment may help to redress problems relating to historical agency. However, by prioritizing individual experience, it ignores broader processes and implications and produces a skewed historical interpretation. Similarly, the obsession with authenticity of minutiae, as Michael Kammen has noted, favors shallow historical understandings over

²⁶¹ Thelen, 163.

²⁶² R.G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History: Revised Edition with Lectures 1926-1928*, ed. Jan Van Der Dussen. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 282-302.

²⁶³ Alexander Cook, "The Use and Abuse of Historical Reenactment: Thoughts On Recent Trends in Public History," *Criticism* 46, no. 3 (June 2004): 491.

apprehending important trends.²⁶⁴ More fundamentally, this emphasis on authenticity implies that there is an historical “objective truth” which reenactors discover via their meticulousness.²⁶⁵ This notion negates understandings of history’s subjective construction and of the role of the invented traditions and cultural memories that often infiltrate reenactors’ consciousnesses.

While notions of authenticity imply the existence of objective history, scholars have noted the extremely subjective quality of historical reenactment. The fundamental problem lies in the blurred boundary between the past and present. If reenactment provides a unique vehicle to truly know the past, this implies that the reenactor possesses the ability to *become* the historical actor. This is, of course, impossible, and ignores the fact that reenactors experience their own emotions in the context of a modern activity inspired by the past. Therefore, they cannot truly know how a historical actor felt; they can know only how their modern mentalities respond to this constructed simulation of history. Ultimately, this emphasis on an emotional experience of history subverts the kind of detachment necessary for criticism and provides only a subjective, internal historical interpretation that is inaccessible to spectators.²⁶⁶

Although historians have criticized the subjectivity of reenactment as a hindrance to historical pedagogy, reenactors reveal that they are not solely attempting to educate. One Civil War reenactor remarked that “education...makes up fifty-percent of this hobby,” another designated education as a “side benefit,” and a third

²⁶⁴ Michael Kammen, *American Culture, American Tastes* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999), 220.

²⁶⁵ Eric Gable and Richard Handler, “After Authenticity at an American Heritage Site,” *American Anthropologist* 98, no. 3 (September 1996): 573.

²⁶⁶ See Cook, 487-496; Vanessa Agnew, “What Is Reenactment?” *Criticism* 46, no. 3 (June 2004): 327-339.

even seemed annoyed at the “silly questions” he received from the public.²⁶⁷ The inadequacy of public education as an explanatory motivation suggests that reenactment also fulfills other functions for individual participants. As argued in the preceding chapters, embodied re-creation of the past is often deeply personal; the public performances of Confederate veterans and Mildred Rutherford also served private, self-affirming functions. Contemporary reenactors’ performances of the past similarly contain deeply personal meanings.

The subjective quality of this historical interpretation is, in fact, one of the celebrated features of Civil War reenactment. Reenactors seek “magic moments,” or “time warps,” in which they experience an “emotional jolt” and truly feel as though they were living in the nineteenth century.²⁶⁸ In this moment, the reenactor “has gone beyond fooling others and is fooling himself”; reenactors “live for moments like this.”²⁶⁹ Therefore, although they insist upon authenticity for public clarity, reenactors do not deny their personal involvement. In fact, they revel in these internalized experiences.

Some scholars have theorized that the appeal of these visceral experiences derives from a postmodern angst generated by ambiguity and fragmentation. For example, Richard Handler and William Saxton write about historical reenactment in general and suggest that obsessions with replicating the authenticity of the past are related to experiences of present-day reality as decidedly inauthentic and alienating.

²⁶⁷ Todd Hutchins, quoted in Jim Phillips, *Reenacting... Why? A Look at Civil War Reenactors and Why They Do What They Do* (Decatur: The Confederate Bookstore, 2001), 65; David Shackelford, quoted in Phillips, 101; David Dougherty, quoted in Phillips, 163. As noted in the introduction, Phillips is a reenactor who published a compilation of his interviews with roughly seventy-five reenactors from throughout the country. His status as a fellow reenactor lends credence to the candor of these interviews. This study relies heavily on his work.

²⁶⁸ Hadden, 36.

²⁶⁹ Hadden, 225.

Relying heavily on Heideggerian explanations of authenticity, they theorize that reenactors crave the experience of an emplotted narrative as a reaction to their incoherent, un-integrated lives.²⁷⁰ Others have more specifically applied similar ideas to Civil War impersonators, theorizing that postmodern anxieties about increasing complexity and ambiguity have sparked the need for a nostalgic escape to the past.²⁷¹ These analyses, though seemingly logical, remain somewhat vague and theoretical. They do not identify which aspects of the modern world are problematic for reenactors, nor do they explain why the Civil War specifically quells these anxieties.

Recently, some scholars have produced more specific studies of Civil War reenactors.²⁷² These investigations have focused mostly on Confederate impersonators to suggest that re-living the Civil War provides an outlet to express whiteness. Indeed, reenactors, a majority of whom are white, sometimes reveal deep attachments to Confederate paraphernalia and maintain a romanticized Lost Cause memory by claiming that the underdog-South heroically fought to preserve states' rights.²⁷³ These studies confirm reenactment's continuity with the semi-centennial and centennial Reconciliation-influenced mock battles which promoted white

²⁷⁰ Richard Handler and William Saxton, "Dyssimulation: Reflexivity, Narrative and the Quest for Authenticity in 'Living History,'" *Cultural Anthropology* 3, no. 3 (August 1988): 242-260.

²⁷¹ See Randal Allred, "Catharsis, Revision and Re-enactment: Negotiating the Meaning of the American Civil War," *Journal of American Culture* 19, no. 4 (Winter 1996): 1-13. Dennis Hall, "Civil War Reenactors and the Postmodern Sense of History," *Journal of American Culture* 17, no. 3 (Fall 1994): 7-11.

²⁷² Perhaps this pursuit was inspired by journalist and Pulitzer Prize winner Tony Horwitz's *Confederates in the Attic*, which provides a glimpse into the social world of Confederate reenactors. See Tony Horwitz, *Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches from the Unfinished Civil War*, (New York: Vintage Departures, 1998), especially 6-18.

²⁷³ See Mitchell D. Straus, "Identity Construction Among Confederate Civil War Reenactors: a Study of Dress, Stage Props, and Discourse," *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal* 21, no. 4 (2003): 149-161; James O. Farmer, "Playing Rebels: Reenactment as Nostalgia and Defense of Confederacy in the Battle of Aiken," *Southern Cultures* 11, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 46-73.

supremacy. They aptly shed light on racially-charged motivations for reenacting the Civil War, but to suggest that racial anxiety is the only motivating influence for the approximately 40,000 American Civil War reenactors would be an oversimplification.²⁷⁴ Gender identity, a vein that runs through male-dominated reenactment in more subtle ways, has not yet been fully explored as a motivating factor.²⁷⁵

Male reenactors' opposition to women's soldier impressions introduces the possibility that like historical actors before them, Civil War reenactors use historical simulation to forge connections to an idealized past gendered system. The historical precedents found in the cases of Confederate veterans' reunions and in Mildred Lewis Rutherford's performances provide a paradigm for understanding this dimension of contemporary reenacting. Through embodied enactments of romanticized memories, both personal and collective, these historical actors affirmed their idealized gendered identities in the face of destabilizing social change. Understanding these performances involved examining both their rhetorical celebration of southern manhood and womanhood and the discontent they expressed with contemporaneous change. A similar framework will help to investigate how Civil War reenactors

²⁷⁴ McPherson, *Drawn With the Sword*, 243.

²⁷⁵ The most thorough investigation of gender in living history is Stephen Hunt's interpretation of this practice as constructing masculinity; his study focuses on Civil War reenactment in England and does not consider the importance of American historical traditions as a contextual paradigm. See Stephen Hunt, "But We're Men Aren't We!: Living History as a Site of Masculine Identity Construction," *Men and Masculinities* 10, no. 4 (June 2008): 460-483. Elizabeth Young has considered Burgess's place within a historical tradition of female cross-dressing and the Civil War but does not delve into the intricacies of gender and reenactment. See Elizabeth Young, *Disarming the Nation: Women's Writing and the American Civil War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 287-290. Jim Cullen has noted gendered antagonisms in reenactment, but still focuses on reenactors' maintenance of Reconciliation memories to suggest their latent racism. See Jim Cullen, *The Civil War in Popular Culture: A Reusable Past* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995), 193-199.

embrace analogous idealized gendered narratives of the past in order to channel contemporary discomfort and discontent.

While preferences for “authentic” gender roles are often expressed, it is rare for reenactors to explicitly convey discontent with modern attitudes towards gender. Verbal manifestations remain subtle, and analysis first requires considerations of pertinent cultural changes regarding American manhood. The rise of Civil War reenactment since the 1960s coincided with what Michael Kimmel has designated American manhood’s “erosion of confidence.”²⁷⁶ This may mostly be attributed to the Civil Rights era’s liberation movements which threatened the white male heterosexual identity as the empowered norm.²⁷⁷ Some scholars who have suggested latent racial anxieties in reenactment have cited its increased popularity in correspondence with these social inclusion movements which threatened white supremacy.²⁷⁸ These movements should also be considered in relation to gender as destabilizing forces to reenactors’ masculine identities; thus, they suggest a gender-related motivation to escape from the present.

In some extreme cases, reenactors have expressed explicit antipathy to changing gender dynamics. In an editorial responding to Burgess’s case, reenactor Ross Kimmel criticized her “modern-day in-your-face feminism” and charged that her desire to portray a soldier was only a product of “one zealot rais[ing] a hullabaloo” and of her “single-agendaism.”²⁷⁹ Similarly, in the *Camp Chase Gazette*,

²⁷⁶ Michael Kimmel, *Manhood in American: A Cultural History* (New York: The Free Press, 1996), 270.

²⁷⁷ Sally Robinson, *Marked Men: White Masculinity in Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), especially 14-17.

²⁷⁸ Farmer, 46-73.

²⁷⁹ Ross M. Kimmel, “It’s a Case of Historical Purity,” *The Washington Post*, June 22, 1992, A16.

another reenactor urged his peers not to engage in the politics of the contemporary “gender war” by allowing women in the faux ranks. He even instructed them to “ignore her threats of legal retaliation.”²⁸⁰ This antagonism suggests that for some, Civil War reenactment provides a venue to eschew notions of gender equality; however, most reenactors are not so explicit. Their anxieties towards social changes appear more latent and remain veiled in euphemism.

The majority of reenactors’ expressed aversions to modernity are somewhat vague. The general theme of discontent refers to a contemporary “age of uncertainty” in which “personal freedoms are eroding away” and people feel “loss in control.”²⁸¹ Reenactors describe their ability to “escape the cares and worries of the 20th century” and to find a haven from the contemporary “rat race.”²⁸² It reminds them of a time “before life jumped into fast forward warp speed” and provides a “warm feeling that has become rare in our mechanical world.”²⁸³ Many express a certain satisfaction with experiencing a “simpler way of life” by camping outside in lieu of watching television.²⁸⁴ These ambiguous frustrations with modernity do not in themselves imply reactions to threatened notions of masculinity; however, coupled with reenactors’ aversion to unorthodox gender crossovers, they begin to suggest that reenactors’ apparent “loss in control” and their desire for “simpler” times may relate to destabilized notions of white masculinity. Furthermore, this escapist cure bears

²⁸⁰ Jonah Begone, “Vandals at the Gates,” *The Camp Chase Gazette* (May 1998), <http://wesclark.com/jw/vandals.html>. (Accessed March 29, 2010).

²⁸¹ Phillips, 216-217.

²⁸² Andy Wirch, quoted in Phillips, 85; Ron Younger, quoted in Phillips, 111.

²⁸³ Darryl Hinkle, quoted in Phillips, 144; Victor Mahler, quoted in Phillips, 176.

²⁸⁴ Dwight Hensley, quoted in Phillips, 216.

similarity to other kinds of masculine retreats which provide an illuminating context for Civil War reenactment.

The phenomenon of men escaping their contemporary world in the company of other men to counter apparently undermined masculinity is not unique, as Confederate veterans have illuminated. In contemporary times, other men's associations have similarly attempted to retreat from perceived emasculation; the mythopoetic men's movement, largely inspired by poet Robert Bly, provides one popular example. Some scholars have regarded this loose affiliation of men, who often embark on group camping trips, as a reaction to the feminist movement:²⁸⁵ its mission is to practice communal psychological self-help in order to address an apparent feminization resulting from "energetic women" who produce "soft" sons.²⁸⁶ As Michael Kimmel has noted, this contemporary escapism bears similarity to responses to the "crisis of manhood" at the turn of the twentieth century which stemmed from a perceived loss of control and feminization of the home due to industrialization.²⁸⁷ As historians have argued, this period bolstered manly ideals of physicality and inspired the formation of male-exclusive arenas to enact these ideals.²⁸⁸ The historical tradition of male escapism to combat perceivably threatened masculinity provides context for the gender-related functions of contemporary Civil

²⁸⁵ Michael S. Kimmel and Michael Kaufman, "The New Men's Movement: Retreat and Regression with America's Weekend Warriors," *Feminist Issues* 13, no. 2 (Fall 1993): 11.

²⁸⁶ Robert Bly, *Iron John: A Book About Men* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 1990), 3.

²⁸⁷ As noted in the first chapter, this perceived crisis contributed to a reinvigorated approval of southern men's supposed martial virtue, solidified by soldiers in the Spanish-American War.

²⁸⁸ For example, this period saw the rise of male sports, which emphasized a virile masculinity by allowing for physical and aggressive displays. See Kimmel, 137-141; E. Anthony Rotundo, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1993), 36; Gail Bederman, *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), 16.

War reenactment, yet it would be an overstatement to fully equate reenactment to these other kinds of reactionary groups.

Many Civil War reenactors eschew the notion that their practice is on par with these sorts of male-dominated leisure pursuits. They take pride in the unique skills and painstaking efforts that their practice requires; one reenactor described how “anyone can put on a costume and play soldier but it takes a special breed to portray and relive a time period accurately. You really have to do your research.”²⁸⁹ Another boasted that no other kind of activity is “as demanding physically or mentally.”²⁹⁰ These arduous efforts reflect the profound meaning ascribed to their intention to pay homage to the struggles of actual Civil War soldiers. Ultimately, they aspire to “honor these men for their bravery” and to “appreciate...the sacrifices that were made.”²⁹¹ To them, embodying these soldiers is not a means of “simply ‘playing army,’” but of “doing honor to the memory of those we portray.”²⁹² Therefore, unlike other therapeutic male-focused activities, reenactment invokes the past to assume an apparently profound commemorative purpose. In addition, reenactors’ method of honoring soldiers via battle simulations suggests a more specific function of reenactment: it provides participants with vicarious martial experiences, which are one of the most celebrated aspects of reenactment.

Reenactors’ enthusiasm for re-creating battles suggests that they particularly identify with martial ideals. Accordingly, the “excitement of the battlefield” and the thrill of “cannon blasts and roars of infantry muskets” are the most alluring moments

²⁸⁹ Jerry Sills, quoted in Phillips, 150.

²⁹⁰ Steven Rigoni, quoted in Phillips, 129.

²⁹¹ Dwight Hensley, quoted in Phillips, 33; Michael Stone, quoted in Phillips, 202.

²⁹² Layne Chartrand, quoted in Phillips, 60; Paul Worthington, quoted in Phillips, 41.

of reenactment.²⁹³ It is in the midst of a performed battle that many reenactors achieve the desired “magic moments” in which they momentarily believe their performances. One reenactor described his favorite “special moment” when he ascertained “the enemy [was] on the march and coming for us.” At this moment, he reported being “choked thereon with emotion.”²⁹⁴ Another actor similarly described the satisfaction of experiencing a “need to fight or die,”²⁹⁵ and a third alleged that “to actually see an enemy soldier take aim and fire at you can be a hair-raising experience.”²⁹⁶ If reenactors’ sought-after subjective and emotional moments occur during battle simulations, this suggests the self-affirming function of these martial experiences.

Of course, reenactors’ utilization of warfare’s ideals to provide self-affirmation in the context of emasculation has a multitude of historical antecedents, including the case of Confederate veterans who therapeutically re-lived past battles. This tradition was noted by William James in 1906, who conjectured that war’s “horrors make the thrill” and provide salvation from “industrialism unlimited, and feminism unabashed.”²⁹⁷ Indeed, this affirmative mechanism of lionizing military endeavors was exploited during the turn-of-the-century “crisis of masculinity”; the Spanish-American War’s aggressive expansionism provided an outlet for apparently disoriented men to display reactionary ideals of physicality and aggression.²⁹⁸ War

²⁹³ Daniel Lindsay, quoted in Phillips, 22; Peter Sikora, quoted in Phillips, 71.

²⁹⁴ Layne Chartrand, quoted in Phillips, 60.

²⁹⁵ John Maxwell, quoted in Phillips, 157.

²⁹⁶ Curtiss Maddox, quoted in Phillips, 122.

²⁹⁷ William James, “The Moral Equivalent to War,” 1906. The Constitution Society, <http://www.constitution.org/wj/meow.htm>. (Accessed March 29, 2010).

²⁹⁸ Kristin L. Hoganson, *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 12; Michael S.

has continued to be an important vehicle for subsequent generations whose ideals of a virile and physical masculinity are largely rooted in battle fantasies. In response to apparently emasculating historical moments, representations of powerful and strong soldiers involved in American wars have repeatedly emerged to counter these forces.²⁹⁹

While Civil War reenactors are similar to men throughout history who have been “remasculinized” by displaying ideals of warfare, this does not explain their desire to impersonate Civil War soldiers in particular. Their selection is not only based on a desire for martial experiences, but on their identification with these specific historical actors with whom they cite a “feeling of kindred spirit” or a “special kinship.”³⁰⁰ One reenactor’s strong connection to these men compelled him to suggest that he and his peers are “actually reincarnates from the Civil War era.”³⁰¹ Their personal identifications with and glorifications of Civil War soldiers’ “brave souls” imply that soldiers from this war have an extraordinary martial allure.³⁰² This imagined preeminence of Civil War soldiers subtly conjures longstanding cultural memories which elevated the unrivaled valor of these men, and especially of southerners. While reenactors do not differentiate between the military experiences

Kimmel, *The History of Men: Essays on the History of American and British Masculinities* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 99-100.

²⁹⁹ For example, the emasculating effects of the Great Depression, which rendered men incapable as providers, were assuaged by popular conceptions of powerful protectors during World War II. See Christina S. Jarvis, *The Male Body at War: American Masculinity During World War II* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois Press, 2004), 10-44. In addition, following the failure of the Vietnam War, which coincided with the social inclusion movements that perceivably threatened white males as an empowered group, Vietnam veterans were “remasculinized” in popular media representations which constructed a narrative in which the veteran was a victim of feminized enemies. The failure of the war was blamed on the Government, war protestors, and the women’s movement. See Susan Jeffords, *The Remasculinization of America: Gender and the Vietnam War* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 76-82.

³⁰⁰ Ken Creswell, quoted in Phillips, 206; Peter Sikora, quoted in Phillips, 69.

³⁰¹ Phillips, 217.

³⁰² Rick Moock, quoted in Phillips, 15.

of Union and Confederate soldiers, their invocations of these soldiers' idealized martial virtue closely resemble cultural glorifications of devoted and war-torn soldiers which were fundamentally shaped by postbellum southern actors. Therefore, reenactors represent subtle continuity with idealized notions of nineteenth-century southern manhood. Like Confederate veterans, they use embodied simulations of the war as a vehicle to identify themselves in relation to these southern-rooted ideals of manhood.

Interestingly, in keeping with the tradition of this earlier model of martial manhood, Civil War reenactors do not equate twentieth-century notions of virility with their manly identities. Newer values of "rampant athleticism" do not concern reenactors, who jokingly refer to themselves as "tubby bearded guys."³⁰³ Instead of broadcasting sheer physical strength, reenactors are more interested in displaying graphic consequences of martial endeavors. Although they cannot boast amputated limbs as Confederate veterans did to testify their soldierly struggles, they do perform faux injuries to complete their martial displays. Hadden's guidebook invites actors to "use makeup to simulate wounds" and to "make all the noise you want" upon sustaining an injury. He also warns actors not to fret if they see "false arms, legs and fingers...scattered around."³⁰⁴ This pretend gore was verified by one reenactor who recalled a battle in which he and his comrades were besieged. He "heard someone scream with pain" and discovered his friend on the ground with "his guts protruding from his stomach."³⁰⁵ In addition to simulating injury, reenactors perform their own deaths, which they refer to as "taking a hit." Although they sometimes avoid taking

³⁰³ Kimmel, 137; Hadden, 216.

³⁰⁴ Hadden, 116.

³⁰⁵ Jerry Sills, quoted in Phillips, 149.

hits in order to continue fighting, it is common etiquette to submit when the enemy has clearly “scored a hit.”³⁰⁶ Performances of injury and death, deemed necessary to thoroughly pay homage to the experiences of Civil War soldiers, are further indications of reenactors’ desires to connect to southern-influenced glorifications of these men’s martial devotion.

The mutual understanding of when to “take a hit” is especially revealing of reenactors’ collective interest in combat regardless of Union or Confederate impersonations. Indeed, their emphasis on violent experiences seems to transcend political affiliation or social ideology; as one reenactor said, when he saw his peers “heavily engaged in fight, the color of the uniforms didn’t matter.”³⁰⁷ Furthermore, the practice of “galvanizing,” or switching sides to ensure equal numbers of opposing reenactors, proves that for many, the allure of reenactment relates more to vicarious combat than to expressions of political ideology. These collective inclinations suggest that the pursuit of a martial identity provides a more inclusive motivation for reenacting than scholars’ explanations of Confederate impersonators’ latent racial anxieties. Furthermore, they indicate that the gory martial Civil War experiences once glorified predominantly by southerners have, indeed, remained embedded in national imaginations of this past.

In addition to providing personal fulfillment by forging embodied connections to cultural myths, reenactment offers a secure community of like-minded individuals. Reenactors often cite the close bonds they have developed, as when one reenactor

³⁰⁶ Hadden, 116.

³⁰⁷ Jerry Sills, quoted in Phillips, 149.

described his love for the “camaraderie of the boys.”³⁰⁸ Indeed, references to camaraderie pepper many reenactors’ conversations, a sentiment evident in descriptions of regiments that “have become like family.”³⁰⁹ As seen in historical antecedents, the support of a collective provides a necessary affirmative audience for performances of cultural memories; maintaining an insular group ensures that these ideals remain intact. It is unsurprising, then, that these bonds are often rhetorically linked to gender, as when one reenactor described a “collective brotherhood that looks out for its members.”³¹⁰ The security of a like-minded male majority perhaps minimizes subversive threats to performances of martial manhood. While women portraying soldiers may spark discomfort, the collective “brotherhood” ensures the hegemony of their ideals within this insular world.

While reenactors prefer male exclusivity on the faux battlefield, they also significantly desire the presence of women on the side-lines. They may object to women impersonating soldiers, but they approve of several acceptable civilian impressions. In Hadden’s guidebook, there is a section entitled “Roles for Women” that is devoted to listing options for female reenactors. In his list, the role of soldier does not appear. However, Hadden invites women to portray “mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, sweethearts of officers”; or, if they want a more specific role, they may impersonate “laundresses, cooks, itinerant seamstresses, sutlers, merchants, letter writers, nurses, or nursing aides.”³¹¹ Therefore, although reenactors may condemn women who join them in simulated battles, they allow for a peripheral female

³⁰⁸ Dwight D. Hensley, quoted in Phillips, 31.

³⁰⁹ Paul Worthington, quoted in Phillips, 41.

³¹⁰ David Dougherty, quoted in Phillips, 163.

³¹¹ Hadden, 95.

presence to provide “femininity in the masculine world of war.”³¹² Thus, their performances of idealized martial manhood are offset by corresponding feminine enactments.

Reenactors’ enthusiastic responses to women who choose to impersonate acceptable historical characters are telling. Women like Julainne Layman, who researches and dons “cotton stockings, garters, drawers, a chemise, corset, hoop, petticoat, and...two-piece dress,” or Sally Hoisington, who gladly provides faux soldiers with “pies and breads using the skills of the 1860s” do not refer to facing opposition for their impressions.³¹³ Reenactors welcome these impressions in part because they function to “take some pressure off the men” following exhaustive combat.³¹⁴ Similarly, some soldier impersonators suggest that their impressions even require the efforts of these women; one described how sutlers, a merchant role acceptable for women, are “the ones that really make reenacting happen.”³¹⁵ Another described a specific sutler, Drucilla Combs, with a great appreciation for always being there “when a button falls off and you forgot to pack needle and thread, when you’re out of coffee and can’t wake up without it.”³¹⁶ Therefore, the presence of peripheral female reenactors who provide pragmatic essentials ensures that male reenactors can fully focus on their commitment to inhabiting martial identities.

While women may provide practical amenities like coffee and buttons, they also serve more significant roles by completing male reenactors’ imaginations of the Civil War era’s gendered order. This is exemplified by one impression option for

³¹² Shari Hutchins, quoted in Phillips, 99.

³¹³ Julainne Layman, quoted in Phillips, 48; Sally Hoisington, quoted in Phillips, 81.

³¹⁴ Hadden, 96.

³¹⁵ Del Warren, quoted in Phillips, 169.

³¹⁶ Claude Combs, quoted in Phillips, 37.

female participants, which Hadden notes is greatly appreciated: the role of women who watch their kin depart for battle is considered “one of the most touching.”³¹⁷ He reports that reenactors love these impressions because “it’s nice to be missed by the people who care.”³¹⁸ This romantic description of an impression that Hadden admits is rarely portrayed reveals the desire for a female presence that is solely devoted to complementing male martial ideals. This model of womanhood is deeply reminiscent of the idealized Confederate narrative of unyielding female devotion which justified southern martial manhood. Therefore, reenactors’ retrieval of southern-mythologized martial ideals also invokes embedded cultural memories of devoted feminine counterparts. Thus, women who perform doting activities like cooking or sewing are celebrated, while women who eschew these mythologized characters in favor of portraying traditionally male roles are received with animosity.

Reenactors’ desires to retrieve gendered narratives in which martial virtue is complemented by subordinated feminine devotion is additionally reflected in their efforts to mimic nineteenth-century social etiquette in civilian camps. *The Camp Chase Gazette* offers (male) reenactors a long list of guidelines for how to “treat a lady with respect”;³¹⁹ men are advised to never leave her unattended without her permission, to refrain from foul language in her presence, and to never allow her to walk into oncoming obstacles because “part of her duty is to appear completely absorbed in your fascinating conversation.”³²⁰ These simulations seem to provide pleasure for reenactors, who “love to see people transform into what they could or

³¹⁷ Hadden, 96.

³¹⁸ Hadden, 96.

³¹⁹ Craig L. Barry and Glenna Christen, “Nineteenth Century Manners,” *The Camp Chase Gazette* 35, no. 5 (April 2009): 36.

³²⁰ Barry and Christen, “Nineteenth Century Manners,” 36.

should be,” and delight in re-creating a world in which “men become more gentlemanly, women become more lady-like.”³²¹ This delight indicates that reenactors not only wish to perform as martial men on battlefields, but more generally identify with an imagined patriarchal social milieu. Their reference to gentlemen and ladies presents further indication that their imagined Civil War-era gendered order is rooted in the sentimentalized constructions of southern Lost Cause architects.

Reenactors’ attraction to this apparently appealing gender system is also related to their imaginations of a social world still unmarred by economic modernization. In this sense, their rhetoric of discontent bears resemblance to southern actors who resisted post-war industrialization. Reenactors’ dissatisfaction with “a world of mass production” in which “there is little room for individuality” is assuaged by escaping to one which fulfills “the need to be different, free, self-reliant.”³²² Indeed, reenactment “makes...a unique individual.”³²³ Like their predecessors, reenactors express aversion to industrialized processes of modernity and its social effects which seem to threaten their identities as individualized, powerful and in control. Much like previous southern actors, their aversions to modernity are mollified by embodying roles of “gentlemen and ladies” from this seemingly untarnished social world.

Given the subtle presence of these culturally-embedded southern-influenced narratives, reenactors’ vague references to escaping the modern world to an imagined nineteenth century become clearer. When a reenactor describes himself as a “hopeless romantic [who] should have been born in another time,” or when he

³²¹ Phillips, 216.

³²² Phillips, 216-217.

³²³ Tim Norton, quoted in Phillips, 148.

designates reenactment as a way to “sooth your irritated spirit and enable you to experience a simpler way of life,” he is perhaps expressing latent yearnings for a gendered order in which martial and chivalrous men are complemented by submissive and devoted women.³²⁴ The presence of these underlying narratives suggests that Civil War reenactors have chosen this particular war in part because of its association with these enduring romanticized memories. Indeed, the decision to reenact this specific era is deliberate: reenactors assert that if they “could go back in time, [the] choice would be the 1800s,” and they wax wistful about the “wonderful innocence to the period that we moderns would do well to emulate.”³²⁵ Like their historical predecessors who helped establish sentimentalized notions of this particular past, reenactors use performance to retrieve and perpetuate these appealing ideals.

The personally-therapeutic functions of reviving these southern-rooted romanticized gender ideals have, as history has shown, proven appealing to a national population. Just as the public imagination accepted southern men’s martial identities at the turn of the twentieth century, as evidenced by the success of *The Birth of the Nation*, and just as it similarly took solace in vicariously re-living Scarlett O’Hara’s plantation-era womanhood, so, too, have Civil War reenactors embraced self-affirming gendered narratives of martial men and devoted women to escape their frustrations with the present. And while academic historians have since debated and revised these southern-invented myths, reenactors present evidence that they endure within a contemporary consciousness. Not only do they subtly persist within the confines of reenactment, but they do so under the guise of historical “authenticity.”

³²⁴ Jack Pickup, quoted in Phillips, 178; Phillips, 216.

³²⁵ Ron Younger, quoted in Phillips, 85; David Snider, quoted in Phillips, 13.

Therefore, while academic historians' revisionism has revealed, for example, frustrated women who attempted to thwart war efforts, reenactors maintain traditional historical understandings while claiming that academic scholarship has "lost [its] relevance to the public."³²⁶ Their disavowal of academia allows them to preserve these conservative cultural memories as authentic.

To counter academic historians' revisionism, reenactors have assumed an "obligation to keep their memories alive."³²⁷ So long as they do "not let go of the ideals set forth," they ensure that this history "cannot be taken away."³²⁸ Their vehicle to preserve these ideals, their own bodies, affords a certain control over this history, rendering it inaccessible to academic revision. They even imply that revisionism is an affront to the memories of these past actors by suggesting that they would "look into our hearts and souls and know why we do what we do"; they would "say 'thank you'" for the reenactors' efforts.³²⁹ With the imagined sanction of Civil War soldiers' gratitude for maintaining their "authentic" history, unmarred by academic revisions, reenactors legitimate notions of the existence of absolute historical truths and deny or mask the personally-restorative functions of their performances. These objective "truths" make certain historical evidence unpalatable, such as that of the existence of female Civil War soldiers which Lauren Cook Burgess researched to justify her place on the simulated battlefield.

Yet under the authoritative guise of historical authenticity, reenactors rejected Burgess's impersonation and her subversion of their imagined gender system.

³²⁶ Hadden, 6.

³²⁷ Michael Stone, quoted in Phillips, 202.

³²⁸ Phillips, 217.

³²⁹ LaVern LeClair, quoted in Phillips, 89; Paul Worthington, quoted in Phillips, 39.

However, Burgess was ultimately given a legal mandate to perform as a soldier. Her case, in conjunction with her subsequent research on female soldiers in the Civil War, might have compelled reenactors to reflect upon the impossibility of complete historical knowledge. However, instead of sparking reflective discourse, Burgess effectively produced a new controversy in reenactment related to how a female soldier should present herself. Many male reenactors now find it problematic when women do not “properly disguise themselves” and “are easily recognized as being women.”³³⁰ The desired effect of women’s disguises is to ensure that fellow reenactors do not perceive a female presence: Hadden applauds a woman whose sex was only evident to him after her son addressed her as his mother.³³¹ Therefore, if modern notions of gender equality must infiltrate their haven, reenactors wish to be ignorant of them.

Ironically, the notion that a woman should be able to “pass” as a male soldier is indicative of modern understandings of gender as learned and performed. It exposes gender as inauthentic and imitated, much like historical reenactment. As Elizabeth Young has cleverly suggested in reference to Judith Butler’s premise of gender’s performativity, Burgess’s is a case of life imitating theory.³³² However, reenactors have not embraced this exposure of the inevitable infiltration of modern concepts that challenge their practices and purposes. Instead, they perceive Burgess as a threat to their faithful depiction of what they perceive as objective and immutable history.

³³⁰ Dan Miller, quoted in Phillips, 124; Hadden, 140.

³³¹ Hadden, 141.

³³² Young, 288.

In order to counter Burgess's subversion of their ideals, reenactors write her off as "inauthentic" and an aberration in their otherwise untarnished history. Authenticity, then, becomes the vehicle to secure the boundaries of their desired social landscape. Indeed, Hadden informs his peers, "authenticity liberates you to do anything and be anyone in a simpler world that existed 130 years ago."³³³ Authenticity, however, did not "liberate" Burgess when she encountered opposition to her impression; rather, it stifled her. And while reenactors allege that they "should always strive to be 100% authentic," when it comes to their own comfort and convenience, many abandon their inflexibility.³³⁴ They admit that they "have all kinds of modern conveniences like porta-johns" and that if Civil War soldiers saw them, they might say "it wasn't really like that."³³⁵ Indeed, they know that attaining true authenticity is a "losing battle," which implies that the past can never truly be reproduced.³³⁶ However, when their idealized gendered narratives are called into question by academic revisions or female soldiers, they invoke the necessity of depicting exact and "authentic" history. Their selectively tenacious insistence upon certain "authentic" narratives is matched by the intensity of their desire for this earlier era.

Reenactors' refusal to consider the subjective construction of collective memories or of historical interpretation renders their practice problematic. They may correctly identify a general waning interest in history and may usefully challenge historians' bias towards written documents as primary evidence, but to claim superior

³³³ Hadden, 36.

³³⁴ Michael Brown, "Cavalry Reenacting with a Saber," *The Camp Chase Gazette* 36, no. 8 (July 2009), 53.

³³⁵ Paul Worthington, quoted in Phillips, 43; LaVern LeClair, quoted in Phillips, 89.

³³⁶ Warner Huston, quoted in Phillips, 110.

historical pedagogical methods without acknowledging the subjectivity of both historical interpretation and of their practice does not seem to be a viable approach to teaching about and understanding the past. Furthermore, their glorification of past ideals, which they have rendered immune to criticism, does not suggest that there are lessons to be learned from this history, but that contemporary actors ought to emulate and reproduce these older and “simpler” values.

It is impossible to ascertain with any degree of certainty the impact of glorifying these gendered ideals on the ordinary lives and interactions of reenactors. More relevant than gauging the quality of their everyday interactions is understanding the continued salience of these larger cultural memories. As historians have shown, versions of this embedded memory have had dire social consequences; they once successfully influenced a national historical interpretation that officially sanctioned violent white supremacy. And while my investigation has singled out the gendered aspects of the cultural memories latent within contemporary reenactment, these narratives cannot be divorced from racial oppression: mythologized martial manhood and devoted womanhood are historically inextricably linked to propaganda for racial subordination, as was made crystal clear by Mildred Rutherford’s historical arguments. This is further reason to approach contemporary Civil War reenactment with suspicion; in addition to negating critical notions of history’s construction, it provides a space to perform and protect remnants of cultural memories that endorse the gendered hierarchies which historically preserved racial oppression. The preservation of these memories stands to maintain their social burdens within the contemporary cultural milieu.

Conclusion

“Popular Historymakers”

“‘Look at these buttons,’ one soldier said, fingering his gray wool jacket. ‘I soaked them overnight in a saucer filled with urine’”;³³⁷ Tim’s urine-soaking commitment to authenticity, recorded in the pages of Tony Horwitz’s Pulitzer Prize-winning bestseller, has rendered him a fan favorite. His status is revealing: not only does he represent Civil War reenactors’ intense devotion to historical pursuits, but his popularity and the colossal success of Horwitz’s *Confederates in the Attic* reflect a widespread engagement with American history. However, professional historians make very different claims about trends in the public’s attraction to history. They see a steadily waning interest, as evidenced, for example, in half-filled college seminars, or in the Connecticut Humanities Council’s reported 50% decline in attendance figures from historical museums in the past thirty years.³³⁸ Therefore, while historical museums are fighting for survival, reenactors’ communities continue to grow and Horwitz’s book has attained a cult following. This inconsistency begs the question: how does the public prefer to engage with the past?

The Connecticut Humanities Council report argues that the public wishes for experiences with history to be “tailored to their individual interests.”³³⁹ While the CHC generally referred to the content of museums’ exhibitions and their methods of presentation, their verdict speaks to a consistent proclivity for attaching personal

³³⁷ Tony Horwitz, *Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches from the Unfinished Civil War* (New York: Vintage Departures, 1998), 7.

³³⁸ Connecticut Humanities Council report, quoted in an e-mail from Katherine Kane, Director, The Harriet Beecher Stowe Center, Hartford, Connecticut, April 10, 2007.

³³⁹ Connecticut Humanities Council report.

identity to romanticized notions of the past. Contemporary reenactors' use of an imagined social world to assuage personal discontent provides an apt example. Furthermore, as past actors have shown, the tendency to forge connections with an imagined history to provide personal empowerment is not a new phenomenon: Confederate veterans and Mildred Rutherford all found fulfillment in engaging with sentimentalized memories of the past. Their prized vehicle, embodied enactment, highlights the intimate quality of their approaches to connecting with history; the process of physically assuming an idealized identity provides a subjective experience that is never accessible to spectators. Through these personal endeavors, past and present actors situate themselves within larger cultural narratives to provide the security of an imagined community.

Confederate veterans and Mildred Rutherford faced little opposition as they performed their idealized pasts. This was because their performances were consistent with—and helped to produce—an emerging consensus in national historical memory. By the end of the nineteenth century, many Americans had embraced notions of southern men's martial eminence, and indeed believed in the superior femininity of devoted southern women. Furthermore, in the years preceding Rutherford's costumed orations, professional historians of both the North and South confirmed southern versions of Civil War history and Reconstruction, and thus implicitly sanctioned southern gendered myths. And while these actors subtly revealed that their idealized pasts could not possibly be retrieved, the anachronisms that marked their performances were inconsequential in light of larger cultural acceptance of the Lost Cause narrative which they helped to generate. Their privately-motivated

contributions highlight the often-forgotten place of personal circumstances and intimate concerns within the construction of broad, hegemonic, and oppressive cultural myths. In addition, their personal urgency in solidifying these myths provides one insight as to why southerners, who lost the war, could successfully inscribe these memories in the national imaginary in order to obstruct the post-war social changes that threatened their self-conceptions. Thanks to their determination, their version of the past is still readily available to those who similarly feel discomfort with their present social conditions.

Contemporary reenactors' subtle identification with older, southern-influenced gendered myths suggests that these narratives have remained deeply entrenched within popular American historical imagination, and that they continue to offer a sense of personal empowerment in the face of perceived social and economic disorientation. Like past actors, reenactors channel their nostalgia by engaging with the past on a personal basis via the subjective practice of physical embodiment. Unlike past actors, though, contemporary reenactors do not have the sanctioned support of an academic community; in the past half-century, historians have produced scholarship that overwhelmingly rejects Lost Cause ideology. This rupture between historical scholarship and popular memories was seen clearly in reenactment's re-birth at the controversial centennial commemoration in the 1960s. Changes in the academic historical community have not eradicated older cultural memories from popular historical imagination; Lost Cause and Reconciliationist sentiments continuously re-emerge in popular historical representations. Civil War reenactment offers a particularly strong case for these memories' persistence, both in its

Reconciliationist historical revivals and, as I have argued, in its preservation of idealized Southern gender narratives. Reenactors' deliberate disengagement with academic scholarship allows them to preserve these now-defunct historical understandings.

Reenactors' detachment from academia has also rendered them immune to trends in scholarship that have fundamentally questioned how present actors know the past. Far from adhering to the Ranke-style philosophies that dominated the professional historical community which sanctioned the Lost Cause, historians no longer posit the possibility of knowing the past "as it actually happened."³⁴⁰ Instead, they suggest the inherently subjective quality of writing history, emphasizing and constructing certain narratives, and offering interpretation. They have also considered the processes by which memories like the Lost Cause are constructed, and what functions these kinds of collective memories serve. Thus, trends in historical scholarship have not only shattered these once-widely accepted patriarchal and white-supremacist cultural memories, but they have exposed their unscientific, subjective and self-interested constructions. However, reenactors, in their rebuke of historical revisionism, maintain a faithfulness to historical authenticity and to the pursuit of objective truths via exacting physical reproductions. These reproductions, though, can never truly retrieve the past, and no performed behavior can exactly replicate its immediate antecedent, let alone ones from more than a century ago. The invention of their performances, then, mirrors the subjective construction of the memories they preserve.

³⁴⁰ Leopold Von Ranke, quoted in Fritz Stern, ed., *The Varieties of History from Voltaire to the Present* (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1956), 55.

Civil War reenactment's preservation of cultural memories and adherence to notions of objective history reflects a schism between the contemporary historical profession and, as David Thelen and Roy Rosenzweig write, "popular historymaking."³⁴¹ Some historians who recognize these divergent paths have argued for collaborative forums to bridge this gap.³⁴² The Internet, for example, has been suggested as a possible venue to generate discourse between academic and recreational historians.³⁴³ However, as several historians have pointed out, this "chasm" will not be easy to overcome, especially given academics' own critiques of their discipline as having become fragmented, overspecialized, and inaccessible.³⁴⁴ More importantly, the underlying reason for the divide renders this collaboration improbable: reenactors resist recent academic revisionism because it threatens their self-affirming cultural memories and soothing notions of an unchangeable past. Thus, these "sacred narratives" must be shielded from critical analysis and interpretation precisely because of their personal functions.³⁴⁵

The improbability of collaborative discourse does not imply that professional historians ought to ignore reenactment. To dismiss reenactment would be to fail to consider its positive aspects: clearly, reenactors reflect a public interest in history, and they propose an apparently appealing interactive method of historical presentation. The quandary for historians, then, is how to engage this public interest, despite its

³⁴¹ Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen, *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 3.

³⁴² Rosenzweig, "Afterthoughts: Everyone a Historian" in *The Presence of the Past*, 184.

³⁴³ Michael O'Malley and Roy Rosenzweig, "Brave New World or Blind Ally? American History on the World Wide Web," *The Journal of American History* 84, no.1 (June 1997): 154.

³⁴⁴ David Lowenthal, "The Timeless Past: Some Anglo-American Historical Preconceptions," *The Journal of American History* 75, no.4 (March 1989): 1275, 1277.

³⁴⁵ Edward Linenthal, "Problems and Promise in Public History" *The Public Historian* 19, no. 2 (Spring 1997): 46.

rejection of historical scholarship, in a more critical, socially productive way. Should historians appropriate performance to engage greater interest in a history that adheres to the current professional consensus? How might historians utilize the power of performing history, via reenactment, film, or even Internet media, to generate shared understandings of the past? Might this be a viable method of reconstructing and disseminating another national collective memory? It seems the first step towards embracing this progressive approach to teaching history is understanding the functions and operations of reenactment as it currently exists. Therefore, instead of discarding reenactors' cultural memories as inaccurate and irrational, historians might critically consider their persistence.³⁴⁶ Indeed, scholars' detection of a racially-laden Lost Cause ethos has made important strides toward understanding reenactment's appeal as a venue to preserve white supremacist constructions of Civil War history. While race is certainly integral to these performances of cultural memories, historians should also consider gender identity as central to their emotional hold on reenactors. Detecting this more subtle component will further endeavors to understand, and even affect, the preservation and transmission of these longstanding cultural memories.

³⁴⁶ David Thelen, "Memory and American History," *The Journal of American History* 75, no. 4 (March 1989): 1125.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- . “A Great Day at Cordele.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 6, 1896.
- Barry, Craig L. “The Watchdog: Civil War Hair.” *The Camp Chase Gazette* 35, no. 7 (June 2008): 26-29.
- Barry, Craig L. and Glenna Christen. “Nineteenth Century Manners.” *The Camp Chase Gazette* 35, no. 5 (April 2008): 27-36.
- Brown, Michael. “Cavalry Reenacting with a Saber.” *The Camp Chase Gazette* 36, no. 8 (July 2009): 50-57.
- Begone, Jonah. “Vandals at the Gates.” *The Camp Chase Gazette* (May 1998), <http://wesclark.com/jw/vandals.html>. (Accessed March 29, 2010).
- . “Celebrating Seney.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, May 16, 1882.
- . “Cobb and Phillips: The Reunion of Two Legions at Great Park Yesterday.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 25, 1893.
- Cook v. Babbitt*, Civ. No. 91—0338 (D.D.C. 1993).
- . *Confederate Veteran* vol. 1, 3-4, 9, 12. Nashville, TN. 1893, 1895-1896, 1901, 1905.
- Connecticut Humanities Council Report. Quoted in an e-mail from Katherine Kane, Director. The Harriet Beecher Stowe Center. Hartford, Connecticut, April 10, 2007.
- . “Evacuation of Macon Complete: Gray-Clad Veterans Depart and Decorations Coming Down.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, May 11, 1912.
- . “Face to Face.” *The Atlantic Constitution*, July 27, 1886.
- Fleming, Victor. *Gone With the Wind*, DVD. 1939. Agoura Hills, CA: Selznick International Pictures.
- . “Georgia Woman Made Address.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, May 9, 1901.
- . “Georgia’s Great Historian.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, June 6, 1915.
- Griffith, David W. *The Birth of the Nation*, DVD. 1915. Big Bear Lake, California: David W. Griffith Corp and Epoch Producing Corporation.
- . “In Camp Two Days.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 21, 1894.
- Hadden, R. Lee. *Reliving the Civil War: A Reenactor’s Handbook*. Mechanicsburg: Stackpole Books, 1999.
- James, William. “The Moral Equivalent to War.” 1906. The Constitution Society. <http://www.constitution.org/wj/meow.htm>. (Accessed March 29, 2010).
- Kimmel, Ross M. “It’s a Case of Historical Purity.” *The Washington Post*, June 22, 1992.
- . “Lee’s Old Army.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, April 22, 1894.
- . “Louisiana To Have a Fair Sponsor at the Confederate Veteran Reunion in Nashville.” *The Daily Picayune*, January 4, 1897.
- Marcus, Amy Dockser. “When Janie Came Marching Home: Women Fought in the Civil War.” *The New York Times*, March 23, 2002.
- Meyer, Eugene L. “A Civil War of the Sexes; Park Service Wanted Male Cast at Antietam.” *The Washington Post*, June 9, 1992.
- . “Mildred Lewis Rutherford.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, June 25, 1922.

- . “Mr. Lucian L. Knight Introduces Sponsors.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 22, 1898.
- . “On the Ground: The Dinner and the Speeches in the Afternoon.” *Wheeling West Virginia*, September 24, 1886.
- . “Once More In Line.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 24, 1894.
- Phillips, Jim. *Reenacting... Why? A Look at Civil War Reenactors and Why They Do What They Do*. Decatur: The Confederate Bookstore, 2001.
- Philpott, William Bledsoe. *The Sponsor Souvenir Album and the History of United Confederate Veterans’ Reunion, 1895*. Houston: Sponsor Souvenir Company, 1895.
- Pollard, Edward Alfred. *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates*. New York: E.B. Treat, 1890.
- . “Reunion of Southern Soldiers.” *The Sun*, July 27, 1875.
- Robinson, Lynda. “It’s a Man’s Job: A Woman’s Fight to Be a Civil War ‘Soldier.’” *The San Francisco Chronicle*, October 13, 1991.
- Rutherford, Mildred Lewis. “Contrasted Lives of Jefferson Davis and Abraham Lincoln.” *Miss Rutherford’s Historical Notes, Formerly Scrapbook 6*, (June 1927): 1-20.
- Rutherford, Mildred Lewis. “Historical Sins of Omission and Commission.” Delivered on October 22, 1915, in *Four Addresses*, 85-119. Birmingham: The Mildred Lewis Rutherford Historical Circle, 1916.
- Rutherford, Mildred Lewis. “The Civilization of the Old South: What Made It: What Destroyed It: What Has Replaced It.” Delivered on November 9, 1916. Athens: The McGregor Co. Printers, 1916.
- Rutherford, Mildred Lewis. “The South in the Building of a Nation.” Delivered on November 14, 1912, in *Four Addresses*, 3-15. Birmingham: The Mildred Lewis Rutherford Historical Circle, 1916.
- Rutherford, Mildred Lewis. “Thirteen Periods of United States History.” Delivered on November 21, 1912, in *Four Addresses*, 19-45. Birmingham: The Mildred Lewis Rutherford Historical Circle, 1916.
- Rutherford, Mildred Lewis. “What Has the Negro Meant to the South? What Has the South Meant to the Negro?” *Miss Rutherford’s Scrapbook 3*, (October 1925): 1-24.
- Rutherford, Mildred Lewis. “Wrongs of History Righted.” Delivered on November 13, 1914, in *Four Addresses*, 49-82. Birmingham: The Mildred Lewis Rutherford Historical Circle, 1916.
- . “Shall We Forget the War.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, June 28, 1886.
- . “Southern People Entertain in New York.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, Decemeber 29, 1911.
- . *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 6, 1883.
- . *The Atlanta Constitution*, June 26, 1886.
- . “The Boys in the Trenches.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 22, 1898.
- . “The Forty-Fourth Georgia.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 18, 1892.
- . “Annual Reunion at Chattanooga.” *The Knoxville Journal*, June 25, 1889.
- . “The Reunion.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 2, 1883.

- . “The Reunion of Harris’ Brigade.” *Vicksburg Daily Commercial*, November 22, 1879.
- . “The Veterans.” *Charlotte News*, January 25, 1889.
- . “The Soldier Boys.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, July 23, 1886.
- . “They Will Go Into Camp.” *The Atlanta Constitution*, August 26, 1893.
- . “Widows of Confederates and Daughters of South.” *Lexington Herald*, May 24, 1913.
- . “Women Sues Over Exclusion From Events at National Park.” *The New York Times*, February 25, 1991.

Secondary Sources

- Agnew, Vanessa. “What Is Reenactment?” *Criticism* 46, no. 3 (June 2004): 327-339.
- Allred, Randal. “Catharsis, Revision and Re-enactment: Negotiating the Meaning of the American Civil War.” *Journal of American Culture* 19, no. 4 (Winter 1996): 1-13.
- Anderson, Jay. *Time Machines: The World of Living History*. Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1984.
- Bachofner, Simone. *Hollywood Film and the Cultural Memory of the Civil War South: How America's Memory of the Civil War Is Reflected in Films Like "Gone With the Wind" and "Cold Mountain."* Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller, 2008.
- Bailey, Fred Arthur. “Mildred Lewis Rutherford and the Patrician Cult of the Old South.” *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 78, no. 3 (Fall 1994): 509-535.
- Barrett, Jenny. *Shooting the Civil War: Cinema, History and American National Identity*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2009.
- Bederman, Gail. *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Blight, David. *Beyond the Battlefield: Race, Memory and the Civil War*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002.
- Blight, David. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Bohannon, Keith S. ““These Few Gray-Haired, Battle-Scarred Veterans’: Confederate Army Reunions in Georgia, 1885-1895.” In *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History*, edited by Gary W. Gallagher and Alan T. Nolan, 89-111. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.
- Bonner, Thomas N. “Civil War Historians and the ‘Needless War’ Doctrine.” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 17, no.2 (April 1956): 193-216.
- Boydell, Christine. “Review Article: Fashioning Identities: Gender, Class and the Self.” *Journal of Contemporary History* 39, no. 1 (2004): 137-146.
- Bly, Robert. *Iron John: A Book About Men*. Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 1990.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Case, Sarah H. “The Historical Ideology of Mildred Lewis Rutherford: A Confederate

- Historian's New South Creed." *Journal of Southern History* 67, no. 3 (August 2002): 599-628.
- Chadwick, Bruce. *The Reel Civil War: Mythmaking in American Film*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2001.
- Clare, Virginia Pettigrew. *Thunder and Stars*. Georgia: Oglethorpe University Press, 1941.
- Collingwood, R.G. *The Idea of History: Revised Edition with Lectures 1926-1928*. Edited by Jan Van Der Dussen. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Cook, Alexander. "The Use and Abuse of Historical Reenactment: Thoughts On Recent Trends in Public History." *Criticism* 46, no. 3 (June 2004): 487-496.
- Cook, Robert J. *Troubled Commemoration: The American Civil War Centennial, 1961-1965*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007.
- Cook, Lauren and DeAnne Blanton, *They Fought Like Demons: Women Soldiers in the American Civil War*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002.
- Cox, Karen L. *The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2003.
- Cullen, Jim. *The Civil War in Popular Culture: A Reusable Past*. Washington: Smithsonian Institute Press, 1995.
- Donaldson, Mike. "What Is Hegemonic Masculinity?" *Theory and Society* 22, no. 5 (October 1993): 643-657.
- DuRocher, Kris. "Violent Masculinity: Learning Ritual and Performance in Southern Lynchings." In *Southern Masculinity: Perspectives on Manhood in the South since Reconstruction*, edited by Craig Thompson Friend, 46-64. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2009.
- Farmer, James O. "Playing Rebels: Reenactment as Nostalgia and Defense of Confederacy in the Battle of Aiken." *Southern Cultures* 11, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 46-73.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. "Altars of Sacrifice: Confederate Women and the Narratives of War." *The Journal of American History* 76, no. 4 (March 1990): 1200-1228.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. "Christian Soldiers: The Meaning of Revivalism in the Confederate Army." *Journal of Southern History* 53, no.1 (February 1987): 63-90.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Foster, Gaines M. *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South: 1865-1913*. New York: The Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Franklin, John Hope. *The Militant South, 1800-1861*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Friend, Craig Thompson. "From Southern Manhood to Southern Masculinities: An Introduction." In *Southern Masculinity: Perspectives on Manhood in the South since Reconstruction*, edited by Craig Thompson Friend, vii-xxiii. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2009.
- Friend, Craig Thompson and Lorri Grover. "Rethinking Southern Masculinity: An

- Introduction.” In *Southern Manhood: Perspectives on Masculinity in the Old South*, edited by Craig Thompson Friend and Lorri Glover, vii-xvii. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2004.
- Gable, Eric and Richard Handler. “After Authenticity at an American Heritage Site.” *American Anthropologist* 98, no. 3 (September 1996): 568-578.
- Gallagher, Gary W. *Causes Won, Lost and Forgotten: How Hollywood & Popular Art Shape What We Know about the Civil War*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Greenberg, Amy S. *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Greenberg, Kenneth S. *Honor and Slavery: Lies, Duels, Noses, Masks, Dressing As A Woman, Gifts, Strangers, Death, Humanitarianism, Slave Rebellions, the Pro-Slavery Argument, Baseball, Hunting and Gambling in the Old South*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Griffin, Roger. “Afterthought: Redressing the Balance in Historiography.” In *Fashioning the Body Politic: Dress, Gender, Citizenship*, edited by Wendy Parkins, 217-226. New York: Berg Publishers, 2002.
- Hale, Grace Elizabeth. “‘Some Women Have Never Been Reconstructed:’ Mildred Lewis Rutherford, Lucy M. Stanton, and the Racial Politics of White Southern Womanhood, 1900-1930.” In *Georgia in Black and White: Explorations in the Race Relations of a Southern State, 1865-1950*, edited by John C. Insoe, 173-201. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994.
- Hall, Dennis. “Civil War Reenactors and the Postmodern Sense of History.” *Journal of American Culture* 17, no. 3 (Fall 1994): 7-11.
- Handler, Richard and William Saxton. “Dyssimulation: Reflexivity, Narrative and the Quest for Authenticity in ‘Living History.’” *Cultural Anthropology* 3, no. 3 (August 1988): 242-260.
- Heyrman, Christine Leigh. *Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Hirsh, Marianne and Valerie Smith, “Feminism and Cultural Memory: An Introduction.” *Signs* 28, no. 1 (Fall 2002): 1-19.
- Hoganson, Kristin L. *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Horwitz, Tony. *Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches from the Unfinished Civil War*. New York: Vintage Departures, 1998.
- Hunt, Stephen. “But We’re Men Aren’t We!: Living History as a Site of Masculine Identity Construction.” *Men and Masculinities* 10, no. 4 (June 2008): 460-483.
- Janney, Caroline E. *Burying the Dead But Not the Past: Ladies’ Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Jarvis, Christina S. *The Male Body at War: American Masculinity During World War II*. Dekalb: Northern Illinois Press, 2004.
- Jeffords, Susan. *The Remasculinization of America: Gender and the Vietnam War*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- Kammen, Michael. *American Culture, American Tastes*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf,

- 1999.
- Kammen, Michael. *In the Past Lane: Historical Perspectives on American Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Kimmel, Michael. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York: Free Press, 1996.
- Kimmel, Michael. *The History of Men: Essays on the History of American and British Masculinities*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.
- Kimmel, Michael S. and Michael Kaufman, "The New Men's Movement: Retreat and Regression with America's Weekend Warriors." *Feminist Issues* 13, no. 2 (Fall 1993): 3-22.
- Kirby, Jack Temple. *Media-Made Dixie: The South in the American Imagination*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986.
- Lears, T.J. Jackson. *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Linenthal, Edward. "Problems and Promise in Public History." *The Public Historian* 19, no. 2 (Spring 1997): 45-47.
- Lowenthal, David. "The Timeless Past: Some Anglo-American Historical Preconceptions." *The Journal of American History* 75, no.4 (March 1989): 1263-1280.
- Mahan, Vista Anne. "Textiles: Who Made Them and Who Used Them." In *Georgia Quilts: Piecing Together a History*, edited by Anita Zaleski Weinraub, 125-151. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2006.
- Mattingly, Carol. *Appropriate[ing] Dress: Women's Rhetorical Style in Nineteenth-Century America*. Carbondale: The Southern Illinois University Press, 2002.
- McConnell, Stuart. *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- McClurken, Jeffrey W. *Taking Care of the Living: Reconstructing Confederate Veteran Families in Virginia*. Charlotte: University of Virginia Press, 2009.
- McPherson, James. *Drawn With the Sword: Reflections on the American Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- McPherson, James. Forward to *An Uncommon Soldier: the Civil War Letters of Sarah Rossetta Wakeman, alias Pvt. Lyons Wakeman, 153rd Regiment, New York State Volunteers, 1862-1864*, by Sarah Rossetta Wakeman, xi-xiii. Edited by Lauren Cook Burgess. Pasadena: The Minerva Center, 1994.
- McPherson, James. "Long-Legged Yankee Lies: The Southern Textbook Crusade." In *The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture*, edited by Alice Fahs and Joan Waugh, 64-78. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- McPherson, Tara. *Reconstructing Dixie: Race, Gender, and Nostalgia in the Imagined South*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.
- O'Malley, Michael and Roy Rosenzweig. "Brave New World or Blind Ally? American History on the World Wide Web." *The Journal of American History* 84, no.1 (June 1997): 132-155.
- Orville, Miles. *The Real Thing: Imitation and Authenticity in American Culture, 1880-1940*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989.

- Ownby, Ted. *Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, and Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Parkins, Wendy. "The Epidemic of Purple, White and Green: Fashion and the Suffragette Movement in Britain 1908-1914." In *Fashioning the Body Politic: Dress, Gender, Citizenship*, edited by Wendy Parkins, 97-124. New York: Berg Publishers, 2002.
- Rable, George C. *Civil Wars: Women and the Crisis of Southern Nationalism*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989.
- Reardon, Carol. *Pickett's Charge in History and Memory*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Roach, Joseph. *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
- Robinson, Sally. *Marked Men: White Masculinity in Crisis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Rosenberg-Smith, Carroll. *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Rotundo, E. Anthony. *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era*. New York: Basic Books, 1993.
- Schechner, Richard. *Between Theater and Anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.
- Scott, Anna Firor. *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Silber, Nina. *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865-1900*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993.
- Stern, Fritz, ed. *The Varieties of History from Voltaire to the Present*. Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1956.
- Straus, Mitchell D. "Identity Construction Among Confederate Civil War Reenactors: A Study of Dress, Stage Props, and Discourse." *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal* 21, no. 4 (2003): 149-161.
- Taylor, Diana. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Thelen, David. "Learning from the Past: Individual Experience and Re-enactment." *Indiana Magazine of History* 99, no. 2 (June 2003): 155-71.
- Thelen, David. "Memory and American History." *The Journal of American History* 75, no. 4 (March 1989): 1117-1129.
- Thelen, David and Roy Rosenzweig. *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- Thompson, Jenny. *War Games: Inside the World of Twentieth-Century War Reenactors*. Washington: Smithsonian Books, 2004.
- Turner, Rory. "Bloodless Battles." *The Drama Review* 34, no. 4 (Winter 1990): 123-136.
- Tyson, Timothy B. "Dynamite and 'The Silent South': A Story from the Second Reconstruction in South Carolina." In *Jumpin' Jim Crow: Southern Politics from Civil War to Civil Rights*, edited by Jane Dailey, Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore and Bryant Simon, 275-297. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

- Wakeman, Sarah Rossetta. *An Uncommon Soldier: the Civil War Letters of Sarah Rossetta Wakeman , alias Pvt. Lyons Wakeman, 153rd Regiment, New York State Volunteers, 1862-1864*. Edited by Lauren Cook Burgess. Pasadena: The Minerva Center, 1994.
- Whites, LeeAnn. "Stand By Your Man: The Ladies Memorial Association and the Reconstruction of Southern White Manhood." In *Women of the American South: A Multicultural Reader*, edited by Christie Anne Farnham, 133-149. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Whites, LeeAnn. *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995.
- Will, Brian Steel. *Gone with the Glory: The Civil War in Cinema*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2007.
- Wilson, Charles Reagan. *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980.
- Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *Southern Honor: Ethics & Behavior in the South*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Young, Elizabeth. *Disarming the Nation: Women's Writing and the American Civil War*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Yuhl, Stephanie E. "Rich and Tender Remembering: Elite White Women and an Aesthetic Sense of Place in Charleston, 1920s and 1930s." In *Where These Memories Grow: History, Memory and Southern Identity*, edited by W. Fitzhugh Brundage, 227-248. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.