

92. Goodwyn, *Democratic Promise*, 528; Cecilia Elizabeth O'Leary, *To Die For: The Paradox of American Patriotism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 5.
93. O'Leary, *To Die For*, 150–52. For a discussion of the GAR's creation of a national flag day, usually held on June 14, see Dearing, *Veterans in Politics*, 408.
94. Porter quoted in *New York Times*, October 31, 1896.
95. *New York Tribune* quoted in Jones, *The Presidential Election*, 292; *Des Moines Register*, October 31, 1896.
96. O'Leary, *To Die For*, 8.
97. *Chicago Tribune*, November 3, 1896.
98. O'Connell, *John Ireland*, 426.
99. *Washington, D.C., National Tribune* quoted in Dearing, *Veterans in Politics*, 466.
100. Ashby, *William Jennings Bryan*, 69 (quotes). For an analysis of election results, see Sanders, *Roots of Reform*, 145–47.
101. Walter Dean Burnham, "The System of 1896: An Analysis," in *The Evolution of American Electoral Systems*, ed. Paul Kleppner, Walter Dean Burnham, Ronald P. Formisano, Samuel B. Hays, Richard Jensen, and William G. Shade (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1981), 147–202 (quote on 195–96).
102. Keller, *Affairs of State*, 586.

LeeAnn Whites

You Can't Change History by Moving a Rock

Gender, Race, and the Cultural Politics of Confederate Memorialization

On August 16, 1974, in the Missouri summer heat and when most university students were far from campus, the city of Columbia quietly removed a five-and-a-half-ton Confederate memorial from the center of the University of Missouri campus. Placing the pink granite boulder on a flatbed truck trailer, workers transported it to an outlying weed-infested field in a city park. There it stood, its original 1935 bronze plaque in dedication to the "valor and patriotism of Confederate Soldiers of Boone County" virtually obscured by the spray paint and graffiti of a younger generation of students.¹ This ignominious end was hardly the future that the local members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) envisioned for the Rock when they first unveiled it with great pomp and ceremony some forty years earlier. With their eyes trained firmly on the past, as their motto "lest we forget" would indicate, the women of the UDC hoped that the Confederate Rock would continue to bind the following generations to a memory of what was for them, even in the early twentieth century, a lived experience of the Civil War and Civil War loss.²

What they could not imagine in 1935 was that the threat to their memories would arise from the members of a younger generation of university students. Not only would some white students forget the sacrifices of their Confederate forebears but also some students would not be white. By the late 1960s African American students had arrived on the University of Missouri campus in sufficient numbers to present an alternative view of the Confederacy's "valor and patriotism" that the Rock was intended to perpetuate. The struggle that emerged concerning the proper location of the Confederate Rock was therefore in many ways part of a larger cultural struggle over how and in what ways the campus in particular, and the



Members of the John S. Marmaduke chapter of the Columbia UDC with Confederate veterans from the Missouri Confederate Soldiers Home at the dedication of the Confederate Rock on June 3, 1935. (Courtesy of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, John S. Marmaduke Chapter, Scrapbook, 1935-36, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, Columbia, Mo.)

surrounding community more generally, would be racially integrated. Could or would the legacy of the white South continue to be the university's largely unquestioned hegemonic culture? Could or would the culture of white slave holders' descendants simply coexist with the cultural legacy of former slaves' descendants? And what role would white women play in this moment of potential cultural renegotiation? For when the UDC members placed the Rock at the campus center in 1935, they acted out of their position as cultural arbiters, as keepers of the public memory through their role as guardians of the white male Confederate past. Would a younger generation of white women choose to perpetuate this strategy or would they use the new cultural configuration offered by the change in the racial order to establish a new and more autonomous race and gender politics for white women?³

The Columbia chapter of the UDC was formed in 1903. Of the thirty founding members, twenty-three had fathers, or some other male relation, who actually had fought for the Confederacy. The chapter was named after John S. Marmaduke, a distinguished Confederate general who hailed from the region and whose niece was a member of the group. A poem written in 1995 by one Columbia chapter charter member reveals the ways in which this chapter's naming was more than an effort to honor one man. "UDC Ideals" points out the noble and manly qualities of all the men from Missouri who served the Confederate cause:

John S. Marmaduke, noble man
 Among Missouri's best he stood
 Brave and true, as all men are
 Who love their country and their God:
 Leader of men he was born to be
 With his heaven endowed capacity
 Of brain and blood, he dared to show
 What men were made of sixty years ago

John S. Marmaduke, Oh how souls are thrilled
 Every UDC Heart is filled
 With renewed zeal the torch to wave
 Borne by hands of men so brave.

The last two stanzas made the daughters' claim to their father's war, which became a central tenet of the organization.

Drooped and flickered tho ne'er
Trailed in the dust,
Caught up by hands true to the trust
Held aloft in the hearts and lives
Of the Daughters in Nineteen twenty five

The Children too shall know the truth
and point to All, in North or South
The Path that noble manhood trod
And leave the victory with our God.⁴

The fathers, despite their courage and valor, may have nearly "trailed" the Confederate flag in the dust, but now their daughters would keep it aloft and even pass it on to their children. Here the UDC proposed to do on a cultural level what their fathers had failed to do: win the war for the South. This white cultural war began formally as soon as the military war was lost, with the formation of such groups as ladies' memorial associations across the South. These associations were dedicated to the proper burial of Confederate soldiers and ceremonies rich in respectful symbolism.

This informal cultural war can be traced back even further to the experiences of Confederate civilians on the home front, a "second front" upon which the war was fought. The women who initially formed the Columbia UDC in 1903 had particularly strong reasons to feel that Missouri women had made significant wartime contributions to this second front. Columbia, located along the Missouri River in the heart of Boone County, was a major slaveholding area of the state where a majority of its white men fought for the Confederacy. While their men were off in the battlefields of the "first front," women were left to deal with their own sort of war. Their town and their county were contested territory, with occupying Union troops and Confederate guerrillas, or bushwhackers, pitted against one another.⁵

The story of Mary Tucker, a member of the Columbia UDC in the 1920s, illustrates this two-front experience of war in Missouri. While her father was off fighting with the Missouri State Guard against the advancing Union forces in the summer of 1861, Union troops were sacking her family home before the battle of Carthage. She was forced to flee with her mother to St. Louis after their home was burnt to the ground and their town's stores destroyed. In the following summer her father was killed at the battle of Pea Ridge, the last serious effort of the Missouri Confederate forces to control the state. By the end of the war Tucker had also lost her husband and her brother. Perhaps not surprisingly, Tucker and her mother became militant

members of the second-front war and were arrested, imprisoned, and eventually banished from St. Louis for aiding Confederate spies.⁶

In the early twentieth century the Missouri UDC took up the task of preserving home front stories of Confederate sympathizing Missouri women like Mary Tucker. Their more public efforts were devoted to memorializing their men's experiences on the first front. They worked hard to secure their men's reputation based on stories of honorable battlefield behavior. In addition UDC women stressed women's valor on the second front, focusing on the ways in which women's commonplace daily activities were transformed into important political and public acts. They told the story, for instance, of a neglected grave on a farm some seven miles northwest of Columbia marked only with the single word "Benedict." Benedict was the name of a commissioned officer of the Confederate army who fell ill while on a recruiting mission in the Columbia area. He was hidden on a Confederate sympathizers' farm, where despite the diligent efforts of the family's women to nurse him back to health he died. According to the UDC's telling, the county was so "overrun" by "federals" it was impossible to give the man a decent public burial and instead the immediate neighbors were forced to gather together secretly, during the dead of night, and convey the body to its final resting place, marking it with a stone engraved only with "Benedict."⁷

Not only did the UDC lay claim to Confederate sympathizers' valor and courage on the second front but they also demanded recognition for the loss of life that fighting on the second front had cost its participants. Just as their men had sacrificed their lives on the battlefield, civilians on the home front also lost members of their families and their community to guerrilla warfare. In a paper she read before the Columbia UDC in the 1920s Ann Hickam recounted the deaths of four close neighbors at the hands of Union troops. The first, she claimed, was a "young man not yet out of his teens" who was "shot through his heart, and in the agonies of death was pierced through the throat by a bayonet and left dead and unburied." According to Hickam, friends of the family "risked their lives" to bring his body home to his sisters. "We were," as she put it, "almost afraid to bury our dead in those troubled times." The next victim was her nearest neighbor. Union soldiers also met him on the road and even though he pleaded with them to spare his life, if only because of his wife and six children, they shot him. A few days later another man was killed, also the father of a large family, and a few days later his wife died of a broken heart. Obviously these were the kind of immediate, devastating, personal experiences that people could not eas-

ily forget. The experiences were fused in a particularly intense way with women's traditional domestic activities. Hickam concluded in her account almost sixty years later, "All these sad and harrowing things happened in the small circle of our own neighborhood."⁸

After the war officially ended, former Confederate women across the South converted their wartime soldiers' aid societies, which had fed, clothed, and nursed soldiers during the war, into Ladies' Memorial Associations, which memorialized the dead. Missouri women, in contrast, found it difficult to form such organizations. This difficulty arose because the state had remained in the Union and had been convulsed by guerrilla warfare. Only in St. Louis, where large numbers of Confederate prisoners of war died in local hospitals, and in Springfield, where the state's one major formal battle, the battle of Wilson's Creek, created more than a thousand casualties, were women able to start public memorial organizations. As was the case elsewhere in the South, the Springfield Monument Association struggled to reinter the dead. Its members sought to move bodies from a temporary location in an open field in front of the county courthouse, where they had been hastily buried in the August heat. The association raised the funds successfully for a Confederate cemetery and later acquired standard grave markers. In the rest of the state commemoration of the war dead was necessarily observed as a private matter because guerrilla fighting tended to result in the dead, frequently civilians, being scattered across the landscape.⁹

It was not until the late nineteenth century that Missouri former Confederate women found the necessity and the opportunity to publicly organize and memorialize their wartime experiences. In the 1890s these women formed the first chapter of the Daughters of the Confederacy in their state to help secure the construction of a Confederate soldiers' home. Perhaps in recognition of the extent of Missouri civilians' involvement in warfare, the Missouri Confederate Home would be the only soldiers' home in the country to admit women. By the turn of the century mounting problems associated with the proper memorialization of this Confederate generation spurred Missouri chapters of the Daughters of the Confederacy to consolidate their resources to form the United Daughters of the Confederacy. In 1901, forty years after the battle of Wilson's Creek, the Missouri UDC erected the first public monument to the Confederate dead in the state.¹⁰

Confronted by aging and death, UDC members were acutely aware that they needed to not only care for the aging veterans but also preserve the memory of the Confederate generation that was passing away before their

eyes. They needed lasting gravestones and monuments to stand as testaments to their vision of the past. Perhaps more important, they needed to transmit their stories to the younger generation, which was quickly losing contact with firsthand war accounts. At the dedication of the Confederate Rock on June 3, 1935, the Columbia UDC brought veterans, the youngest of whom was eighty-seven, from the Confederate Soldiers' Home some forty miles away in Higgensville to have living war participants present. By this point even the Confederate "daughters" were passing on. The officers of the organization who stood beside the aging denizens of the Confederate home were the granddaughters of noted war heroes. Columbia's mayor, R. Searcy Pollard, who pledged at the dedication that the city would always keep a light burning over the monument, was himself a grandson of J. J. Searcy, who in the summer of 1861 led the Columbia Home Guard against the Union at the battle of Boonville.¹¹

These grandsons and granddaughters hoped that the placement of the Confederate Rock on the University of Missouri campus would perpetuate the memory of their families' wartime sacrifices long after the war's participants were gone. Indeed, the 1935 dedication was the culmination of a generation of successful effort by these women not only to care for, bury, and memorialize the passing of the Confederate generation but also to affect their descendants. There was, for example, the local elementary school, Robert E. Lee Elementary, home of the "Patriots," which they decorated with pictures of Lee and Jefferson Davis and provided with approved Civil War histories. At the University of Missouri the UDC formed a close relationship with the Kappa Alpha fraternity; meeting at the fraternity's chapter house to celebrate Lee's birthday and other significant dates on the Confederate calendar. At one such event Mr. Crowe, a grandson of a Confederate soldier, extended a particularly warm welcome to the UDC and formally extended to its members the use of the Kappa Alpha's chapter house any time. As the UDC secretary noted in the minutes of the next meeting, "the cordial welcome and evident care in decorating for our coming gives the Kappa Alpha Boys a warm place in the hearts of the 'Daughters.'" The UDC members expressed the warmth of their affection for the Kappa Alpha men by passing a motion to have a Confederate flag made for them.¹²

Admittedly not all the UDC's efforts at cultural preservation succeeded. The members petitioned the state legislature to designate a Gray and a Blue wing at the university's main library. It remained unnamed, but the Missouri Historical Society, housed in what the UDC intended to be the Gray

wing of the library, labored tirelessly throughout the 1930s to collect over fifteen hundred service records of Missouri Confederate soldiers. Floyd Shoemaker, the secretary and librarian of the State Historical Society and editor of the *Missouri Historical Review*, was himself an avid supporter of Confederate memorialization, as was his wife, who was a member of the Columbia UDC. At a speech he gave in 1941 at the unveiling of a monument to three of Missouri's leading Confederates on the state capitol grounds, Shoemaker suggested that despite the monument they were gathered to dedicate on that day, Confederate military experiences remained largely unmarked in the state. It was rather the lived cultural tradition, "pride in southern tradition and southern ancestry," as he put it, that "binds to the present the spirit of the days of the Confederacy." Evidence of Southern tradition could be found in "the love Missourians have for the strains of 'Dixie'" or in "the high columned porch so often associated with memories of old southern homes." It was then in the survival of these cultural forms, "the music, literature, legends, and architecture of the South, (that) we find the South of tradition living today."¹³

A generation later, in the early 1970s, students wondered how a memorial like the Confederate Rock, which they viewed as inappropriately political and arguably racist, could have been located on the campus in the first place. In 1935, however, women of the UDC thought that the world had finally righted itself. Through their public organizational work in honoring their men, they had honored themselves, their families, and their Southern culture more generally. They had finally won the battle of the second front. They had secured what they saw as an appropriate level of respect and recognition, of public space, for white Southern descendants and their cultural forms in the state.

Then, in 1939, an African American named Lloyd Gaines won a suit against the university and gained admission to the school as its first black student. There was a place for African Americans in the world of the UDC, but it was not as students at the university. Indeed, every year on Memorial Day the local UDC members even decorated the grave of one African American, "Uncle Jack Coates," along with white Confederate soldiers' graves. But "Uncle Jack" was honored as a loyal body servant to his master, not as a soldier in his own right. In a sense the "place" the UDC members envisioned for African Americans was not dissimilar to the position the women envisioned for themselves: as loyal supporters of white men and as avid supporters of the second-front war. Of course the difference was that their men really were *their* men, while for their slaves their owners were in

fact no "real" kin of theirs and this despite the "Uncle" in Jack Coates or even the "Aunt" in Aunt Harris, "our black mammy," who was buried with her white owners in the same cemetery as Uncle Jack.¹⁴

Although the UDC continued to celebrate those African Americans who appeared (at least to them) to be like members of their families, even advocating that a special pension be established for slaves who remained loyal to their owners during the Civil War, the black community in the state worked diligently to establish itself as a truly free people. As defeated white Confederates of the county and the state looked to their kin and community to perpetuate their culture, African Americans in central Missouri looked to their kin and community for the same purpose. As white women of the UDC asserted the honor and valor of their defeated men, and therefore the honor and worthiness of their white Southern culture more generally, the black population struggled to acquire an equal place for itself in the public cultural life of the state.¹⁵

This struggle on the part of the state's African Americans sprang from their experiences of the Civil War, particularly its guerrilla warfare, in the same households that the UDC were so intent upon memorializing. Lloyd Gaines's admission as a student to the university represented two trends. The first was simple: that a racially exclusionary society could no longer be maintained at public institutions such as the University of Missouri. Second, it represented something arguably of much wider cultural and social significance. For intertwined with the recognition of a more racially egalitarian future was the emergence of a more racially egalitarian past. The public acknowledgment of a different past cut right to the heart of white Confederate memory.

Just as the UDC was establishing a hegemonic place for the cultural politics of the second-front war, the admission of black students to the university represented the possibility that the black story would be presented in a form that white people in the state would hear. What that black story would reveal was that the war in central Missouri was actually a three-front war, fought not only on the battlefields and in white households but also in black households. At the war's beginning, of course, black slaves lived with their white owners. Their dispersal throughout the white community created the basis for the white women at the time, and the UDC ever afterward, to cling to their single-minded vision of African Americans as servants and thus as loyal participants in their second-front war.¹⁶

In many ways slaves' experiences in Boone County during the war were similar to those of their owners. The African American third-front war

emerged from the fortunes of the second-front war. Until 1863 slaveholding households were largely stable in the area thanks to the Union troops stationed in Columbia. However much Confederate sympathizers may have resented the presence of these soldiers and conspired against them, they had to recognize the usefulness of the Union military's commitment to upholding slavery in Missouri's formally "loyal" border area. Beginning in the fall of 1863, however, the Union military began actively recruiting slaves by offering them freedom in exchange for their service as soldiers. Union officials sent out recruiting agents from St. Louis into the heart of slave-holding regions like Boone County.¹⁷

This shift in Union policy marked the beginning of the end of slavery in the county and opened the war's third front. General Order 135 opened the door to black enlistment in Missouri in November 1863, and opposition by white slaveholders was strong. In Boone County the provost marshal refused to accept black enlistees and the recruiting agent returned to St. Louis in disgust. Local bushwhackers, some of whom were members of prominent slave-owning families, threatened black men with death if they enlisted. Nonetheless, that fall more than two hundred of the county's slaves ran away to the next county, where the Union accepted their enrollments. By May 1864, 387 slave men of the county had enlisted. That number represented 69 percent of black males between twenty-one and forty years of age in Boone County as of 1860. The overwhelming majority of these black enlistees would never return to their families, as the mortality rate of their regiment was above 75 percent.¹⁸

There were striking similarities between the white and black experiences of the war in Boone County. Like their mistresses, slave women suffered the loss of their men at the front. These black men, like their owners, had often been forced to run away in the dead of night to fight a war to uphold their beliefs. For the UDC, the story of Benedict the Confederate recruiter epitomized the secrecy and danger that accompanied Confederate recruiting efforts in the county because of Union occupation. For slaves, white slave owners and white support for slavery turned enlistment into a similarly dangerous proposition. And just as white Confederate owners, who were serving at the battlefield, left behind women and children, so too did slave men leave behind women and children to deal with a hostile occupying force. But while Confederate sympathizing women had to fear the random violence of the occupying Union forces, slave women faced possible violence from both their owners and the bushwhackers.¹⁹

Two stories of slave women's activities illustrate the dangers they faced.

As with the white women of Boone County who aided and assisted Confederate recruiters like Benedict, black slave women assisted the Union forces by providing critical information. The occupying Union military could count on the loyalty of the black population only because Confederate sympathy was so widespread among whites. Slaves carried out this assistance at great personal risk. One slave woman, Easter, came to Columbia with her daughter to look for protection after bushwhackers left a threatening note in the kitchen of her owner, a Mr. Samuel Davis, which read: "From Camp Dixie, Boone County, Mo. Addressed to Samuel Davis' Black woman Easter. As you are known to be a notorious reporter, this is to inform you that if you are found in this county one-month after receiving this notice you will pull a rope. You must take all your brood with you and skedaddle like hell. We are determined to have no more of your damned reporting."²⁰

Easter did indeed "skedaddle like hell" and was fortunate enough to reach the safety of the Union military outpost with her daughter and two other women. Another slave woman, identified in the military record only as "a negro woman slave of Edward Graves," was not so fortunate. She had taken advantage of the county's increasingly chaotic conditions to run away to the town of Sturgeon. In the fall of 1864 she attempted to return to help some slaves from her former household escape. She started back to Sturgeon with a woman, a girl, a boy, and two small children. After proceeding several miles the group was overtaken by three men disguised in Union uniforms. They forced the slaves a distance into the woods, hung one woman before they shot her, shot the other slaves, and then returned the bodies of the two small children to their white owner. The master was taken into custody by Union officials and charged with complicity in the killing.²¹

As these stories would indicate, during the last year of the war as the second front began to collapse guerrilla activity aimed at the slave population increased sharply. In the fall of 1863, when the new Union policy encouraged slave men to enlist in the army, local bushwhackers responded by threatening with death any slave they caught attempting to join up. By 1864, however, the institution of slavery was in such tatters that the state legislature voted for gradual emancipation, and by January 1865 it voted for immediate abolition. Boone County bushwhackers responded to the news of emancipation by posting notices that blacks who sought paid work and whites who hired them would be lynched. The guerrillas gave the black population two weeks to leave the countryside and insisted that all able-bodied adult men had to enlist in the Union army. They apparently feared

the continued presence of adult black men in the county now that they were free. They made good on their threats by lynching several freedmen who remained in the county's rural areas. As one Union officer described the situation, "I blush for my race when I discover the wicked barbarity of the late masters and mistresses of the recently freed persons of the counties heretofore named. I have no doubt but that the m^{rs}gster, Jim Jackson, is instigated by the late slaveholders to hang or shoot every negro he can find absent from the old plantations. Some few have driven their black people away from them with nothing to eat or scarcely to wear. So between Jackson and collaborators among the first families, the poor blacks are rapidly concentrating in the towns."²²

Even with the close of the war in 1865 the freedpeople and Confederate sympathizers continued to share a conflicted history. Both would have their stories of valor and sacrifice suppressed. In the war's immediate aftermath the overwhelming majority of the county's white male citizens were disenfranchised because of their pro-Confederate stance. They found themselves living in a county and a state firmly in the hands of their wartime enemies, the Radical Republicans. For the few black soldiers who returned to their families and for the much larger number of their wives, parents, and children who lived through the war's harrowing years on the home front, the postwar era offered even fewer opportunities to publicly celebrate their sacrifices to the triumphant Union war effort than had the months immediately following the war. The demands of fighting the war had destroyed the institution of slavery that had undergirded the county's white households. But immediately after Lee's surrender the racial hierarchy was quickly reestablished through a system of de facto segregation.²³

The Union's military victory was followed shortly by political domination of Missouri by the Republican Party. Faced with a political situation in which they had little power, former Confederates could at least attempt to retain control over the private relationship between themselves and their former slaves. They also sought to control the memory of the war. Many white citizens of Boone County claimed to respect and feel genuinely fond of their former slaves. Some whites even assisted freedpeople in their efforts to build separate communities, churches, and schools. Whites were at the same time militantly opposed to anything resembling racial equality. Although they might be happy to celebrate the loyalty of their family retainers, whose faithfulness began in earnest with the test of the Civil War and persisted into emancipation, they clung to their vision of the freedpeople as extensions of themselves. In their view the war did not move beyond the

second front. They created a narrative of the war that privileged their own experience, even though blacks had demonstrated the same kind of wartime valor and sacrifice. Simply put, Boone County's Confederate daughters and sons claimed the power to commemorate the war on their own terms as a story of white sacrifice and white valor.²⁴

The death of the white Confederate generation fueled the rise of Confederate demoralization in Boone County. The death of the "old family retainers," the slavery generation, also fueled the rise of militancy among African Americans. Empowered by the struggles of the older generation to provide them with education and material opportunities, this younger generation formed the NAACP in the first decades of the twentieth century and began to press for greater social and economic opportunities for African Americans. A few years after the dedication of the Confederate Rock they had finally found in the person of Lloyd Gaines the possibility of breaching the highest bastion of exclusionary public education, the University of Missouri.²⁵

Shortly after winning his case and being formally admitted to the university, Lloyd Gaines disappeared while traveling on a train to enroll at the school. His body was never found. The message was clear: blacks were not welcome at the University of Missouri. No African American attempted to attend the university again until the 1950s, and even then only a handful did. Black enrollment swelled in the late 1960s, but on campus students found an entrenched white Southern and Confederate culture. The Kappa Alphas still flew the Confederate flag and read the Ordinances of Secession at "Old South Days" every year, the band played "Dixie" at Tiger football games, and women regularly posed on the Confederate Rock for pictures in the school annual.²⁶

A particularly hostile encounter between black and white students centered on the Confederate flag and led to the formation of the first black student organization in the 1968-69 school year. By that time African American students numbered between three and four hundred on campus. At a Tiger football game a few black students responded to the custom of waving Confederate flags by waving a black flag. The response to their gesture was a small riot. At some point in the brawl a university police officer drew a gun on one of the black flag wavers and said, "We don't do things like this here" (or, according to another account, "You SOB, you drop that flag or I'll blow your brains out"). After the incident African American students formed the Legion of Black Collegians. The following fall they established the *Black Out*. In this publication black students ex-

plained why they thought it necessary to form a separate organization. As one writer explained, black students were tired of being "constantly regarded as a silent minority . . . ignored by the main stream of campus life." Another offered a more militant explanation, describing the University of Missouri, "alias 'Little Dixie,'" as a "society of Racism." According to this writer, "If George Wallace were to walk through the dorms of this University his heart would be overflowing with pride. The number of Confederate flags that would meet his eyes could make an old veteran bigot glad. . . . The monument rock dedicated to the Confederacy would fill his eyes with tears of happiness and make him want to embrace the white faculty and staff of this University, who are all his loyal comrades."²⁷

This writer went on to describe the university as one large plantation. He called the central administration building "The Big House," which "stands in all its old southern splendor and basks in its deep southern environment." The "overseers" of this plantation, "otherwise known as the 'security police' still have their guns. . . . They fit perfectly into the system and have no qualms about doing the jobs 'Big Massa' calls down for them. The security police don't know that this is 1969 and slavery ended one hundred and three years ago." Black students were, according to this writer, "125 miles from nowhere" and therefore in no position to fight the sort of "political revolution" that was going on in major urban areas.²⁸

Here this *Black Out* writer referred to the university's distance from Kansas City and St. Louis, major urban centers with large African American populations. Ironies abound here since in the nineteenth century the river counties in the center of the state had constituted the center of the black population. At the time of the Civil War, for instance, slaves constituted 25 percent of the population of Boone County. After the war freedpeople left rural areas and moved to local towns and eventually to big cities such as St. Louis, Kansas City, and Chicago. Thus, by the time African Americans were able to return to central Missouri as students at the university they faced an area with a powerful slave-holding tradition and almost devoid of permanent black residents. Recognizing the impossibility of a direct "political revolution," the *Black Out* writers quite astutely proposed to foment a "revolution of cultural change" and proceeded to take aim at the very aspects of Southern culture that the UDC had labored so diligently to promote.²⁹

Black students expected to find no "reinforcements" among white students, but they were, in fact, forthcoming and from an unlikely place: white women. Some white women of the younger generation abandoned the

older generation's role as keeper of white men's reputation for honor and valor in the war. Instead, the younger group tried to establish women's rightful place on campus. The demands of African American and white women students converged in the early 1970s, as both groups demanded more women and black faculty as well as course work that focused on the contributions of women and minorities to the culture at large. The fall of 1971 marked a banner time for both groups, as a black studies minor was established along with the first course that focused entirely on women. In connection with this nascent women's studies program the Association of Women Students brought in a series of speakers. The first were Gloria Steinem, by this time a well-known spokesperson for the women's movement, and Dorothy Pittman, a pioneer in establishing New York City's child day care program. Steinem did not disappoint her audience as she proceeded to "tear down every myth held sacred by oppressors of women." She expressed amazement that "a school of close to 20,000 students still has only one black faculty member and a handful of female professors." She called for a coalition of blacks and white women on campus because, as she put it, "together you can work some changes, but if you don't get together the establishment will try to run you against each other."³⁰

Steinem argued, "It is up to us to make the white male more aware of the intrinsic value of the individual. . . . Only then will the human race stop dividing itself because of outward differences." She assumed white men were responsible for racism because they refused to recognize the "individuality" of white women and blacks. Through their support of feminists such as Steinem and the women's studies program, these young white women appeared to renounce the UDC's goals. Rather than viewing male honor as something to be cherished, many of these white women regarded it as highly suspect. Instead of "standing by their men," this younger generation attempted to ally itself with blacks and other social groups subordinated to white male dominance. As Steinem claimed, "(white) women have more empathy with blacks because both have been victims of the white man's discrimination." Steinem did acknowledge that the parallel between African Americans and white women was not complete, since "women may have lost their identities, but blacks are losing their lives."³¹

In her speech Steinem singled out the Confederate Rock and the Rebel flag waving over the Kappa Alpha fraternity house as two symbolic manifestations of the racial exclusion blacks faced on campus. She followed the lead of black students who had published a full-page picture of the Confederate Rock in *Black Out* the previous year with the caption "Is Racism

Fostered Here?" This query apparently received little attention from the overwhelmingly white student body. On October 6, however, less than a week after Gloria Steinem had castigated the Rock, the student senate passed a resolution calling the monument "offensive and insulting to blacks and to all who sincerely desire an end to black oppression." The senate members asked the city to remove the offending boulder as soon as possible. According to coverage in the town newspaper, this resolution constituted a "belated controversy" surrounding a "long ignored red granite boulder" and had taken other Columbia residents "by surprise." Of course, the citizens referred to were not among the 10 percent of the population who were black and certainly were not readers of the *Black Out*.³²

News stories covering the student senate motion contributed to controversy brewing among the townspeople. "Party Line," an audience participation program on a local radio station, was flooded with calls about the Confederate Rock. The student senate president claimed to have received "menacing and obscene phone calls" in response to the students' request. Citizens wrote numerous letters to the editor and offered a whole range of reasons to keep the Rock on campus. Townspeople believed that the Rock stood for public recognition of their heritage. Anyone else offering an opinion were outsiders in their view. Gloria Steinem came in for criticism on this score. As one writer asserted, "Here's an astounding example of a New York City resident, an acknowledged traveling rabble rouser, coming into Columbia, being paid by the student government association to sound off, who then tells people in the Central Missouri city how they should handle their historical monuments." Even the students were viewed as "transients" by some townspeople. As one letter concluded, "How ridiculous can one get? If the Student Senate has nothing better to do than try to stir up ill feeling between the races—they should go home."³³

What the younger generation of white women students began, black women completed. In 1971 the Rock remained in place despite the first formal request to remove it. Another protest soon followed but it, too, failed. In 1974, however, Angela Davis came to speak on campus. After her speech the Legion of Black Collegians sent a list of demands to the university's administrators that included removing the Confederate Rock from campus and warehousing it out of public view. That summer the Rock was regularly defaced, and some townspeople formed a patrol to guard it at night. Authorities became concerned that serious conflict between students and townspeople seemed likely to break out. Late in the summer of 1974,

before the students returned to campus, the city sent workers to remove the rock to a remote field in an outlying city park.³⁴

This move was not, of course, exactly what the black students had demanded. The Rock was still in public view, however far off the beaten track. The move was also not acceptable to at least some of the townspeople, especially members of the UDC and the county's historical society. These groups hired a lawyer and joined forces with the townspeople most concerned with preserving the (white Southern) "history" of the town. They first arranged to have the Rock moved to the grounds of the historical society and finally, after a formal hearing before the county judge, to have the Rock, at public expense, permanently relocated in front of the county courthouse. No students appeared at the hearing to contest the placement of the Rock in front of the courthouse, and it rests there to this day. Apparently, removing this marker of a certain kind of race and gender politics from university grounds was change enough. In having the Rock moved these students asserted the existence of a different kind of university "family," one in which African Americans were students and faculty rather than slaves and servants and in which white women were equals rather than subordinates as their father's daughters or their husband's wives.³⁵

This new but fraught alliance between white women and black people would bring substantial changes to the university in the years to come by enhancing black and women's studies programs and increasing the numbers of black and women faculty, staff, and students. The Rock, for the moment, appeared not to be an issue. Its former location on campus was converted into an open circle where all were free to speak.

But in the 1980s memorialization of the Civil War was revitalized in Missouri. The Sons of Confederate Veterans was formed anew in the state and began to spearhead memorial activities such as Civil War battle reenactments, the placement of new markers on Confederate graves, and the annual celebration of Decoration Day. In Columbia the organization's members arranged to have a concrete walkway built up to the Confederate Rock to make it more accessible to the public and began to gather at it to memorialize the county's Confederate dead. In 1988 the United Confederate Veterans in Columbia paid to have a ramp built to the Rock to allow even better public access to it. And in the early nineties some townspeople once again began to celebrate Memorial Day at the Rock, not unlike the ceremony on June 3, 1935.³⁶

By the early nineties, however, the resurgence of Confederate commem-

orative activities met with organized resistance from Missouri's African Americans. The state NAACP chapter actively opposed celebrations of Confederate heritage, pointing out that what represented valor and courage of the common soldier to heritage groups represented a history of slavery and oppression to African Americans. By 1994 pressure from the NAACP and other groups and individuals who viewed the Confederate memorialization as inherently racist caused officials at William Jewell College to refuse to allow the ceremony honoring the reburial of Jesse James to be conducted on their campus in Liberty, Missouri. The issue was not so much the reburial of a notorious Civil War guerrilla and postwar outlaw as it was the use of the Missouri Confederate flag, with which the organizers proposed to drape the casket. According to campus officials, the dark blue Missouri Confederate battle flag, while "not resembling the more familiar and controversial 'stars and bars,'" was "still judged by school officials to be a racially inflammatory symbol."³⁷ School policy, according to one official, "equated Confederate flags with Nazi uniforms and Ku Klux Klan attire."³⁷

The appropriateness of Confederate memorialization was questioned again on the University of Missouri campus in the fall of 2001 when two students decided to hang a three-by-four-foot Confederate flag in their dorm window. Other students on their floor protested and a petition was circulated and signed. Passersby frequently responded to the flag with calls of "racist." Nonetheless the two undergraduates persisted, arguing along with the larger Confederate memorial movement in the state that the flag represented "southern pride and rebellion," not, as their neighbor on the floor suggested, "oppression and prejudice." University officials hesitated to take action against the students because they feared a "tough legal battle" if they tried to force them to remove the flag. More to the point, one administrator noted, the problem was one of "differing cultural views trying to live peacefully together."³⁸

And so we might ask, what has changed? Can you change history by moving a rock? This question was taken up by the school's town newspaper when the students first proposed the idea in 1971. As they put it, "A rock is a rock. It just sits there minding its own business . . . probably not even aware that it is racist. How much can you expect of a rock? The rock can symbolize racism, or anything else a passerby wants it to. . . . You can't change history by moving a rock." Insofar as the Rock's removal reflected larger social changes in the racial and gender climate of the University of Missouri, it at least suggested a change in the perception of Civil War

history. Across the state in the 1990s Confederate memorialization met stiff resistance or defeat, indicating that the public culture had indeed restructured its telling of the past. In this new racial climate today we might expect the Rock to receive the same negative response as the Confederate flag hung in the dorm window. We might expect a return to the kind of pitched battle that created the need to move the Rock in the seventies. Instead, we find little renewed protest against the Rock and its re-memorialization and even the addition of a new Civil War monument alongside it.³⁹

In October 2001 while students were breaking into the dorm room in Gillette Hall and throwing a broken television through the window where the Confederate flag was hung, Civil War reenactors lined up on the courthouse square waving Confederate and Union flags to dedicate the new Civil War monument. Photo coverage of the event shows a young black girl laying a wreath from all the black school children in the county at the base of the monument and black members of the town's citizenry sitting in the front row of the audience. What this reveals is not simply a change in the memorializing event itself but a revision of the history that undergirds it. The Confederate Rock was originally dedicated solely to the white dead of the county, but the new monument includes the names of twenty-six black soldiers who gave their lives in the Union war effort, a number that surpasses the twenty-four white Union dead. The recognition and inclusion of the third front has transformed the meaning of memorial events like the dedication of Columbia's new Civil War monument.⁴⁰

This is not to say that all is race happiness in central Missouri. Even the new monument, while including the black Union dead, critically undercounts the participation of African Americans in the war. There were, for instance, all those slaves who ran away to enlist in the nearby county because Boone County was too conservative to have its own military recruiter. It seems likely that if their names are added to the monument, the county's black Union dead will not just outnumber the white Union dead but will outnumber the total white dead, both Union and Confederate. When bounded by the experience of the UDC's white women and the standpoint of the second front, what appeared to be a white southern story in 1935 turns out, with the collapse of the tight weld between the first and second front and the politics of standing by your man, to have been a black story all along. Who knows what the Civil War and its memorialization will become in Columbia and the former slaveholding states more generally as we move ever further away from the patriarchal slaveholding households

and the race and gender politics of those households that generated secession and war.⁴¹

NOTES

1. The use of such stone markers was commonplace in central Missouri in 1935. The UDC erected almost identical commemorative stones at the Confederate Soldiers' Home in HiggenSVille and also at the state capitol in Jefferson City. While official UDC records do not discuss the reason for the use of granite boulders, the placement of a photo of Columbia's stone unveiling next to a large photo of the Rock of Gibraltar in the Columbia chapter's scrapbook is suggestive. While the Rock of Gibraltar had stood unconquerable since ancient times, speculation in 1935 was that it would fall to the modern technology of German warfare, much as the Confederacy was alleged by the UDC to have fallen because of the superior industrial might of the North, despite its stalwart and "rock like" defense. John S. Marmaduke Chapter scrapbook, 1931-35, Belle Troxell Collection, Western Historical Manuscripts, University of Missouri, Columbia. For a further discussion of Confederate monuments in the state, see Sarah Guitart, "Monuments and Memorials in Missouri," *Missouri Historical Review* 19, no. 4 (July 1925): 555-603; and "Civil War Monuments and Battle Sites," Vertical File, Missouri State Historical Society, Columbia.

2. On the history of the UDC, see Karen L. Cox, *Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003), and Mary B. Poppenheim, Maude Blake Merchant, Mary M. Farris McKinney, Rassie Hoskins White, Eloise Welch Wright, Anne Bachman Hyde, Susie Stuart Campbell, Charlotte Osborne Woodbury, and Ruth Jenning Lawton, *The History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy* (Raleigh, N.C.: Edwards Broughton, 1925). See also Fred Bailey, "Mildred Lewis Rutherford and the Patriotic Cult of the Old South," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 78, no. 2 (Summer 1994): 509-35; Fred Bailey, "The Textbooks of the 'Lost Cause': Censorship and the Creation of Southern State Histories" *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 75, no. 2 (Summer 1991): 507-33; John M. Coski and Amy R. Feely, "A Monument to Southern Womanhood: The Founding Generation of the Confederate Museum," in *A Woman's War: Southern Women, Civil War, and the Confederate Legacy*, ed. Edward D. C. Campbell Jr. and Kym S. Rice (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1996), 131-63; and Angie Parrott, "Love Makes Memory Eternal? The United Daughters of the Confederacy in Richmond, Virginia, 1897-1920," in *The Edge of the South: Life in Nineteenth Century Virginia*, ed. Edward Ayers and John Willis (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1991), 219-38.

3. On the role of monuments and memorialization more generally in mediating contemporary social conflicts, see David W. Blight, *Race and Remon: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001); John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Pa-*

triotism in the Twentieth Century (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); John Bodnar, ed., *Bonds of Affection: Americans Define Their Patriotism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); and W. Fitzhugh Brundage, ed., *Where These Memories Grow: History, Memory, and Southern Identity* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

4. Mrs. Foster Martin to Mrs. S. C. (Margaret Blight) Hunt, March 12, 1925, Hunt Family Papers, Western Historical Manuscripts, University of Missouri.

5. On the Ladies' Memorial Association, see Gaines M. Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865 to 1913* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 36-46; LeeAnn Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender: Augusta, Georgia, 1860-1890* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995), 160-98; 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), 133-49; and Catherine Bishir, "A Strong Force of Ladies: Women, Politics, and Confederate Memorial Associations in Nineteenth Century Raleigh," *North Carolina Historical Review* 77, no. 4 (October 2000): 455-91.

6. Mary Tucker clipping, scrapbook 1, John S. Marmaduke Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy Collection, Western Historical Manuscripts, University of Missouri. On guerrilla warfare in Columbia, see William Switzer, comp., *History of Boone County, Missouri* (St. Louis: Western Historical, 1882), 43-53; and Thomas Prather, "Unconditional Surrender: The Civil War at the University of Missouri-Columbia, 1860-1865," April 10, 1989, Missouri State Historical Society. On guerrilla war in Missouri, see Gerald Fellman, *Inside War: The Guerrilla Conflict in Missouri during the American Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Richard S. Brownlee, *Gray Ghosts of the Confederacy: Guerrilla Warfare in the West, 1861-1865* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958); and Albert E. Casel and Thomas Goodrich, *Bloody Bill Anderson: The Short, Savage Life of a Civil War Guerrilla* (Mechanicsburg, Pa.: Stackpole Books, 1998).

7. Missouri Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, comp., *Reminiscences of the Women of Missouri during the Sixties* (Jefferson City: Hugh Stevens, 1912); Benedict clipping, scrapbook 1, John S. Marmaduke Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy Collection.

8. Ann Hickam clipping, scrapbook 1, John S. Marmaduke Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy Collection.

9. *The Confederated Memorial Association* (New Orleans: Graham Press, 1904), 215-26.

10. *Minutes of the Third Annual Meeting of the Missouri Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy* (Fayette, Mo.: Press of the Democrat-Leader, 1900), 1-6; R. B. Rosenberg, *Living Monuments: Confederate Soldiers' Homes in the New South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993). Although monuments to many Union generals, including Ulysses S. Grant, Nathaniel Lyon, and Frank Blair,

were erected in the state as early as 1873, there were no major Confederate monuments until the first decade of the twentieth century. Vertical File, Civil War Monument and Battle Sites, Missouri State Historical Society, Columbia.

11. John S. Marmaduke Chapter scrapbook, 1931-35, Belle Alexander Troxell Collection.

12. Minutes of the Marmaduke Chapter, April 1924. United Daughters of the Confederacy Collection.

13. Floyd C. Shoemaker, "Missouri—Heir of Southern Tradition and Individuality," *Missouri Historical Review* 36, no. 4 (July 1942): 438-46.

14. Delia Crutchfield Cook, "Shadow across the Columns: The Bittersweet Legacy of African Americans at the University of Missouri" (Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri at Columbia, 1996); Uncle Jack clipping, scrapbook 1, John S. Marmaduke Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy Collection.

15. On the African American experience in Missouri, see Lorenzo Greene, Gary R. Kremer, and Antonio Holland, *Missouri's Black Heritage* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1993).

16. On the wartime experience of African Americans in the state, see Ira Berlin, Barbara J. Fields, Steven F. Miller, Joseph P. Reidy, and Leslie S. Rowland, *Slaves No More: Three Essays on Emancipation and the Civil War* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1992), 60-76; Greene, Kremer, and Holland, *Missouri's Black Heritage*, 62-87; Michael Fellman, "Emancipation in Missouri," *Missouri Historical Review* 83, no. 1 (October 1988): 36-56; John W. Blassingame, "The Recruitment of Negro Troops in Missouri during the Civil War," *Missouri Historical Review* 68, no. 3 (April 1964): 326-38, and Suzanna Maria Grenz, "The Black Community in Boone County, 1850-1900" (Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri at Columbia, 1979).

17. Switzer, *History of Boone County*, 433; Blassingame, "The Recruitment of Negro Troops."

18. Grenz, "The Black Community in Boone County," 27, 172.

19. For a further discussion of the particular experience of black slave women in the Civil War, see Jacqueline Jones, *Labor of Love, Labor of Sorrow: Black Women, Work, and the Family from Slavery to the Present* (New York: Basic Books, 1985); Leslie Schwalm, "A Hard Fight For We": *Women's Transition from Slavery to Freedom in South Carolina* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997); and Thavolia Glymph, "This Species of Property: Female Slave Contrabands in the Civil War," in *A Woman's War*, 55-71.

20. *Missouri Statesman*, July 22, 1864.

21. *Missouri Statesman*, November 25, 1864.

22. Union officer quoted in Greene, Kremer, and Holland, *Missouri's Black Heritage*, 91.

23. In the 1868 registration of voters, only 411 of the county's 3,411 white men were allowed to vote; the other 3,000 were disqualified for their wartime Southern sympathies. Switzer, *History of Boone County*, 495-96. They would not regain the vote until

1871 and by that time the regional orientation of the state had been fundamentally altered. See Fellman, *Inside War*, 291-66.

24. Grenz, "The Black Community in Boone County," 30-37. The historical work that perhaps best depicts this white cultural hegemony is the only monograph on slavery in the state, Harrison A. Trexler, *Slavery in Missouri, 1804-1865* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1914). Based in large part on the recollections of slave owners or their descendants, Trexler argues that the close and harmonious relations between master and slave that persisted into the postwar era characterized Missouri as a small slaveholding state.

25. Greene, Kremer, and Holland, *Missouri's Black Heritage*, 140-57.

26. "Student Activism," Vertical File, University of Missouri Archives, University of Missouri.

27. *Black Out*, November 20, 1969, Legion of Black Collegians Collection, University of Missouri at Columbia College Ephemeris, Collection 3628, Western Historical Manuscripts, University of Missouri; interview with Tommy Mendenhall, August 3, 1999, Columbia; interview with William Berry, October 8, 1999, Columbia.

28. *Black Out*, November 20, 1969.

29. *Black Out*, November 26, 1970.

30. Steinem quoted in *Columbia Daily Tribune*, October 5, 1971.

31. *Ibid.*

32. *Black Out*, November 26, 1970.

33. *Columbia Daily Tribune*, October 12, 1971.

34. *Columbia Missourian*, April 5, 1974, April 26, 1974; *Columbia Daily Tribune*, April 26, 1974, April 30, 1974, August 16, 1974; *Columbia Missourian*, August 17, 1974.

35. *Columbia Daily Tribune*, October 29, 1974, November 5, 1974, December 4, 1974; *Columbia Missourian*, December 6, 1974.

36. *Columbia Daily Tribune*, March 30, 1988.

37. *Columbia Daily Tribune*, October 21, 1995. See also *Columbia Daily Tribune*, October 29, 1995.

38. *Columbia Daily Tribune*, October 21, 2001. See also *Columbia Daily Tribune*, October 16, 2001, October 29, 2001, November 6, 2001, November 8, 2001, November 10, 2001, November 13, 2001, November 20, 2001, and December 7, 2001.

39. *Columbia Missourian*, October 15, 1971.

40. *Columbia Daily Tribune*, October 8, 2001. See also *Columbia Daily Tribune*, April 6, 2001.

41. According to the local NAACP, the flying of the Confederate flag from the students' dorm room window continues to be a kind of litmus test of local race relations. "The atmosphere at the University that makes a student comfortable flying a rebel flag, brings again the question of how the University of Missouri is actually doing in the area of race relations? Not very good in my opinion." *Columbia Daily Tribune*, December 7, 2001. In contrast, no one publicly expressed opposition to the

flying of Confederate flags at the dedication of the new Civil War memorial in the town, perhaps partly because the monument committee, made up largely of local Sons of Confederate Veterans members, made a point of collecting the names of the county's black as well as white Civil War dead. The monument itself was designed to accommodate the addition of more names, pointing to the very real possibility of an even more inclusive memorial tradition to come in Boone County. Interview with William Berry, chairman, Boone County Civil War Monument Committee, January 23, 2002, Columbia.

Jon Wiener

Civil War, Cold War, Civil Rights The Civil War Centennial in Context, 1960-1965

If the South has lost the Civil War, it is determined to win the centennial.²¹ So said a West Virginia critic of the centennial observances quoted in the *New York Times* in 1961. The reference, of course, was to the renewal of the civil rights movement, especially the dramatic sit-ins that had begun during the spring of 1960. The sit-ins had started at a segregated lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina, in February and spread rapidly. By October four national chains capitulated and announced the integration of 150 stores in 112 cities, and by the end of the year the sit-in movement had involved 70,000 participants sitting in in 100 cities, resulting in 3,600 arrests—making them the largest direct action protests in American history. In this context Civil War commemoration became a political battlefield, an opportunity for supporters and opponents of civil rights, and for the president and others uncommitted on the issues, to reconsider and redefine the meaning of the Civil War, to find heroes and villains, to decide, in the words of David W. Blight, “what was lost and what was won.”²²

The dominant memory of the Civil War had changed little since the fiftieth anniversary observances in 1913, which, as Blight has shown, had been a celebration of white reconciliation and white supremacy. This is the version that had subsequently dominated the history books and the school curriculum as well as public and political life. What had been lost was the emancipationist vision of the war rooted in African Americans' memories of their own fight for freedom, in the politics of radical Reconstruction, and more generally in the notion that the war, by winning citizenship and constitutional equality for blacks, had reinvented the republic and advanced democracy. That reality had been repressed by a sentimental and romantic racism that, in Blight's words, served as “a mother lode of nostalgia” for the white supremacist ideology that had dominated the national memory every since.³

But the civil rights movement made it clear that the centennial would be

CIVIL WAR AMERICA

Gary W. Gallagher, editor



**The Memory
of the Civil War in
American Culture**

Edited by Alice Fahs & Joan Waugh

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

Chapel Hill and London

MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE LIBRARY