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I. Introduction

Although it was originally passed to mandate gender equality in educational institutions, today Title IX is most often associated with athletics programs. Passed as part of the Educational Amendments of 1972, Title IX has reached its forty-fifth anniversary and continues to be a driving factor behind academic and athletic decisions.\(^1\) Specifically Title IX requires that, “no person shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.”\(^2\) The legislation opened varieties of opportunities to women within education both at the high school and university levels. This included any sports teams or programs that the high school or university offered. Specific focus on Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC) presents how Title IX affected a specific university’s decisions about its athletic institutions.

II. Development of Title IX Standards

After its enactment in 1972, one of the first dilemmas university administrators faced was how to adequately monitor and measure whether a school met Title IX’s requirements for equal opportunities. The wording of the original law did not specify how a school could prove that it was not discriminating against students based on sex. As a result, the Javits Amendment was passed in 1974. This amendment required the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to issue regulations that are “reasonable to the nature of sports.”\(^3\) This means that the regulations could not call for direct equality because of the nature of certain sports. For instance, the amendment stipulated that regulations should be fair so that they can
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2 Ibid., 14.
equally apply to a football team that includes sixty members, and a volleyball team that includes around twelve. The regulations were issued by the HEW in 1975, and schools were given a three-year grace period to become compliant with the regulations.4

Interestingly, SIUC was involved in the process of creating these regulations.5 Charlotte West worked at SIU for forty-one years between 1957 and 1998. During that time she was head director of the women’s athletic department at SIUC from 1960-1986, and from then until retirement she was an associate athletic director.6 According to West, the HEW sent down lawyers to discuss and format the regulations with SIUC administrators.7 These regulations, including financial assistance, athletic benefits and opportunities, and accommodation of student interests and abilities have remained unchanged and still remain the main method of monitoring Title IX today.8

In 1978, the three-year grace period to become compliant expired. In the same year, HEW issued the “Final Policy Interpretation” regarding Title IX. This resulted in what is currently known as the three-prong or three-part test for a school to demonstrate that it meets the athletic benefits and opportunities requirement for Title IX compliance. A school can demonstrate compliance with Title IX if it is able to adequately show that it meets one of the three parts of the test. These parts include: whether opportunities are substantially proportionate to their respective enrollments, whether an institution can show a history and continuing practice of expansion to developing interests and abilities of members of the underrepresented sex, and whether the interests of the underrepresented sex have been fully accommodated.9 However, many argue that universities are overly dependent on the proportionality part of the test.10 In fact, this is commonly referred to as the “safe harbor” for universities to be compliant with Title IX.11
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4 Ibid.
5 Charlotte West, Personal interview by author, November 6, 2017, audio recording, Carbondale, IL.
7 Charlotte West, Interview.
8 “Title IX Intercollegiate Athletics Requirements,” Charlotte West Papers, Special Collections Research Center, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Box 1.
11 Charlotte West Interview.
This standard requires the allocation of resources be proportionate to the percentage of athletes, which should reflect the enrollment of the sex within the institution. For example, if a school is sixty percent male, forty percent female, the number of athletic opportunities should also be approximately sixty percent male, forty percent female. If a school does not have proportionality, it has the choice to either add women’s sports and positions, or it can drop men’s sports and positions. This particular “prong” generated large amounts of backlash because it was perceived as discriminating against male athletes and reducing the number of athletic opportunities and sports for men. For instance, one argument states the other two prongs of the test are too ambiguous, schools choose to comply with the proportionality requirement. As a result, schools are required to cut men’s athletic teams more frequently to comply. However, when looking at the difference between the number of men’s teams added and the number of men’s teams dropped between the years 1988-2016, there was a net increase of 845 male teams nationally. This prong of the test was not the only backlash that Title IX has faced in its history and implementation.

One of the earliest and most significant opponents of Title IX was the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). In 1976, the NCAA filed a lawsuit against HEW asserting that the Title IX regulations did not apply to athletics because these programs did not receive direct funding from the federal government. There was never a decision for the NCAA v. Califano case because it was determined that the NCAA did not have the legal standing to file a lawsuit. However, this issue later reappeared in 1984 during the Grove City v. Bell court case. The court decided that Title IX and its regulations only applied to programs that were receiving direct federal funding. For most schools, this exempted sports programs from Title IX requirements. It was not until the 1987 Civil Rights Restoration Act overrode the decision that Title IX once again became a prominent policy for pursuing equality in sports programs.

In 1994 the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) passed. It required that all institutions receiving federal financial aid must disclose information about participation rates, scholarship aid, expenditures, and other program areas. This law strengthened Title IX because it required schools to publicly share their financial information and athletic participation annually, making it easier to monitor individual institution’s compliance. The legislative history of

12 Ibid.
15 Nancy Bandy, “Past and Present Attempts to Alter Title IX Athletic Provisions,” May 6, 1982, Charlotte West Papers, Special Collections Research Center, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Box 3.
17 Ibid., 52.
Title IX includes many other decisions and debates, but the events mentioned above are considered some of the most influential to the history of Title IX.

III. Implementation of Title IX at Southern Illinois University

The impact of Title IX on SIUC’s athletics demonstrates the improvements that have resulted because of the law. It is necessary to acknowledge the ways in which this legislation impacted the athletics departments to provide insight in the growth of women in college athletics. Southern Illinois University Carbondale provides a great opportunity to study the effects of Title IX on women in athletic programs. More specifically, it offers an insight as to how Title IX influenced the opportunities of the female athletes that participated in the sports programs.

During the 1970’s, the conditions and treatment of SIUC’s women’s teams were dramatically different than the treatment of the men’s. This was the case even after the initial passage of Title IX. One example of this can be seen when reviewing the spending during the 1974-1975 fiscal year. SIUC spent approximately $1,250,000 on athletic programs; roughly $1,140,000 (91%) on men’s athletics, and the remaining $114,000 (9%) on women’s athletics.\(^{18}\) It is important to mention that at the time this data was being gathered, there were still no regulations created for Title IX, so a potential reason for this discrepancy could be because SIUC had thought that it was compliant by offering an equal number of men’s and women’s teams. Head of women’s athletics Charlotte West, commented on Title IX’s impact at SIUC in August 1975, stating that it “doesn’t mean equal funding, it’s just equal opportunity.”\(^{19}\) Based on this interpretation, SIUC was compliant in 1975 because it had eleven teams for both the men’s and women’s athletic departments.\(^{20}\) Yet, at the same time, Southern Illinois University’s treatment of women’s teams as secondary to men’s teams also illustrates the initial inequality of the programs.

Another source of inequality between the women’s and men’s programs that can be seen during the 1970’s were the resources and facilities provided to the teams. For instance, Charlotte West details an experience she had in 1974 that she believes demonstrates the unfair treatment of women athletes. At one field hockey game, one of her players had injured her head and required medical attention, but there was no emergency vehicle provided at the game. The Health Service ambulance was stationed at the football stadium waiting for
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\(^{20}\) Ibid., 8.
a possible injury from the football game. This required her to take the player in
her personal vehicle to the emergency room. Not only did the football team have
the emergency ambulance stationed at the game, but the players also had on-
Charlotte West Papers, Special Collections Research Center, Morris Library, Southern
Illinois University Carbondale, 4. Box 1.} Another service lacking from women’s sports was
rehabilitative services. Since the women did not have their own rehabilitative
center, they shared the men’s. However, the women were only allowed to use
it whenever the men were not.\footnote{Ibid., 4.} Considering that football teams consist of at
least sixty players, and that it is an injury-prone sport, the likelihood of the
rehabilitative center being open was very slim. This demonstrates how women’s
athletics was literally placed on the sidelines so that the men could receive
primary care and resources.

However, there are signs of change after the HEW Title IX regulations
were released in 1975. During the 1975-1976 fiscal year, the funding for the
women’s athletic department almost doubled. The women’s department received
seventeen percent of the total budget.\footnote{House Higher Education Subcommittee, 9.} Based on this financial data, SIUC was
taking steps to become compliant with Title IX. The university would continue
to do so for the rest of the 1970’s. By the time of the 1978 “deadline” to become
compliant had occurred, SIUC had demonstrated progress toward compliance
with Title IX but was still far from achieving the goals and requirements created
by the regulations. In 1979, Southern Illinois women’s athletics expenditures
had increased to twenty-one percent of all athletic expenditures.\footnote{Southern Illinois University at Carbondale Undergraduate Student Organization.
Women’s Intercollegiate Athletic Discrimination Investigatory Commission. \textit{Final
Report}. 1979, Charlotte West Papers, Special Collections Research Center, Morris Library,
Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Women Budget Table. Box 2.} Since the
university was still not compliant, as can be seen by the financial data of 1979,
the student athletes decided to take matters into their own hands and filed a
lawsuit against the university.

As a result of the lawsuit, two committees were formed. The first was the
Women’s Intercollegiate Athletic Discrimination Investigatory Commission
(WIADIC). This was a student-run organization. The Title IX Intercollegiate
Athletics Evaluation Committee did the second investigation. This committee
consisted of the heads of both athletic departments, representatives for male
and female athletes, as well as other university administrators.\footnote{Title IX Intercollegiate Athletics Evaluation Committee. \textit{Report Evaluating Equality of
Opportunities}. 1979, Charlotte West Papers, Special Collections Research Center, Morris
Library, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 1. Box 1.} The complaint
stated that there was discrimination in eight different areas. Both committees
were able to find inequalities in scholarship aid, recruitment money, facilities, number of coaches, and scheduling of practices and competitive events but the major discrepancies were found in scholarships and facilities. The WIADIC found that per capita, women were receiving thirty-five percent of what the men received. Of the total scholarship aid offered, the women received only eleven percent. For facilities, both reports found major discrepancies. The WIADIC compared the condition of the lockers, showers, and practice facilities of sports the offer both a male and female teams, and found that approximately twelve and a half percent of the women’s facilities were in poorer condition than those of the men. The Title IX Committee reported that only the gymnastics and swimming teams had equivalent showers and lockers for both men and women.

Both committees specifically mentioned the need to renovate Davies Gym as soon as possible. This facility was specifically criticized for being an “unequal facility” because of its need for renovation and for its “unsafe condition.” For instance, the building had poor electrical wiring that made it impossible to use the copier and electric typewriter at the same time without blowing a fuse.

These reports also offered a variety of recommendations for how Southern Illinois University could become compliant to Title IX. These recommendations included reallocating scholarship funds to be equivalent to the student athlete ratio, removing Junior Varsity teams, rearranging schedules of the athletic fields to be used by both male and female teams, and increasing funding to provide women with equivalent equipment as the men’s teams. Each of these recommendations eventually came into effect at SIUC. These changes resulted from the lawsuit that could occur because of Title IX’s application to athletics. Before the lawsuit, SIUC was making slow and minimal progress toward equality among men and women athletes, but the lawsuit resulted in dramatic improvements in the athletic program. According to Charlotte West, the lawsuit allowed Southern Illinois to “get ahead of a lot of the [other schools].”

By 1981, SIU was meeting the proportionality standard for the number of athletes. In 1981, the student population was sixty percent male, forty percent
female. The breakdown of athletes was fifty-nine percent male, forty-one percent female.\textsuperscript{36} The school also began to redistribute the financial assistance offered to the female athletes, as sixty percent of the financial aid was provided to men, and thirty-three percent was offered to women.\textsuperscript{37} This is a twenty-two percent increase compared to two years before. Another change that appears to have been the result of the lawsuit was the renovation of Davies Gym in 1982. Based on this, SIUC was working toward achieving compliance by following the recommendations made by the committees. However, the Grove City v. Bell court case in 1984 greatly reduced the impact of Title IX, as Title IX no longer applied to athletics except for scholarships.\textsuperscript{38} Despite this court case, SIUC continued to work towards achieving equality between men and women in athletics. A letter to the Chancellor Albert Somit by Richard Higgerson, SIU’s legal counsel at the time, recommended that SIUC should not initiate, “any changes in [their] cooperation with the Office of Civil Rights, OCR, in the reporting and monitoring schedule.”\textsuperscript{39}

SIUC continued to implement policies aimed at improving the athletic opportunities for women during the 1980’s, as the data from a 1990 audit of SIUC athletics indicates. The audit found that Southern Illinois University was compliant with Title IX in seven out of ten areas investigated. Indeed, the auditors were “impressed with the quality of opportunities for students in intercollegiate athletics.”\textsuperscript{40} Their report also found that financial assistance was proportionally distributed. They determined that sixty-seven percent of the athletes were male and they received sixty-four percent of the financial aid; thirty-three percent of the athletes were female and received thirty-six percent of the awarded aid.\textsuperscript{41} According to the proportionality standard, SIU was demonstrating compliance for financial aid. By the 1990’s Southern Illinois had managed to become compliant with Title IX regarding the financial aid requirement, but it struggled to achieve compliance in other areas. The three areas that the audit found deficient were scheduling of games and practice times, travel and per diem expense, and provision of locker rooms, practice,

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 4.
\textsuperscript{38} Women’s Sports Foundation, “Title IX Legislative History.”
\textsuperscript{39} Richard G. Higgerson, E-mail message to Albert Somit, “Grove City College v. Bell – Title IX” March 13, 1984, Charlotte West Papers, Special Collections Research Center, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Box 1.
\textsuperscript{40} Elaine Hyden, E-mail message to Jim Hart, “Audit Report 130.” April 9, 1991. Charlotte West Papers, Special Collection Research Center, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Attachment. Box 1.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid. 3.
and competitive facilities. One of the major concerns placed by the audit was the inequality of equipment and facilities between the baseball and softball teams.

The audit found that softball had lesser equipment and facilities compared to baseball. For instance, the softball team received less equipment compared to the baseball team. The baseball team was provided seventeen helmets in excellent condition, fifty bats, and two batting cages. Softball was provided twelve helmets in poor condition, fifteen bats, and one batting cage. Although there was a clear discrepancy between the quality and quantity of equipment offered between the two teams, the auditors did not find it to be significant enough to consider SIU noncompliant in the component because this was the only noted discrepancy. However, the inequality between baseball and softball facilities (locker rooms, practice and competitive fields) was considered enough for SIU to be deemed non-compliant.

The baseball field (Fig. 1, Fig. 2) included large bleachers, restrooms, a clubhouse, a superior irrigation system, a press box, and a superior dugout. The clubhouse included showers, laundry facilities, a weight room, and a training room. The dugout, in Figure 2, was covered and had individual seats. The softball field (Fig. 3, Fig. 4) consisted of a smaller set of bleachers, and a dugout that was not covered. The softball locker room was located in Davies Gym. Although the conditions of the locker room were good, the proximity of the locker room to the field was much further than that provided to the baseball team, making the locker rooms non-compliant. One potential reason for the high-quality baseball facility compared to the poor softball facility is that the baseball facility was funded through large donations. However, the source of funding is not considered for Title IX compliance. Although the baseball facility was funded by donations, this can hardly account for all the differences in quality of the two fields.

Kathy Blaylock has been a coach at Southern Illinois University for twenty-eight years, nine as an assistant, and nineteen as a head coach. She has experienced first-hand the original softball field and summarized its condition, stating “it was bad.” The original field was directly across the street from the Student Recreation Center, with the back stop right up against Grand Avenue parking lot. This resulted in foul balls hitting both cars in the street and in

42 Ibid., 18.
43 Ibid., 5.
44 Ibid., 5.
45 Ibid., 10, 11, 12.
46 Ibid., 10.
47 Ibid., 10.
48 Kerri Blaylock, Personal interview with author, November 1, 2017, Carbondale, IL.
49 Ibid.
the parking lot. Another problem caused by the poor softball facility was the lack of a nearby locker room. When players needed to change for practice, they often had to go into an on-site equipment shed. This shed was not equipped with lights, leaving the girls to change in the dark. Based on the descriptions provided by Blaylock and the audit report, the facility that the softball team had was far from equal to that of the men’s baseball.

Another issue that SIU faced during the 1990’s was achieving proportional representation for female athletes. What this means is that the percentage of female athletes should be similar to the percentage of full-time female students attending the university. According to Associate Athletic Director Charlotte West, if the percentages are within five percent of each other, it can be argued that Southern Illinois University is substantially proportionate. In 1994, the discrepancy between the female athlete percentage and the school population percentage was eight percent. Using the 1994 athletic participation data this would mean that to be compliant, the school would have needed to either replace thirty-two male athletes with female athletes, cut eighty-three male athletic positions, or add approximately fifty-four more female athletes. In 1996, SIU was able to reduce this difference down to six percent, with the student body being forty-one percent female, and the athletic department was thirty-five percent female. A year later, the difference was back up to seven percent. SIUC had once again struggled to provide equal opportunities to male and female athletes.

Due to the continued challenge to meet proportionality, SIUC began using a policy called Roster Management. This policy placed a maximum number of positions on men’s rosters, and a minimum number of positions on women’s teams. This policy was considered a better choice than cutting entire men’s teams, or bearing the cost of adding another women’s team. Although SIUC seemed to be facing non-compliance with regard to substantial proportionality, there was still great improvement compared to the numbers from before Title IX, demonstrating the positive impact that Title IX had on the opportunities offered to women at SIUC. The university still uses this policy today. Although

50 Ibid.
51 Ibid.
54 Ibid., Table 2.
55 Ibid., Table 3.
56 Bode, “Gender Equity Law.”
57 Ibid.
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this policy has greatly affected the entirety of the athletics department at SIU, one of the largest improvements for a specific team resulted from a Title IX complaint in 1999.

In 1999, SIUC faced another lawsuit, this time over the discrepancies between the softball and baseball facilities. As noted before, there was great inequality in the softball and baseball equipment. The audit that occurred in 1990 recommended that the university begin to resolve these differences and dilemmas. However, the university made few direct changes because of the audit. One of the changes that was initially made was the construction of nicely covered brick dugouts. These dugouts were surrounded by an old stadium that still lacked restrooms, locker rooms, a press box, or more seating. These minimal changes prompted the filing of another lawsuit against the university, similar to what occurred because of the 1978 lawsuit. Before the lawsuit, SIUC athletics was making minimal progress toward obtaining equal opportunity and treatment for their female teams. However, once a lawsuit was filed, there were dramatic changes to become compliant. According to Coach Blaylock, the lawsuit was the “nudge” that got things going for the new stadium. The changes leading up to this point were minimal. Considering that the audit report was done in 1990, the nine years between the audit and the lawsuit showed minimal progress. Perhaps it is appropriate to call the lawsuit a “nudge” as Blaylock states, because it resulted in dramatic improvements to the conditions and experiences of the softball team.

The result was the construction of the current softball stadium in 2003, named the Charlotte West Stadium-Rochman Field (Fig, 5). This stadium contained locker rooms, an on-site training room, on-site restrooms, on-site batting cages, and improved seating. It is important to note that this stadium was a result in large part of the reaction and cooperation of the athletic department to the lawsuit. According to Blaylock, the school was immediately supportive of making the necessary changes to resolve the issue. Not only did the university respond quickly, but it also built an amazing softball stadium. “It didn’t have to be done as nicely as it was.” The reaction of the players and the coaches to the new stadium demonstrated the gratitude as well as the quality of the new facility compared to the old one. “[The] team didn’t want to

59 Kathy Jones, Personal interview with author, October 31, 2017, Carbondale, IL.
60 Hyden, Audit Report, 13.
61 Kerri Blaylock, Interview.
62 Ibid.
64 Kerri Blaylock, Interview.
65 Ibid.
66 Ibid.
leave after seeing the locker room,” said Blaylock.67 She continued to describe this stadium as being one of the best, if not the best, in the Missouri Valley Conference.68 In fact since its construction, the stadium has hosted the Missouri Valley Conference Championship four times; in 2004, 2008, 2012, and 2016.69 The dramatic changes between the old field, Figure 3, and the new stadium, Figure 5, demonstrate that SIUC took the Title IX complaint very seriously, demonstrating the continued legal influence and relevance to athletic program decisions. As a result of Title IX, female athletic teams at SIUC moved from being a sideline attraction to playing on the field.

IV. Conclusion

Overall, the passage of Title IX dramatically shaped SIUC athletic opportunities. The data collected from the 1970’s shows the unequal treatment between the men’s and women’s athletic departments and teams. However, a lawsuit in 1979 inspired the athletic department to improve the equality in multiple areas. These changes resulted in great improvements and equality of the programs during the 1980’s, despite the decision of the Grove City v. Bell court case. However, the 1990’s saw a resurgence of difficulties that the university was having towards maintaining proportionality as well as equivalent services for the baseball and softball team. This ultimately resulted in yet another lawsuit for SIUC in 1999. Similarly, SIUC reacted quickly to create the new facility to become compliant with Title IX.

Despite SIUC’s difficulties with maintaining compliance with Title IX from the 1970’s to the beginning of the twenty-first century, the policies and actions put into place demonstrate SIUC’s commitment to providing equal treatment of male and female athletes. One clear example is the construction of the Charlotte West Stadium. Lawsuits were the catalysts for change within the program. However, these lawsuits would not have had any legal claim without the creation and institutionalization of Title IX. From this, Title IX positively affected the opportunities and experiences of women athletes in Southern Illinois University Carbondale, and placed female athletics beside their male counterparts on the playing field.

67 “Ribbon Cut at New SIU Softball Field.”
68 Kerri Blaylock, Interview.
Figure 1 – Men’s Baseball Facility

Figure 2 – Dugout at Men’s Baseball Facility
Source: “Audit Report 130.”
Figure 3 – Women’s Softball Facility
Source: “Audit Report 130.”

Figure 4 – Dugout at Women’s Softball Facility
Source: “Audit Report 130.”
Figure 5 – Charlotte West Stadium
After the Civil War, the former Confederate states experienced massive upheaval and change. The Southern system that had been built by and was entirely dependent upon slavery had to be dismantled, as slavery was now illegal. This change in law affected every part of Southern life: not only did Southerners depend heavily on slavery due to the fact that their economic system was founded on unpaid labor, but their social system was also dependent on slavery due to the power structure that slavery had helped to build and maintain. This system, one of social stratification, ensured that the rich plantation owners could hold immense power. Farther down the social ladder were other whites, from the middle class to those who were poor, and at the very bottom fell enslaved people of African descent. The dismantling of slavery and its systems of oppression and stratification meant that other core aspects of Southern society were also under threat of being challenged or forgotten. To fight these threats, white Southerners responded by working to conserve and consolidate their power. Reconstruction did not last long; Jim Crow laws soon sprang up to take its place and slavery’s place from the 1870s onward. Racist white supremacists responded with groups such as the Ku Klux Klan, founded in 1865. Others formed groups to indoctrinate children to the “Lost Cause” narrative. Some even edited textbooks to be friendlier to the South. Alongside these changes, monuments to the Confederacy, its veterans, and its dead, began to appear, dotting the southern landscape as nostalgic reminders of the past.

Female disenfranchisement, a further instrumental social norm in the Post-Civil War South, held women back from holding any form of political power and demanded strict adherence to gender roles as shaped by an inherently patriarchal society. Throughout the United States during the nineteenth century, the “cult of domesticity” constrained women, calling for them to be patriotic mothers who only existed inside of the home with the purpose of educating children to become loyal citizens. Gender roles were even stricter for Southern women. Marjorie Spruill Wheeler argues that the Southern system was founded upon a “patriarchal system based on ‘frail, tender’ women and
According to Wheeler, upon the end of the Civil War, the “traditional role of the Southern lady was...a key element of a culture that white southerners were determined to preserve.” This determination came from an attempt to preserve the Southern culture that had become so threatened by Confederate defeat and subsequent emancipation. Just as many whites worked for consolidated racial power, men worked to consolidate gender-based power. I will seek to show that women’s participation in the memorialization of the Confederacy was neither innocent nor powerless. Confederate monuments were not haphazardly funded nor built as harmless nostalgic reminders of the past, although the women desired for them to be portrayed as such. Instead, these monuments were built as an extension of the “Lost Cause” narrative because they provided power to those who were scrambling to find it. I will argue that the largest and most influential group seeking power through the memorialization of the Confederacy were white, middle-class women working inside of prescribed gender roles after the Civil War, and that their motivation was largely shaped by their recent loss of previously consolidated racial power with emancipation.

**The United Daughters of the Confederacy**

Caroline Meriwether Goodlett and Anna Mitchell Davenport Raines founded the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) in Nashville, Tennessee, on September 10, 1894. Goodlett hailed from Tennessee, and Raines was from Georgia. According to the UDC’s history of their founders, both had been involved in the war effort to some extent, with Goodlett leading other women to help by creating a sewing circle and tending to the wounded. While Raines had been just a child, she still took time to help supply her local Confederate hospital with food and bandages. Information concerning these women is difficult to find beyond the UDC’s website, but whether or not the provided information is true, it demonstrates a core ideal of the UDC: women helping with the war effort.

The UDC consolidated and fulfilled a long tradition of women being publicly involved supporting the war effort. Immediately after the Civil War, Ladies Memorial Associations became incredibly popular. As members of these Ladies Memorial Associations, women sought to ensure that their loved ones were given proper burials and funerals, as well as advocating for the care of
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2 Ibid., 175.

southern veterans. With the passage of time, the need for burials diminished, and the need for a larger memorializing organization like the UDC arose. The UDC was a national organization, in contrast to Ladies Memorial Associations, which were place-specific. Only one year after the UDC’s founding, there were twenty chapters in Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Washington, D.C. Within three years, 138 chapters existed. By the end of World War I, nearly 100,000 women were members of the UDC, or “Daughters.” The UDC also represented a much larger goal than obtaining proper burials for veterans, as it was closely aligned with and helped create the “Lost Cause” narrative.

The UDC’s purposes can be easily contested. Historical evidence shows that the women involved in the UDC had ulterior motives, such as redefining the public’s perception of their Confederate parents’ intentions through shifting the Civil War narrative from one concerned with prolonging slavery to a “War of Northern Aggression,” a “War Between the States,” or a war concerning state’s rights. Not only did these women have motives for reshaping history, but they also held white supremacist beliefs and allegiances. In 1917, the UDC presented a commemorative plaque to Pulaski, Tennessee. They placed the plaque, that documented and commemorated the KKK’s founding dates and members, on the building in which the original Ku Klux Klan was founded. The Southern Poverty Law Center, an organization that documents American hate groups and their actions, defines the UDC as a Neo-Confederate group, emphasizing that they have frequently defended slavery and affiliated with well-known white supremacists. The UDC’s official narrative differs, however, and it claims the following seven goals:

1. To honor the memory of those who served and those who fell in the service of the Confederate States.

2. To protect, preserve and mark the places made historic by Confederate valor.

3. To collect and preserve the material for a truthful history of the War Between the States.


Ibid., 28.

Ibid.

Ibid., 29.


4. To record the part taken by Southern women in patient endurance of hardship and patriotic devotion during the struggle and in untiring efforts after the War during the reconstruction of the South.

5. To fulfill the sacred duty of benevolence toward the survivors and toward those dependent upon them.

6. To assist descendants of worthy Confederates in securing proper education.

7. To cherish the ties of friendship among the members of the Organization.¹⁰

These goals reveal a staunch commitment to the Confederacy, even after its defeat and dissolution. They can also prove UDC members’ desire to reshape history, a desire which is especially obvious in goals two, three, four, and six. This push to reshape history will be revisited when I later discuss the UDC and the Lost Cause.

The UDC’s requirements of membership also provide insight into these women’s staunch commitment to the Confederacy. To this day, women must jump through considerable hoops to join the UDC. Not only must they show proof of their ancestor’s service for the Confederacy, but they are also required to prove that they are related by blood to a Confederate veteran.¹¹ Adopted children cannot claim their adopted parents’ relation to a veteran, and must also have sufficient documentation to prove relation by blood to a veteran.¹² If a veteran took the Oath of Allegiance (an oath which required renouncing the Confederacy) to the United States prior to Confederate surrender on April 9, 1865, that veteran cannot be considered a valid relation for joining the UDC.¹³ All of these requirements demonstrate a disturbing devotion to the supposed supremacy of supporters of the Confederacy.

Even with stringent membership requirements, large numbers of women joined the UDC. Caroline E. Janney argues that the Daughters relied heavily on Southern history to “shape race and gender relations in the New South.”¹⁴ Despite this reliance on tradition, women found that, within the UDC, they had the power to reshape the New South into a place where they could have more
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social power. Daughters could not act too far outside of prescribed gender roles, but they were able to tailor gender roles to give themselves more authority. Additionally, Janney asserts that UDC members “consciously constructed an image of themselves as elite women.” Due to class-based power structures, Daughters were able to find and create even more social power by portraying themselves as elite women.

Alongside social power, women found political influence through the UDC. Women could not claim that it was political power, however, and were often hesitant to be portrayed as claiming such. The Daughters’ attempts to publicly avoid being labeled as a political organization resulted in them going so far as to claim at their first annual convention that the UDC was “social, literary, historical, monumental, benevolent, and honorable in every degree, without any political signification whatever.” But the Daughters claim that they did not have political power did not mean that they truly did not hold this influence.

The political power they did hold was acceptable because it was not related at all to women’s suffrage. In her memoir, A Slaveholder’s Daughter, southern suffragist Belle Kearney discusses the way in which Southern men were determined to hold women within the “woman’s sphere.” She tells that not only did men hold this determination, but that there were also

Thousands of women in the South who have arrayed themselves in a belligerent attitude toward the [suffragist] movement that was instituted especially for their well-being. There are multitudes of others who are still in a deep sleep regarding the necessity of having the ballot, and are continuing to drone the old song in their slumbers: “I have all the rights I want.”

Southern women often showed disdain for the suffragist movement. It would have been much easier for women like the Daughters to maintain this disdain because they had found political power within the UDC’s work. Many influential Daughters kept an extreme distance from the suffrage movement, including Mildred Rutherford, who was a well-known Historian General of the UDC and a fervent member of the “Georgia Association Opposed to Woman
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Suffrage.” Rutherford’s ability to deny the need for female enfranchisement shows the extent to which she held social power through her position in the UDC. Although these women’s political power was not nearly as developed as their social power, UDC members were still able to resist female disenfranchisement through their new-found social and political influence. Recognizing this helps us develop a deeper understanding of the Daughters and what drove them.

The UDC and Memorializing the “Lost Cause”

The “Lost Cause” narrative was one that began to appear almost immediately after the Confederacy lost the Civil War. It consisted of the notion that the Confederacy was fighting for a lost cause from the very beginning of the Civil War, and that it was honorable for them to have continued fighting for so long when their defeat was inevitable. Many Southern historians and intellectuals supported this narrative, hoping to shift future generations’ perspectives of the Civil War and its causes to be kinder to the South. Consequently, the “Lost Cause” was a purposeful movement that sought to vindicate the Confederacy through attempting to prove that their goals had been good, decent, and righteous. Bradley T. Johnson, a former Confederate Brigadier General of Maryland, perfectly summed up the purpose of the “Lost Cause” when he spoke at the dedication of the Confederate Museum in Richmond, Virginia:

Our memorial...for all time will sanctify [the Confederacy] to all true men and women. They will know that it is a memorial of no “Lost Cause.” They will never believe that “we thought we were right,” they will know, as we know, that we were right, immortally right, and that the conqueror was wrong, eternally wrong.

Johnson clearly displays a belief in an infallible Confederacy. It is also telling that he gave this speech at an event that was dedicating the Confederate Museum, one of the earliest large-scale memorials to the Confederacy that was orchestrated and designed by women.

In attempting to vindicate the Confederacy, those who developed the “Lost Cause,” including the UDC, endeavored to shift the Civil War narrative away from true causes of the war, such as slavery. Although almost every Confederate document of secession explicitly included the preservation of slavery as a goal of
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secession, many sought to erase this ugly history. The UDC specifically worked
to rewrite this history in schools. In 1912, the *Evening Star*, a Washington, D.C.
newspaper, told that the UDC had “made a determined attempt to oust history
textbooks regarded as unfair to the south from the public schools.”24 Mildred
Rutherford, the aforementioned UDC Historian General, made considerable
attempts to lobby against textbooks that reflected poorly of the South. She
even published *A Measuring Rod to Test Text Books, And Reference Books in Schools,
Colleges and Libraries* in 1920. This “measuring rod” included specific instructions
on which books were acceptable and which were not. It told those in charge of
choosing books to be used in schools and libraries to:

Reject a book that calls the Confederate soldier a traitor or
rebel, and the war a rebellion. Reject a book that says the South
fought to hold her slaves.

Reject a book that speaks of the slaveholder of the South as
cruel and unjust to his slaves.25

These specific directions show how purposeful the UDC and the Daughters
were in devoting themselves to the “Lost Cause” narrative. Rutherford even
supports her directions for measuring textbooks with various references
to flawed histories, citing sources such as William Makepeace Thackeray’s
“Roundabout Papers” to support the thesis that slaveholders were not cruel or
unjust. She includes his description of slaves as support for her guidance:

How they sang! How they danced! How they laughed!
How they shouted! How they bowed and scraped and
complimented! So free, so happy! I saw them dressed on
Sunday in their Sunday best — far better dressed than our
English tenants of the working class are in their holiday attire.
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 tenantry system.26

This alarmingly false description of slavery was used to inform
Southerners who were choosing textbooks for children. It demonstrates
the dedication to preserving a deceptive narrative in order to vindicate the
Confederacy. Even more, the entire handbook shows the immense social
power held by a single woman, Mildred Rutherford in this case. She had a
hand in choosing the textbooks that thousands of Southern children would
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use, without many qualifications besides being a rich Southern woman in an elected UDC position.

The UDC did not stop at changing textbooks. They also created an offshoot for youth called Children of the Confederacy. Founded one year after United Daughters of the Confederacy, Children of the Confederacy acted as an after-school program, and it taught them about the Confederacy and the “Lost Cause.” Beyond the textbooks encountered in school, children were also taught the false history promoted by the UDC through “Confederate Catechisms.” The catechisms were practiced as a call-and-response, in which children were asked a question and were required to give a specific answer. Boys and girls received positive reinforcement for memorization, and those who could recite the catechisms word-for-word were given points. One specific production of these catechisms was written by Lyon Gardiner Tyler, a son of the slaveholding US President John Tyler. One of his catechisms is as follows:

Did the South fight for slavery or the extension of slavery?

No, for had Lincoln not sent armies to the South, that country would have done no fighting at all.

All across the South, children were purposefully taught these catechisms, riddled with a false history. The catechisms further prove that the Daughters were determined to exert their social power and exonerate the Confederacy for generations to come. It was also no mistake that so much of the Daughters’ influence was in indoctrinating children, clearly inside of their prescribed gender roles.

The Daughters realized, however, that their indoctrination of children could only last so long without public spaces memorializing the Confederacy. With the construction of the Confederate Museum in Richmond, Virginia, women began to grasp the immense power in public memorials. As women worked to put the Confederate Museum together, they found that they could be more publicly assertive. Because they had done all the fundraising to build the museum, women had more power to assert their opinions concerning decision-making for the museum. Women also enjoyed the ability to work outside of the home in some capacity. Minnie A. Baughman, one of the women who worked at the Confederate Museum, wrote in a letter that “home duties detain us when we should like to be at our work at the museum.” The museum was only
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in Richmond, however, and it did not take long to plan and implement the women’s plans. Consequently, women began to partake in much more public memorialization of the Confederacy.

This public memorialization took place in the form of the Confederate monuments we all know so well today. Thanks in part to the UDC, Tennessee has more monuments and markers for Nathan Bedford Forrest, a Confederate general and a General Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, than Illinois does for Abraham Lincoln, Virginia has for George Washington, or any other state has for any one person. As of April 2016, there were at least 1,503 symbols commemorating the Confederacy in public places, ranging from monuments and statues to schools and highways named after Confederate leaders. A study completed by the Southern Poverty Law Center found that 718 of these symbols are monuments. These monuments can be found in 31 states and the District of Columbia; most are located within former Confederate states, but many are also in Union states, especially border states, and in states that did not yet exist during the Civil War. A large majority of these monuments were erected and dedicated between 1888 and 1919 – over twenty years after the Civil War had ended, showing that they were not a direct result of mourning the losses of the Civil War. All of these monuments were erected despite warnings given by Robert E. Lee, the renowned Confederate General. On various occasions, Lee openly opposed Confederate monuments, claiming that they would continue or even add to “the difficulties under which the Southern people labour.” Lee also refused requests to attend a dedication of various markers at the Gettysburg battlefield, claiming that he thought it “wiser, moreover, not to keep open the sores of war, but to follow the example of those nations who endeavor to obliterate the marks of civil strife, to commit to oblivion the feelings it engendered.” While this stance may have been held because Lee disapproved of monuments that could prolong an anti-
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Southern legacy of the Civil War, it is curious that his words were so blatantly disregarded, especially considering how well-respected he was throughout the South.

The blatant disregard for Lee’s advice can be answered in knowing that, as women memorialized the Confederacy with these monuments, they continued to expand their social power. Because the monuments memorialized men who had fought in the Civil War, women were able to bend, not break, gender roles and exert public influence. The UDC planned massive events to unveil their monuments, and they used these occasions as additional ways to exert social power. Their functions were seen as extraordinary. For example, upon the unveiling of a monument in front of the Holmes County Courthouse in Lexington, Mississippi, the superintendent of Holmes County schools called off school for the day. The dismissal was reported in the newspapers, and it was justified as the superintendent claimed that all students needed the “opportunity to learn the lessons of patriotism that this occasion will afford.”

On the same page of the newspaper, there are three different advertisements for postcards and photographs of the monument. One says that “every person in Holmes County wants a photo of the elegant confederate monument,” and another advertisement claims that “everybody should have one.”

The reaction of the community, as detailed in *The Lexington Advertiser*, shows that the UDC claimed excessive power through the events they planned to unveil their monuments.

The UDC also found that they had the power to bring masses of people together. At one 1910 “Confederate Reunion” in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, the Daughters amassed over 8,000 people. The *Hattiesburg News* reported that these crowds were the largest ever seen in the city, and even the largest that region of Mississippi had ever seen. There was also a speech given in front of this massive crowd by a Mr. Stokes Robertson, who was a member of the Board of Supervisors in Hattiesburg’s Forrest County. He supported the UDC and the Daughters in telling that he could “personally...vouch” for the “entire truthfulness” of the inscription on the brand new monument. The inscription he referenced claimed that it was through the “devotion and untiring efforts” of...
While the Daughters were able to find formidable social power in bringing such large crowds to the unveiling of their monuments, they were able to solidify this power by having powerful men – such as a member of the County Board of Supervisors – give speeches that spoke so highly of them. The Daughters’ need to have powerful men affirm their efforts revealed that they were still having to work inside of gender roles.

The events also gave women a public speaking platform. Although men were the only people allowed to speak at the earliest dedications of Confederate monuments erected by Ladies’ Memorial Associations, women were eventually able to make speeches.\footnote{Coski and Feely, “A Monument to Southern Womanhood,” 134.} In Lexington, Missouri in 1906, the Lexington Intelligencer reported that approximately 6,000 to 10,000 people were documented in attendance at the dedication of a monument.\footnote{“Dedication of Confederate Monument,” The Lexington Intelligencer, (Lexington, MO), June 9, 1906. Library of Congress, Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers, accessed October 20, 2017, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn86063623/1906-06-09/ed-1/seq-1/.} The Lexington Intelligencer also reported that five different women gave public speeches at this event.\footnote{Ibid.} Another woman was recorded as giving the presentation address at the unveiling of a Lowndes County, Mississippi monument in 1912.\footnote{“Will Unveil Monument,” The Port Gibson Teville, (Port Gibson, MS), Aug. 8, 1912. Library of Congress, Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers, accessed October 2, 2017, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn86090233/1912-08-08/ed-1/seq-4/.} The Mississippi Governor attended this event, showing that women had begun to more thoroughly consolidate their power and further bend gender roles in speaking publicly with such a lofty guest.

One specific monument that shows the social and political power of the UDC on a grand scale is the Confederate Monument in Arlington Cemetery – the military cemetery of the United States, the Confederacy’s enemy. The fact that women were able to exert their power and build a monument within Arlington Cemetery shows the Daughters’ immense sway. Many of the speeches given by men at the event showed admiration for the Daughters, revealing that they gained the respect of men despite gender roles.\footnote{“Monument to Heroes of South Dedicated,” The Washington Herald, (Washington, DC), June 5, 1914. Library of Congress, Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers, November 3, 2017, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83045433/1914-06-05/ed-1/seq-1/.} This is especially evident in that a woman presented the memorial “to the government,” and her presentation was received by the US President Woodrow Wilson, who was in attendance at
this dedication. Wilson even gave an address during the program, showing that the Daughters had sufficient social and political influence to lobby him to speak at their event.

Another power demonstrated by the Daughters was that to erect a memorial to a Southern woman named Emma Sansom. Sansom was said to have helped Confederate General Nathan Bedford Forrest during the Civil War by burning a bridge behind him and his men, allowing them to escape Union forces. This was only the third public memorial in the South to a woman, and it was monumental that women had the ability to build a tribute to another woman. It is also telling that this marker made ripples across the country – it was even reported on in Hammond, Indiana – a city in Northwestern Indiana, located far from the South. This shows that the Daughters’ influence was not isolated in former Confederate states. This is displayed on various occasions by monuments in border states and even Northern states, and it is further reflected by Northern newspapers reporting on their movements.

However, the Daughters’ power was not entirely full or uncontested. There were various occasions when men attempted to memorialize Southern women, but the women often refused such memorials in fear of being portrayed as weak mothers. Kelly McMichael, whose writing details the UDC’s work in Texas, tells that veterans “continued to view women as simply the vessels that produced great manhood rather than recognizing women as agents of their own lives.” Although women worked so hard to find authority outside of the household in building Confederate monuments, and although they were often publicly recognized for this work, they were yet to be recognized as full humans.

Today, Americans still do not widely recognize the work of the Daughters that resulted in hundreds of public Confederate monuments. It is even less known as the work of women to exercise social and political power, and hardly acknowledged as women purposefully rewriting history in order to gain such command. Because this history is so often forgotten, generations are enslaved to the lies perpetuated by the UDC and its members. Today, monuments are seen as harmless memorials of brave Southern heroes, memorials which were placed to remember the great sacrifices made by Confederate soldiers. They are often argued to be markers of heritage and history, and many fail to see
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them as markers of a false history. Tensions flare whenever monuments are suggested to be markers of slavery and wistful reminders of a white supremacist society, thanks in part to the way in which the UDC cemented the “Lost Cause” narrative public memory through the education of Southern children. In turn, monuments continue to tell the UDC’s false narrative of the Civil War – a “Lost Cause” from the beginning, and a Confederacy in support of state’s rights that men fought so valiantly to protect. McMichael tells that the Daughters understood these repercussions, and told and supported this false narrative so fully because they understood that “creating memory – controlling memory – constitutes real societal power.”54 In creating monuments to the Confederacy, in memorializing the Confederacy as they saw fit, the UDC constructed a narrative that to this day exonerates the Confederacy and its intentions, and this is the truest marker of the Daughters’ long-lasting power.
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Alice Paul created and led the National Woman’s Party (NWP) to secure the Nineteenth Amendment, granting women suffrage in the United States. Known for her militant tactics in lobbying for suffrage, Paul alienated Carrie Chapman Catt, head of the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA), who believed such tactics were counterproductive. Moreover, the NWP and NAWSA disagreed on issues of race, equality, and overall strategies for securing woman suffrage. In March of 1913, Paul organized a procession in Washington D.C. to call attention to the woman suffrage movement. Despite Paul’s best efforts, the march faced substantive opposition among anti-suffragists and conservatives. Overall, Paul’s march was successful in garnering the public’s attention. Both organizations, however, appealed to President Woodrow Wilson for support of suffrage. President Wilson was initially reluctant to offer his endorsement. Regardless of the opposition from within the suffrage movement, Alice Paul’s radical tactics for winning the vote: the formation of a separate suffrage organization, the woman’s march on Washington, the acceptance and attempted inclusion of African Americans in the suffrage movement, the campaign against the Democratic party, the lobbying of western women voters, and the picketing of the White House, were essential to the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment.

Alice Stokes Paul was born on January 11, 1885. She grew up on her family farm, Paulsdale, in New Jersey. Her parents were active members of the Quaker community and raised their children to believe in equality between the sexes. Alice was an astute student with a strong desire to learn about the world. In 1901 Alice attended the prestigious Swarthmore College, which boasted a coeducational program. She excelled in her studies and soon went on to study social work at Hull House in New York City and Woodbrook in England.

While overseas, Alice inhabited activist spaces as she joined fellow suffragettes, Lucy Burns, and the Pankhurst mother-daughter duo, Emmeline and Christabel. Her involvement with Emmeline Pankhurst and the British suffragette movement led to her radicalization. While in Europe, Paul engaged in militant protests via acts of civil disobedience. She was arrested several times, but her first encounter with force-feeding was not until her hunger strike in Holloway Jail in 1909. When asked about her demonstration Paul said, “those were the recognized tactics among the suffragettes. Last October the custom of
forcible feeding was introduced, and I was one of the victims of the practice.”  

After being released from Holloway Jail, Paul shifted her attention to the woman suffrage campaign in America.

Alice Paul returned to the United States in 1910 and became an active member in suffragist circles and formed her own suffrage organization, The Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage (CU) in 1916. The CU later developed into the National Woman’s Party, formed by the amalgamation of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage with the former Woman’s Party.  

Prior to the formation of the CU, Paul teamed up with fellow suffrage organization, the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA). During her time with NAWSA, Paul’s position as militant leader of the Congressional Committee (CC), a branch of NAWSA, starkly contrasted that of conservative NAWSA leader, Carrie Chapman Catt.

NAWSA’s conservative approach and disapproval of Paul’s tactics did not hinder her campaign. In March 1913, Paul led a procession in Washington D.C. on behalf of NAWSA’s Congressional Committee. The march was to be held on March 3, the day before President-elect Woodrow Wilson’s inauguration. Paul knew from her experience with militant suffragettes in Britain that she could not miss such a grand and dramatic opportunity to advocate for woman’s suffrage. Despite Paul’s motives, the march was not embraced by all, and Paul worked to overcome the opposition posed by her adversaries. Paul faced resistance from anti-suffragists as well as her fellow suffragists.

Paul’s radical tactics also translated into the organization of the procession, as she proposed the inclusion of African American suffragists in the day’s activities. Paul’s upbringing in the Quaker community bred her strong convictions in regards to securing equality for African Americans. Prior to the Civil War, Quakers were steadfast in their commitment to the abolitionist movement. While Paul was a prominent advocate for the rights of African Americans, conservative members of NAWSA were less than enthusiastic about Paul’s plans.  

Many of NAWSA’s more rigid traditionalists were unwilling to march alongside African Americans as they worried it would cause added risk to marchers’ safety. The march symbolized the struggle between races and the privilege white women held over African Americans. Anti-suffragists were constant in their disapproval of white suffragists but were even more vocal in their opposition to African American suffragists. The threat of violence combined with the potential of alienating white southerners proved too much.
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for NAWSA members, and African Americans were segregated from white suffragists. Paul believed the integration of African Americans could strengthen the movement’s numbers, but she also recognized that conservatives would be unwavering in their refusal to march alongside black women. Paul did not want to divide her supporters over the logistics, however, Paul’s militant approach and refusal to ignore African American voices ultimately garnered enough support that she was able to bypass the negative sentiments of NAWSA’s conservatives.4

Despite initial apprehensions, Paul managed to alleviate tensions between white and African American suffragists, but other issues remained, including where to hold the procession, the collection of monies to fund the march, and the provision of security for marchers. To fund the march, Paul relied heavily on NAWSA’s financial supporters. Paul’s reliance on NAWSA’s benefactors to raise money for the march was successful but displeased the leader of NAWSA, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who believed Paul’s march took away from NAWSA’s potential funds. Paul argued that the earnings collected for the march were to benefit the collective woman suffrage movement. The issue of monetary funds was merely the first of many signs leading to a schism in tactics between Stanton and Paul.

Securing the route for the procession proved to be a laborious task, but Paul refused to give in. Police Chief Richard Sylvester was initially reluctant to provide Paul access to Pennsylvania Avenue. Paul specifically planned the procession to coordinate with the inauguration ceremonies of President Woodrow Wilson. Paul knew Washington D.C. would be crowded with politicians and affluent members of society, so this was an ideal time to hold the procession to garner attention from policymakers and the public. Coordinating the procession was more difficult than Paul had initially expected but her efforts proved fruitful.5

Paul was unconcerned about the harsh reaction she received from Elizabeth Cady Stanton and other conservative members of NAWSA. Paul deemed security for marchers to be the more important issue. Paul had been promised police escorts for marchers, but on the day of the march, police officers lined the streets, but did little to assist the marchers as they were attacked by protesters. Paul was furious with the officers on duty during the procession, and publicly denounced Police Chief Richard Sylvester for his negligence.6

Despite the lack of security, the march proved successful as it had attracted over half a million spectators, received overwhelming praise from the media, and garnered public support of a federal suffrage amendment. Prominent newspapers expressed their admiration for the marcher’s ability to continue

---

4 Ibid., 67.
5 Ibid., 54.
with the procession even though they were at risk due to negligent security measures. The New York Times sympathized with suffragists and openly shared the trauma they experienced in the march at the expense of Police Chief Sylvester’s credibility. Two days after the march, the New York Times exposed the danger suffragists were exposed to due to the incompetence of the on-site security. Then NAWSA President, Dr. Anna Howard Shaw was quoted by the New York Times describing the procession as “one of the most beautiful parades that I have ever seen. It would have been a distinct feature of the inauguration if we had not been so disgracefully treated.”

Regardless of security’s refusal to protect marchers, the procession had raised awareness of the proposed federal amendment, while simultaneously garnering compassion towards gender equality. Paul with the support of her fellow radical suffragists had managed to make the fight for enfranchisement front-page news.

While the march itself heightened awareness of the suffragists’ movement, the organization of the procession aided in the growing polarity between radical and conservative suffragists. Paul’s tactics were far too militant not only for her opponents but also for many in her suffrage organization, the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA). The leaders of NAWSA and the American woman’s suffrage movement were staunch adversaries of the militant approach adopted by suffragettes in London. NAWSA viewed British tactics as too forceful and feared that they would alienate conservatives. NAWSA believed women were above such things as hunger strikes and argued that women served as the moral compasses of society.

Paul’s inability to persuade NAWSA to adopt a more radical approach forced her to create a new, more militant suffrage organization, the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage (CU), in 1913. The two suffrage organizations, NAWSA and the CU, had conflicting ideas about how to campaign for woman’s suffrage. The CU pushed for a federal amendment, while NAWSA enacted a state-by-state approach. The CU believed that the only true way to secure suffrage for women in America was to ratify a national amendment. NAWSA, on the other hand, focused on a campaign that would allow states to choose whether they would support woman’s suffrage. On the issue of race, NAWSA was far less inclusive than the CU. Many members of NAWSA were self-proclaimed conservatives and did not want to isolate white southerners. NAWSA was much more limited in its vision of equality for women, whereas the CU wanted equality and the vote. These contrasting ideologies on social constructs and the roles of women separated Alice Paul from conservative suffragists of NAWSA such as Carrie.
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Paul worked with militant suffragist organizations and continued the fight for a federal suffrage amendment. In 1916, the Congressional Union (CU) formed a secondary suffrage organization, the National Woman’s Party (NWP). The NWP and CU “concentrated on the federal (rather than state) government and aimed to amend the United States Constitution to gain woman’s rights... it employed a ‘political’ (rather than simply educative) strategy.”10 Suffragists in the NWP and CU attempted to persuade President Wilson to put suffrage on the Democratic agenda, but he refused to recognize suffrage as a national issue. Frustrated yet determined, Paul employed an anti-Democratic party campaign to counter President Wilson’s policies. The campaign was designed to garner support from Republicans and Wilson’s political adversaries to secure a federal amendment. At the Republican Convention of 1916, Alice Paul and fellow suffragists held a banner with a quote from prominent women’s rights activist, Susan B. Anthony. The banner read, “No self-respecting woman should wish or work for the success of a party that ignores her self.”11 The banner was a clear critique of President Wilson and his refusal to support a federal suffrage amendment.

NAWSA once again disapproved of Alice Paul’s radical tactics and denounced her campaign against the Democratic party. NAWSA President, Carrie Chapman Catt met with President Wilson and said, “she would recommend to the convention that it preserve it nonpartisan attitude.”12 NAWSA was unwilling to publicly alienate Republicans or Democrats and they maintained a neutral stance in their support of politicians and their respective political parties. Paul viewed Catt’s actions as cowardly and refused to be swayed by NAWSA’s neutrality.

To assist with her campaign against the Democratic party, Paul enlisted the help of women voters in the west. Western women had received the vote in order to attract women to western territories and swell the population to enable territories to become states. NAWSA was aware of women voters in the west but was not interested in lobbying there. NAWSA’s primary goal was to ensure that the political rights of white southerners were not jeopardized by women voters. They were not concerned about women that already had the vote.13 However, NAWSA did not approve of Paul’s attempts to recruit women voters in the west to push for a federal amendment. In March 1917, Paul combined the NWP and
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CU into a single entity, the NWP, to strengthen and unify the voices of militant suffragists. Paul’s radical tactics not only rejected conservative policies but fully embraced a militant approach that focused on the inclusivity of all women to secure a federal suffrage amendment.

Paul’s campaigning in the western states proved extremely successful, with over four million women becoming eligible to vote for president. In 1916, “the twelve suffrage states control[led] ninety-one electoral votes. They control[led] one-fifth of the Electoral College. Women’s political power [had] more than doubled since the last presidential election.” With the growing number of qualified women voters, support of the federal suffrage amendment grew accordingly. Paul’s ambitions to make woman suffrage a national issue had become a reality. Politicians could no longer ignore the voices of women voters and suffragists.

Paul kept the momentum going when she, with the support of the NWP and CU, picketed the White House in January 1917. She elicited help from newspapers to force President Wilson to support a federal suffrage amendment to the Constitution. Newspaper reporters knew that the issue of suffrage was a controversial topic as it did not coincide with the president’s political agenda. However, newspapers recognized that stories covering the suffrage movement sold, so they followed the continuing story of Alice Paul and the militant suffragists. Paul used the newspapers to her advantage to spread the advancements made by suffragists and make the ratification of a federal suffrage amendment a national issue.

Initially, the public was sympathetic to picketers and provided them with blankets and hot beverages in bad weather. However, public opinion changed once the United States became involved in the Great European War. Those that had once supported the suffragists and their protests now accused them of being traitors. Anti-suffragists claimed that Paul and the Silent Sentinels, as the picketers were nicknamed, were advancing a political agenda at America’s expense. President of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, Mrs. Arthur Dodge, warned, “that their threats against members of the House and Senate, who have refused to cringe before their demands are idle and absurd, does not alter the fact that they will be resented by the big majority of American people.”

Nevertheless, Paul refused to back down to her adversaries. The Silent Sentinels began to hold banners with quotes from President Wilson. The quotes were meant to show the ironies of the United States fight overseas for democracy,
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yet the denial of it to women in the states.\textsuperscript{17} One banner held by picketer Virginia Arnold read, “Kaiser Wilson have you forgotten your sympathy with the poor Germans because they were not self-governed? 20,000,000 American women are not self-governed. Take the beam out of your own eye.”\textsuperscript{18} Comparing the leader of the so-called free world with the militarist leader of Germany not only damaged Wilson’s public persona but gained the public’s attention.

Police arrested picketers for obstruction of justice in June of 1917. Yet Paul and others indicated that the arrests violated their first amendment rights. Initially, suffragists who were arrested were released after a short internment. Wilson expected the suffragists to grow tired and weary, but they did not. With each arrest, Paul believed they were edging closer to the precipice of a federal amendment. As the protests persisted, the consequences grew in severity. On October 19, 1917, the police warned suffragists that future picketers would receive six months in prison. The very next day, Paul led the picket line with a banner reading, “The time has come to conquer or submit for there is but one choice - we have made it.”\textsuperscript{19} As the suffragists continued to picket they and Paul were sent to the Occoquan workhouse to serve their sentences. \textit{The New York Times} reported that after having been arrested for picketing the White House, “Alice Paul, Chairman of the Woman’s Party, and Caroline Spencer... were sent to jail today to serve seven months for picketing the White House.”\textsuperscript{20}

The conditions of the workhouse were unsanitary, the women were malnourished, and the guards and others prisoners treated the suffragists harshly.\textsuperscript{21} On November 15, 1917, violence against the imprisoned suffragists escalated to new heights. Guards were instructed by Occoquan Superintendent Raymond Whittaker, to intimidate the picketers by any means necessary. “Women were beaten, pushed, bodily carried and thrown into their cells when

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{19} Harris & Ewing, Washington, D.C. [The day after the police announce that future pickets would be given limit of 6 mos. in prison, Alice Paul led the picket line with banner reading “The time has come to conquer or submit for there is but one choice - we have made it.” She is followed by Mrs. Lawrence Lewis Dora Lewis. This group received 6 mos. in prison], United States Washington D.C., 1917, Photograph, retrieved from the Library of Congress, accessed May 1, 2017, https://www.loc.gov/item/mnwp000219/.
\bibitem{21} Lunardini, \textit{Alice Paul}, 127.
\end{thebibliography}
they refused to cooperate and attempted to negotiate with the superintendent.”

At the workhouse, Paul petitioned to be recognized as a political prisoner. She believed her actions were legitimate in protesting what she regarded as an unfair government action. She knew that newspapers would cover the story of the imprisoned suffragists, and she believed it could heighten awareness of the woman suffrage movement. While in the workhouse, Paul and her fellow suffragists went on a hunger strike and were force-fed. Paul knew the force-feeding of suffragists was controversial and hoped it would capture the public’s sympathy. While imprisoned, Paul refused to end her hunger strike and was taken to the psychiatric ward in the District Jail. Paul had seen the effects of hunger strikes on the general public during her time with the Pankhursts and recognized that her militancy would garner the support and sympathy of Americans in the same way.

President Wilson attempted to limit communications between suffragists and newspapers. He claimed that it was a threat to national security to have suffrage advocates speaking against the president in times of war. He knew that the suffragists threatened his authority and he censored them. Despite President Wilson’s attempt to silence the picketers, they refused to submit to his scare tactics. Wilson was eventually forced to release Paul and her fellow suffragist prisoners. Wilson refused to credit Paul for his decision to support a federal suffrage amendment. Wilson claimed that he had chosen to support a federal suffrage amendment after his discussions with NAWSA. Ironically, many members of NAWSA were pacifists, but they had already declared their allegiance to Wilson’s policies before the war. Catt believed that women must prove their loyalty to America in order to maintain a positive outcome within the suffrage movement.

Shortly after Paul and the Silent Sentinels were released from the workhouse, President Wilson publicly announced his support for a federal suffrage amendment. “Alice Paul’s tactics placed Wilson in an unattainable position... in order to maintain at least the appearance of integrity and consistency, made a political rather than a principled decision to support the woman suffrage amendment.” Wilson was forced to support the federal amendment and could no longer refuse to make it a national issue.
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Wilson's failure to recognize Paul as a force in passing the federal suffrage amendment did not offend Paul. She was grateful to be released from the workhouse and knew that her actions had enabled a revolution in Washington D.C. Paul was not prideful and did not require official recognition of her accomplishments. For Paul, seeing the ratification of the federal suffrage amendment was enough gratification. On June 4, 1919, the Senate began the process of ratifying the amendment and on August 26, 1920, the Nineteenth Amendment was officially instituted. Alice and her fellow suffragists were elated at the news, but the question emerged of what the movement should do next. Many felt that their job was done, but Paul continued her work for equality. After the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment, Paul began to lobby for the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). Paul worked with women all over the country to unite under a single cause, complete equality. She lobbied Congress and continued her work for the NWP. American women were too divided in their views of equality. Some were satisfied with having the vote and preferred to remain in the private, domestic sphere. Others wanted to fulfill gender equality to the highest degree, and break down the societal constructs of designated gender roles. Striking a middle ground between the differing ideologies proved too difficult, and Paul was ultimately unable to win ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. Still, she remained a vital voice for women's rights until her death in 1977.

While Alice Paul is no longer with us, her legacy lives on as the feminist movement remembers her militant approach that ensured women's right to enfranchisement and the progression of human rights in all sectors of society. It is easy to imagine that Paul would have been a prominent advocate for the radical women's movement currently taking place. As Paul aided in securing the vote through radical tactics such as the inclusion of African Americans in the early twentieth century, today's feminists continue the fight for human rights as they march on Washington alongside LGBTQ populations. The key to the success of American women's movements is the same today as it was in the twentieth century, the adoption of radicalism as introduced by Alice Paul and her contemporaries provides a voice to those outcast by a society that deems them as “others”.
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Tyler D’Ambrose

Morality in an Era of Lawlessness: How the KKK and Organized Crime Attempted to Instill their Visions of America during the Prohibition Era

Introduction

“Today I am entirely disillusioned in regard to the alleged teaching of the great American organization,” said the anonymous biographer of a book heralding Sheriff S. Glenn Young for his service in several southern Illinois counties. He continued, “I am fully persuaded that the principles espoused by the Klan are of the highest, and that conditions which have developed in our American life have demanded just such an organization of red blooded men to bring about those dramatic changes which must be effected.” Sheriff Young was undoubtedly a controversial figure. While he was celebrated for his ability to quick-draw on vigilantes and lock away criminals, Young did so largely on behalf of the Klu Klux Klan. The conflicting views surrounding Sheriff Young are echoed in this paper, as it explores what it is that truly defines someone as a moral person.

For many Americans, the Progressive Era embodied a nationwide effort to move towards a moral society in the wake of the infamous Gilded Age. Morality, an ambiguous concept, is bound to offer different interpretations of its meaning. To many Progressive reformers, morality in American society meant the weeding out of corruption and the move towards wider civic engagement in the political process. But to the more ideologically-driven reformers like the KKK, morality in America meant the advancement of white Protestantism and the elimination of alcohol from the country. And to others such as the Shelton and Birger gangs that dominated bootlegging in Southern Illinois during Prohibition, the concept of morality was used to mask violent activities.

This paper examines how morality factored into the major events that transpired in Southern Illinois during the Prohibition Era. More specifically, it looks at how notions of morality guided these events. Through the use of local newspaper articles, biographies, and historical commentaries, this paper explores the multiple discourses of morality that were prevalent during this
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time, specifically in regards to the notion of honorable masculinity. It finds that despite the efforts of moral reformers, actions taken under the guise of morality during the Prohibition Era in Southern Illinois were in fact morally questionable. Rather, the non-hegemonic nature of morality was taken advantage of by organized crime, the KKK, and law enforcement so that each group could further their own ambitions. Additionally, this paper analyzes the personal dynamics and characteristics of the actors involved, and formulates alternative historical explanations of the events described in light of these complexities.

**Literature Review: Organized Crime in the Progressive Era**

The historiography of organized crime has its roots in the field of sociology. Before popular culture attempted to make sense of the world of organized crime through movies and literature, scholars devoted their efforts into understanding how criminal organizations functioned. In the 1920s, during the age of Prohibition, there was not a solid body of scholarly work in place that examined organized crime. During this time a great deal of lore surrounded the gangs and violent criminals who thrived in an illicit environment. Scholars responded to this cultural intrigue by examining the structure, functioning, and organization of organized criminal organizations (OCOs).

Frederic Thrasher’s *The Gang: A Study of 1,313 Gangs in Chicago* was not only one of the first works to examine the sociological aspects of the American gang, but also a landmark study in the historiography of organized crime. In his study he argues that gangs “develop in definite and predictable ways” predetermined by “characteristic internal processes and mechanisms.” Thrasher reached the conclusion that gangs could be easily studied because they operated on identifiable natural processes. In his study, *Theft of the Nation: The Structure and Operations of Organized Crime in America*, Donald Ray Cressey outlines a more structured methodology to study organized crime. Cressey showed that since the early 1900s, organized criminal organizations often linked to powerful government interests reshaped the logic of their operations by functioning as closed enterprises. More recent scholars such as Alan Block have challenged much of what we know about organized crime, and how we study the subject. In his study, *History and the Study of Organized Crime*, Block notes two major fallacies in the study of organized criminal organizations. First, he argues that cultural misrepresentations of OCOs in popular culture have led to a historical naïveté.
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on organized crime.\(^7\) Secondly, he insists that the tendency of scholars to rely on personal testimony as absolute truth has contributed to an inaccurate view of organized crime.\(^8\) Block noted that law enforcement officials and the criminal justice system at large have contributed to this historical naiveté by taking the sworn testimony of criminals as absolute fact.

The most recent works on organized crime challenge the notion of the existence of OCOs. In Peter Reuter’s work, *Disorganized Crime: The Economics of the Visible Hand*, the author argues that modern criminal organizations are inherently disorganized because of their lack of structure and failure to focus on a specific aim.\(^9\) This view on organized crime stands in contrast to Frederic Thrasher’s landmark study, as it calls into question the idea that OCOs operate on predictable and natural processes. In all, the literature on organized crime reminds us of the importance of organizational structure in the context of studying criminal operations. But most importantly, the literature compels us to question the fixed notions that have been developed on the structure and functions of OCOs. Nonetheless, it is important to examine organized crime through the multiple lenses offered by the literature so as to develop a more complete view on the mechanisms of organized crime.

**Historical Background: The Progressive Era and the KKK**

The Progressive Era, which defined the political climate of the 1920s, came into fruition in the wake of the Gilded Age. From the 1870’s to the early 20th century in the Gilded Age, American society experienced a rapid transformation as a result of the Industrial Revolution. Positive changes such as technological advancement and economic prosperity came alongside financial inequality and rampant political corruption. The corruption of the Gilded Age left many Americans ready for the reforms that would follow in the Progressive Era.

The political struggle of the Progressive Era pitted the will of the public for a “good” government against the corrupted “machine politicians” and “special interests.”\(^{10}\) The public worked towards a more “honest government” through changes in the political system that would change both the structure of government and the manner in which public officials were elected.\(^{11}\) Reformers went about achieving this vision by enacting municipal government reform, which sought to restore morality and rationality in the political process. These reform efforts worked to combat the forces of political corruption and elitism
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in government, and by doing so would theoretically prevent the moral erosion of American society.

Reformers sought to take control of municipal politics in a variety of ways. Public regulatory activism was a means that reformers relied upon to instill their idea of a good government into their local communities. The modernization of public health and public education was a cause that many middle-class activists and professional reformers alike worked towards.\(^12\) Through a combination of philanthropy and municipal reforms, programs in indigent health care and health education were successfully created in some progressive regions of the country.\(^13\)

There is strong evidence to suggest that the progressive reforms of the early twentieth century achieved measurable success in both enacting effective reforms and reducing government corruption. Reports on instances of corruption “declined between 1870s and the 1920s.”\(^14\) Between 1908 and 1917, during a period of significant reform, instances of corruption notably declined.\(^15\) Actions that business interests and political factions took that were previously allowed became better enforced against, which was a major factor in the decline of corruption. Governments that had “rarely prosecuted themselves” responded to reform efforts, as they “more effectively patrolled each other.”\(^16\)

The progressive sentiments of the era made their way into the established news entities and levels of government of the time, and thus reformers were able to weed corruption out of many facets of American society.

Progressivism was not relegated solely to reformers that fought for social reforms deemed moral by societal standards. By the early 1920s, the Klu Klux Klan had resurged to a membership of over 2 million in a “sentimental reverence” to the Klan of the 1860s.\(^17\) Like the progressive reformers who sought to vanquish political corruption and enact public regulatory activism, the KKK attempted to instill their own vision of a moral society in the Progressive Era. The Klan attributed the rampant government corruption of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to an American economy “taken over by strangers.”\(^18\) The KKK worked to combat the forces of corruption by operating as a “national political lobby,” one that sought to reform government in much the same way.
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as the grassroots activists who enacted municipal government reforms. This movement fought for “purity reform measures” which kept with the Klan values of “Americanism” and tradition by supporting immigration restriction laws that would restore the American economy in addition to lobbying for Prohibition in defense of Christian values.

The Klan practiced temperance towards alcohol long before the Progressive Era. During Reconstruction, the residents of Southern Illinois viewed drinking and criminality as synonymous. Additionally, an influx of immigrants into the region led residents to believe that they had lost their “cultural homogeneity.” Cultural change was not welcomed in “Egypt”---to which southern Illinois was sometimes referred---as many residents were sympathetic to the discriminatory cause of the South during the war. The combination of temperance attitudes and anti-immigrant sentiments led to the introduction of the postwar Klan into “most Egyptian counties of southern Illinois.” Klansmen in the region used intimidation tactics and “reactionary violence” in an attempt to make community leaders “conform to the old values” of pre-Civil War times. Klan activity in the area declined after the Progressive Era, but the ideals of this movement would go on to be replicated during the 1920s.

In the 1920s, KKK membership peaked in towns that held strict religious values. In the case of Belvidere, Illinois, the town’s mostly white and highly-Protestant population made the place a “perfect recipe” for Klan membership. Belvidere was “overwhelmingly Protestant,” and sought to abide by its religious principles. According to a local newspaper, the introduction of the Klan into the area came to be in an effort to combat the “immorality of the times.” One instance of this effort came in the form of the KKK’s opposition to the showing of Sunday movies. In the view of this group, Sunday pictures were a “violation of God’s Day.” The Klan also fought against immorality by enforcing Prohibition. Community leaders in Belvidere followed with the “law and order” mentality of the Klan by establishing committees to investigate local shops suspected of making alcohol.

---

19 Ibid.
20 Ibid.
22 Ibid., 22.
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid.
25 Ibid., 44.
27 Ibid., 17.
28 Ibid., 18.
29 Ibid., 19.
30 Ibid., 35.
The issue of the “moral erosion” of society drew many into the Klan, and it proved particularly effective at bolstering female membership.\(^31\) Prohibition was a clear moral topic for the KKK to focus on, as the group was dominated by deeply religious members who held strict views on temperance. For Klansmen and Klanswomen, the grand vision of the KKK constituted a “white, Protestant America” that had “perfected private family life.”\(^32\) To the KKK, the “serpent of alcohol” was a necessary political target, since the group believed that America’s overindulgence of the drink had eroded family life.\(^33\) The Ku Klux Klan’s opposition towards alcohol would prove to be a serious issue of contention as organized crime and bootlegging began to flourish in the Prohibition years.

### Prohibition and the Rise of Organized Crime

Many reformers’ efforts of the Progressive Era were made with good intentions. Reformers attempted to restore honesty and morality into a corrupted government. The Eighteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution embodies this sentiment. Prohibition of alcohol in the United States—also referred to as the “noble experiment”—was implemented in 1920 with great ambition. Reformers hoped the law would reduce crime and corruption, improve the nation’s health, and solve a variety of social problems.\(^34\) However, Prohibition was in fact a “failure on all accounts.”\(^35\) Instead of improving the health of the country, the Eighteenth Amendment resulted in an “appallingly high” death rate from alcohol poisoning, with the national death toll rising by roughly 3,000 from 1920 to 1925.\(^36\) Additionally, the government’s inability to control where drinking establishments were located led to a number of “speak easies” being created in previously dry regions.\(^37\) These illicit drinking locations outnumbered the number of saloons in the country, and they were responsible for increasing the availability of alcohol during Prohibition.\(^38\)

The illicit drinking market spurred by Prohibition worked as an avenue for criminal activity to flourish. Bootlegging—or the selling of illegal alcohol—was used to serve the drug to thirsty Americans. The large number of speak easies in the country meant that bootlegging was bound to be a profitable enterprise. Bootlegging, being an unregulated, illicit, and profitable market, became a valuable area for organized criminal organizations to exploit. Competition between rival gangs would inevitably lead to violence. However, it was perhaps
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the reaction by those in favor of Prohibition to the OCOs that was the most significant source of conflict.

The Klan Anti-Klan War

The Klu Klux Klan employed violence in the organization’s fight for temperance. Klansmen hoped to quell the public’s thirst for alcohol and tendency to resort to bootlegging by conducting raids of suspected distilleries. Additionally, the KKK worked with law enforcement to achieve the mutual goal of suppressing illicit activity. Local sheriffs were paid by the Klan to operate as “raiders” that fought against the bootleggers. These raiders came to be regarded with great reverence in towns that opposed the illegal consumption of alcohol, as many wanted a “cleanup of vice” in the Prohibition era.39

One of the most widely praised raiders from Southern Illinois, was Sheriff S. Glenn Young. As one resident commented, “There is hardly a nook or corner of the entire United States where the name of S. Glenn Young is not known.”40 Young came to Williamson County, Illinois in 1924 and quickly made a reputation for himself as a quick-draw master. There were hardly any activities of Young’s that were not the “chief topic of conversation” among Williamson residents.41 Due to his tendency to dress in civilian clothes, the sheriff embodied a notion of morality that was easily within reach for many onlookers. To his most ardent admirers, Young was a “dauntless crusader” who fought sin wherever he found it.42 Thus in 1924, when Young was employed by the KKK to conduct raids in Williamson County, many of his supporters came to view the Klan as a force of virtue.

The violent raids perpetrated by the Klan were met with mixed reactions. Local periodicals quickly condemned the KKK for its “religious intolerance” and “race hatred.”43 However, many who lived in Southern Illinois did not harbor ill sentiments towards the Klu Klux Klan. Some residents believed that Williamson County became a “vastly different and better place to live” thanks to the actions of the KKK and Sheriff Young.44 The KKK was viewed as “one of the very greatest organizations of patriotism” by those who believed that the organization was acting on behalf of morality and Americanism.45

It is easier to regard the Klu Klux Klan, and the law enforcement officials on their side, as moral crusaders in comparison to the forces they were fighting against. In the 1920’s, the anti-Klan forces in Southern Illinois consisted of
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ruthless gangs that sought after illicit profit-making schemes and that used violence to control their enterprises. The Shelton and Birger gangs were the most prominent OCOs in the region. These groups fought side-by-side against the Klan forces due to their common interest of maintaining control of illicit bootlegging and gambling markets. The Birger gang was headed by Art Newman and Charles Birger, from whom the gang gets its name. The Shelton gang was founded by the brothers Carl, Earl, and Bernie Shelton, who rose to prominence with the advent of bootlegging during the Prohibition Era. While these gangs initially collaborated in opposition to the pro-KKK forces, they eventually turned on each other in an effort to win control of the bootlegging market in Southern Illinois.

From the perspective of the bootleggers in Southern Illinois, as well as several law enforcement officials, the actions of the KKK, and those who supported them, were far from moral. For some, in Williamson County, the infiltration by the Klu Klux Klan into the area was a breach of authority for those previously in charge. Some law enforcement officials such as George Galligan of Williamson County lamented the fact that KKK members regularly broke into the homes of residents without proper search warrants. 46

While the Klu Klux Klan represented the religious and demographic values of many residents in the region, there remained a sizeable portion of the population that objected to their activities. When the Shelton and Birger gangs came together in opposition to the Klu Klux Klan, they were supported by many people who, while normally law abiding, “objected to the Klan on general principles.” 47 The support of the gangs by the citizens of Williamson County, in conjunction with the backing of a few law enforcement officials, gave the gangs a backing to wage war against the Klan.

On August 30, 1924, the KKK and the bootlegging gangs, each with their respective motives, came to a particularly bloody clash in a battle in Herrin, Illinois. On one side of the quarrel were the KKK supporters, backed by local hero Sheriff S. Glenn Young. In opposition to them were the Shelton and Birger gangs, backed by Sheriff George Galligan and those who believed the Klan had gone too far in their moral crusade. The battle was bloody, and at the end of the conflict seventeen combatants were dead. 48 The bootlegging gangs had shown no mercy, as evidenced by their particular modes of fighting. Shelton gang members used makeshift tanks, which were in essence armored cars fixed with guns, to wage gruesome warfare. Birger and Newman equipped their men with machine guns, which surely outgunned the simple revolvers famously employed by Sheriff Young. The end result of the fighting was devastating for
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the pro-Klan forces; the hero S. Glenn Young perished amongst many others, and through the strength of the organized criminal forces the Klu Klux Klan was effectively shut out of the area.

While it is tempting to view the defeat of the Klu Klux Klan in Williamson County as an instance of justice, the details of the event prove otherwise. From the perspective of the Shelton and Birger gangs, the KKK were simply an obstacle to their bootlegging business. The fight against the Klan was merely an opportunity for vengeance. Sheriff S. Glenn Young personally conducted raids on several Shelton-Birger joints, and his pestering of the gang leaders even led to Charles Birger’s arrest and sentencing to a year in jail. Thus, the slaying of Sheriff Young in the Herrin battle can be seen as the fulfillment of a personal vendetta by Birger rather than an incidental casualty. It is important to note the personal dynamics and motives of the people involved in these gangs and conflicts, as it serves to shed light on the true nature of the historical events. When taken from a big-picture perspective, the Klan anti-Klan conflict appears like a battle between good and evil. Klan supporters in Southern Illinois viewed their side as good, as the Klan fought for “American” values in the 1920’s. Those who opposed the group believed that their side was the truly just cause, as the Shelton and Birger gangs fought to eradicate the unwanted presence of the KKK from Williamson County. However, as the events of this time period unfold, it becomes clear that neither side was inherently honorable, but rather merely driven by personal motives.

The Shelton/Birger Feud

Once organized criminals eliminated the KKK, the Shelton and Birger gangs soon turned on each other. The most obvious reason for this split was that the Shelton brothers, Charles Birger, and Art Newman simply entered into a power struggle in order to win control of the bootlegging operations in the region. Like with the personal dynamics that acted upon the Klan Anti-Klan War—including the vendetta Birger had with Young and the feud between George Galligan and the KKK—it is worth examining the specific motives of the characters involved so as to not lead to a complicated big-picture rendering of the events.

Personal dynamics help to explain the Birger/Shelton split. In addition to the monetary conflict between the factions, there was also a personal conflict between the gang leaders. Carl Shelton and Charles Birger, either by coincidence or by circumstance, fell in love with the same woman. After receiving a lofty $100,000 inheritance, Ms. Helen R. Holbrook promptly left her husband and set out to “enjoy life.” Whether it was for the money or for the woman, both Birger and Shelton fell into a jealous hatred with each other as they pursued the attention of Ms. Holbrook.
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While the personal dispute between Charles Birger and Carl Shelton may not have been solely responsible for the feud that followed, it is hard to ignore that it had a measurable effect on gang relations. Furthermore, it is worth noting the nature of this personal dispute as well as its relevance in explaining the personal characteristics of the men involved in these gangs. Both Charles Birger and Carl Shelton grew up in environments where violent and aggressive behaviors were seen as indicative of manliness. Charles Birger grew up as a Russian immigrant in a tough neighborhood. The gang leader had to learn to “be tough” to survive in St. Louis; this mindset clearly stayed with him as he entered the illicit bootlegging industry. The Shelton brothers experienced a similar upbringing in East St. Louis, and likewise came to cultivate a similar mindset. This information brings significant relevance to the personal dispute between Charles Birger and Carl Shelton. Their competition to win the attention of Ms. Holbrook created a dynamic where each man desired to prove his worth through his superior virility. For many men, “violence is, under certain conditions, the only perceived available technique of expressing and validating masculinity.” Thus, it is plausible that the threat to Birger’s and Shelton’s masculinity played a significant part in sparking the Shelton/Birger feud.

When applied in other contexts, masculinity can serve to explain other aspects of the Shelton/Birger feud. Upon separating into competing factions, the Shelton and Birger gangs went to great lengths to demonstrate the strength of their respective side. At each gang’s base of operations stood armed guards, mounted machine guns, barbed-wire fences, piles of ammunition, and fleets of armored “tanks.” In anticipation of all-out gang warfare, both the Shelton and Birger gangs put on heavy recruiting campaigns to rally troops to their sides. Over the radio, gang leaders issued stark provocations and warnings to enemy fighters and citizens alike. To Southern Illinois residents, Charles Birger stated “you need have no fear for your lives. We know whom we are after.” In response, Earl Shelton contended that citizens “needn’t fear any reprisals from the Shelton brothers because of the depredations committed by Charley Birger and his gang.” Additionally, he quipped, “I want to say that Birger is full of hot air and crazy.” Following their radio exchange, the Shelton brothers decided to flex their muscles. In a military parade of sorts, the Shelton gang drove their fleet of armored cars into downtown Marion and circled the courthouse for all citizens to see. Shortly after, the Birger gang paraded their own armored cars.
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vehicles to the public. Despite the strength shown by each side, neither gang resorted to violence.

While it is not clear what this accomplished for either gang, there is no doubt that each gang attempted to express their masculinity through a show of strength. The Shelton and Birger gangs employed morality through the concept of honor, which involves being “good” at being a man.\textsuperscript{58} In the context of this feud, manliness called for these men to stand up for themselves as “independent” and “proud” actors, and to hold their own when challenged.\textsuperscript{59} This helps explain the excessive weapons build-up and extravagant show of strength by the Shelton and Birger gangs. Although neither side sought to impose their vision of morality on society, the organized criminals used the concept of honorable masculinity to justify their aggressive actions.

Despite the threat of violence, tensions between the Shelton and Birger gangs eventually subsided. Law enforcement eventually removed the Shelton brothers from the region after a twenty-five-year conviction sent them to prison in 1925. The Birger gang reached a demise in their own right. In 1928, gang leader Charles Birger was hanged for killing the mayor of West City.\textsuperscript{60} While violence did not completely stop after the removal of the gang leaders, it never reached the same levels of aggression.

The behavior of the Shelton brothers after their retreat from control of the bootlegging industry speaks to the nature of the men involved in this criminal organization. Even after discontinuing his involvement in the bootlegging industry, Carl Shelton found great difficulty in refraining from personal feuds. In 1948, an angry neighbor named Charles Harris murdered Carl Shelton. According to Earl Shelton, Harris’s disdain for Carl came from a dispute they had about some stray Shelton cattle.\textsuperscript{61} Earl Shelton did no better in refraining from abhorrent activities. On two separate occasions, Earl Shelton faced charges for molesting young girls.\textsuperscript{62} A broader categorization of the organized criminal warfare in Southern Illinois can be made in light of the immoral behavior of the Shelton brothers.

**No Honor Among Thieves**

It is incredibly tempting to paint history in broad brush strokes and with satisfactory generalizations. But in doing so, the smaller dynamics that play into historical events are sometimes lost. Whether one was in support of the KKK or the Shelton and Birger gangs did not determine the facts of the events that transpired. For pro-Klan citizens, arguing that the KKK fought
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for American values and moral principles was only true within their specific ideological framework. In fact, a good percentage of Americans disagreed with the KKK’s moral assessment, as evidenced by the popularity of bootlegging and speakeasies during the Prohibition Era. And for the supporters of the gangs in their fight against what they deemed to be the intrusive Klan, arguing on the basis of morality was rendered futile when the bloodshed and bad behavior perpetrated by the Shelton and Birger gangs was taken into consideration.

Perhaps one finds not an entire side, but only a singular figure who supposedly embodies the right qualities one would look for in a moral or heroic person. Sheriff S. Glenn Young was undoubtedly a hero to many Southern Illinois residents. By fighting sin and dauntlessly crusading against criminals, Young embodied the courageous and righteous qualities that many wished to have for themselves. To the 1920’s small-town man, this could very plausibly be the case. But to someone living in the present, the mere fact that Young fought on behalf of the KKK is enough to dismiss any heroic or redeeming qualities he may have possessed. Some residents of Southern Illinois must have also looked up to men like Carl Shelton and Charles Birger. By embracing the aggressive tendencies of honorable masculinity, the members of the Shelton and Birger gangs acted out the part of the risk-taking rebel that many men wished to become. To the ordinary American man, either side could have echoed the values or personal qualities that he admired. But to someone living in present times, it is difficult to justify the actions that the KKK, law enforcement officials, and the bootlegging gangs took using the rationale that their behavior abided by moral principles.

Conclusion

While the Klu Klux Klan and the organized criminal organizations that operated in Southern Illinois during the 1920’s fought for specific values and purposes, any granting of outright righteousness to either side is unwarranted. The KKK attempted to uphold the American ideals they wished to see in the country, but nonetheless alienated the vast majority of the population while operating on a moral crusade. Although the Shelton and Birger gangs successfully fought off the Klan to the delight of many, their violent tendencies and less-than-redeemable personal characteristics were a far cry from moral superiority. Even though there were singular figures from each side that embodied the values that many residents admired, none fit within the modern interpretation of a truly moral person. While many who lived during the Progressive Era attempted to move America towards a more moral society, in the case of Southern Illinois morality remained remarkably absent.
Kyle Garrity

The American Engine

You have heard it in action movies when the hero is involved in a high-stakes car chase. You have heard its distinct shouting sound coming from a Ford Mustang or Chevy Corvette near where you live. Perhaps less noticeable, the same sound comes from the Nissan work truck that travels around your neighborhood to a construction site; from that rusty old beater and the brand new Cadillac SUV. They all serve a different purpose, all are produced by different companies and cost vastly different prices. What do all these automobiles have in common? Under the hood lies an American-born V8 engine.

The V8 engine is America’s motor. Its mass use compared to the rest of the world proves it. American manufacturers built some of first and most influential V8 engines. Its unique characteristics made it superior to other engine options. American lifestyles and economic affluence fostered continual use of these engines from World War II to the present. The V8 has had an inestimable impact on the culture of the United States while remaining invisible, hidden beneath the hoods of millions of American cars and trucks.

The V8 is an internal combustion engine that powers many cars. Internal combustion means that the engine produces energy by exploding a mixture of air and gasoline that then moves pistons. The pistons movement is then used to turn the wheels. The V in V8 describes the layout of the pistons inside of the engine. (Fig.1) The eight refers to the number of pistons in the engine. They are lined up in a V shape divided with four pistons on each side or “bank” of the engine. The V8 is not the only engine used in automobiles four-cylinder and six-cylinder engines are also common.
In the present, V8 engines are found in three kinds of automobiles: sports cars, luxury cars and trucks, with trucks being the most prevalent. Nearly all trucks that are sold in the United States could have the possibility of having this special motor under its hood. All manufacturers from Audi to Toyota produce a V8 in some capacity. There is one major difference between the V8's in trucks and cars and that is price. Buying a truck is the cheapest way to experience this motor with most manufacturers putting out basic, work trucks for just over thirty thousand dollars. With the exception of Chrysler, no sedan under $60,000 has a V8 engine. In the past, however, the V8 was widely available.

From the 1930's to the 1980's the V8 was the king of engines in the American automobile. During this period the V8 engine was the standard engine throughout the automobile industry in the United States. As today it was a premium but one that was much more affordable because so many cars had them. From the budget Fords to top of the line Cadillacs a V8 could be found under the hood along with other engine choices. This can be seen in some of the production numbers from manufacturers during the height of the V8's usage, the 1960's. In 1960, for example, Chevrolet produced 1.4 million full-size cars, which was comparable with many of the other domestic producers like Ford, which produced 1.3 million cars. A 1961 advertisement (Fig. 2) from Chevy which displays the lineup of full-size cars is evidence of how numerous the V8 was in these production numbers. The advertisement displays eighteen different models, from wagons to coupes all were offered with the possibility of having a V8 under the hood. Even the cheaper models have the V8 option displayed in the illustrations. Domestic manufacturers relied almost exclusively on the V8. Few imports offered the V8 engine option.

The automobile had its start in Europe before the turn of the twentieth century. The first record of a V8 engine is a 1902 patent created by French engineer Léon Levavasseur. His engine, along with many of the other early V8’s, were used in boats and airplanes rather than cars. Eventually the design made its way over to the engine bay of automobiles but never truly came into widespread usage. This is not to say that the engine did not exist, as some companies like British Rover and Italian FIAT used them sparingly. Many European manufactures placed their focus on very small engines. Four, three and even one-cylinder cars could be found on the streets of England and France. Even in many luxury cars a six cylinder would be chosen over other options. Evidence for this is found in that Mercedes-Benz used nothing larger than six

cylinders in all their models from 1926 well into the 1960’s. Due to the lack of development of the V8, it was an imported American engine powering the car models offering the V8 configuration. Rover, a British manufacturer bought the rights to reproduce a V8 engine, originally designed by Buick, in the 1960’s.

The geography and lifestyle of Europe, where widely-used forms of public transit have existed for a longer time, prevented widespread adoption of V8 engines. Other places in the world, such as the former Soviet Union, rarely produced more than four-cylinder engines. Only in the late 1960’s was a V8 engine produced, but it was completely reserved for upper ranks of the communist party and KGB agents. One exception to the general lack of V8 powered cars across the industrialized world of the early to mid-twentieth century was Australia. In Australia V8 engines have been numerous and unlike in America continue to see popular and widespread use today. This is due to the massive presence that American manufacturers had in Australia and the growth of Australian companies that followed the American formula after World War II.

The V8 engine has received short shrift in the historiography of the American automobile and is absent from European historiography. Jay Hirsch, James Flink, and John Jerome, define the historiographical debate.

---

In *Great American Dream Machines: Classic Cars of the 50's and 60's*, Jay Hirsch examines a collection of cars all considered American classic cars. These cars are all from what the author and many others called the golden age of American automobiles, 1950-1970. Each car is displayed with technical information, photographs and a small history and explanation of the car’s significance. The V8 engine was found under the hood of these American classics. Each car is unique and enjoyed widespread popularity or brought some innovation that would revolutionize future models. This book brings the character of these cars to life. His introduction onto the subject helps to explain why these cars are so special and remain so to this day. Hirsch argues the golden age saw the car ownership skyrocket and having something aspirational was not unobtainable. Further, the memories and experiences people had with these cars is what makes them valuable and sought after today.\(^7\)

*Death of the Automobile* by John Jerome is a very different commentary on the golden age of automobiles in America. Written not long after the “golden era,” the central claim of the book is that the automobile cannot remain the primary mode of transportation. He too argues that the period of 1950-1970 was unique in automotive history but rather than producing dream machines that evoke nostalgia, the results were more sinister. Jerome questions the excess of automobile design during this period and how the future or sustainability were not considered. In his chapters focusing on this significant twenty-year period he argues that it was not truly the golden age for the cars and their drivers but rather the corporations that manufactured and sold the cars. I disagree with his claims that the V8 and other large engines were completely unnecessary and wasteful. He points out that the horsepower race of the big three (Ford, GM, Chrysler) in this period led to lack of innovation in other areas but I believe it is that race which made people so interested in the cars of this era and the engine. Jerome’s view targets the strategy of these companies building cars for young people, “Supercars,” as he calls them. He often brings up that purchasing a car in this period was an event; family friends and neighbors would all be taken for rides. Looks and comfort may have impressed buyers but experiencing the thrill of acceleration is what really shocked and awed. This could only be possible with the V8 that came from these American cars. The book provides a great counter to the automobile and highlights many of the statistics that make this period so different.\(^8\)

Merging Hirsch’s and Jerome’s arguments is Roger Flink, whose deeply-researched and carefully detailed *The Automobile Age* focuses on the cultural impacts of the automobile on American culture. In his book, Flink argues the

---

\(^7\) Jay Hirsch, *Great American Dream Machines: Classic Cars of the 50s and 60s* (New York: Macmillan, 1985).

American century (1890-2000) is defined by a combination of what he calls “the highway renaissance” and “the automotive ideal.” The synthesis of these ideas, when combined with post-war economic prosperity and the ubiquity of the automobile, especially those with V8 engines, orients the entire field of twentieth-century American history as an orbit around automobiles. Without Flink’s work no examination of post-war American culture is complete.[9]

To determine why the V8 is America’s engine it is important to examine the beginnings of the Engine in the United States at the beginning of the 20th century. The very first American manufacturer to utilize a V8 engine was Cadillac in their 1914 Type 51. Just as today the Cadillac of 1914 was a luxury car beyond the reach of the general public due to its high cost. In 1917 Chevrolet attempted to bring a more affordable V8 to the market with the Chevy Series D. At great risk, Chevrolet designers decided to use a more advanced valve train for the time and this would backfire on them. The standard four cylinder used in many other Chevy models had more power, were more reliable and economical than the complex V8. The Series D was only sold for one year.[10] This was the problem that faced manufacturers who tried to produce V8’s in the early 20th century. If they built V8 engines cheaply they were too inefficient and if they built them too well the cars were too expensive.

In the 1930’s, Ford Motor Company produced a V8 that changed everything. The success of the Model T, Ford’s first car, had made the company massively profitable in the nineteen years it was on the market. When it came time for a replacement the company poured everything they had into a new car from the ground up. They even initially attempted to create an entirely new engine to power it, the X8. It had too many issues during testing and Ford eventually ordered his engineers to create a V8 that would be cheap to manufacture but still be high quality. Henry Ford’s personal engineer, Charles Schulz, was responsible for the majority of the engine and Amol Zoline designed the complicated ignition system.[11] The group that designed the engine were given simple tools and machinery to make sure what they produced would be easy to reproduce and maintain. This is what made the Ford V8 different than those that came before it. The new Ford V8 was designed with the intention of being mass-produced for a car that would sell in the millions. To accomplish this the engine block was cast out of iron in a single piece. As much of the engine as possible was included in the block, unlike other engines where the block served as the

base and other parts are attached to it. Cutting costs this way made it affordable to own, simple to maintain, and more reliable. Ford had gambled wildly on this engine as its long and costly development strained company finances. In 1932 the Ford Model B was released with both a four cylinder and V8 option. The V8 engine really made a difference to buyers and was so popular that Ford ceased to provide the four-cylinder engine in 1934 due to low sales. The V8 was an additional $50 which in 2018 would be equal to $881. Demand was so high for the new Ford V8, people were willing to spend the equivalent of nearly $900 to get it, even at the height of the Great Depression.\(^\text{12}\) The average net income for 1930's was only 1,386 dollars. Spending that much on the V8 showed its value to the consumer. Fifty dollars would go a long way in the era of the Depression when for some families had much greater priorities than an option on a car.\(^\text{13}\) Ford’s design was unrivaled by its competitors, all of whom did failed to grasp the importance of this engine until years later. Competitors focused on four and six cylinders well into the 1950's. Chevrolet didn’t produce a V8 until 1955 and most other domestic competitors implemented them around 1950.

What, then, caused such a demand for the V8 that led to consumers, to pay an additional $50 for a car during the Great Depression? The V8 engine had some properties that made it superior to the other options available to the average consumer during the middle of the twentieth century: balance, torque and size. It is vital for an automobile engine to be balanced to ensure it is dependable in the long term and performs well. With the pistons of an engine moving anywhere from one to six thousand revolutions per minute a small imbalance can be catastrophic to operations. There are two engine designs that are naturally balanced: the inline three- and six-cylinder. The V8 is not perfectly balanced but counterweights made for a smooth-driving and dependable car. This balance is much more difficult to achieve in the inline 4 and V6 engines even with counterweights. The inline six was the V8’s biggest competitor due to its natural balance but the size of the engine often played a large part in automobile design. Because all six pistons perfectly lined up back to front, the engines were long. The V8 was much more compact. Having to stretch cars to fit an inline six can made them heavier and more complex, becoming an Achilles heel in manufacturing and sales.

This leads to the final argument for why the V8 was superior to other engines, power. Due to a lack of the technology and precision we have today the only way to make an engine more powerful for most of the 20th century was to make it bigger. The bigger an inline six gets the less reliable


it gets. The V8 avoided these problems by being compact. Some of these advantages are displayed in a technical document from the 1934 Ford V8. The 1934 Ford V8 was capable of a power output of ninety horsepower and one hundred forty seven foot pounds of torque, compared to the four-cylinder in the 1932 Ford, which achieved only forty horsepower. The V8 had a great effect on top speed as the four-cylinder could go no faster than sixty five miles per hour (mph) while the V8 could attain speeds exceeding 85 mph.

As other companies began producing these engines and funding continual technical improvement and innovation they grew more powerful. Once American consumers got the V8 they didn’t want much else because it was suited very well to the needs of the average American.

The automobile became most widespread in Europe and the United States after World War II, with many families owning a car or in the U.S. case, some even owning two. One of the largest contrasts between these two places of automobile prominence was the size. Europe spans about 4 million square miles and the United States covers nearly the same at 3.8 million square miles. Although not far off from each other in total area, this does not take into account that those 4 million miles are divided up between fifty countries. All 3.8 million square miles are just the United States and so long-distance travel was often more common in the day-to-day lives of an American rather than a European. Traveling long distances in a four cylinder during the middle of the twentieth century could put too much strain on the engine and speeds were limited. Having a smooth running V8 for long trips where the car could cruise at higher speeds with ease was important to Americans.

The V8 was also well suited for the American lifestyle as the growth of suburbs spread rapidly in the twentieth century. With many Americans needing to commute often long distances as suburbs grew farther and farther from the city a car that could handle the long travel times was needed. This was fueled by the lack of public transportation, another difference between Europe and the U.S. Family was an important factor too as the birth rates increased greatly in the post war. As the cars grew in size to fit larger families and more things, more powerful engines were needed to assure that the cars remained drivable.

Finally, the most important part of the V8’s place in America is its contribution to our culture. The V8 has affected our sports, media and society. Motorsports have forever been changed by the introduction of the V8. During

---


the Prohibition era criminals used Ford V8s and other powerful cars to run moonshine and escape from the authorities. Along with the liquor runners many bank robbers and organized crime made use of the V8. Over time these criminals began to race each other when the police were not chasing them. These races became more organized over time and eventually led to the sport of NASCAR. The V8 was also a major part of hot-rod-ding in the postwar era, as owners began to tinker with their cars to make them faster, louder and cooler they too began to race. Many of these races were held originally on the salt flats in the deserts near southern California but eventually they would move into more organized events. Enthusiasm led to the creation of the NHRA or the National Hot Rod Association, which today runs professional drag racing with some of the fastest cars in the world, many of which have V8s. This tradition of hot-rod-ding continues to this day as a large number of people continue to modify and maintain the legendary cars that have the V8 engine. People all across the country young and old still meet up decades later to continue to this postwar tradition of racing and car culture.

Muscle cars and Pony cars would not exist without the V8. These classes of car are completely American with the first and longest running example, the Ford Mustang. The Mustang has been built continually from 1964. It is known around the world as a truly American car. The Chevrolet Corvette also has a long history in the U.S. and around the world as America’s sports car. While Europe had Ferrari and Alfa Romeo America had the Corvette and it continues to compete with the finest sports cars from around the world.

V8 cars have been used in countless movies and television shows were often they were just as famous as the actors. Movies like Bullitt, Smokey and the Bandit, and The Fast and the Furious all feature V8 power. They have been a part of TV shows, KITT from Knight Rider and the General Lee in Dukes of Hazzard were just as much characters as the actors who drove them. The V8 even found its way into music during the twentieth century, including The Beach Boys’ “Little Deuce Coupe,” Elvis Presley’s “Pink Cadillac” and Commander Cody’s “Hot-Rod Lincoln.” Maybe the most influential affect it had on music was the song “Rocket 88” from 1951. The song, performed by Bill Haley and the Comets, reached the top of the Billboard charts and many attribute its success to helping to fuel the wave of Rock and Roll that followed soon after.

What is the future of the V8? Automotive technology will continue to advance as the demand for making faster, cleaner and more efficient cars grows. It has been a massive part of the automobile industry: General Motors alone built their one hundred millionth small block V8 engine in 2011. According to their site that commemorates the milestone, “One-hundred million engines since 1955 is the equivalent of more than 1.78 million produced every year – or about 3.4 small-blocks produced every minute for the last 56 years.” That is a significant number of engines and is just the production record of one of the many companies that have participated in the manufacturing of V8 automobiles. The same year General Motors produced its one hundred millionth small block engine they sold around nine million cars. Putting that against the statistic of 1.78 million engines per year means that nearly twenty percent of all General Motors cars sold had a V8 in them. This also does not include the production of big block V8’s by General Motors. The use of the larger engines has slowly tapered off over time, but they are still produced today.

In the last ten years electric car technology alone has made massive strides against the V8. Companies like Tesla who build luxury electric cars that have all the power of a V8 but with far less impact on the environment threaten its place in the luxury automobile market. Many of the other manufactures are following like Chevy and Nissan, who both offer completely electric cars. Things are changing for trucks as well. Turbocharging advancements are making the V8 obsolete in working vehicles as all the torque required to haul can be achieved with smaller four and six cylinders that also get much greater fuel economy saving both the environment and money. A turbocharger is a turbine that can be run off the exhaust gasses of an engine, these turbines compress air which then is put into the engine to make more power. Where the V8 will remain viable is with the sports and muscle car enterprise. The sound they make can never be replaced and along with its usage in motorsports like NASCAR it has cemented a place in automobiles for the foreseeable future.

The V8 is America’s engine. Only here in the United States will you find its usage so widespread. From its beginnings as a luxury item to Fords push into the affordable market and ever since the V8 has been the engine Americans wanted. America perfected its usage in normal cars leading to demand worldwide. It was uniquely suited to the American lifestyle and has become an influential part of our culture in the past one hundred years of its existence. From museums to your neighbor’s Mustang, the V8 will always be in America.


Barbecue as a Historical Looking Glass

John Shelton Reed, a sociologist whose work focuses on the American South and barbecue, once said, “Southern barbecue is the closest thing we have in the U.S. to Europe’s wines or cheese; drive a hundred miles and the barbecue changes.” Throughout its history, barbecue has continually evolved and changed depending on the new influences it encountered. American barbecue is the result of the cultural mixing of Native American, African enslaved, and European settlers as they interacted and intermixed within the Caribbean and the Continental United States, especially the American South. Through this essay, I will use the phenomenon of barbecue as a useful lens through which one can observe and understand the racial dynamics within both the US and the South itself. I will also prove that barbecue can even be seen as a metaphor of the South. Both are derived from multiple ethnic backgrounds, although both have also been historically defined as being created primarily by white, rural men.

The definition of “true” barbecue is something hotly debated across the South. Barbecue in the South can be defined by the wood used to produce the smoke during the barbecuing process, the speed at which the meat is cooked, the meat that is chosen, and/or the style and amount of barbecue sauce the pit master applies while cooking. Ultimately, the true definition of barbecue is vague because there are so many different regional disputes regarding the nature of barbecue. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the etymology of the word barbecue derives from the Spanish term “barbacoa,” which comes from the Taino (native Caribbean tribe) term “barbacòa.” The editors of Oxford go on to debunk the first of many myths surrounding the beginnings of barbecue when they note that “the alleged French barbe à queue ‘beard to tail,’ is an absurd conjecture suggested merely by the sound of the word.” Since its origin, barbecue has been influenced by the infusion of the multiple different cultural practices that would collide in what would become America and the etymology of the word is only the beginning.

---

The origins of barbecue are tied to the racial mixing that occurred during the Spanish incursions into the Americas. While the Spanish were certainly not looking for racial integration when they entered the Americas, cultural diffusion persisted. The first mention of barbecue in writing was by the explorer and writer Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo in 1547 when he described how the Native Americans he observed roasted “the flesh on sticks which they place in the ground, like a grating or trivet, over a pit. They call these barbacoas, and place fire beneath them.” While this is the very first written observation of the native practice, it was certainly not the last. For one reason or another, the practice of roasting meat on a wooden frame above a fire was not unique to any certain native Caribbean or American people group. Figure 1 is a depiction of Native Americans barbecuing their fish, engraved in 1590 by Theodor de Bry. This same technique was adopted by the Spanish as a new way to prepare pork.

In 1698, Pere Labat, a Dominican monk traveling in French territories throughout the New World, describes the “boucan” of pigs and turtles in his work Nouveau Voyages aux Isles de l’Amérique. His descriptions of the grills that the natives used to roast their meat is very similar to the description provided by Oviedo and the image crafted by de Bry. Labat goes on to describe the process of cooking a “boucan pig” as the pig being “laid open on its back, stomach open, spread as much as possible, and held in this position by forks.” Labat also mentioned the cavity of the hogs as being filled with “lemon juice, salt, and hot chiles.” Though Labat was a French observer in the French West Indies, hogs were not native to the Americas, so they must have been brought over by either French or Spanish explorers. French and Spanish buccaneers assimilated this style of cooking. This process eventually found its way to the Caribbean island of Jamaica, where they added allspice to the process to fashion their own unique style. Bev Carvey, a native Jamaican and descendant of maroons herself, argues that the jerk pork found in Jamaica is a result of the culmination of escaped African maroons arriving in Jamaica with these new techniques, which they most likely learned from being enslaved by the Spanish or from French buccaneers. It was here that barbecue found a similar cultural conglomeration as the one later created within the United States. Native American, African, Spanish, and French culture and activity all influenced the creation of an entirely unique cultural food.

5 Ibid.
6 Jessica B. Harris, “Caribbean Connection,” in Cornbread Nation 2, 17.
The Spanish love for this Native American style of cooking pork can also be seen through their involvement on the North American continent. According to Don Harrison Doyle, a Professor of History at the University of South Carolina, when Hernán Cortés arrived in the lower Mississippi Valley, he encountered the Chickasaw people. In order to create an allegiance with this tribe, Cortez hosted feasts for the chief of the Chickasaw and his people, feeding them their first ever barbecued pork. The Spanish continued to spread the foodways of the Native Americans they encountered, as can be seen through the cultural diffusion of these similar practices throughout time in parts of America where the Spanish had a considerable influence, such as Florida. In Florida and parts of the Carolinas, the barbecue sauce is still made with lemon and lime juice, as well as a heavy amount of hot peppers, just like Pere Labat described in the French Caribbean. These practices originated with the Native American tribes that originally inhabited the Caribbean islands and coastal regions of North America, but they soon spread across the New World thanks to the infatuation of Spanish and French explorers with this new style of cooking.

It was not only the French and Spanish who appropriated the native barbecuing style and spread it across the United States. Once the English arrived in North America, many men began writing on the strange native foodways and some even adopted the practice themselves. In his Natural History of North-Carolina, John Brickell, visiting from his native Ireland, observed Native Americans using their barbacoa grills for turkey, fish and shellfish. Later, Robert Beverley, born in Virginia in 1673, wrote about how the local tribes in Virginia would either broil their meat by leaving it on burning coals itself or barbecue it by leaving it high above the burning coals to cook slowly. Beverley later wrote about his distaste for the style of cooking, noting that there is “nothing commendable in it, but that it is performed with little trouble.” Beverley was not the only colonial who disapproved of barbecues. In his book, Travels through the States of North America, Isaac Weld, another Irish writer, described how English settlers would gather in large groups and roast whole hogs over open flame, though he said that barbecues were “an entertainment chiefly confined to the lower ranks, and, like [most] others of the fame nature, it generally ends in

8 Don Harrison Doyle, Faulkner’s County: The Historical Roots of Yoknapatawpha (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 27.
9 Frederick Douglass Opie, Zora Neale Hurston on Florida Food: Recipes, Remedies & Simple Pleasures, (Charleston: American Palate, a division of The History Press, 2015), 96.
12 Ibid.
Similar sentiments existed throughout barbecue’s early history in the continental United States, showing that not everyone was thrilled with barbecue’s rising popularity.

Though originally considered a poor man’s pastime, barbecue became increasingly popular throughout the English world. One of the first published cookbooks, Richard Bradley’s *The Country Housewife and Lady’s Director in the Management of a House, and the Delights and Profits of a Farm* (London, 1732), included a recipe for how to cut, spice, and barbecue a hog. There is a reference in the recipe that notes the barbecuing should take place in “Yard, or Garden with a Covering like a Tent over it.” While the English soon became infatuated with barbecues, they also took root in the colonial south, where enslaved African brought their own cultural adaptations to the New World.

The contributions of African-Americans to barbecue during the era of enslavement can be tied to strongly to their dominance of the kitchen and Southern cuisine during that time. As cooks, enslaved men and women were in charge of preparing almost every meal on the plantation, so the food culture they brought from Africa was heavily influential on the development of Southern cuisine. One area where the influence of African culture on southern barbecue can be seen is through the spices used. While West and Central Africans did not have much of a tradition of barbecuing, Africans still brought their spice practices to the kitchen of plantation homes. These spice practices were integrated into the everyday food of both slaves and whites. Soon, these African spices became central to the barbecue traditions around the South. According to Wesley Jones of South Carolina, a former slave, it was his job to baste the meat that was barbecued all night with a sauce made up of “vinegar, black and red pepper, salt, butter, a little sage, coriander, basil, onion, and garlic.” At least two of these ingredients, garlic and red pepper, can be traced back to having African origins. Both of these spices are central to the


Another way in which African-Americans made their impact on barbecue was through their mastery of the kitchen itself. As slaves, African-Americans were consistently expected to perform the dirty work of barbecuing, which included stoking and maintaining the fire throughout the night, applying sauces, and making side dishes. Some enslavers would force their enslaved men to barbecue a hog and their enslaved women to make the desserts for large Christmas meals. Mose Davis of Georgia, another former slave, noted that the largest barbecues were usually thrown on the Fourth of July and Christmas. Forced to cook for their white enslavers, African-Americans were able to effectively alter the entire southern white palate with their cultural adaptations to American dishes. Soon, the line between “slave” and “white” foodways would be only discernible by the quality of ingredients. Slaves were given the cheapest, most difficult cuts of meat and vegetables, but they prepared them in the same general ways that they prepared food for whites. African-Americans were celebrated for their ability to rule the barbecue, though the credit for their recipes often went to their white enslaver. Barbecue soon became a sign of celebration for enslaved individuals. Annie Huff of Georgia described barbecues on the plantation from a slave’s point of view when she said, “When the work was completed, the guests cooked chitterlings and made barbecue to be served with the usual ginger cake and persimmon beer. They then dressed in their colorful ‘Sunday’ garments, dyed with maple and dogwood bark, to engage in promenades, cotillions, etc., to the time of a quill instrument.” Barbecues continued to be seen as a means of celebration throughout African-American culture after enslavement.

Barbecue was just as important to early white Americans as it was for the men and women forced to prepare it. The figurehead of early America, George Washington, was as fond of these celebrations of red meat as anyone else. Throughout his diary, he mentions the various barbecues he attended throughout Virginia, including one he threw himself in Antioch, Virginia. George Washington was certainly not the only American to write about
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barbecues, however. John James Audubon, a renown painter and naturalist, described the picturesque scene of a Fourth of July barbecue in Kentucky in the early nineteenth century when he penned, “As the youth of Kentucky lightly and gaily advanced towards the Barbecue, they resembled a procession of nymphs and disguised divinities... it served to remind every Kentuckian present of the glorious name, the patriotism, the courage, and the virtue, of our immortal Washington.” Barbecues quickly developed into a staple of Southern culture and were the go-to event for celebrations of all kinds. One of the most intriguing aspect of Southern society before the Civil War in regards to race relations was the lack of separation between white and black life, namely their celebrations. The African-Americans within the South were forced to serve whites on nearly all occasions, especially during their holiday celebrations and festivals. This led to a tradition of barbecues as a means of celebration or holiday in both white and black cultures, though the way these barbecues were held and the foods served diverged over time.

It is obvious how Southerners adored barbecues and used them to celebrate the birth of America, but not everyone was a fan. Colonel Landon Carter of Virginia described the third barbecue of the year in 1772 and noted that he thought barbecues were expensive affairs. William Richardson, visiting rural Virginia from his home city of Charleston, wrote to his wife that he witnessed “one lady devour a whole Hog head except the bones, don’t tell this to any of your squeamish C town ladies for they will not believe you...” Both of these men wrote extensively on the barbecues of the South and found their own flaws. Colonel Carter believed that many of the people attending these barbecues were not paying the upfront fee to cover the amount of food given out. He feared that throwing these affairs too often would result in a large debt on the part of the Virginia elites. Richardson perceived barbecue to be an activity that should be reserved for the poor and not suitable for those with any class or sense. Both of these men stood opposed to the rise of America's first cultural food creation.

While slavery forced the races into an integration that fostered the development of this new foodway, segregation and Jim Crow laws following emancipation in the South slowly moved barbecues out of this union. On the plantations of the South, African-Americans were still expected to cook for the whites at their barbecues early on, but they were not allowed to interact with the guests. A Harper's Weekly article, appearing in print on October 24, 1896, refers to the African-American cooks as “negroes” and “darkies” throughout, reminding us that the racism that has plagued the South for
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centuries was just as integral a part of barbecue culture. Maude Andrews, the author of this article, goes as far as to refer to these African-American cooks as “darkies, gnawing barbecued bones on the outside, smack[ing] their lips in approbation...” This quote also helps to detail the segregation present at these barbecues. The African American cooks at these barbecues were forced to sit alone, far off from the thralls of white men and women, where they would sing and eat joyously. As they celebrated the delicious feast they had played such a large role in producing, the white men who had very little interaction with these cooks developed vain, assumed opinions about these.\textsuperscript{25} Across the South, newly freed African-Americans chose to throw their own barbecues as a celebration for the Emancipation Proclamation, known today as Juneteenth. Anderson Jones, a former slave, remarked that when they held Emancipation celebrations, whites and blacks from all around would come together for some barbecue.\textsuperscript{26} Newly freed African-American men, who would invite both black and white speakers to these barbecues, threw very similar jubilations during this time. Many of the white speakers defended slavery and white superiority, like J.A. Turner, a local plantation owner, who said in 1866, “your forefathers were savages like the wild Indian when they were brought to this country. Now, you, their descendants are civilized, and intelligent, and all enjoy Church privileges. Had it not been for slavery you would now be savages in Africa.”\textsuperscript{27} The ideas of white superiority and a savior complex that persisted throughout the South only increased as Jim Crow segregation spread throughout southern cities.

Instead of the unequal integration present during slavery, racial dynamics began to be defined by legalized separation. As the South became increasingly urbanized, white barbecue restaurants began to pop up and black barbecue began to be symbolized by the roadside BBQ stands.\textsuperscript{28} Old habits proved to die hard across the South, as many of these white barbecue restaurants served white-only customers but had all-black cook staffs. One example of this was Leonard’s Barbecue in Memphis, Tennessee, which did not desegregate until the 1960’s.\textsuperscript{29} According to Robert Moss, author of \textit{Barbecue: The History of an American Institution}, “in interview after interview, black barbecue restaurateurs cite that the desire to not have to answer to anyone as a key reason why they went into the business.”\textsuperscript{30} Many black employees were frustrated with the fact that despite doing most of the work in these barbecue restaurants, they were

\textsuperscript{26} Robb Walsh, \textit{Legends of Texas Barbecue Cookbook} (San Francisco: Chronical Books, 2002), 114-115.
\textsuperscript{27} Robert F. Moss, \textit{Barbecue: The History of an American Institution} (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2010), 100.
\textsuperscript{28} Robb Walsh, “Texas Barbecue in Black and White,” in \textit{Cornbread Nation 2}, 52.
\textsuperscript{29} Moss, \textit{Barbecue}, 151.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 167.
insufficiently compensated and disrespected. Bill and Geraldine Long raised money for two years, learning the craft of barbecue, until they could open their own establishment in Atlanta.\textsuperscript{31} With the passing of the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906, these black roadside stands soon began losing business. These men and women barbecued their hogs in the ground, which was not conducive to sanitary inspections.\textsuperscript{32} Barbecue stands still existed across the South, but they were often unable to achieve the fame and success that many indoor restaurant facilities obtained.

Because of the racial divide present in these barbecue restaurants, the history of the development of barbecue began to become murky. With white men owning the vast majority of barbecue restaurants, they were the ones who received the national acclaim and fame. Therefore, the idea that barbecue was a conglomeration of Native American, African-American, and European settler food culture did not make sense to those who viewed it as a whites-only venture. One of the strangest myths to develop around the creation of Texas barbecue was the idea that “in the early days, a cattle owner, a Mr. Bernarby Quinn, used a branding iron with his initials B.Q., with a straight line under the B. He also served the best steaks for a hundred miles around. Thus the Bar-B-Q is synonymous with excellent cook-out foods.”\textsuperscript{33} Some accepted the fact that there was a notion of barbecue before white men dominated it, but still applied their ideals of white superiority to the history. In 1940, the Texas Writers Project stated that barbecue did develop in a simple form before, but “wherever it came from, and whatever in the beginning may have been its recipes and customs, the barbecue fell into friendly hands when it met the pioneers who were settling in the Southwest.”\textsuperscript{34} Because of this revisionist history, many whites began to feel like they rightfully owned barbecue and fought against any form of reintegration.

Throughout the Civil Rights Movement, there are multiple lesser-known legal battles that stemmed from barbecue restaurants and their refusal to integrate. One of these legal battles is titled \textit{Katzenbach v. McClung}, which involved the owner of Ollie’s Barbecue in Birmingham, Alabama, suing to avoid integrating his establishment. While the majority of Ollie’s employees were African-American, they still only served black patrons through take-out. The owner of Ollie’s believed that if the restaurant began serving black customers, they would lose white business. After Ollie’s lost their case in the Supreme Court, the restaurant finally obliged and chose to integrate.\textsuperscript{35}
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Carolina, Maurice Bessinger refused to integrate his restaurants until he lost the case of *Newman v. Piggy Park Enterprises*. Even after he was forced to integrate, Bessinger distributed religious pamphlets justifying slavery through the Bible and chose to fly a Confederate flag over his restaurant instead of an American one.\(^{36}\) In Atlanta, Lester Maddox refused to serve African-Americans in his restaurant, choosing instead to chase them away with pick handles. He ultimately closed his restaurant to avoid desegregating.\(^{37}\) Barbecue often reflects the climate of the South, so there is little surprise in the fact that Southerners fought back against perceived slights through their barbecue. Ollie McClung Sr. still defends his decision to sue for the right to remain segregated.\(^{38}\) This shows how deeply rooted these racial divides dwell.

In today’s South and today’s America, these racial lines still exist, but barbecue is slowly being reclaimed as a multiracial collaboration and not something enhanced by some innate mystical Anglo-Saxon ability. Organizations like the Southern Foodways Alliance, who “insists that any SFA program about barbecue in the American South must be multiracial,” are fighting against these archaic ideals.\(^{39}\) In 1980, Texas officially marked Juneteenth as a state holiday, adding legitimacy to the African-American celebration of the Emancipation Proclamation.\(^{40}\) There are moves being made to redefine barbecue as a symbol of an interracial connection, something that exists within the past of many cultures and therefore unites us. For these moves to prove productive, however, the true history of barbecue has to be accepted and acknowledged.

If we as a society are not able to acknowledge the contributions of African enslaved and Native American peoples to our culture, then we will forever face the color line. There is no true history of America, the history of barbecue included, that can be told without discussing the ramifications of centuries of enslavement. Acceptance of the inherent differences that alienate barbecue opinions may bring together those who love their craft, because their passions are very similar. They receive an adrenaline rush from mixing spices to create rubs and sauce, from meticulously smoking and basting their meat of choice, and from being able to devour a delectable piece of barbecue that they know was their own creation. A very similar argument can be made for the reconciliation possible through the history of barbecue. If Southerners and Americans as a whole were able to develop an understanding and acceptance of the partnership of ethnic cultures throughout southern history, then this may allow for some of the wounds to heal. This would take a deep dive into the horrors and
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repercussions of slavery, but we may just come out with a deeper understanding of how our history has formed America, the South, and the awe-inspiring dish of barbecue. By culture we are separate, but with culture we can unite. And for that I am thankful.

Figure 1. De Bry, Thomas “Native Americans barbecuing fish in North Carolina” (Moss, *Barbecue: An American Institution*, 9).
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Home is Where the Farm is: Identity Formation in Antebellum Southern Illinois

Introduction

“There can be no neutrals in this war, only patriots or traitors,” exclaimed Stephen A. Douglas on April 25, 1861.\(^1\) Douglas called on the people of Illinois, and the United States, to become patriots and to defend the Union, which meant making national alliances undeniably clear. One could not remain between the two sides. The line was drawn, and people needed to find out what side they were on. In the context of Illinois of the 1860s, these words echoed the long rooted traditions and family alliances between those who had migrated from the Southern states who now had to choose between becoming “patriots,” supporting the North and the state of Illinois where they lived; or to become traitors, and side with their family roots and political ideology. This was true for reputable Illinoisan men such as Congressman John A. Logan. While Congressman Logan denounced “abolitionist Black Republicans,” he believed that the “election of Mr. Lincoln, deplorable as it may be, affords no justification or excuse for overthrowing the republic.”\(^2\) While the Civil War solidified the identities of the “patriots” in Illinois, this process of identity transition through geography, politics, and religion had been well on its way since the early part of the nineteenth century. The Pate family was one such family undergoing this transition of identity.

For many people living in Southern Illinois, the Civil War created an instability of identity. Southern Illinois, often called Egypt, had the demographics of a southern state.\(^3\) Most of the population had southern origins, and they grew typically southern crops such as cotton and tobacco. However, during the Civil War, the people of Southern Illinois showed themselves to be more northern than previously thought. This paper argues many in Southern Illinois went against their Southern origins and identified as Northerners during the Civil because of their background and their primary identity as farmers. This paper will use the Pate family, a family living in Southern Illinois originally from the South, to illustrate this argument. Personal letters, biographical records,
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and obituaries allow us to reconstruct the pre-Civil War image of the Pates including their education, religion, and politics; they were similar to most people in Southern Illinois. The Pates were Baptist subsistence farmers from Tennessee with access to a limited education. However, two members of this family willingly fought and died for the Union Army during the Civil War. Personal letters written during the Civil War, military records, and secondary accounts of the time reveal how their identity as farmers helped them cement their loyalty to the North.

**Literary Review**

While the literature on the Civil War is vast, fewer studies center their analysis specifically on the impact of the Civil War on agriculture. R. Douglas Hunt’s recent work, *Food and Agriculture during the Civil War*, examines how agriculture was more than simply an economic endeavor. Hunt argues that agriculture was “a form of power similar to military power” in that it could unite or destroy the union.4 Victor Hicken’s *Illinois in the Civil War* discusses Illinois’ involvement in the Civil War and the role of Illinois regiments in specific battles.5 Hicken discusses the effect of geography of Illinois soldiers with the state’s “southern tip pointed like a sword at the heart of the new-formed confederacy.”6 Written by eyewitnesses W.S. Morris, L.D. Hartwell, and J.B. Kuykendall, *History 31st Regiment: Illinois Volunteers Organized by John A. Logan* conveys the history of the infantry regiment from Southern Illinois.7 Roger Biles, in his study titled *Illinois: A History of the Land and its People*, demonstrates the relationship between statehood and agriculture, and narrates the movement of people into Illinois.8 Kay Carr also looks at the demographic variation across the state in her book, *Belleville, Ottawa, and Galesburg: community and democracy on the Illinois frontier*.9 The book focuses on the “link between frontier community building and the acceptance of particular types of democratic political processes in the United States.”10 She proves this by examining three towns from various parts of Illinois in the early nineteenth century. This includes the development of communities in Southern Illinois and the effects of their cultural background. Barton Price examines religion in Southern Illinois during the nineteenth century in his article, “Religion, Reform, and Patriotism
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in Southern Illinois: A Case Study, 1852-1900.”¹¹ Price examines the progression of religion during the Gilded Era through the “lens of the Southern Illinois Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church” which he believes represents “the antithesis of the cultural refinement of New York City or Chicago,” which most authors focus on while examining religion during the Gilded Era.¹² Price talks about the devotion to Christian duty and morals in Southern Illinois that shaped its Antebellum Era and Gilded Era culture.¹³ These secondary sources deal broadly with specific aspects of the Pate Family’s identity from Agriculture and religion to military service and region demographics. These generalizations when applied specifically to the Pate family paint a picture of identity transformation and the reasoning for the decisions they made.

Brief History of the Pates

The history of the Pate family in the first half of the nineteenth century, mirrored the history of many other families moving westward at the time. Originally, the Pates immigrated to Franklin County, Virginia from Ireland.¹⁴ Edward Pate’s father fought in the Revolutionary War.¹⁵ Edward Pate moved with his family from Franklin County, Virginia to Jackson County, Tennessee. They were one of many families to pioneer west of the Appalachian Mountains, newly available to American settlers. Edward and most of his children lived out their lives in Tennessee, but two of his sons left Tennessee for new frontiers. Anthony Pate moved to what later became Homer, Louisiana, and Perlemon Pate settled in Somerset Township, Illinois.¹⁶ Perlemon’s journey followed the general trend of farmers from the southern states moving to the Southern Illinois region.¹⁷ The two brothers wrote to each other about once a year, each informing the other about their families, friends, and farms; their personal correspondence provides insight into the lives of the average farmers living in Louisiana and Southern Illinois in the decades preceding the Civil War.

Education

One’s worldview is a product of their education. The handwritten arithmetic book of Edward Pate provides insight into the education of the Pates
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¹⁶ There are multiple spellings of this man’s name including: Perlemon, Perleamon, and Pearlemon. Anthony Pate, Letter to Perlemon Pate, September 17, 1850. Southern Illinois University Carbondale Special Collections, Pate Family Papers (SIUCSCPFP), Folder 2.

and Southern Pioneers, revealing the level of emphasis placed on education and the knowledge they deemed necessary to be a farmer on the frontier. As families moved westward, migrants had to find new ways of subsistence. For many, educating their children became a personal endeavor due to the lack of schools on the frontier. Edward’s descendants wrote their names in the book, implying that it was an educational tool used over generations. In this respect, the Pates represented the people of Southern Illinois in the decades following statehood. Most of the settlers in Southern Illinois migrated from the southern states and held on to their Scotts-Irish or Anglo-Celtic values. They did not place much value in formal education. The Pates and most children in Southern Illinois planned to spend their adulthood on a farm, and therefore, an extensive education in the humanities seemed unnecessary.

The book taught basic mathematical skills in a very practical sense. Sections include “Apothecaries Weight,” “Practical Multiplication,” and “Cloth Measurement.” The section on the measurement of time explained the units of time (seconds, minutes, hours, days, and years) as well as the number of days in each month and leap years. All of the practice problems were examples of the practical application of these skills with farm and family. In addition, the book taught the mathematical skills needed to be a farmer, such as how to measure supplies and manage finances. The other sections in the book dealt with units that a farmer used on a regular basis in the first half of the nineteenth century. The section on money teaches coin conversions for the pound sterling. The book dates four years after the Coinage Act of 1792, establishing the U.S. dollar. The Pates, therefore, used the pound sterling for currency rather than the U.S. dollar in 1796. Precious space in the book was used to teach about the pound sterling instead of the U.S. dollar. This suggests that the children using this book were more likely to use the pound sterling than the U.S. dollar. The use of the pound sterling in the book supports the idea that it was more prevalent than the dollar in 1796. This is an example the U.S. Government’s lack of immediate authority with Southern pioneers. The Pound Sterling was a remnant of their British identity. This also displays a more gradual change in identity from British colonists to American citizens. Scarcity of educational materials necessitates versatility. Despite it being an arithmetic book, the Pates used it to teach other subjects as well. They learned common legal statements by practicing phrases
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such as, “King George County, to wit, I command you....” and “Summon William Williamson to appear before me....” Money and paper were scarce resources, and the fact that the Pates dedicated any toward education shows its value to them. However, every page applied explicitly to their everyday lives. The versatility and practicality of Edward Pate’s Arithmetic book reinforces the claims of Roger Biles, who stated that the Southern migrants received a practical education of law and mathematics.

Religion

The Pates were devout Baptists in Tennessee and held their religion as one of the cornerstones of their lives. Anthony and Perlemon carried that strong faith with them as they moved further west. Just as a farming family develops a close bond with the land that they worked, they formed a close bond with the church where they worshiped. This held true for Perlemon as he moved away from Jackson County, Tennessee. Indeed, he remained a member in good standing with the Baptist Church of Jesus Christ at Salt Lick, Tennessee, six years after he moved to Southern Illinois. Plausibly, Perlemon found a new church and felt connected enough to it and made it his new home church, which demonstrates his transition in identity from Southerner to Southern Illinoisan. Perlemon severed a tie to Tennessee and the South in 1845 when he did not maintain his membership with Baptist Church of Jesus Christ at Salt Lick, Jackson County, Tennessee. While it took six years to change, he eventually severed that tie to his Tennesse identity. It was a process of gradual adaptation to his new home in Southern Illinois.

Perlemon was not the only person with a changing identity in a new home. In letters to Perlemon, Anthony talked about a Baptist meeting that occurred every month and a Methodist service every week near his house. Anthony held the Methodist preacher, “old father Stevisan” in high regard, having given the best sermon Anthony had heard up to that point. Anthony’s respect for Father Stevisan, a non-Baptist minister, suggests that either denominational differences were not important, or he was being influenced by his new community. This was further confirmed when four years later in the spring of 1848, Anthony Pate and his family joined the Methodist Church. It was not until two years later Anthony wrote to his brother about his conversion to the Methodist church, possibly because he was concerned about how Perlemon would react to such a change. While Perlemon simply changed congregations, Anthony
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changed denominations. However, it is plausible that Perlemon would have approved of his brother being a Methodist. After all, Perlemon’s son, also named Anthony Pate, later became a member of Centenary Methodist Church.\(^\text{31}\) Both brothers altered the religious aspect of their identity in accordance to their new surroundings. This further emphasizes the effect of geographical location on the identity of farmers during the Antebellum and Civil War Eras.

**Politics**

Religion was not the only area in which the two brothers differed. When they headed westward toward their new homes in Illinois and Louisiana, their new surroundings changed them in other ways. Political tendencies were one of these changes. Perlemon Pate, while not active in politics, was a devoted Democrat.\(^\text{32}\) This paralleled with most people living in Southern Illinois at the time. Illinois allied itself with Andrew Jackson and his Democratic Party because they saw Jackson as the common man for westward expansion.\(^\text{33}\) He worked to expand rights and opportunities for common men west of the Appalachian Mountains, and he supported the removal of the Native American from land desired by Illinoisans.

While Illinois almost unanimously supported the Democratic Party, Louisiana was more divided. In Louisiana, Anthony Pate was a dedicated member of the Whig Party.\(^\text{34}\) The Whigs stood in opposition to Jackson and the Democrats, primarily on issues such as tariffs and the national bank. In Louisiana, the Whig party in the 1830s and 1840s was successful enough to win two gubernatorial elections and achieve majorities in the state legislature.\(^\text{35}\) Merchants and sugar plantation owners were primary voters for the Whig Party, because they had the most to gain from tariffs and a national bank.\(^\text{36}\) It is curious that Anthony Pate supported the Whig party. He was neither a sugar farmer nor a merchant, but instead a small cotton farmer.

On May 5, 1844, the *Daily Picayune* (an influential New Orleans newspaper) published an article claiming Whig leader Henry Clay opposed the annexation of Texas, a major issue for Louisianans.\(^\text{37}\) The article cost Clay Louisiana’s electoral votes, but not Anthony Pate’s vote.\(^\text{38}\) Anthony wrote his brother three months
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later about supporting Henry Clay in the upcoming presidential election. Anthony must have been opposed, or at least indifferent, to Texas annexations. This is an odd position to have considering he came from a family of westward expansionists. Influences from his new life in Louisiana turned him against the idea of westward expansion, or fostered more loyalty to Clay than to this aspect of his family heritage. Anthony’s geographic location in Louisiana does not fit within his political party, as he lived in the northern part of the state. In the election of 1844, Northern Louisiana primarily voted for Polk. Most of Clay’s votes came from New Orleans and Southern Louisiana. Anthony’s political opinions and their conflict with his location and family heritage demonstrates the possible conflict between different aspects of Perlemon’s identity and their effect on his own political opinions at this time.

While political leanings reveal some of the ideologies of the Pates, the amount and time of political discussion in personal letters revealed the importance of politics to the Pates. Anthony Pate did not hide his political allegiance. He attempted to sway Perlemon to the Whigs in two different letters. He first wrote about being a Whig in July of 1842, the same year as the gubernatorial election. In his September, 1844, letter, he concluded it by reminding his brother, “Don’t forget to vote for Henry Clay...Don’t forget the true Whig principal.” Either Anthony did not send any letters to Perlemon during any other election year, or these letters are lost. However, in correspondence after the election he did not mention the Whig Party. Outside of election time, political parties fell by the wayside. The Whigs proved that Antebellum Louisiana was not as monolithic as it would later become. Anthony Pate illustrates how individuals could still go against geographical political tendencies by voting Whig in the Democrat dominated Northern Louisiana. The Pate brothers showed that while common farmers in the 1840s were involved in politics, they were not engulfed by politics.

The Civil War

As hostilities between North and South increased over the issues of slavery and the rights of states, the Pate brothers continued their loving correspondence, uniting Illinois and Louisiana, two states that soon became foes. In 1861, attempts by Southern states to secede from the Union ushered in five years of bloodshed known as the Civil War. As the nation stood divided during the length of the Civil War, the Pate family in the North had to make the difficult decision to either pledge loyalty to “state and country” or stay
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true to traditions and family. The pressures of the time, that is, to choose sides on the conflict, troubled the people of Southern Illinois. Migrant farmers originally from the southern states made up the bulk of the population settled in Southern Illinois. As farmers moved into the Southern Illinois region, they brought with them their old loyalties to the Democratic Party. An example of their faithfulness to the Democratic ideology and political alliances, that is support for slavery and strong state rights, can be observed in the election of John A. Logan. Congressman Logan was elected to Congress in 1860 by eighty percent of what John Y. Simon called “hardscrabble subsistence farmers” in the region. Logan was popular among his contemporaries in large part because of his “reputation as a proponent of legislation excluding free blacks from Illinois and as a defender in Congress of Southern rights.” There were those who supported Logan for his politics, but whose loyalties remained close to their Southern origins. Soon after the start of the Civil War, over thirty men from Egypt joined the Confederate Army. For many, such as the Pate family, this was a complicated dilemma.

The Illinois Pates were often secluded from national politics due to living in a rural area. At the dawn of the Civil War, they had to confront their reality as they struggled to make sense of their loyalties. Perlemon was a life-long Democrat. He always voted for the Democratic ticket. However, his political involvement never went beyond the ballot box. The events of the Civil War placed him outside of his political comfort zone: this had moved past politics. This was war. The situation moved beyond political parties, it was now a national duty to protect the land that sustained his family for decades. It had become a matter of keeping the nation united, not only politically, but also geographically. That meant showing a united front in the North, and cooperation across party lines in the interest of preserving the Union. For the Pates, in Southern Illinois, it became a question of “where was home?” Was Tennessee, the birthplace of Perlemon Pate, home? Alternatively, was Illinois home, where John and Matthew were raised and land their family worked for decades? For John and Matthew Pate, two of the sons of Perlemon Pate, home was Illinois.

Without much explanation, John A. Logan, a strong Democrat and defender of Southern rights, announced his support for the Union Army as he joined the war effort. Logan spoke against extremists in both the North and the South, but claimed that “the time has come when a man must be for or against his
country." Logan’s decision gradually became the decision of the region. They made the choice of “state and nation” versus heritage and family - duty to “state and nation” trumped duty to heritage and family. In order to keep the nation united both politically and geographically, citizens had to move past party lines. For the Pates, Perlemon’s sons John and Matthew answered Logan’s call to arms. John and Matthew Pate were mustered on August 30, 1862, and they were not alone. That same day, neighbors Monroe Martin and Samuel Gray joined Company D of the 31st Illinois Infantry. These four and the other Murphysboro men joined the war effort at the same time representing the decision of Murphysboro to support the Union. Logan and the actions of their peers had persuaded them that they were no longer men of the South living in a Northern state, but true Northerners. The people of Murphysboro affirmed that they were Illinoisans, living in the United States and this association with Illinois and the Union came before any association to John and Matthew ‘s father’s Southern home. John and Matthew Pate chose to side with Illinois over the South, which makes sense. There probably was little connection to Tennessee, because by 1862 Perlemon had lived in Illinois almost as long as he lived in Tennessee. While a farmer has a strong connection to his heritage, he forms a stronger bond with the land. The Pate brothers chose to side with the land that they put years of labor into and that had sustained them for even longer. While blood is thicker than water, in this case it appears that soil was thicker than blood.

Ironically, John and Matthew Pate marched south with the 31st Illinois Infantry almost twenty years after Anthony Pate inquired about taking a riverboat to see Perlemon in Illinois. Anthony had wanted to see Perlemon more than anyone in the world, and “take [Perlemon] by the hand once more.” John and Matthew made the journey down the Mississippi River to lay siege to a town less than 150 miles from their uncle’s home. Tragically, the prospective journey of brotherly embrace became a journey of war instead.

While the Civil War challenged the institution of slavery this was not the reason Matthew and John Pate joined the Union army. Rather, it was their loyalty to the Union and its preservation despite its views on slavery. A letter written by Matthew Pate to his brother during the war from Corinth, Mississippi illustrates this point. After complaining about the rain Matthew Pate says, “A soldiers life is a harde one altho I am not bin deceived in that I am very well satisfied with my situation if it was not for one thing and that is the infernal n----- we have plenty of the here but we are not blessed so well as them that is at Corinth.”
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upset because the slaves had better shelter from the rain than he did. There was support or at least indifference to the institution of slavery, which illustrates the idea that the Pates joined the Union War effort out of loyalty to nation and not for the fight against slavery. Just as Logan did, the Pates put aside personal ideology to side with their country. There was no internal moral decision, but instead a joining with community, state, and country to stand together. Geography meant more than ideology.

The brothers fought with General Grant in his campaign to capture Vicksburg, MS. Their company missed the Battle of Corinth, Mississippi by hours. Later, Matthew returned to his birth state of Tennessee, and he died there too, February 5, 1863. John Pate fought for the Union during the siege of Vicksburg from May through July. He fought in the blood bath battle for Fort Hill, seeing comrades and commanding officers alike fall on both sides of him. On July 4th, John Pate marched triumphantly into Vicksburg. John wrote to his brother Sabe about the near 32,000 prisoners being paroled, and how they surrendered on account of having nothing to eat “but mule meat and cow peas.” While John Pate survived the siege of Vicksburg, the war still took his life with camp disease on July 19, 1863. While they did not die in combat, the war between brothers still claimed the lives of brothers John and Mathew Pate. In less than a generation, John and Matthew had abandoned their Southern identity in the name of loyalty to the Union. The brothers died in the South, but they died as Northerners.

Conclusion

People fought in the Civil War for various personal reasons. These reasons do not always align with the reasons of the nation. One must look at personal factors such as family origin, education, religion, and politics to determine these reasons. John and Matthew Pate did not join the Union Army for the same reasons as their fellow soldiers from other geographies of the North. The Pates had a vastly different background than that of those who lived just a couple hundred miles north of them. Most soldiers from Northern Illinois had better access to education, originated from the Northeastern part of the U.S., were not Baptist, and voted Republican. Despite these differences, John
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and Matthew Pate fought alongside them against Confederate soldiers with whom they shared more cultural similarities. Ties to the land they lived on, and worked, proved to be greater than their ties to the state of birth. Where they lived at that moment was more meaningful to their lives than where they had come from. They sided with the geographical North instead of where they were perhaps more ideologically similar to: the South. This instance shows the importance of national crisis in the formation, or cementation, of one’s identity. Throughout American history, in times of national crisis, Americans put party politics aside in favor of a national identity as exemplified by John A. Logan, the Pates, and the people of Southern Illinois in the 1860s. However, cementing one’s identity was based more on the contours of national geography in the nineteenth century than in the 2010s. During the 2016 election, there was a heated political climate where support was not entirely based on geography one reason is the new technologies of our times such as the internet. In the nineteenth century, people, such as the Pates, joined with their communities to be part of something larger than themselves. Today, people are able to more easily find and ally themselves with people with similar ideology to be part of something larger. Understanding how people choose sides and found identity in conflicts such as the Civil War helps identify how people choose sides and find identity today.
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