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1 INTRODUCTION

One of the many obituaries about Miss Mildred Lewis Rutherford written in Georgia newspapers explains her life and legacy:

The passing of Miss Mildred Lewis Rutherford, of Athens, was not unexpected, as she had been in ill health for several months. The news of her death, however, is a shock to all that knew her and loved her, and to thousands of others who did not know her personally but who had read from her virile pen and admired her great learning, her profound knowledge of southern history . . . It is doubtful if any woman in the south has performed a greater service in moulding the mental strength and womanly characteristics of the home-makers of this and other southern states. . . . She was a woman of grace, culture, piety, all of which outstanding virtues were linked with a warmth of heart, an appealing personality, and a radiating happiness that made of her an unusual woman. Her long life was one of blessed service.¹

As the above excerpt from the August 17th 1928 issue of the Atlanta Constitution shows, in her time, Rutherford was a woman of true importance in melding the minds of southerners. She was Historian-General of the United Daughters of the Confederacy from 1911-1916, and during her years as officer she promoted the writing of a “true southern history.” While the history of the Lost Cause is by no means a new topic of inquiry, a deeper study of Mildred Lewis Rutherford adds an important dimension to the historiography of the topic. The above obituary of Rutherford paints a contradictory image of the Historian-General – both womanly and virile; and her contribution to southern history and memory is no different. Completing an analysis of the speeches and texts written by Rutherford exposes and explains the contradictions and intentions embedded in much of her writing; such an in-depth study has never been done on the

¹ “Miss Mildred Rutherford,” Atlanta Consitution, 17 August 1928, 6.
woman whom the historian David Blight explains, “may have had the greatest influence on the southern historical consciousness.”

In analyzing the speeches and writing of Mildred Lewis Rutherford my goal is not only to expose the contradictions manifested in her writing, but to also define her Lost Cause “vendetta” as reactionary. Rutherford, writing in years between the Civil War and World War I, reacted to changes in the southern economy which preceded a reordering of the society that had been racially stratified for centuries before the Civil War, and to the northern monopolization of history which followed the Civil War. Rutherford was most active and influential during her years as Historian-General. During those years the South underwent a period of economic change known as the “New South” period, and continued to change as the economy of the United States mobilized for the First World War. Rutherford, along with other Lost Cause supporters, culled images of the idyllic Old South in an attempt to restore rapidly waning social and cultural systems. Rutherford frequently referred to the disintegration of traditional southern values such as love, honor, and hospitality, and to an unfavorable reordering of society. While the negative opinion of Rutherford about the societal changes which occurred in the South is a result of personal and regional bias, these changes were legitimate observations in that they were the result of structural changes in the southern economy through the first twenty years of the twentieth century.

---

The final dimension of the thesis is aided by analyzing Rutherford’s texts with intense scrutiny; she intended to shape the collective memory of the Civil War in order to create a specific future that would outlive the New South period, and would be based on white supremacy. Obituaries of her death, newspaper articles written about her speeches, and other primary and secondary sources, show that Rutherford was not an inconsequential figure; she was a woman who played a major role in the reordering of society in the new economic age. Her version of the past was well-publicized and created a memory that the white masses could not deny was desirable. However, her histories were flawed at best, and she tried to create binaries which do not align and shared remembrances which cannot be verified.3 While her stated goal was to write “true southern histories,” with her glorified stories of the antebellum South, her larger impact was that she tried to define the future by molding the public memory of the Civil War, and convinced the minds of many that “the good will between the races white and black in the South must be rebuilt upon the foundation laid in the days of slavery.”4

In order to expose the contradictions in her texts and the way that Rutherford used her texts to create a southern memory idealizing the civilization of the Old South, I use methods of linguistic turn analysis. A tool of the linguistic turn which is particularly relevant to the reading of Mildred Lewis Rutherford’s speeches is that of reading for contradictions and inconsistencies. Kathleen Canning, in her article, “Feminist History after the Linguistic Turn: Historicizing Discourse and Experience,” expresses the value she places on “the ability to attend to the rhe-

3Blight, Race and Reunion, 287.
torical aspects of historical texts, to their contrasts, exclusions, and/or binary oppositions.”⁵ In navigating between her own discourse and reality, Mildred Lewis Rutherford constantly contradicted herself while also excluded information which could have proved contrary to her purpose of creating a nostalgic vision of the southern past.

The method explained in Canning’s article, “Feminist History after the Linguistic Turn” is also helpful because Canning emphasizes the importance of texts in creating historical realities. Canning states:

In the field of history the term linguistic turn denotes the historical analysis of representation as opposed to the pursuit of a discernible, retrievable historical “reality.” What is new and controversial about the linguistic turn for social historians is the pivotal place that language and textuality occupy in poststructuralist historical analysis. Rather than simply reflecting social reality or historical context, language is seen as constituting historical events and human consciousness.⁶

Likewise, the images of the past presented in Rutherford’s texts contributed to the creation of a distorted image of the Old South in the public memory. Rutherford’s position as Historian-General of the United Daughters of the Confederacy allowed her the venue with which she could insert her idyllic images of the Old South into the public discourse. The insertion of Rutherford’s imagery of the Old South into public discourse, as part of the larger Lost Cause Movement, created a memory of the South that was not entirely based on reality.

In addition to the poststructural analysis of the linguistic turn, historical materialism will be pivotal to understanding Rutherford’s texts. Historical materialists such as Karl Marx cannot separate the structure of a society from its means of production. In The German Ideology Marx explains:

⁶ Canning, “Feminist History after the Linguistic Turn,” 369-370.
The mode of production must not be considered simply as being the reproduction of the physical existence of the individuals. Rather it is a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite mode of life on their part. As individuals express their life, so they are. What are they, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce. The nature of individuals thus depends on the material conditions determining their production.  

Therefore, as changes occur in the means of production so too will noticeable changes in society emerge; the changes in society addressed by Rutherford in her texts were expressions of changes which occurred in the mode of production.

I also use a mode of production analysis in order to show that the owners of the means of production control the prevailing ideas in society. In The German Ideology Marx asserts, “The class which has the means of production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships.”

According to this view, societal ideals evolve as the economic systems evolve and power structures are changed. In the case of Mildred Lewis Rutherford, she battled against northern portrayals of the Old South which dominated in the post-Civil War years during which the South was in economic ruin. However, the view of the Old South Rutherford purported was hardly the South that existed for most southerners. Rutherford promoted her particular concept of the Old South because it benefited members of the former elite planter class such as herself.

---

A contradiction of method that will need to be rectified is that of using the poststructuralism of the linguistic turn combined with historical materialism. Poststructuralists argue that language creates reality, whereas historical materialists argue that the mode of production manifests itself in the social and cultural life of a society. However, this contradiction can be resolved by explaining that while the society of the New South changed as a result of economic shifts, the insertion of Old South mythology into public discourse did create a historical reality in the collective memory of the public. Patrick H. Hutton, in History as an Art of Memory, explains Michel Foucault’s contribution to the field of collective memory studies when he iterates:

The past is continually being remolded in our present discourse. What is remembered about the past depends on the way it is represented which has more to do with the present power of groups to fashion its image than with the ability of historians to evoke its memory. Rather than culling the past for residual memories, each age reconstructs the past with images that suit its present needs.\(^\text{10}\)

The “present needs” in the above quote are of utmost importance in describing the impact Rutherford had on southern society. In their introduction to Representations, Natalie Zemon Davis and Randolph Starn argue that the boundaries of history and memory should be interrogated so to better understand why varying representations of the past were accepted or rejected during different time periods.\(^\text{11}\) The contributions of scholars such as Foucault, Davis, and Starn, among others, are combined with the foundational studies on collective memory done by Maurice Halbwachs to explain how creating a particular image of the Old South in the collective memory of white southerners, especially, was useful to Rutherford during a time of economic and social transformation. Rutherford harnessed the imagery of the Old South as an

\(^\text{10}\) Patrick H. Hutton, History as an Art of Memory (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1993), 6.

attempt to retain cultural and social systems that had no chance of surviving, unaltered, in the midst of the industrializing New South period.

The first chapter of the study consists of a review and synthesis of Lost Cause literature and studies about the changing structure of the southern economy in the twentieth century up to World War I. World War I is the ending point of my study because I subscribe to the beliefs of historians such as Karen Cox who argue that the Lost Cause Movement waned in importance following the First World War, and I dispute historians such as Gaines M. Foster who feel the end of the movement was a result of the reunification that followed the Spanish-American War. I discuss studies such as Karen L. Cox’s, *Dixie’s Daughters*, and David W. Blight’s *Race and Reunion*, as they specifically discuss the impact of Rutherford’s work, as well as Sarah Case’s, “The Historical Ideology of Mildred Lewis Rutherford: A Confederate Historian’s New South Creed,” an article written specifically about the influence and ideology of the Historian-General.

The second chapter addresses the inconsistencies and contradictions within Rutherford’s texts. Rutherford frequently presented oppositions between the North and the South, and life before and Civil War and after the Civil War. However, these binary oppositions had little basis in reality and were rather, textual constructs. Chapter two also argues that the creation of binary oppositions, while often bolstering the Old and criminalizing the New, were necessary to the edification of the image of the Old South. A textual analysis reveals that while creating her texts, Rutherford tried to make a clear divide between the pre- and post-war South. But regardless of her best efforts, Rutherford was not fully capable of sorting out the contradictory societal changes following the Civil War.
Another dimension of the second chapter is a mode of production analysis of the Old South versus the New South. While Rutherford’s interpretations of southern history are typically factually flawed, she lived in a region undergoing rapid economic transformation and expansion, and her observations reflected this transformation. Much to the dismay of Rutherford, the agrarian economy based on slave labor, and the cultural and social systems such an agrarian economy evoked would not survive without alterations. The shift which occurred in the economy coincided with the changes reported by Rutherford in her speeches, and the reality of these changes is addressed.

In addition, the second chapter contends that Rutherford was not solely reacting to the societal changes which emerged as a shift in the mode of production occurred. Along with other Lost Cause proponents, Rutherford felt the need to assert the rightfulness of the southern cause, and this need was a reaction to the northern monopolization of history following the Civil War and the subsequent collapse of the southern economy. The freeing of slaves, and the destruction of land due to events such as Sherman’s March to the Sea, left the North in a position of economic dominance. The northern control of the means of production meant that northerners were able to circulate histories of the Civil War which were later disputed by organizations such as the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Rutherford iterates in the Preface to *Truths of History*, “Histories as now written lay great stress upon the industries of the New England colonies, and speak of the South as made up of ‘a landed aristocracy with slavery as its only excuse for existence.’” The Historian-General went on to reference histories of the Civil War: “The South is no longer willing to stand for these misrepresentations and omissions of history, and a fair-minded North will not blame the South, and will be ready to hear the side of the sto-
ry, provided it is given from the facts and not traditions.”

Rutherford’s attempts to have new histories written which did not belittle or blame the South were a reaction to the fact that the North’s ideas of the history of the United States were beginning to become not just opinion, but fact in the minds of Americans. However, as the economic dominance of the North diminished relative to the South, so too did the acceptance of “northern” histories. The rising economic prosperity of the South allowed for “southern” histories to gain validity amongst the American public.

The last chapter builds upon the previous chapter by explaining that Mildred Lewis Rutherford’s creation of a picturesque image of the Old South was not simply an attempt to create a “true southern history” in public memory, but was also an effort to create a specific future that would lay its roots in the early twentieth century. While the past idealized by Rutherford was not a historical reality for the vast majority of southerners, the eminent need for promoting such an idea of the past and promoting a return to that past in the future was wrought from a shift in the economy of the South. Rutherford used her texts to transform fictional southern past into historical reality in the minds of the public. Rutherford’s manipulation of the past is in accordance with Hayden White’s belief: “We choose our past in the same way that we choose our future. The historical past, therefore, is, like our various personal pasts, at best a myth, justifying our gamble on a specific future, and at worst a lie, a retrospective rationalization of what we have in fact become through our choices.”

While advocating a “true southern history,” Rutherford not only tried to recreate the past in the public’s memory, but also attempted to

---

control her present and the future by reinstating a version of the antebellum social order during a new era of economic progress.

Rutherford adhered to what Maurice Halbwachs felt was a necessity of the collective memory: in order for a fact or story to become part of the collective memory it does not so much need to be grounded in truth as believable to the members of the social group adhering to the narrative.14 Rutherford’s idyllic version of the past was desirable to the public, and Rutherford’s re-creation of the past provided a prescription for recovery of the alleged historical reality in the future. When describing Christmas during the Old South, Rutherford illustrated, “How happy all were, white and black, as the cry of ‘Christmas Gif’ rang from one end to the other of the plantation, beginning early in the morning at the Big House and reaching every negro cabin – Christmas can never be the same again.”15 This sense of losing a harmonious past was present throughout Rutherford’s speeches, and the entrance of this discourse into the public consciousness created a longing for the past and hope for the future. The optimism came from the hope that blacks could be restored to some semblance of their former status in antebellum southern society.

Also of particular interest to Rutherford was erasing the image of southern cruelty to slaves and to turn the institution of slavery into a benevolent institution. In her speech entitled, “The Civilization of the Old South: What Made It: What Destroyed It: What Has Replaced It,” Rutherford obviously defended the reputation of the South when she asserted, “Very different was the relation that existed between the slave-holder and his slaves under the institution of

slavery as it was in the Old South. By the way, the negroes in the South were never called
slaves – that term came in with the Abolition crusade. They were our servants, part of our very
home.” She went on to explain the various ways that life for blacks worsened since emancipa-
tion – an increase in drunkenness and disease occurred as well as a decrease in church mem-
bbership. Rutherford revealed, “To me, it is the dearest institution I have ever seen and these
slaves seem far better off than any tenants I have seen under any other tenancy system.”

Rutherford’s discussion of slavery in the public sphere was part of her crusade to revive what
she expressed was an accurate history of the Old South. The entrance of this discourse into the
public helped to create a glorified image of the South which in turn shaped historical memory.

Rutherford’s invocation of the leisure of the Old South combined with her defense of
the institution of slavery was pivotal to the effort to create and maintain a system of racial se-
gregation during a time of industrialization and urban growth. Her interpretation of slavery as a
benevolent institution became a justification for “paternalistic” segregation and the simultane-
ous limiting of the rights of African Americans. While the social order of the Old South was
“Gone With the Wind,” Rutherford was a pivotal part of a movement which aimed at adjusting
their ideal social order to a region faced with a new economic order. Rutherford’s speeches
and writing created a grandiose image in the collective historical memory which aided in justifying
and maintaining a new model of white supremacy that was intended to work with the new
model of capitalism.

LADIES, LEGACIES, AND LOOKING FORWARD: THE CONTINUING JOURNEY OF LOST CAUSE LITERATURE

A study of Mildred Lewis Rutherford’s contribution to the Lost Cause Movement has a unique place in literature on surrounding topic. Surprisingly, very little has been written about Rutherford even though many historians have researched the Lost Cause. While I am not disputing the meaning of the Lost Cause, a case study of Rutherford does expose new information concerning the validity and purpose of claims made by those individuals who perpetuated the glorified the Lost Cause history of the South. An exposé of Rutherford’s speeches, as they are works written by the foremost female proponent of the Movement, explores the fabrication of Lost Cause histories and opens the field to examine why such histories were fabricated. Studying Rutherford’s speeches contributes to the literature which has only just begun to argue the politics of woman as purveyors of southern history. From the time soldiers were dying on battlefields through the early decades of the twentieth century, women were acting politically. Even though women such as Rutherford tried to mask their politics with their womanhood, attempting to recreate the memory of the Civil War had political consequences in the attempted maintenance of social and material relationships. Arguing Rutherford’s politics, however, does not complete her story; Rutherford was writing in a stressful environment. Many Lost Cause historians made the argument that Lost Cause Movement was born of rapid economic change which caused social stress, and studying Rutherford’s speeches as she discussed economic growth and social change clearly exemplifies the materialist connection. But while this connection has been loosely made in the past, historians have yet to explore how the defeat of the South impacted the publication of histories in the immediate postwar era, or how familial and
social relationships changed when the South did begin to industrialize at the end of the nineteenth century. And importantly, Rutherford exemplifies how women were more adverse to these changes than men, and women reacted to their lives by rising to prominence in the Lost Cause Movement as members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. The unfavorable reaction of women to the economic and likewise social changes shows that women’s efforts lasted well into the twentieth century, after the Movement is said to have ended. Women such as Rutherford were at a distance from the means of production but were still being affected by the economic transformation which was echoed in society, and were therefore in a position to critique its affects. Using gender as a category of analysis, while opening a study of the southern economy to an exploration of material conditions beyond their face value, is a task that has only been touched upon by the relevant literature.

~

Alan T. Nolan best illustrates the controversial nature of the memory of the Civil War in the first four paragraphs of his essay entitled, “The Anatomy of the Myth.” In these four paragraphs, Nolan presents the only facts of the Civil War which he feels are concrete, information such as: “In the period 1861-65, there was a major war in the United States of America (USA),” “The two sides had been unable to politically resolve sectional disagreements,” and “The war had been enormously destructive.” The vague nature of Nolan’s statements aids him in his goal of conveying that the majority of the history of the Civil War has been highly disputed.¹⁷ This disputed memory of the Civil War can be better understood by an examination of the Lost Cause Movement, which was a movement generally understood as an attempt to: restore hon-

or the reputation of the Confederacy and the men who fought to defend it; to memorialize the Confederate dead; and to establish that the Civil War was not fought about slavery, but instead about irreconcilable sectional differences. But however constant the concept of the Lost Cause has been in the literature about the topic, the interpretations of the role of women in the movement, the emphasis of the Lost Cause Movement on reconciliation, and the overall function the movement has played in national, and especially southern culture, has evolved since Gaines M. Foster wrote his seminal piece of literature, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South*. Since Foster’s writing, the literature has placed an increased emphasis on the importance of women in the Lost Cause Movement, and has argued that impact of the movement lasted well into the twentieth century. Along with the role of women in the Lost Cause Movement and the lengthened periodization of the Movement, another topic of inquiry is the way in which women of the Lost Cause Movement have shaped Confederate history through their memorialization efforts, and of more interest to me, the way in which their efforts to disseminate pro-Confederate histories helped shape the South during the New South Period and also helped to delay the process of reconciliation.

Women’s work in memorializing the fallen heroes of the Confederacy began immediately upon the war’s finish. As Drew Gilpin Faust has clearly illustrated in *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War*, the scale of human loss and physical destruction which

occurred during the American Civil War was unprecedented in the nation’s history.\textsuperscript{19} In her study of death and the Civil War, Faust shows how, as a result of the unprecedented scale of the war:

> Americans had to identify – find, invent, create – the means and the mechanisms to manage more than half a million dead: their deaths, their bodies, their loss. How they accomplished this task reshaped their individual lives – and deaths – at the same time that it redefined their nation and their culture. The work of death was Civil War America’s most fundamental and demanding undertaking.\textsuperscript{20}

While \textit{This Republic of Suffering} focuses primarily on the way in which Civil War death was dealt with on an individual and eventually on a national scale, Faust’s work is crucial to the understanding of the Lost Cause Movement in its nascence, as an attempt to give meaning to the hundreds of thousands of lives that were lost during the war.

The first chapter of \textit{This Republic of Suffering}, “Dying: ‘To Lay Down My Life,’” addresses the concept of a “Good Death” and the way that the loss of life was dealt with on an individual basis. The idea of a “Good Death” was important to the Victorian culture of nineteenth century America. In a “Good Death,” “the deceased had been conscious of his fate, had demonstrated willingness to accept it, had shown signs of belief in God and in his own salvation, and had left messages and instructive exhortations for those who should have been at his side.” However, this “work” of death to communicate with the families of casualties about the circumstances of their loved one’s death, fell upon the nurses and fellow soldiers who surrounded the victims in their final moments. But by the end of the war, the scale of death proved to outweigh the knowledge that the men who had died had died in the preferred manner; no concept of a “Good Death” could provide adequate relief to ailing families or to the nation. To the South in

\textsuperscript{19} Faust, \textit{This Republic of Suffering}, 128.

\textsuperscript{20} Faust, \textit{This Republic of Suffering}, xviii.
particular and to many individual families, the solace of a “Good Death” had to be replaced with some larger purpose so that the men who had died had not done so in vain – that larger purpose became the vindication and memorialization of the Confederate and antebellum past.  

The fact that a massive number of lives were lost during the Civil War was compounded by the fact that these men died away from their families and loved ones and were buried collectively, and often anonymously, in cemeteries. The condition of death during the Civil War was a pivotal departure from previous American wars and is essential to an understanding of how the uncharted circumstances of the Civil War altered the way the country dealt with death. Faust provides a direct linkage to the Lost Cause when she discusses the burying of Confederate dead in places such as Hollywood cemetery in Richmond, Virginia:

In rituals like those at Hollywood, the fallen were being transformed into an imagined community for the Confederacy, becoming a collective in which a name or identity was no longer necessary. These men were now part of the Confederate Dead, a shadow nation of sacrificed lives to be honored and invoked less for themselves than for the purposes of the nation and the society struggling to survive them. These soldiers could no longer contribute to the South’s military effort, but they would serve other important political and cultural purposes in providing meaning for the war and its costs.

Southern women mobilized an effort to do for the Confederate dead what the federal government would not: provide the deceased soldiers with an honorable burial. During the Civil War, burying and mourning the dead became a public ritual, a ritual that helped a tormented nation deal with its grief. The way that the South chose to find solace for its grief was in the Lost Cause and the preservation of the Confederate memory. While the North could find meaning

---

21 Faust, *This Republic of Suffering*, 17; 24; 31; 100.
22 Faust, *This Republic of Suffering*, 82-3.
23 Faust, *This Republic of Suffering*, 83.
in victory, the weary South had to find meaning elsewhere. The melancholy tone of Faust’s work provides insight into the despair felt by the South at the end of the war. While she does not expand in any great length about the meaning the South gleaned from their defeat, *This Republic of Suffering* provides an excellent introduction to the emergence of the Lost Cause by explaining that in the decades following the war, southerners began their efforts to affirm that the thousands of southern lives had not been taken in vain.\(^2\)

A work which does expand on the meaning southerners created from their loss is a work indispensable to Lost Cause literature: Gaines M. Foster’s *Ghosts of the Confederacy*. Foster asserts that meaning in his discussion of the movement to memorialize and celebrate the Confederacy: “the rituals and rhetoric of the celebration offered a memory of personal sacrifice and a model of social order that met the needs of a society experiencing rapid change and disorder.”\(^3\) Therefore, the efforts of the Lost Cause Movement helped to ease the transition into the New South Period. But in order to study what Foster actually refers to as the “Lost Cause tradition,” he feels that “the historian must examine who controlled these postwar Confederate organizations (and thereby served as keepers of the past), how southerners responded to these groups, what these groups had to say about the war, and what their rituals meant.” While minimally incorporating women into his argument, Foster focuses on the rhetoric and rituals of men. When the responsibility of perpetuating the Lost Cause fell on women during the early twentieth century, Foster argues that this transference represented the waning value placed on the Confederate tradition in the South. Therefore, the crux of Foster’s argument rests on his flawed assumption that women’s efforts illustrated a decline in the movement’s social power.

\(^2\) Faust, *This Republic of Suffering*, 238; 163; 193; 191; 193.
\(^3\) Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 6.
and that by 1913, “Defused and diminished by so many diverse meanings and uses, the Confederate tradition lost much if not all of its cultural power.” While there is validity in his argument that the Lost Cause helped ease the transition from the antebellum to the New South Period, by looking at the role of the United Daughters of the Confederacy in the years before World War I, and particularly the influence of Mildred Lewis Rutherford, Foster’s periodization is disputable.²⁶

Despite the flaws of Ghosts of the Confederacy, the study does provide foundational arguments that other scholars used to structure their studies of the Lost Cause. A point that Lost Cause historians following Foster subscribe to is the explanation that the Lost Cause Movement was an opiate for a society in the mist of rapid social and economic change.²⁷ After the Civil War, not only was the South forced to deal with physical destruction and the loss of thousands of lives in the wake of defeat, but numerous southerners lost their labor force as a result of the emancipation of the slaves. The freeing of the slaves immediately after the war, and the emergence of a black middle-class in the last decades of the nineteenth century, caused a great deal of social stress in southern society. For men such as John B. Gordon, a Georgian and renowned Confederate military leader articulated, nostalgia for the Old South and clinging to values such as honesty and loyalty was a way to combat the harshness of life that accompanied the transformation to a commercialized economy. The Lost Cause Movement, and its emphasis on the

²⁶ Foster, Ghosts of the Confederacy, 5; 179; 197.
Confederate tradition and on the values of the Old South, as presented in speeches at veterans reunions, served as a way to calm a society experiencing extreme social stress.\(^{28}\)

Historians such as Caroline E. Janney in *Burying the Dead but Not the Past: Ladies’ Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause*, Karen L. Cox in *Dixie’s Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture*, and Lloyd A. Hunter in his essay, “The Immortal Confederacy: Another Look at Lost Cause Religion,” affirm the social stress faced by the South in the decades following the Civil War.\(^{29}\) However, a method that these historians fail to adopt is that of historical materialism. Foster has the opening to make the historical materialist argument numerous times such as when he discusses the United Confederate Veterans, “The middle class, which constituted the majority of its membership – struggling members of the middle class, if the organizers were at all typical – found in the UCV relief from competition and acquisitiveness of an increasingly commercial society.”\(^{30}\) Foster, as well as other scholars, could easily have made the argument that the social stress was a reflection of a shift in the mode of production from a society based on slave labor to an industrialized society using “free” labor. The social stress and the unhappiness of the working class was a societal reflection of the economic changes that occurred within the capitalistic structure. This argument is in accord with Karl Marx’s belief that the mode of production determines the “mode of life.”\(^{31}\) The grasp for the Old South made by men like John B. Gordon can be explained as resis-
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tance to the inevitable societal changes that occurred as a result of a shift in the mode of production.

While the materialist argument has not been entirely developed, some historians began making connections between the ways in which capitalism and “northern” economic concepts began to impact life in the South during the New South period. In his study of the way racial ideologies factored into the circumstances under which the South would accept reunion with the North, David Blight discusses the impact of the policies of Radical Republicans during Reconstruction. Blight’s study is confined to the years from Reconstruction to the bicentennial of Gettysburg in 1913, and he discusses the terms on which reunion between the two regions could be achieved. During Reconstruction the federal government passed the Reconstruction amendments in an attempt to drastically transform the racial policies and beliefs of southerners. Belief in such ideas as equality of all men, in addition to “faith in free labor in a competitive capitalist system” by the Radical Republicans, undoubtedly, made reunion during Reconstruction an impossible task. In the immediate postwar period, southerners rejected not only the military occupation of the federal government, but also the first attempts at imparting ideas of industrialism and the free market economy on the agricultural South that had for centuries been rooted in slave labor. Not until the early 1900s was reunion was possible because by that time the federal government had acquiesced to allow white supremacy to reign in the South.32

In Race and Reunion, Blight not only connects feelings of southern disdain toward the North to the introduction of industrial/free-labor capitalist ideals, but also draws a very interesting connection between Lost Cause narratives and the development of the publishing indus-

32Blight, Race and Reunion, 79.
try during the last two decades of the nineteenth century. Blight speaks at great length about a series printed in the periodical, Century. The Century was a series of printed “remembrances” by Civil War veterans from both the North and South. However, if veterans wanted their submissions to be published, these written “memories” had to be strictly “factual.” By factual, Blight means inclusive of only details and timelines of the war and specific battles that soldiers on neither side could dispute. The reason the memoires were required to be factual and free of any bias was to focus on the shared experiences of soldiers in order to portray a reunionist version of history. Blight adds that the emphasis on reunion instead of on the antebellum dichotomy of beliefs, provided relief from the changing world. These published memoires created a bond between soldiers from opposing armies and helped them to find mutual solace in choosing to only recollect their shared experiences. In addition, the soldiers’ memories helped increase the readership of Century by nearly 100,000 readers in a six month period, and Blight admits, “Never had memory possessed such commercial value in America.” To the Civil War’s battle veterans, the memory of the war became a point of universal heroism. By including his analysis of the Century series, Blight is able to illustrate the way the newly developing industry plays a role in forging a national reunion by appealing to both Blue and Gray consumers.33

While Race and Reunion is an insightful addition toLost Cause literature in that it explains the complexity of reunion as it was shaped by wavering northern policies and ideas of racial equality, or lack thereof, Blight makes a mistake similar to Foster. Overall, Blight is more interested in the contributions of men than women to the Lost Cause Movement. Focusing on the experiences of men exaggerates the degree to which reunion was achieved, especially on

33 Blight, Race and Reunion, 171; 176-177.
the emotional level.\textsuperscript{34} Women held on to feelings of resentment toward the North much longer than men, and these women were running households and raising children influenced by their beliefs. But despite this weakness, Blight has contributed a compelling and useful piece of scholarship. And obviously being influenced by the memory theories of Maurice Halbwachs, Blight uses the Gettysburg Battlefield a “site” of memory. According to Race and Reunion, reconciliation was solidified after the Spanish-American War, but the bicentennial celebration of Gettysburg was so significant that it served as both the beginning and ending points of the book. Blight expresses, “Gettysburg haunted American memory, both as a reminder of the war’s revolutionary meanings and as the locus of national reconciliation.”\textsuperscript{35} Gettysburg can be seen as the “ultimate” Civil War battle because of the record number of casualties, but is also the place where Lincoln gave his “Gettysburg Address,” asking the Union Army to renew its strength to make sure the nation remained whole. Using the Gettysburg battlefield as a site of memory is similar to the way that Confederate organizations tried to mark the southern landscape with memorials and statues of southern bravery. So while sites are memory are undoubtedly essential to a study of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and Blight is inclusive of the connection between the memory of the Civil War and the developing industrial economy, he errs in the same fashion as Foster in that he does not push the economic component enough and stunts the timeline of reconciliation by primarily focusing on men.

While many historians have not pushed the connection between the changing South and the economy, the scholarship does express that southern leaders were ambivalent about their loyalties to the Old South or the New. Many spokesmen of the New South longed for the

\textsuperscript{34} Cox, Dixie’s Daughters, 144.
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virtues and values held by the society of the Old South, these same leaders made speeches and purported the recently industrialized economy of the New South, and Mildred Lewis Rutherford is no exception. Many southern leaders of the antebellum period became advocates of the Lost Cause and used their publicity to advocate reconciliation with the North. Foster specifically discusses these “Ghost Dancers” of the immediate postwar period who longed for the past but also supported their present.\textsuperscript{36} Men like Jubal E. Early, a former Confederate General who is credited with originating the Lost Cause history of the Civil War, attempted to restore the honor of southern men by attempting to control the public’s memory of the Civil War and made claims such as:

Lee was a heroic soldier who led an outnumbered army of Confederate patriots against a powerful enemy. With “Stonewall” Jackson initially at his side, he faced northern generals of minimal talent who later lied in print to explain their failures. . . . Lee and his Army of Northern Virginia set a standard of valor and accomplishment equal to anything in the military history of the Western world until finally, worn out but never defeated, they laid down their weapons at Appomatox.\textsuperscript{37}

While Early’s history, which argued that the southern soldiers were brave and only lost due to overwhelming numbers was widely accepted, his resistance to change and his adherence to an antebellum worldview caused his popularity to plateau relative to other Confederate leaders who were more willing to embrace change.\textsuperscript{38} According to Foster, the Lost Cause Movement became a movement which emphasized the shared wartime experiences of the North and South and promoted sectional reconciliation. The Lost Cause Movement developed a sense of

\textsuperscript{36} Foster, \textit{Ghosts of the Confederacy}, 47-62.
mutual respect between men who were foes on the battlefield, and “by the mid-80s, most southerners had decided to build a future within a reunited nation. A few remained irreconcilable, but their influence in southern society declined rapidly.” In the essay, “New South Visionaries: Virginia’s Last Generation of Slaveholders, the Gospel of Progress, and the Lost Cause,” Peter S. Carmichael adds that the generation who came-of-age during the late antebellum period were more willing to embrace the economic order of the New South because in the late antebellum period the slave economy had already become a market economy. In accordance with Marx, his change catalyzed to the social transformation that occurred as the mode of production was altered when southern economy adopted a new form of capitalism. And the willingness of men to embrace the new economy illustrates an important difference in sentiment between men and women. Men, being the true beneficiaries of the shift in the southern economy, were more willing to accept its fruits unconditionally than were the women felt alienated and were distanced from production and could therefore more readily see the social consequences. By the late nineteenth century then, according to historians who focus on men such as Carmichael, Foster, and Nolan who openly supports Foster in his essay, the Lost Cause Movement highlighted shared experiences of war in an effort to ease the reunion of the North and South amidst a society being rapidly transformed by industrialization.

The reconciliationist argument of Foster, however, is flawed in two respects, the first of which pertains to his argument that if the South did not want to be part of the Union, the southern states would have seceded in 1877. David Blight, respected author of Race and Reu-
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nion: The Civil War in American Memory, who as earlier stated uses roughly the same timeline as Foster, agrees with this first flawed argument. In 1877, Hayes became president after a disputed election. The Democrat Tilden won the popular vote, yet after an electoral crisis in which the Republican Party promised to remove the remaining federal troops from the South and bring an official end Reconstruction, Hayes had the support of the South. Foster believes that if the South wanted to secede at this time then the inauguration of Hayes would have been the catalyst. By making the point about Hayes, Foster discounted the fact that the South did not so much want to be a participating part of the Union as much as it wanted to attempt to restore the antebellum social order based on white supremacy. The antebellum social order only had chances of restoration if federal intervention in the South subsided. Therefore, even though southern leaders did begin to support the New South and reconciliation with the North in the late eighteen-hundreds, the fact that Hayes became president in return for the end of Reconstruction hardly provides evidence that bolsters Foster’s pro-reunion claim. Hayes’ election truly only supports the fact that the South would only begin to consider reunion if white supremacy could be restored.

Another aspect of the reconciliationist argument which is problematic is the fact that Foster, as well as other historians, based his research on the involvement of males in the Lost Cause Movement. While Foster acknowledges the early work and memorializing efforts of Ladies’ Memorial Associations, he more stridently claims that “the destruction and despair of defeat also discouraged the development of a women’s movement, for females had to join with males to solve the more basic problems of survival. . . . The women adjusted quickly to their old

---

42 Blight, Race and Reunion, 87.
43 Foster, Ghosts of the Confederacy, 63.
role, as their homage to the soldiers testified.”\textsuperscript{44} But more recent scholarship, such as Janney’s \textit{Burying the Dead but Not the Past}, fervently stresses, “regardless of the specific situation, gender patterns did not return to their antebellum status . . . women of the LMAs proved determined to control the direction of their associations, expand their civic duties, and redefine the very nature of southern femininity.”\textsuperscript{45} Foster’s view that southerners who did not want to reconcile with the North were in the minority discounts the fact that many southern women disdained Yankees and made efforts immediately following the war to memorialize the Confederate dead and acted politically in favor of the Confederate legacy. \textit{Ghosts of the Confederacy} admits that southern women often held more contempt than men for Yankees because of the destruction caused to homes and because of the loss of loved ones. However, when discussing the waxing and waning of Confederate fervor, Foster uses as evidence the appearance and content of the rhetoric and rituals of men.

This strict emphasis on men has triumphantly been contended in more recent scholarship including Cox’s \textit{Dixie’s Daughters}. Cox pulls the timeline of reconciliation to the end of World War I, over-shooting Foster’s periodization by approximately twenty years. Cox is able to convey that reconciliation occurred more completely after the First World War than as a result of the Spanish-American War because of her emphasis on the impact of women on the Lost Cause Movement and their attempt to vindicate Confederate men and the causes for which they fought. Cox argues that the United Daughters of the Confederacy, an organization created in 1894 by women who were once only members of memorial associations, made the goal of the “movement about vindication, as well as memorialization.” Cox even discusses “the ways
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in which the organization’s insistence on promoting Confederate social and political values hampered the process of sectional reconciliation until World War I.” Through their memorialization and vindication efforts women found a new role in southern society – a covertly political role.46

Caroline Janney’s writing is similar to Cox’s in that they both seek to expose the political nature of the actions of members of Ladies’ Memorial Associations and eventually the United Daughters of the Confederacy. In the feminist fashion, Janney sought to properly recognize the members of Ladies’ Memorial Associations who were excluded from previously written histories. While at times her writing is overly recuperative, Burying the Dead but Not the Past is an outstanding contribution to Lost Cause literature. In the Introduction, Janney reveals the goal of her writing:

This book restores these women’s place in the historical narrative by exploring their role as the creators and purveyors of Confederate tradition in the post-Civil War South. Through a study of Virginia’s Ladies’ Memorial Associations from 1865 to 1915, it examines how and why middle- and upper-class southern white women came to shape the public rituals of Confederate memory, Reconstruction, and reconciliation.47

Beginning in 1865, in the words of Drew Gilpin Faust, women began the “work” of death, which was primarily to honor the Confederate men who had sacrificed their lives for their cause. The women of the South wanted to ensure that the lives of men were not lost in vain and that the cause they fought for would not be forgotten.48 And in the aftermath of the war, southern women began memorializing the Confederacy and in turn altered their antebellum roles in the public sphere, which had been typically confined to orphanages and alms houses. Efforts to
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build monuments required fundraising and organizational skills foreign to many southern women, and these new responsibilities as well as the fact that members of Ladies’ Memorial Association were now acting on behalf of a southern “nation,” marked a shift from their antebellum roles as homemakers and as subordinates to masculine authority.49

The new role southern women filled in southern society was political, yet was masked by their gender, and their actions were often anti-reconciliationist. Janney defines politics as the “ability of individuals or groups to wield influence in their communities, state, or region.” In the context of her definition of politics, Janney later reveals, “The act of hiring burial crews, establishing cemeteries, and organizing elaborate Memorial Day spectacles all represented means by which they could keep alive their intense feelings of Confederate patriotism and demonstrate their continued commitment to the cause.”50 The cause being referred to is the rights of states’ versus the federal government in an antebellum society shrouded in honor and valor and decorated with pictures of loyal slaves, moonlight, and magnolias. Members of Ladies’ Memorial Associations, especially those women born after 1850, clung to a romanticized version of the Old South. These women, who came-of-age during the Civil War, “had grown up hearing tales of beautiful plantations, faithful slaves, and heroic Confederate soldiers. They had heard countless stories of the ‘southern lady’ and the Confederate women, two role models this generation of women wished to both celebrate and emulate.”51 However, these women, Rutherford included, were still acting politically although masked by their womanhood. And in
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their communities, many women rejected the reconciliation that Foster argues so many men readily accepted.

The establishment of Confederate Memorial Day was pivotal to the commemoration of the Confederacy, and the protectiveness women showed for their uniquely Confederate holiday provides an example of how members of Ladies’ Memorial Associations opposed reconciliation. While men’s organizations were meeting on battlefields and relishing their shared wartime experiences, women were not so eager to share their beloved Confederacy’s Memorial Day with the detested Yankees by making Memorial Day a national holiday. Janney iterates that the behavior of women “indicates that reunion was not as quick or as smooth as many historians have suggested. Veterans could perhaps meet again on the battlefield and celebrate one another’s bravery, courage, and other masculine qualities, but former Confederate women clung to their devotion on the home front, loyalty to their men, and abhorrence of Yankees as emblems of their part in the war.”52 Karen Cox bolsters this point when she discusses the unveiling of the Robert E. Lee Memorial at Arlington Cemetery in 1914: “At the time of the unveiling, most members of the UDC did not honestly believe that reconciliation had occurred between the North and the South. The Daughters, in particular, were loath to speak of reconciliation as long as northerners regarded southerners as traitors.”53 Drew Gilpin Faust, in her study of the ways in which the society of the United States changed in response to the half-million lives lost during the Civil War, also agrees with Janney and Cox. In reference to the memorial efforts of southern women, Faust contends, “Ensuring the immortality of the fallen and of their memory became a means of perpetuating southern resistance to northern domination and to the recon-
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struction of southern society.”

Women of the South resisted reconciliation more than Foster admits in *Ghosts of the Confederacy*. This lack of regard for women’s political action during and after the war directly affects Foster’s thesis and Blight’s point, that the influence of the Lost Cause Movement and the Confederate memory played a decreased role in defining the South after the turn of the twentieth century.

Foster’s and Blight’s research rests on the diminishing importance of the Confederate identity in the South. *Ghosts of the Confederacy* and *Race and Reunion* naively claim that all remaining tensions between the North and South died with the Spanish-American War, and the loss of widespread support from varying economic classes for the movement, and the transfer to women of the responsibility of transmitting the Lost Cause message to posterity evidences the lost influence of the Movement. While Foster could have definitively made the historical materialist argument that in an increasingly capitalist southern economy the elite classes maintained control of the Lost Cause Movement because the alienation of the working class, he simply perceives the change as proof of a complete reconciliation process. Janney, conversely, explains the decline in membership of LMAs as a success of the Lost Cause Movement. Ladies’ Memorial Associations were local organizations that became overshadowed by the United Daughters of the Confederacy in the eighteen nineties. However, the goals of the organizations were identical: memorial, historical, benevolent, educational, and social. Janney successfully argues that the UDC owed its success to the foundation that had already been created by the LMAs. The UDC, however, differed from the Ladies in their increased focus on a “true southern
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history.” The emphasis of the UDC on the publishing and dissemination of histories is where their truly lasting impact can be found, and Rutherford was the most influential player in the UDC’s historical efforts. The history advocated by the Daughters was infused with ideals of the Confederate past in attempt to reinvigorate the white supremacy of the South. But despite the inception of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and their largely middle- and upper-class constituencies, the loss of support across economic classes attests to the success of the movement. The elevated economic status of members of the UDC does not mean to Janney that popular support for the Lost Cause Movement had declined, but instead that women used their experience in LMAs to venture into roles in other social movements.

Another historian who disagrees with Foster is Sarah H. Case. Case has written the most complete work to-date about the career of Mildred Lewis Rutherford in her article, “The Historical Ideology of Mildred Lewis Rutherford: A Confederate Historian’s New South Creed.” Case discusses many of the same topics as other historians, such as reconciliation, the entrance of women into the political sphere, and the economic shift from the antebellum to the New South Period. However, where Case obviously differs is in the fact that the focus of her study is Rutherford. In her article, Case discusses the overall impact of the UDC, but as implied by the article’s title, focuses on Rutherford. Her article details Rutherford’s efforts to promote a “true southern history,” and how through these efforts she aimed to support white supremacy while at the same time promoted industrial and economic growth within the New South. Case’s article is insightful in that there is otherwise a lack of extensive research and scholarship done on
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Mildred Lewis Rutherford, however, Case’s work seemed to meander away from the topic of Rutherford’s exclusive contribution to the development of the New South.

“The Historical Ideology of Mildred Lewis Rutherford” begins with a discussion of the public role the woman of the UDC played and how they were able to defy societal norms by masking their politics with their feminity. And of primary importance is their “political” role in perpetuating and promoting antebellum culture. Case specifically expresses her disagreement with Gaines M. Foster in reference to the women’s efforts. She states, “the UDC actually expanded the influence of the Lost Cause movement by emphasizing its goal of educating the nation about the ‘true’ nature of the Civil War and the Confederation.”

Since Rutherford was the most pivotal member of the UDC in these efforts to promote a true southern history, and considering she held the position of Historian-General within the national UDC organization from 1911-1916, Foster’s argument that reunion had been achieved by 1900 is again disputed.

Case is obviously well-versed in the writings of Rutherford and spends much of her article discussing the focus of Rutherford’s own writings. Rutherford was principal of the Lucy Cobb Institute in Athens, Georgia, a prestigious school for girls, for most of her adult life. And as principal, she was dissatisfied with most of the textbooks which existed, so she began to write and publish her own. Case explains the focus of Rutherford’s life’s work:

She defended the legality of Confederate secession and asserted that the true cause of the war had been not slavery but ‘a different and directly opposite view as to the nature of the government of the United States.’ In doing so, she sought to justify the extensive segregation and disenfranchisement laws by southern state legislatures in the 1890s and early 1900s in direct violation of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments.
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Rutherford idealized slavery and gender roles during the antebellum period, and like many women and men before her, argued that the South had fought for a just cause. But being the most politically active member of the UDC at the time, in that she made numerous public speeches and even addressed the Georgia General Assembly, she never acknowledged the fact that her public role was actually in direct violation of the femininity she purported.62

The remainder of Case’s article focuses on Rutherford’s dedication to the topic of the economy and the benefits of the New South vs. the Old South. While Rutherford spends a considerable amount of time in her writing and speeches supporting the life and values of the Old South, conversely, she also congratulates the gains made during the New South period. Case admits, “the same speeches that defended secessionists and denounced lapses in modern manners extolled the myriad accomplishments of the South, Old and New.” Case also adds that Rutherford’s ultimate goal was “to promote industrialization and sectional reunification.” But while Case does acknowledge the contradictions within Rutherford’s writing and speeches she does not interrogate this topic and takes the Historian-General at face value and argues that she was attempting to reconcile the North and South. Case’s intent seems to be to write a narrative chronicling the life and work of Rutherford, as significant as that may be, but not to deeply explore her narratives or to investigate the economic roots of the contradictions.

The final sentence of Foster’s study concludes, “The ghosts of the Confederacy had shaped the New South, but in the twentieth century they had become too elusive and ephemeral to define its identity.”64 As Caroline E. Janney and journalist Tony Horwitz would agree,

64 Foster, Ghosts of the Confederacy, 198.
Foster’s closing statement is largely inadequate and unfounded because the legacy of the Confederacy has continued to cause social tension and to shape the identities of southerners.\textsuperscript{65} Horwitz, a journalist by trade and a Civil War enthusiast since childhood, embarked on a tour of the former Confederacy to find what legacy of the Civil War had been left with the people of the South. And just like skeletons in the closet, Horwitz found that indeed, in the South, Confederates are still lurking in the attic. Amidst the physical landscape marked by Wal-Marts and Waffle Houses, Horwitz discerned that the appeal of remembering and idealizing the Old South is largely the escape the myth provides from the reality of low-incomes and the drudgery of life. In the twentieth century South, Horwitz also found that the remembrance of the Confederacy stood for ideals such as love of homeland and freedom from government control in personal lives. Overall, Horwitz, who did not set out to prove a thesis, discovers that through flag controversies and interracial rivalries, the legacy of the Civil War is still lingering in the present. But as Horwitz traveled with the “hardcore reenactor,” Robert Lee Hodge to Civil War battlefields, Horwitz realized that not all southerners nostalgic for the Confederacy are “backwards” and racist, but some have a genuine love for history and a time when life was seemingly less complicated.\textsuperscript{66} Horwitz’s expedition revealed that the Confederate legacy cannot be explained in terms of good or bad, but can be said to be contrary to Foster’s thesis in that the legacy exists.
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The past three decades of Lost Cause literature have taken major strides to become more inclusive of the importance of women’s roles in the movement and of the persisting impact of the memory of the Civil War. Historians such as Caroline E. Janney, Drew Gilpin Faust, and Karen L. Cox identified the political nature of women’s involvement in the Lost Cause, departing from Gaines M. Foster’s landmark study of the postwar South. Foster’s work laid a foundation that has since been expanded and built upon. The South was not as quick to reconcile with the North as previously thought, nor has the Confederate cause been completely erased from the minds of Americans. In histories of the Lost Cause, gender has clearly become a category of analysis, but studying the writings of Mildred Lewis Rutherford will provide a canvas to explore the economic roots of shifts that occurred during the New South period and how the Lost Cause Movement was used as a method of structuring society by molding the public memory.
3 “FOR BETTER OR WORSE:” THE AMBIGUITIES OF INDUSTRIALIZATION

Did African Americans in the South truly benefit from their post-war freedom? Did the economic benefits of industry outweigh the accompanying social shifts? How can the South compete with the North in swaying the minds of Americans about the realities of southern and Civil War history? These are all questions Mildred Lewis Rutherford can never truly answer despite her best efforts to make arguments from varying angles. Rutherford’s best-known published works are the speeches she made as Historian-General, and an intense analysis of her speeches highlights her lack of clarity over issues concerning the pre- and post-war South. But while an analysis of her texts exposes inconsistencies and “imaginary” binaries, her words nonetheless influenced the minds thousands of men and women throughout the early twentieth century South, and are therefore a meaningful topic of inquiry.

Rutherford wrote textbooks and spoke publicly on numerous occasions, but I focus on six of her speeches in particular. Her texts and speeches about the contributions of southerners to history and literature are not of primary importance to this study as they do not highlight Rutherford’s complex thoughts about slavery, freedom, and economic and societal conditions in the years both preceding and following the Civil War. Thus, the speeches which are most pertinent are: “The Civilization of the Old South: What Made It: What Destroyed It: What Has Replaced It(1916);” “Historical Sins of Omission and Commission(1915);” “The South in the Building of the Nation(1912);” “Thirteen Periods of United States History(1912);” “Truths of History(1920);” and “Wrongs of History Righted(1914).” And as the title implies, the speech,
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“The Civilization of the Old South,” most directly addressed the aforementioned topics. Later, the third chapter argues that Rutherford attempted to create a specific future and that her discourse did influence the collective memory of the South, and this “memory” created a nostalgia for a fictional South that southerners sought to recreate. But in order to understand that Rutherford “constructed” the past in her speeches and writing, these speeches must be analyzed in order to display their vulnerability as representations of reality.

The issue of slavery is one topic of Rutherford’s speeches which makes the reader question Rutherford’s validity as historical authority. Rutherford’s speeches must not be taken at face value, for when her speeches are read “deeply” in that information within and across texts is compared, the Historian-General’s lack of consistency becomes glaringly apparent. And when these inconsistencies are drawn out, Rutherford’s method becomes clear: glorify aspects of the Old and New South with enough space between opposing facts so to “trick” the reader or listener into feeling strong emotional attachments to both eras without realizing that neither version of history is without authorial embellishment. Specifically, such a deep reading clearly reveals ambiguity and ambivalence in the way in which Rutherford evaluates the South in the pre- and post-slavery worlds, and these ambiguities are what allow for an interrogation between lived history and the reality Rutherford is trying to create in the minds of southerners.

For example, in her many diatribes about the menaces slavery provided for the slaveholder, evidence exists to argue that Rutherford was actually in favor of emancipation. But, in discussions of lifestyle and manners, she also simultaneously touted the glories of the antebellum days. A thorough inspection of Rutherford’s speeches certainly presents enough conflicting in-

formation to confuse a reader who is looking for consistency in her views about slavery across time and space.

Rutherford is a meaningful topic because she emerges as a “public” figure during the New South Period, one that is popularly known throughout the country and especially the South. And like her childhood classmate Henry Grady, Rutherford considered herself a spokes-
woman of the New South in terms of the economic gains the region has achieved. Her views were confused, but were nonetheless influential, and an analysis of her speeches clearly reveals that loyalties are not distinctly placed in the New or Old South, but are instead placed on the social stratum of the Old and the economic gains of the New.68

As previously mentioned, a point of frequent mention in Rutherford’s speeches is the benefits slavery provided to the slaves, which is a point that had relevance for her contempo-
rary society as the social structure of the South was being rearranged.69 In “The Civilization of the Old South,” Rutherford explained, “The negroes under the institution of slavery were well-fed, well-clothed and well-housed. A selfish interest, if no nobler or higher motive, would have necessitated this, for the slave was the master’s salable property. He would not willingly have allowed him to be injured physically. How hard it was for us to make the North understand this!” Rutherford went on to iterate the physical and moral degradation the African American race experienced since legalized slavery’s demise. Rutherford led the reader to believe that before the thirteenth amendment was passed, no black man or woman was ever ill. But since

68 Rutherford, “The Civilization of the Old South;” Rutherford, Four Addresses; Rutherford, Truths of History.
freedom, diseases such as consumption and tuberculosis abounded. She also added, “I never heard of but one crazy negro before the war. Now asylums can not be built fast enough to contain those who lose their minds.” Rutherford was clearly trying to protect the morality of southerners as slaveholders; the great “protectors” of the slave who without the paternalism, guidance, and protection slavery showed, the former slaves were lawless and without mental and physical health. But all the previous information is assumed because Rutherford never completely answered the question: why the sudden downfall in the African American race? Inferences can logically be made, but the Historian-General’s lack of explanation highlights a recurring theme – the flagrant use of unsupported evidence. Rutherford used questionable and unsupported facts about the decline of the freedmen following slavery to justify the institution, and her justification of slavery was not without a purpose.

In addition to ending the system which created “the happiest set of people on the face of the globe,” a system which foremost looked out for the well-being of the slaves, with slavery also went the seemingly superior quality of antebellum life. In watching and reading Gone With the Wind, a viewer or reader would be led to believe that southern life before the war was filled with barbeques, naps, and no worries besides who to put on your dance card, and certain-

---

ly Rutherford, even writing before Margaret Mitchell, imagined this same reality. In “Thirteen Periods of United States History,” Rutherford recalled:

The kitchens in the old civilization were never in the house, but some distance from it. There was no need that they should be in the house then, for there were plenty of young negroes to run back and forth with the hot waffles, the hot egg bread, the biscuits and the battercakes. But when the women of the South had to go into the kitchen after the negroes left, or had become too impertinent to be allowed around the house, the inconveniences were greatly felt... This was the beginning of the breaking up of home life in the South and it proved to be the death blow to the old time Southern hospitality.

This quote reveals that not only did slavery’s demise change life for southerners, but it created an entirely different civilization, particularly for women. In the post-slavery world, women, who had been “managers” of the home and families had to adjust their household roles after emancipation; an adjustment that they undoubtedly resented. These upper-class women did feel a true uprooting of their lifestyle which is precisely why they were fit to criticize the post-bellum world. While Rutherford calls attention to gender as lens for viewing the New South, she again also references the alleged decline of African Americans. Apparently, following the war, former slaves were too “impertinent” to be allowed in the house.

Rutherford portrayed life before the Civil War as idyllic, and the loss of slaves caused this “great civilization” to come to an end, and a new, less romantic civilization was created in its place. Even the gardens of the Old South were grander than those of the new. As part of an audience to one of Rutherford’s speeches, an individual could surely visualize the tranquil life and imagery of the Old South and begin to reflect on what is missing from their present lives and surroundings. A painting or drawing would have been no more effective than Rutherford’s

---
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writing in expressing the reverence the Historian-General showed for her beloved southland of yore. She spent nearly a page in “The Civilization of the Old South” discussing the type of landscaping and flowers used in grandmothers’ gardens before the Civil War, and led the readers to believe that no such gardens do or could exist in a south without slavery, as with slavery went the time and ease of life which allowed such beauty to exist. Rutherford’s portrayal of the Old South is clearly based on her status as not only a woman, but an upper-class woman of the Old landed-elite. Since the majority of southerners were subsistence farmers who had never owned even a single slave they did not share these memories. But nevertheless, in the early nineteen hundreds many of these same families who had been subsistence farmers were now competing for jobs with African Americans. This economic competition created an environment in which even those who never lived the life of leisure as Rutherford describes longed for something different from their present.

A selective reading of passages from Rutherford’s speeches led her readers to believe that Miss Millie was slavery’s biggest proponent because the lifestyle she purports existed before 1861 was dependent on slave labor; however, dissecting these very same speeches also reveals an entirely different outlook on the “peculiar institution.” Rutherford tried to create a binary between the pre- and post-war South, and while no person knowledgeable of southern culture in the nineteenth century could disagree with the fact that the South did indeed change, a discourse analysis reveals that Rutherford does not successfully create a binary as she intends to do, and especially not in regard to the benefits/ evils of slavery.

---

While arguing that slavery was the “linchpin of the Old South,” Rutherford also contended that the South was better-off since slavery came to an end, and showed that consistency in information is lacking in her collective work.⁷⁶ In “Wrongs of History Righted,” she said that regardless of the degradation of emancipated blacks, she was not trying to defend slavery and would not have it back, and in “The Civilization of the Old South” even adds that “the slaves are free, but the slaveholders rejoice over it.”⁷⁷ But what about the gardens? Rutherford’s lack of consistency is perplexing at first glance, but what can be deduced from an analysis of her speeches is that while reminiscing about the culture and lifestyle of the Old South, Rutherford was simultaneously embracing the economic rewards that developing industry provided; she wanted the life of ease and racial and social stratification the Old South provided, but with the affluence achieved during the New South Period. In fact, Rutherford argued, “The South has never been so prosperous as it is today, showing what an incubus slavery was upon the slaveholder.” According to her, the South hoped that after the Mexican-American War, the extension of territory would not allow for the extension of slavery, but instead for gradual emancipation. This hope for emancipation came from the fact that, according to the Historian-General, since the Missouri Compromise of 1820, slaves had overcrowded the South, and “there were many men in the South very anxious for the gradual emancipation of the slaves, for we were beginning to realize that under the institution of slavery the negro was the free man and the slaveholder was the slave.” Miss Millie, a grand supporter of slavery, said that the world was a

better place as a result of the South’s loss?\textsuperscript{78} Again, when her speeches are scrutinized, what becomes glaringly apparent is that she is manipulating the memory of slavery in order convince her audience of the benefits \textit{and} woes of slavery in order to simultaneously embrace the New and Old South.

While Rutherford showed ambivalence toward the institution of slavery, she was more certain about her feelings toward the social consequences of industrialization; Rutherford was very clear and consistent in her opinion that the New South Period caused a moral decline. In “The Civilization of the Old South,” Rutherford explained that as a result of their upbringing in antebellum society, southern men had unequaled social graces and leadership skills. In fact, Rutherford contended that it was the experience of slave owners in controlling their slaves that made men such as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson apt for Presidency.\textsuperscript{79} But as the antebellum period faded, so did the moral and social superiority of southern men. While southerners in general were economically successful during the New South Period, the social graces of southern men did not share the same fortune. But this social transformation was not unprovoked, as it was a consequence of a shift in the southern economy from primarily being based on agriculture with a dependency on slave labor to a developing industrial system; as the southern “mode of production” had been altered, so had the “mode of life.”\textsuperscript{80} Additionally, the individuals controlling the “mode of life” had changed; a study discussed in C. Vann Woodward’s influential work, \textit{Origins of the New South}, revealed that approximately 80% the individuals who were industrial tycoons in the early twentieth century had not been members of the
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slave-owning elite before the Civil War. Therefore, changes in southern economy as well as changes in possession of capital in the South created an atmosphere in which individuals with backgrounds such as Rutherford’s had a profound reaction; this reaction was embodied in Rutherford’s involvement and perpetuation of the Lost Cause.

Despite some lack of consideration by the historian Gaines M. Foster in his seminal work, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South 1865-1913*, such as his neglecting the role and impact of women as part of the Lost Cause Movement, and his devaluing of the long-term impact of the Movement on southern history and culture, Foster did make an accurate point to which many historians have also subscribed. Foster contends that the Lost Cause Movement was an opiate for a society in the midst of rapid social and economic change; and in this case, I agree with Foster’s analysis. After the Civil War, not only was the South forced to cope with physical destruction and the loss of thousands of lives in the wake of defeat, but numerous southerners also lost their labor force as a result of the emancipation of the slaves. The freeing of the slaves immediately after the war and the emergence of a black middle-class in the last decades of the nineteenth century caused a great deal of social stress in southern society. This stress manifested itself in racial violence and rioting. And Georgia, Rutherford’s home state, was second only to Mississippi in the number of total lynchings. The number of lynchings in Georgia peaked in the year 1899 and the most violent lynching occurred in Georgia in 1905. Not coincidentally, during the years racial violence in the South was reaching a climax, Miss Millie was rising to prominence among the ranks of the

---

Like lynching, the Lost Cause version of history was used as a means of social control. The Lost Cause served as a reminder to whites and African-Americans alike of their “place” in society and the economy. With its emphasis on the Confederate tradition and on the values of the Old South, as were presented in speeches at veterans’ reunions, Memorial Day Ceremonies, and gatherings of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, the Lost Cause Movement served as a calming mechanism for a society experiencing this extreme social stress. 83

Rutherford was Historian-General during this time of transition, but this period of economic change around the turn of the twentieth century did not signify a structural shift into or out of capitalism. David Harvey argues in The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change, that cultural indications of a postmodern society are not the result of a structural shift to a postcapitalist society. Instead, since culture mirrors the mode of production, culture and reality seem more fragmented because of fragmentations within the corporate world of capitalism and in the intercontinental division of labor. 84 Similarly, the South did not move from a precapitalist to a capitalist society during the New South Period, however, the way in which the capitalist system functioned did change. In discussing the civilization which has replaced the Old South, Rutherford emphasized, “The adjustments that had to be made in the home, in the state, in the country after the War Between the States caused a complete uprooting in the South.” The shift in the ways of living occurred because the institution of slavery was shattered, and in eyes of Rutherford, slavery was the linchpin of the Old South. 85

85 Rutherford, “The Civilization of the Old South,” 42; 17.
While antebellum society was capitalist in the sense that it was driven by a profit-motive, the conditions which accompany a capitalist society had not yet fully developed prior to the Civil War. For example, antebellum capitalism in the South had not created a working/middle class. The majority of southerners were yeoman farmers who produced as a form of subsistence and not for the purpose of wealth accumulation, and only a small minority of southerners owned large numbers of slaves and owned plantations growing cash crops such as cotton, indigo, tobacco, and rice. However, after the Civil War, when the South became increasingly industrialized, the gap between the society’s upper echelons and the subsistence yeoman farmers began to close. C. Vann Woodward explains, “Within the little islands of industrialism scattered through the region, including the old towns as well as the new, was a new middle-class society. It drew some recruits from the old planter class, but in spirit as well as outer aspect it was essentially new.” Woodward goes on to discuss Richmond in particular and how the “almighty dollar” became society’s driving force and rapidly disappearing were society’s “provincial characteristics.”86 In the industrial age, increased emphasis on market competition influenced a larger portion of society as the population of subsistence farmers diminished while the need for industrial workers grew, and the dependency on wage labor began to weigh on the social climate as well as the economic. The end of legalized slavery and the realization that the South could never compete with the North without diversifying the economy caused the social graces and ease of life chronicled by Rutherford to wane.

Southern states, largely due to the exposure of the economic weaknesses which led to their defeat in the Civil War, were thrust forward into a period shaped by industrialization. At

the end of the Reconstruction period when the “chivalry” of the Ku Klux Klan had “saved” the South, Georgia and the rest of the southeastern region of the United States began to experience an uprooting of the economy, and in turn an uprooting in culture and society.\(^{87}\) As the state was being redeemed from Republican rule and political power was being restored to the Democrats in the 1870s, these Democrats, or the “Bourbons” as they are collectively known in Georgia, sought to industrialize and diversify the agricultural economy. Running on the leadership and inspiration of Henry Grady, the South began to use its natural resources, and instead of sending these resources to the North to be processed, the South’s very own factories began to profit from the abundance of resources the region holds. In 1912, Rutherford remarked about this diversified and commercialized economy, “Yes, the South is triumphant today! She is not only the nation’s greatest asset, but she is the world’s greatest asset. This is the Golden Age – an age of great power, buoyant strength, great wealth, and freedom to run an unhindered race.”\(^{88}\) This same South was described in the *Athens Banner* article, “Georgia is Active in Enterprises: Industrial Index Showing For Past Week Looks Mighty Good For Georgia.” In reference to Georgia and Alabama, the article explains, “Many new enterprises, both industrial and commercial, have sprung into existence all over the two states and are beginning their journey along the highway of Time side by side with the new year, 1911.”\(^{89}\) This economic growth, often interpreted as positive by Rutherford and numerous other southerners, would be the death-blow to the antebellum lifestyle for which Ms. Millie so dearly longed.

\(^{87}\) Rutherford, “Thirteen Periods of United States History.”


\(^{89}\) “Georgia is Active in Enterprises: Industrial Index Showing For Past Week Looks Mighty Good For Georgia,” *Athens Banner*, 13 January 1911.
Like Harvey who saw society becoming increasingly fragmented as a reflection of global capitalism, Rutherford was clearly observed the selfish and competitive values which began to overtake the citizens of the South as their former life faded away with the moonlight and magnolias. In reminiscing about the Old South, Rutherford touted, “The civilization of the Old South was truly unique – nothing like it before or since, nor will there ever be anything like it again.” Rutherford did exaggerate the differences between the Old South and the New, however, many of the changes in society were indeed observable and were the result of a shift in the mode of production.

Rutherford’s final speech as Historian-General has already been cited numerous times, but, “The Civilization of the Old South: What Made It: What Destroyed It: What Has Replaced It,” gives the most insight into the world that Rutherford saw was lost. Life became more hectic during the New South Period around the turn of the 20th century when the southern states experienced unprecedented industrialization. And in the closing paragraphs of the section of her speech entitled, “What Destroyed It,” referring to the civilization of the Old South, Rutherford asks questions such as, “How could hospitality, for which the Old South was so noted, continue under such changed conditions?” And, “How could the husband rushing off to his business office, and children rushing off to school keep up that conversation around the family board so conducive to culture?” What Rutherford saw in society was the alienation that individuals experience as a result of being part of capitalist production. The slow-paced agrarian lifestyle shared by society’s land- and slave-owning elite could not be maintained as many individuals wishing to retain or grow their wealth strove to share in industrial growth.

The profit motive quite literally “alienated” people, specifically men, from their families, and Rutherford chronicled this alienation in her speeches and writing. She began the section of “The Civilization of the Old South,” entitled, “What Civilization Has Replaced the Old,” by praising the freeing of the slaves, yet quickly contrasted the new civilization with the old:

The civilization of the Old South was very different from the civilization of today. There was leisure to think, to read and to meditate. There was time to be thoughtful of others, to be courteous, to be polite. In this rushing life of today we have lost the social graces, the charming manners . . . It is now hurry, hurry to keep up with the telegraph, the telephone, the type writer, the phonograph, the automobile, the moving picture shows, yes, and the flying machine, too.\(^{92}\)

Rutherford, again, said more than she likely realized. The pace of life in a society focused on commodity production was much more rushed and impersonal than life in the Old South; in the Old South most wealthy individuals were not in direct contact with the means of production. In the New South, more individuals were dependent on wages and were more affected by market competition. Before the Civil War, before a middle class had developed, there was less economic independence since most southerners were small yeoman farmers. But as industry and likewise industrial centers emerged, more men and women moved away from the periphery and became part of the economic core. But as industry created economic connectivity, Rutherford saw society becoming disconnected. New technology increased the pace of life and created distance in human interactions. The societal changes Rutherford described were not imagined, but were indeed a reflection of a surface shift in the southern economy as it became increasingly driven by profit-motive and involved in national and global commodity production, while prohibited from using slave labor. Rutherford went on to explain:

The civilization of today is one of fearful activity. The rush and grind of work is wearing out the human frame. . . . We have no time to study the ethics of life. We no longer are polite enough, chivalrous enough. The newspapers are vying with each other to secure the most sensational story, and draw attention to it by the largest headlines. The owners of newspapers and magazines say this is absolutely necessary in order to secure subscribers – they must have what the public demands. Isn’t that fearful!93

The lack of slave labor caused a greater number of individuals to become involved in the production process and therefore have less time to study “the ethics of life” such as manners, social mores, chivalry, and hospitality. The competitive and selfish demeanor required to be successful in an industrial capitalist society transferred into home-lives. Also, especially telling of the changes during the time period was Rutherford’s discussion of newspapers. Competition in the marketplace drove what was written in newspapers, not the reality of life, and as a result the public was exposed to less-modest and more “sensational” stories than before the war. An example would be the Atlanta Race Riot of 1906 which was largely caused by stories that were printed in Atlanta’s newspapers about black attacks against white women, most of which were not proven. These sensational stories preyed upon tensions which already existed as black urbanites developed an upper and middle class to rival that of white society. Then in late September, papers printed stories of four alleged assaults against white women. Despite the best efforts of city officials, a mob gathered and what would become known as the Atlanta Race Riot ensued.94 Stories such as that of Atlanta’s Race Riot are not uncommon of the New South, and while the underlying economic transformation was a catalyst, turbulent times were exacerbated by the media’s willingness to forgo or manipulate facts in pursuit of a cash-paying audience.

Likewise, post Civil War politics and religion were also shaped by the profit-motive. Rutherford exclaimed in the “Civilization of the Old South,” “There is no purity in politics today! Under the old civilization, bribery and corruption was treated with scorn and derision. The office sought the man, not the man the office. Now, no man can gain office without money being used by or against him.” This quote shows that the competition capitalism heralded in the marketplace influenced all walks of life; changes in the economy were clearly manifested in society as well. No longer did familial ties preclude a political life, but politics opened itself to a larger spectrum of society, assuming the candidate had the funds to run a campaign. Rutherford was disturbed to find that people became less religious. Rutherford explained that before-meal prayers and daily Bible readings were omitted from the daily lives of which they were once routine. No longer did individuals have the time to spend with families in prayer or reading the Bible; in the industrial world life became faster-paced, and to Rutherford this shift was a detriment to the Christian home.

Mildred Lewis Rutherford was well aware of the societal and some political changes that occurred, yet had concrete explanation as to why. A materialist perspective on history adheres to the fact that as the economic structure of a society changes so do mores which have dominated that society. Ironically, Rutherford embraced the very economy which had caused her beloved “civilization” to find its demise; it is a sort of dramatic irony. Yet again, even with her virulent criticisms of the loss of southern virtue in the New South period, she still tried to chronicle the benefits of the New South and appeal the interest in the southern progress. Just as the Historian-General explained that daily Bible readings were a rare exception to family life in the

---

New South and that she knew of but what one family of which God was still a primary part of their lives, she recanted her details of civilization’s decline. Rutherford said she did not think that the world was getting more wicked, and in fact, “I really believe more people are studying God’s word than ever before. More are keenly interested in missionary enterprises . . .” How can these contradictory facts both be true? The answer is they cannot, and this contradiction between the qualities of the New and Old South is a precise example of Rutherford’s fabrication of history. In looking for consistency, Rutherford cannot both glorify and demonize the New South as they are a package deal. But as chapter three will discuss, through her speeches and writing, Rutherford is tried to inject a specific history into the minds of the public, however, this imagined reality was at odds with its economic reality.

~

Rutherford had several motives for wanting to become the most prominent female proponent of Old South history and New South accomplishments, one of which was her fear of a hostile takeover of the public memory by northern histories. Following the Civil War, the South was in a state of economic ruin, and was certainly not in control of the national means of production. In 1880, when the New South Movement gathered momentum, the per capita wealth of the South was $376 dollars compared to $1,086 outside of South. Northern industrial might more than northern military strength had been the victor of the war, and this industrial might transferred to mental might – the post-war economy was controlled by the North, and therefore so were the prevailing ideas within society. Then as she emerged as a cultural force around the turn of the twentieth century, Rutherford again was unknowingly conscious of the
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consequences of the economic transformation – the North had not only won the Civil War, but was now winning the battle to control its memory. As such, one of the clearest goals of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and of Rutherford in particular, became to capture the South’s rightful place in history.

In speeches such as, “The South in the Building of the Nation,” “Truths of History,” “Wrongs of History Righted,” and “Thirteen Periods of United States History,” Rutherford attacked a not-so-silent opponent – the northern historian who had negatively portrayed Rutherford’s beloved “civilization.” Since the war’s end, northern histories were the primary source of history lessons in southern schools, a fact which upset UDC members such as Rutherford who felt her progeny would be ignorant of the grand history of the antebellum South. This dilemma of historical consciousness manifested itself in the creation of the position of Historian-General of the United Daughters of the Confederacy in 1908. Speaking in the nation’s capital in November of 1912, Rutherford clarified:

We cannot in the South compete with the North in publishing houses. Therefore, we cannot sell books at as small a cost as they can be sold by northern publishers. This throws the responsibility upon the moneyed men of the South, who have not thought it worth while to spend their means in having publishing houses for southern text-books. We must not blame the manufacturer of books at the North because he is pushing his interests in the matter of his books. You would do it and I would do it. No, Daughters of the Confederacy, too long have we been indifferent to this matter. Only within the last fifteen or twenty years have we really awakened to the fact that our history has not been written.

Rutherford could not have made the point more clear had she have been giving a speech entitled, “Materialism in the World Today.” Southern histories, being printed in minor quantities

---
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compared to their northern counterparts could not compete in the marketplace, and therefore the southern historical consciousness fell victim to market competition. Living in a time when the almighty dollar was the rule of the day, Rutherford realized investment in the southern publishing industry would be required for the South to have their histories told, and Miss Millie would play a principal part in leading the South to her “Rightful Place in History.”

~

During her career as Historian-General, Rutherford sought to create a glorified image of both the New and Old South. While appreciating the present but still longing for the past is certainly not a novel concept, Rutherford told her histories in such a fashion that would make an astute and observant reader question whether her history was actually historic were or merely stories. She contradicted herself numerous times throughout her speeches and writing, especially in regard to slavery and the society of the New South versus the Old. At times she glorified slavery while at others explained that southerners were actually better off as a result of abolition. She also presented a confused depiction of society’s transformation. Rutherford unquestionably argued the superiority of the civilization of the antebellum period, but then sometimes commented that the South of the early twentieth century was thankfully taking leaps toward the future. Her intent was clearly to create a favorable image of the society of the Old South, but she simultaneously campaigned for the New South’s goals of industrialization and diversification. While she acknowledged a shift in society she did not fully realize that the shift in the economy has catalyzed the transformation. She did, however, realize the damage that northern textbooks did to the history of Dixie. The outcome of her work so full of contradiction was a failure to create an accurate and truly believable depiction of either the past or present.
But despite the reality lacking from her work, Rutherford did successfully implant her glorified images of the Old South into the minds of the public, and in doing so she hoped to create a revised version of the Old South that fit with the new economy.
4 Some Things Never Change, but the South is Not One of Them

Rutherford’s lifelong work in education, delivering speeches, and writing histories was a reaction to the fact that the South was experiencing economic and social changes, most of which were catalyzed by emancipation. The freeing of the slaves motivated her actions because Rutherford, along with other southerners who were members of the antebellum landed aristocracy, felt slavery maintained their revered civilization. Rutherford’s most influential work as an orator and writer was completed in the decade preceding World War. Other historians have argued that the nation had effectively reconciled by Rutherford’s reign, and the Lost Cause Movement was no longer important as a political force as it became merely a social outlet for woman who were members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. However, Rutherford’s efforts show that not only was she an admired public figure, but she also captivated and molded the public memory of the Civil War with her rhetoric, long after men shied away from the Movement in order to sully their hands in industrial capitalism. But despite Rutherford’s most potent efforts, her Old South of chivalry, elegance, and most importantly white supremacy, met its eventual fate in the new economy that was driven by industrial progress.

Rutherford’ speeches and historical works, while proven to be flawed, did reflect changes that were observed during the New South Period. Miss Millie, always the tireless educator, took it upon herself to “teach” southerners how they could benefit from economic progress while simultaneously recreating the social and racial system of the Old South. In reference to the civilization that replaced the Old South, Rutherford once claimed, “It really is a selfish age – every man for himself is the rule of this day, and little thought of the one left behind
in the race of life." Rutherford detailed that this “selfish age” was characterized by a decline in leisure time, polities, chivalry, and propriety.101 The disintegration of the characteristics of life in the Old South were not figments of the Historian-General’s imagination, but were reflections of the shift from an agrarian society based on slave labor to an industrializing society based on wage labor. The Old South which Rutherford cherished faded before her eyes, and despite the Athenian’s virulent efforts, the unfettered lifestyle of before the “War Between the States” was never to survive.102

Only a very small number of southerners were able to share in the experiences that Rutherford touts as qualifying the civilization of the Old South. However, as shared in her speeches, before what Ms. Millie called “The War Between the States,” members of the elite class such as herself lived a leisurely life in a racially stratified yet “harmonious” society. While Rutherford’s accounts of the period were infused with her personal vendetta and were biased, they were memories shared by some other postbellum southerners. An example of these memories, and in line with Rutherford’s and likewise the Lost Cause version of history, is a biography written in 1941 about Rutherford’s life growing up in Athens. This book, written by Virginia Clare, is the only book focused entirely on the Historian-General’s life, and is entitled *Thunder and Stars*. Clare’s dialogue-filled narrative, written much in the fashion of Joel Chandler’s Harris’s *Uncle Remus* tales, details the life of Rutherford from birth, when she was immediately “given” a slave of similar age, Anna Liza, until Rutherford’s death. In this narrative-style biography, all that was purported to be good about the South was destroyed as soon as the Reconstruction period began, and the disintegration of the coveted lifestyle of the Old South was

continued through Rutherford’s reign as Historian-General. The end of the Civil War demanded manumission, and this freedom meant the end of the traditional plantation economy that Rutherford and her social equals had been accustomed. So while the capitalistic profit motive existed on plantations, a new form of labor was sought; slavery was replaced by the only slightly less binding systems of sharecropping and tenant farming. But according to Clare and Rutherford, without the yolk of slavery to hold the harmonious South together, life changed so drastically that the freedmen turned to theft and ladies were no longer safe on the streets.  

Despite the fact that few southerners actually experienced this plantation lifestyle shaped by slavery, the lifestyle of leisure, morality, and gaiety chronicled by Rutherford was not only appealing to Rutherford and her fellow UDC members, but also to the masses. But unfortunately for Miss Millie, an alteration of southern life was inevitable under new economic circumstances. However, Rutherford still made her best attempt to use nostalgia for her beloved antebellum South as an effort to turn back time, so to speak. While focusing on men instead of women, in The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking, the historian Paul M. Gaston, wrote an enlightening analysis of the role prominent southern orators and politicians took in creating a new economic order by culling and molding images of the Old South. In his study Gaston concurs, “Loyalty to an agrarian past and determination to preserve the value system produced by it as well as an essentially romantic and static conception of history, class, and race were not compatible with swift industrialization and urbanization.”  Even with the staunchest efforts made by Lost Cause and New South advocates, the traditions of the Old South could
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simply not be remade to fit the New South. A study of Mildred Lewis Rutherford’s contribution to publicly perpetuating this static memory of the antebellum South is a valuable topic because Rutherford was a prominent female who was able to communicate to a large audience and convince that audience that her version of history was the truth.

The reason that Mildred Lewis Rutherford was able to so aptly insert her version of the past into the public discourse is that she was not an “ordinary” woman of the early twentieth century. Rutherford was undoubtedly one of the most well-known members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and her observations and arguments were heard as truths by men and women across the South.\footnote{Blight, Race and Reunion, 279; Cox, Dixie’s Daughters, 39.} After being part of the large audience to hear Ms. Rutherford’s “Wrongs of History Righted” speech at the UDC Convention held in Savannah in 1914, a prominent Athens man remarked and was noted in the Savannah Press: “Miss Millie is the greatest woman in the state, and if she were a man she would be President of the United States.”\footnote{“Miss Mille’ Clears Up Some Historical Wrongs Done Us: Charming Address Heard By Large Crowd at Convention Last Night: Many Floral Gifts for Miss Rutherford,” The Savannah Press, 14 November 1914.} Not surprisingly then, in 1913 Rutherford became the first woman to have one of her complete addresses published in the Congressional Record. One of several articles printed on the topic states that her address given to the United Daughters of the Confederacy in Washington “contained much about the important place the south has sustained in the progress of the nation and correcting some wide-spread fallacies concerning the south, was presented to the house by Congressman S.J. Tribble of the Eighth Georgia and by extension . . . was printed in full in the official proceedings . . . of the house of representatives.”\footnote{“Congress Prints Talk by Miss Rutherford,” The Atlanta Constitution, 3 February 1913.} So while Rutherford did not present the speech herself, it was nonetheless meaningful that Rutherford was influential
enough to have a congressman read “The South in the Building of the Nation” to the entire chamber. Rutherford was even such an esteemed “public” figure that *The Atlanta Constitution* printed an article in 1911 detailing a party Miss Rutherford threw in London while traveling abroad. A woman of no consequence would not have had every detail of her overseas dinner party described, down to a description of each dinner course and the attire of attendees.¹⁰⁸

While it can be argued that *The Atlanta Constitution* was partial to Rutherford due to her connection to fellow Athenian and former esteemed Constitution editor, Henry Grady, her collected papers and scrapbooks show that Rutherford was also influential outside of Georgia and the Constitution’s readership. Rutherford wrote/compiled monthly “Scrapbooks” for several years. The “Scrapbooks,” which were much like contemporary newsletters, included topics pertaining to the “War Between the States,” Lincoln’s assassination, and the freedom of the slaves. In fact, the website for the Georgia Division of the Sons of Confederate Veterans currently references these scrapbooks:

April is a time to remember the men and women of the Confederacy and those who kept their memory eternal; like Ms. Mildred Lewis Rutherford who almost a century ago served as Historian-General of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. She was a respected teacher, writer, speaker and defender of the true history of the War Between the States. Ms. Rutherford also wrote a monthly newsletter from 1923 to 1926 entitled “Miss Rutherford’s scrapbook” and in 1920 wrote the book “Truths of History.”¹⁰⁹

Clearly, her “Scrapbooks” and writing were so influential that among the staunchest supporters and curators of the Confederate past, her words still hold meaning. In these “Scrapbooks,” Rutherford shared collected mementos and discussed various topics, which were then sold to buyers throughout the country. Men and women sent money in envelopes, typically with let-

ters to the Historian-General, requesting scrapbooks. In these letters, admirers would seek Miss Millie’s advice, pay a tribute to her work, request her speaking services, or shared their own personal stories with her.\textsuperscript{110} Samuel Hoyt Venable, a wealthy Georgian and the man who owned the land on which Stone Mountain rests, wrote to Rutherford referring to her as “the most prominent woman in Georgia.”\textsuperscript{111} A Ms. Shackleford who was a member of the Louisiana Division of the UDC wrote a letter requesting a copy of a speech and told Rutherford that she was “an ideal daughter of the South, whose great heart has become the repository of all Confederate glories and all Confederate memories.”\textsuperscript{112} Another woman from Missouri wrote to Rutherford thanking her for sending copies of “The Civilization of the Old South,” and commented that the speech was “a very valuable addition to our literature and one of the ablest and most interesting defences of our beloved Southland and of our Comrades of the Gray as well – Comrades gallant soldiers of another day – whose faces are not turned toward the setting sun.”\textsuperscript{113} Numerous letters such as these exist, showing that not only was Rutherford a woman of consequence, but also that many women across the South were committed remembering the Confederate cause and were not truly reconciled as they were committed to perpetuating Confederate history.

Rutherford’s life shows how women in particular clung to their Confederate past longer than Confederate men. Being from the old planter-elite, UDC members and other women such
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as Rutherford who had been privy to the plantation lifestyle were cast into a position to observe the changes occurring in the South after Reconstruction. By Rutherford’s reign as Historian-General, most UDC members were of the elite stratum, and the antebellum plantation economies that previously sustained the lives of these UDC members were assuredly driven by the profit motive. Yet, the industrialization of the South did mark a change in the nature of southern capitalism, and elite southern women, with their relative removal from the economy, were the perfect candidates to evaluate these changes. In *Dixie’s Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture*, Karen L. Cox made a breakthrough by using gender as her lens of analysis in regard to the Lost Cause tradition. Published in 2003, Cox was the first to analyze the leadership roles women took in preserving Confederate culture in hopes of vindicating the South and perpetuating Old South cultural traditions, particularly white supremacy. Cox astutely evaluated the impact the commercialized and industrialized economy had on the men of the South:

The world and self-image of New Men, therefore, stood in stark contrast to the provincial world of their fathers. While Old South patricians had lived in a region that relied solely on agriculture, New South men lived in a region that offered them economic diversity and many business opportunities. In addition to agriculture, men engaged in mining, manufacturing textiles, and building railroads. The business interests of the region, however, spurred discussion that pitted the values of this New South against the agrarian values of the Old. The Daughters blamed New Men for the trend of abandoning the agrarian past, and Confederate veterans joined in the criticism. New Men . . . were more concerned with making money than with honoring their ancestors.

“New Men,” as Cox calls them, increasingly found their time to be a commodity, and use of that commodity had to be maximized in order to compete in the race for profit. The new competitive world meant that less time was available to adults to spend with families instilling the Old
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South values of chivalry, modesty, and propriety that Rutherford saw as quickly fading under the new order. Women, despite the fact that slaves had been replaced with “servants” in the homes, had to play and increased role in domestic management – a position with which ante-bellum ladies had not been accustomed. Their lives then, regardless of the fact that they were not wage earners, were being altered by the economic shift and were more able to reflect of their new lives since they were not truly part of the new industrial capitalist structure.116

During her term as Historian-General, Mildred Lewis Rutherford spoke fervently across the country to these audiences, largely comprised of women, who had felt the shock-waves of industry in their very own homes. She convinced her audiences that in order for life to be re-ordered around leisure, piousness, civility, and harmony, white supremacy would need to maintained. Conversely, Rutherford spoke about the superior economic state of the South since the demise of slavery and ensuing diversification and industrialization of the economy. But as stated in the second chapter, Miss Millie did not realize is that her glorification of the economy was not compatible with her distain for southern society’s emerging social mores. The Old South simply could never be remade to fit the New South, regardless of her efforts to criticize the society of the New while culling the imagery of the Old. Despite the economic reality of Rutherford’s era, with her prominent status as a writer and orator, she was able to create a historical consciousness, otherwise known as a “collective memory,” which was real to thousands of southerners.

The creation of this “historical reality” was possible because Rutherford made the Lost Cause version of the past seem believable and desirable to her contemporaries. Certainly not

reading studies of the sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, or at least with no evidence exists to suggest a connection, Rutherford adhered to several of the key components of his studies on the collective memory of groups. For one, Halbwachs argued that individual memories have no place apart from the collective memory. While a person can only remember what he or she has at one time seen, felt, or thought, those memories are forgotten or lose their meaning apart from the social group which helped to form those memories. Therefore, the act of forgetting occurs when contact is lost with the social group that triggers remembrances. Likewise, organizations such as the United Daughters of the Confederacy kept specific memories of the South alive. And more relevant to Rutherford’s specific contribution to the Lost Cause, the gatherings which occurred when her speeches were delivered served as locales for triggering certain memories within the needed social settings. When thousands of men and women gathered to hear her speeches about the faithful slave, the hospitality of the Old South, and the morals and manners which accompanied the Old Plantation Legend, those men and women in her audience were coming in contact with the social group that could sustain those glorified memories. If Rutherford’s speeches, and other speeches given in a similar fashion to Rutherford but not in such great frequency, had not occurred, individuals would have lost contact with their memories and therefore would have lost the memories all together. It was important for gatherings to occur in the name of a great oration, a Confederate Memorial Day ceremony, or for the erection of a statue of a Civil War soldier, because society at large had changed. The majority of southerners did not experience the grandiose “memories” Rutherford shared as on-

ly a minute percentage were of the antebellum slave-owning elite.\textsuperscript{118} Since the New South period created an economy in which the aristocracy interacted daily with the middle-class, and the line between the Old landed-elite and the middle-class became blurred, those memories of the Old South as a place grander than their present would have faded without the rituals of commemoration in which Rutherford played a central part.

Also of pivotal importance to Halbwachs, and to any study of the Lost Cause and the memory of the Civil War are the places of memory; Rutherford adhered to this facet of creating a public memory as well. The purpose of places of memory are to make memory static – to make remembrances appear to be history. In his discussion of Jesus Christ, Halbwachs expressed that in order for a memory to become a permanent fixture of the society continuing a particular legend, a memory needs to be “presented in the concrete form of an event, of a personality, or of a locality.”\textsuperscript{119} These places of memory were also essential for Rutherford because according to Halbwachs, collective memories are organic and are ever-changing, but what Rutherford wanted to do was create a specific collective memory and then make that memory static.\textsuperscript{120} Through her memorialization efforts, especially in her work with the Stone Mountain Memorial, and even through her speeches and “historical” writing which became canonized by Lost Cause enthusiasts, Rutherford created “places” where the memory of the Old South and the Civil War transformed from just a memory into a historic reality which had the power to influence society.

\textsuperscript{120} Halbwachs, \textit{The Collective Memory}, 86-87.
I refer to Rutherford’s writing and speeches, as well as her scrapbooks as “places of memory” because even though they did not mark the physical landscape of the South, they were still “places” in that southerners could, and still do, visit her words as images of the Old South. For example, during a time when the southern aristocracy was “gauged by manners and morals and not by the size of the bank account,” the “old-fashioned gardens” had “box-bordered beds so dignified and orderly and stately, with four o’clocks, holly hocks, larkspurs . . . What beautiful wreaths the larkspurs made, purple and white, which we pressed without compunction in the finest books in our father’s library.”

Rutherford painted many images, especially in “The Civilization of the Old South,” which allowed the reader or listener to drift off to the world she fashioned and that was not entirely based on reality. So while Rutherford was involved in the erection of statues across the South as part of the UDC, and the first effort to have General Lee leading his troops carved on the side of Stone Mountain, her most influential work in creating places of memory were her narratives. She created places that southerners nostalgic for the Old South could return to as “sites” where memories of a more eloquent life where society was both racially harmonious and stratified. When southerners purchased her “Scrapbooks” and speeches and revisited her histories, they were keeping Rutherford’s image of the antebellum South alive in the collective memory.

Additionally, a key aspect of the work of Halbwachs which is clearly exemplified in the life of Rutherford is the fact that the sociologist found that in order for memories and “places” to become part of the collective memory they do not need to be grounded in truth as much as
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they need to be believable to the members of the social group adopting the narrative. The fact that the majority of southerners during the antebellum period were not of the slave-owning elite is undisputed among historians, and in Rutherford’s home-state of Georgia in particular, in 1860 only 6% of families owned more than twenty slaves yet still maintained over half of the state’s property. Even among the white families who did own less than twenty slaves, most were considered yeoman farmers and did not accumulate great wealth. Therefore, the stories of the joyful “Big House” as a place where families were greeted each morning by the smell of biscuits wafting in the air, and where “Ole Marster” gallantly rode horseback across his plantation could not have existed for the majority of southerners. Certainly this exaggerated past which Rutherford described, while not experienced in the same way that was portrayed as inclusive of all social classes, was desirable to all classes of southern society. In reference to the meals prepared by slaves that worked inside the households, Rutherford assured, “For white and black had enough and to spare. The household servants always had what the white people at the Big House had, and the poor whites near by, if any, had more from ‘Ole Miss’ generous hand.” Similarly, the Historian-General iterated, “While there were different degrees of wealth – one man owning more slaves than another, or men of business affairs in the towns and cities owning few or no slaves, yet there was little difference in social standing – the line being drawn on education, manners and morals more than on the family tree and the pocketbook.” So even though there was a clear stratification of wealth and therefore social standing during the antebellum period, Rutherford spoke as if lineage or other connections to the plantation-
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owning elite were unimportant when compared to “education, manners and morals.” However, in reality, the grand lifestyle Rutherford referred to in her speeches and writings was clearly associated with families such as her own – Rutherfords and Cobbs – who held the greatest concentration of wealth. Yet still, Rutherford’s “histories,” as part of the larger Lost Cause Movement of which she was the most prominent woman, were accepted as fact throughout the South. \(^{126}\)

This Lost Cause version of the past even prevailed to the point that they would not be publicly disputed until after the Brown ruling in the 1950s, proving the power and longevity of Rutherford’s efforts. Writing in the twenty-first century, in *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory*, Fitzhugh Brundage discusses longevity of the histories that Rutherford helped implant in the public memory and likewise their canonized histories, “the recalled past that prevails in the South’s schools, museums, and civic spaces is under broader revision than at any time since the Civil War. What once were exclusive and enduring preserves of white memory now increasingly acknowledge the past they had, for so long, both ignored and suppressed.” Brundage goes on to highlight, “In a region where texts and curricula had long been subject to the scrutiny of the UDC and their ilk, it was a small revolution when white students began to encounter classroom materials and lessons that promoted racial tolerance and equality.”\(^{127}\)

While Rutherford’s histories were not based on pure fact, they seemed believable to the individuals reading and listening to her work because society was looking for a calming image of the past in comparison to their hectic and rapidly changing lives in the New South. Her power over
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the public consciousness is shown in the fact that, as the largest supported of the Lost Cause version of the past, her “truths” were taught to generations of southerners following her career and death.

Adding to the fact that Rutherford was influential, and her fabricated histories were believed by many, is the question why were her fallible versions of the past and present accepted as fact? The second chapter addressed the fact that Rutherford reacted to the economic changes that occurred during the New South period and that society was undergoing social stress as a result of the economic changes. The stress that society experienced as northern investors brought industry to the South and as an urban-middle class developed made southerners long for a time that was more “simple” and eloquent. So regardless of the fact that Rutherford created an unstable version of history, her audience was ripe to hear and imagine a day when white society held unquestioned economic dominance, and therefore her audience “believed” the Lost Cause version of the past. In 1946, nearly twenty years after Rutherford’s death, southerners were still paying homage to the historian. An article written by Mary E. Woods of Athens in and article entitled, “July 16 – Birthday of Mildred Lewis Rutherford,” proclaims, “She did not try to keep alive a dead cause but attempted to seek out and to correct historical errors concerning south and the War Between the States.”

Southerners truly believed Miss Millie’s histories were not fabrications or glorification, but the true history of the South. But what did Rutherford have to gain by purveying an exaggerated and often flawed version of the past and present? While unsuccessfully trying to create a binary between the Old and New

South, Rutherford attempted to superimpose the society of the Old South onto the economy of the New South.

Rutherford’s “truths” of history were not only a reaction to the changing economy and the northern monopolization of history, but they were also prescriptive because her words were intended to incite actions and foster beliefs. At a time when the economy of the South had evolved and therefore so had its social structure, Rutherford essentially wanted to recreate the social order of the southern slave society without actually having slaves. The most common themes of her writing were: the South was not to blame for the Civil War, the South has not been given the credit it deserves in history and literature books, slavery benefitted the slaves, and the South has seen a moral decline as a result of industrialization. The overall purpose of these recurring themes was to indoctrinate the eager reader or listener with the idea that life was better off before the Civil War, particularly in regard to the racial hierarchy. In this way, Rutherford’s work was meant to help maintain white supremacy amidst the changing economy.

A key part of her plan to recover the society of the Old South was to convince audience that unconditional white supremacy was a nonnegotiable. Rutherford was very clear about the fact that the civilization of the Old South hinged upon slavery and that emancipation ruined that grander civilization.\footnote{Rutherford, “The Civilization of the Old South,” 17; 29.} Her speeches and writing, then, were meant to prevent the embracing of racial equality by convincing the audiences that slavery benefitted the slaves. If the slaves benefitted from the paternalism that slavery provided then surely the freedmen were not prepared for equality. However, other than condoning white supremacy and the Ku Klux...
Klan, Rutherford does not give a picture of what she wanted the new version of the Old South to look like. The Historian-General explained in “Thirteen Periods of United States History,” “The Ku Klux Klan was an absolute necessity in the South at this time. This Order was not composed of the ‘riff raff’ as has been represented in history, but of the very flower of Southern manhood. The chivalry of the South demanded protection for the women and children of the South.”

Rutherford clearly condoned any violence and intimidation methods used by the Klan because they were needed to maintain social order as the former slaves were resorting to violence and alcoholism as a result of their freedom. In “Wrongs of History Righted,” Rutherford gave her interpretation of the condition of the slaves before slavery: “Savage to the last degree, climbing cocoanut trees to get food, without thought of clothes to cover their bodies, and sometimes cannibals, and all bowing down to fetishes – sticks and stones – as acts of worship.” By using such imagery in her speeches Rutherford tried to explain that slavery actually helped civilize and Christianize the slaves. And without the help of the Klan, those very people who had been savages back in Africa would terrorize the South, particularly its women and children. Rutherford tried to make villains out of the African Americans because her society was threatened by rising black prosperity. While the freedmen did not achieve economic equality in the early 1900s as most emancipated slaves turned toward tenant farming and sharecropping as their means of survival, more African Americans achieved economic independence than ever before. For example, Alonzo Herndon, who was born a slave but became an entrepreneur in
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Atlanta, was a millionaire when he died in 1927. While Herndon was the exception and not the rule, a black middle-class did develop, and the fact that African Americans living in urban areas could benefit from industry and wage labor was a great threat to Rutherford’s Old South civilization.

While Rutherford frequently referred to the degradation of the freedmen since emancipation in order to convince southerners of the need for white supremacy in the New South, she also glorified the “faithful slaves.” The Historian-General attested:

We of the South – as much as we have been forced to bear from the impertinent and shiftless negro of freedom – can never and must never forget the faithful negroes of slavery. . . . Let us then children and grandchildren of the men who wore the gray stretch out a kindly hand to the children and grandchildren of those who were the faithful protectors of our mothers and grandmothers in the days that tried men’s souls, and make them to understand that we want them in the South, and that the South is their logical home, and that understanding each other as we do, we can work for the things that are best for both races.

By including rhetoric about slaves who were faithful to their masters, Rutherford painted a lucid picture of what racial relationships were desirable in the New South and what relationships were detrimental to her great civilization. Likewise, an important part of the work of the UDC as a whole was to erect not only memorials to Confederate soldiers, but the organization also raised monuments to “mammies” – the faithful slaves who cared for the masters’ children. Rutherford would frequently write about these mammies and monuments in her scrapbooks, and would include pictures of the memorials.

________________________
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the Black Mammy Industrial School in Athens. The purpose of this school and importance Rutherford’s endowment was discussed in an *Atlanta Constitution* article from 1911:

> While commemorating the usefulness and fidelity of the black mammy who has been so much a part of the home life of the old south, the money will at the same time be doing active service to the living descendants of the black mammy, for in this particular school the students are taught the industrial and domestic arts where-in lay the service and usefulness of the aged negro mammies of the old south who will remain at all time a blessed memory of that period.\(^{136}\)

Not ironically, this particular article came from a section of the newspaper entitled, “Woman’s World: Progress and Work in Home and Out of It . . . Views of Present Problems and Passing Events.” To women in the South, the black mammy, more than any other image, stood for white antebellum domesticity, or rather lack thereof. In the New South, women had to play a larger role in raising children and household management since emancipation; in order for the society of the Old South to be restored, black mammies had to return to their antebellum role as caretakers of the home and family. Therefore, turning the image of the black mammy into a place of memory aided Rutherford in her crusade to vindicate the past.

Rutherford understood the need to create an image of what racial relations in the New South should look like if the society of the Old South was going to be restored, especially public attention turned to men such as W.E.B. DuBois and Booker T. Washington who to varying degrees were symbols of black equality and independence. In order to recreate the Old social order, Rutherford inserted discourse about the harmonious relations between masters and slaves, and even argued that “in all the history of the world no peasantry was ever better cared for, more contented or happier.”\(^{137}\) The creation of this imagery that described a harmonious
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past was meant to create nostalgia and a desire to maintain white supremacy during the first decades of the twentieth century, despite any economic changes.

Rutherford was certainly not alone in her efforts to maintain a racial hierarchy; however, she was unique in her method in that she used discourse rather than direct action. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, southern states passed many laws that entrenched the South in white supremacy. Disenfranchisement methods and Jim Crow Laws became the norm across the South despite the best efforts of early civil rights leaders to achieve equality. But while white supremacy was legally codified by the national, state, and local governments, Rutherford attempted to create the same segregated society by molding southern minds. Rutherford even blatantly says, “There is no new South. The South of today is the South of yesterday remade to fit the new order of things. And the men and the women of today are adjusting themselves to the old South remade.”

She tried to shape the collective memory with her rhetoric about slavery and the breakdown of society since the issuance of the 13th amendment. Through her speeches and writing she tried to outwardly and subliminally convince southerners that in order for the idealistic Old South to be created, white supremacy had to be restored and maintained. But unfortunately for Rutherford, the social system which based social standing on race could not be maintained indefinitely as the southern states continued to follow the path of industrialism.

Since society is a reflection of the economy, as a system, white supremacy was bound to fail as more individuals became part of the industrial production process and were able to gain economic independence. The breakdown of slavery was the first jolt felt by the antebellum

agricultural economy. While certainly most southerners were not plantation-owning or particularly wealthy before the Civil War, they still depended primarily on agriculture but also had economic independence. Then, during Reconstruction the systems of sharecropping and tenant farming expanded and when many white families had to adjust to the fact that their land and livelihood had been decimated and the former slaves needed their basic needs met. In the decades following the surrender at Appomattox, tenancy was the only option available to many southerners, both black and white. However, toward the end of the nineteenth century, with the help of northern investment, southern states joined the northern states in building factories to process raw materials. As cities across the South, and Atlanta in particular, developed as industrial centers, new options were available to many former slaves and to members of the white yeomanry and tenants. And by the time Rutherford assumed her position as Historian-General in 1911, an urban middle-class had started to develop in those industrial centers.

These new economic opportunities outside of subsistence farming created the a challenge for white supremacy in that African Americans had a greater chance to climb the economic ladder. African Americans in the South found their first viable opportunities away from agriculture during the New South Period. However, during the decades around the turn of the twentieth century, legalized white supremacy could prevail due to the fact that only a small portion of African Americans became part of the industrial economic core. However, with each new wave of industry – most significantly World War I and World War II – white supremacy was being chipped away. When more African Americans played a role in the production process and were able to become economically independent as a result of their wage labor, alienating them from society became increasingly difficult. Therefore, Rutherford’s efforts to maintain
white supremacy by harnessing the public memory of the American South was only successful so long as the majority of African Americans remained isolated from the new, wage-delivering capitalist economy. When she heralded the economic gains made by industry she did not realize that the changed economy would eventually crush her beloved civilization.

Rutherford’s battle against the industrial economy, and her use of the public memory as her primary weapon, bolsters the idea present in more recent literature about the Lost Cause which argues that the movement did not end around the turn of the nineteenth century when men left the movement. The nation had not, in fact, reconciled as a result of World War I but that the Lost Cause Movement decreased in importance as woman became involved with other issues such as temperance and suffrage, and as the country continued to industrialize. Historians from Foster to Cox have argued that reconciliation with the North was the end of the Lost Cause Movement. Adding the dimension of gender analysis to Lost Cause research, and specifically looking at Rutherford’s work, stretches the point of reconciliation from the Spanish-American War to World War I. Yet despite the argued longevity of the movement, the reconciliationist argument is still insufficient to describe the end of a movement which began immediately following the Civil War as an effort to memorialize the dead, and persisted for over half a century. 139

Indeed World War I drew attention away from the home front and toward the international conflict. Nonetheless, the industrialization that accompanied the war was the true barricade to the Lost Cause Movement because the image of the Old South that Rutherford and her

counterparts were trying to restore was decreasingly being supported by reality. The wartime economy demanded that the South harness their industrial might. Therefore, the shift in capitalism drew the South even further from the agrarian economy. The demand for labor in urban, industrial centers meant that increasing numbers of African Americans were to move out of rural areas and into cities which were the sights of factories and wage-paying jobs. As the economy shifted so too did southern society; and the memory of the chivalrous and graceful South became even more distant.

Despite Rutherford’s prominence and her importance to the Movement the Lost Cause eventually lost its power as a political force. However, the sentiments for Dixie and the “gracious” institution of slavery were maintained in hearts in minds across the South. On August 16, 1928, the day after Rutherford’s death, an article appeared in the Savannah Press, entitled, “Suppress Movie of Uncle Tom’s Cabin In Atlanta Theater: Pre-Showing of Film Opened ‘Old Wound’ of Southland.” The article detailed:

The wound that Harriet Beecher Stowe inflicted when she indicted the South with her “Uncle Tom’s Cabin” some sixty-five years ago, has not healed so far as Atlanta is concerned. . . . a son of one of the widest known sponsors of the Southern cause during the War of ’61 left the theater with tears of anger coursing down his cheeks before the preview was completed Sunday. 140

Indeed, the end of the Lost Cause Movement did not imply that the North and the South had magically been reconciled. The hearts of women in the South held on to their hatred of Yankees much longer than their male counterparts. The increased industrialization of the South which accompanied World War I meant an increased value had been placed upon a person’s time and labor, and these changes deeply affected the lives of many southern women. Despite
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the fact that Rutherford’s version of the past would live-on in history books and fables, the negative changes in society observed by the Historian-General did not suddenly reverse themselves, and the Ladies of the Lost Cause did not quit because of a job well-done. Instead, the real victor of the age was the mighty hand of industry which tirelessly swept away the remnants of a past that was never to return so long as the new economic order was to stay.
5 Conclusion

While Rutherford did successfully create a historical consciousness she was less successful at permanently reordering society on the basis of white supremacy. Her historical efforts, combined with the efforts of her predecessors, were enough to convince successive generations of Americans that the Old Plantation Legend was a historical reality. However, while her narrative created a historical reality it was not enough to combat the real driver of society – the economic shift. The shift to an industrial economy based on wage labor allowed African Americans the opportunity to climb the economic ladder and likewise eventually up the social ladder. Not coincidentally then, the first civil rights movement occurred during the New South period when some African Americans moved to urban areas and began gaining economic independence. And then the modern civil rights movement gained strength in the decade following the end of World War II when for the first time more southerners were employed by industry than agriculture because new farm technology decreased the need for sharecroppers and tenant farmers. Rutherford’s insertion of a glorified image of the Old South into the public consciousness was only a temporary fix to the problem of reordering society in the New South. Overall, in the competition of poststructuralism and materialism, materialism eventually prevailed because words create a historical reality but did not hold enough power to permanently control society.
Rutherford’s work as Historian-General followed the appearance of very real and observable changes in society and in the economy. However, a dissection of her speeches shows that the worlds she created in her speeches and writing were not entirely based on reality. Rutherford gave arguments both for and against slavery and industry. Rutherford attempted to cleanse the reputation of the former Confederate states by arguing that slavery was more of a charitable institution than a system of labor, and that the southerners would have eventually abolished slavery even without the thirteenth amendment. Miss Millie claimed that even though the freedmen themselves had shown a moral decline since emancipation, white southerners were actually more successful because of the end of the institution. But conversely, Rutherford also went into great detail about the decline of the civilization that existed before the Civil War; a civilization whose existence hinged upon slavery. Rutherford was perplexed by many of the changes she saw, but despite her inconsistencies, society changed due to the changes that occurred as a result of the economic shift from an entirely agricultural economy to a more diversified economy which included industry.

Through her historical efforts, Rutherford aimed to shape the world around her and the world that she left to future generations. The Historian-General’s life was dedicated to educating youth and to making sure the people of the United States did not believe the northern portrayal of southern history. Northern histories that were printed after the Civil War criminalized the Confederacy and the institution of slavery. Speeches such as, “Wrongs of History Righted,” and “Truths of History” sought to extol these negative portrayals and convince southerners in particular that their cause had not been a shameful one. In addition, Rutherford touted the glories of the life before the war and argued southerners could return to a racially stratified yet
harmonious lifestyle if white supremacy were to reign. Ironically for Rutherford, in the same speeches and writing that inserted the myth of the Old South based on white supremacy into the public memory, Rutherford venerated the success the South had experienced since the Civil War. The society Rutherford imagined never existed, but even if it had it could not survive in a world where societal relationships were increasingly based on economic imperatives than on race.

While Rutherford’s efforts to shape her present could not succeed, her work did show that the South had not fully reconciled by the turn of the twentieth century as has been argued by other historians. Women, first in Ladies’ Memorial Associations and then as members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy worked tirelessly to preserve the memory of the fallen Confederate soldier and their precious southland of before the Civil War. Women did act politically because they were trying to preserve social and material relationships that existed during the antebellum period; however, their politics of preservation were masked by their gender. In the earliest decades of the twentieth women were not viewed as a force that threatened the reconciliation that occurred between men of the North and South. Southern men committed themselves to industrial capitalism while women continued to glorify and memorialize the fallen Confederate soldiers. And if the South had been so certainly reconciled by Rutherford’s reign, her work in writing the “truths” of history would not have been so widely praised. This work of preserving the past did not wane in importance until after Rutherford’s tenure as Historian-General. As the economy of the United States mobilized for the First World War, all Americans were needed, not just the white citizens. For a time, the imagery provided by the Lost Cause was of less importance than the military and economic needs of the country. But after
World War I Americans again began the process of reconciling due to their shared experiences in the war in Europe and then, lamentably, as victims of the Great Depression. However, Confederate fervor did not completely die even though attention turned away from the Lost Cause, and a belief in states’ rights and a civilization that could only be grounded in white supremacy found new cause in the civil rights battle of the 1950s and 1960s.
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