APPROVAL SHEET

Title of Thesis: Glory Stands Beside Our Grief: The Maryland Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy's Commemoration and Memorial Efforts in Baltimore

Name of Candidate: Jessica E. Deane
Master of Arts, 15

Thesis and Abstract Approved:

Dr. Anne S Rubin
Professor
Historical Studies

Date Approved: 4/3/15

Jessica Deane

Department of History
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
1000 Hilltop Circle
Baltimore, MD 21250

(443) 567-1649
jdeane1@umbc.edu

Education

MA: University of Maryland, Baltimore County, 2015.

BA: Salisbury University, 2013, Summa Cum Laude.

Study Abroad: American Institute for Foreign Study in Prague, Czech Republic (6/17/2012-7/25/2012).

Employment

Instructor, The University of Maryland, Baltimore County, August 2013 to present

Graduate Assistant, The University of Maryland, Baltimore County, August 2014 to present

Student Circulation Assistant, The University of Maryland, Baltimore County, August 2013 to August 2014.

Student Circulation Assistant, Salisbury University August 2009 to May 2013.

Presentations

Salisbury University Student Research Conference, Spring 2012. Presented a paper titled "The Homespun Dress: The Nationalist Contribution of Southern Women to the Confederacy throughout the American Civil War"

Awards and Honor Societies

Senator, Graduate Student Association: University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Presidential Scholarship: Salisbury University
Thomas E. Bellavance Honors Program: Salisbury University
Thomas E. Bellavance Honors Program Scholarship Award: Salisbury University, Spring 2012
Dean's List: All eight semesters at Salisbury University
Kappa Delta Pi: Education Honors Society, Salisbury University
Phi Alpha Theta: History Honors Society, Salisbury University
Pi Gamma Mu: Social Science Honors Society, Salisbury University
Phi Kappa Phi: International Honors Society, Salisbury University
Phi Eta Sigma: Freshman Honors Society, Salisbury University
Salisbury Symphony Orchestra Scholarship for Non-Music Majors: Salisbury University

Abstract

Title of Document:	"Glory Stands Beside Our Grief": The Maryland Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy's Commemoration and Memorial Efforts in Baltimore.
Directed By:	Professor, Dr. Anne Sarah Rubin, Department of History.

Although Maryland was never a part of the Confederacy during the war, the large number of southern sympathizers within the city allowed for the Maryland Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy to grow into a powerful organization. This thesis examines how the commemorative actions taken by the Maryland Division—and the UDC as a whole— allowed women to gain more political and social power within their communities. The Baltimore Confederate Monument is a physical example of how the elite southern women of the Maryland Division commemorated the Confederate past and culture, particularly within a contested space. Despite being formally a part of the Union, Confederate women in Maryland continued to provide support for Confederate soldiers and to help memorialize the Confederate cause. As they worked to memorialize the "Lost Cause" and the Confederacy within their borders, the Maryland Division faced challenges both typical of their Southern peers as well as those unique to Maryland, given Maryland's position as a border state. In addition, this thesis specifically examines the Baltimore Confederacy Monument, both its design and how the city reacted to the monument. Both the statue and other memorialization efforts done by the Maryland Division allowed Confederate sympathizers within the state to work towards their ultimate goal of the vindication of Confederate culture.

"Glory Stands Beside Our Grief": The Maryland Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy's Commemoration and Memorial Efforts in Baltimore

Jessica Deane

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
the
University of Maryland, Baltimore County in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Masters of Arts
2015

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank my advisor, Dr. Anne Sarah Rubin, for her constant support for my research and writing. Thank you for believing that I could do this, even when I wasn't always convinced. Dr. Denise Meringolo and Dr. Susan McDonough, thank you for all of your advice and guidance. With your knowledge and expertise, you have helped shape this thesis in so many ways, and I cannot thank the three of you enough for that. As teachers, you have encouraged and challenged me to go beyond my best. I would also like to thank the many other professors in the History Department who have encouraged me and supplied me with the tools needed to become a better historian.

I would also like to thank Dr. Jay Carlander of the History Department and Dr. Joel Jenne of the Education Department, both of Salisbury University. Without your support and encouragement, I never would have made it this far in my academic career. In addition, a special thanks to Mr. Michael Lawrence of Jack Britt High School, the teacher who changed everything and made me want to go to school to study history.

In addition, many thanks to:

My graduate school cohort, friends, and trivia team: Nichole, Matt, Talbot, Michael, Celso, Cole, and Susan. Special thanks to Nichole for always supporting me, commiserating with me, and letting me rant to you whenever it was needed—you're the best! To those not listed here: you haven't been forgotten! Deep thanks to you as well.

Those friends outside of school: Lydia, Lauren, Morgan, Carly, Jenny, Sarah, and the whole Salisbury crew. You guys always made sure that I was able to draw myself away from all things school and just enjoy myself and for that, I can't thank you enough.

My family: Mom and Dad, without you I never would have made it to where I am now. Thank you for always loving me, supporting me, and providing me with all of the tools that I need to succeed. Thank you for all of the life lessons and last minute panicked Skype calls and text messages. To my grandparents—Bamba, Bobba, Mary Pat, and Ollie—thank you for fostering a love of learning and history early on that has lasted me for all of these years. And to my brother: Jake, you are amazing and I love you. Thank you for always cheering me on in everything.

Finally, to my husband: Johnny, without you, I never would have made it through this. You have supported me in everything that I have done—through all the stress, tears, and panicked running around, you have always been there to calm me down and tell me that everything is going to be okay. You are amazing and I love you. I can't wait to get our lives started together!

Table of Contents

Introduction

On my first time driving through Baltimore on my own, I became hopelessly lost while going to the Johns Hopkins Homewood campus. Finally pulling over to the side of the road to look up directions, I noticed a statue of a bronze soldier leaning against a winged figure. I was immediately struck by how large it was, towering well over my car. However, having finally figured out that I was traveling away from my destination, I eventually put the monument from my mind and continued driving. It would be several months later before I would come across this particular statue again, this time while researching how Southern sympathizing women supported the Confederacy during the Civil War. As I read about the Maryland Division and the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC), I immediately recognized their longest lasting commemoration effort, the Baltimore Confederate Monument, as the statue I had been parked beside for ten minutes.

While Maryland was never a member of the Confederacy, the large number of southern and Confederate sympathizers within the state allowed for the Maryland Division to grow into a powerful organization, with close ties to the national branch. The Baltimore Confederate Monument is one of the many physical examples of how the elite southern women of the Maryland Division commemorated the Confederate past and culture, particularly within a contested space. Despite being politically and militarily a part of the Union, Confederate women in Maryland continued to provide support for Confederate soldiers and to help memorialize the Confederate cause.

As they worked to memorialize the “Lost Cause” and the Confederacy within their own state’s borders, the Maryland Division faced challenges both typical of their

Southern peers as well as those unique to Maryland itself, given Maryland's position as a border state during the war. This association used public art and public statues to help develop a specific sense of identity to the Confederacy through the dedication of two statues in Baltimore City. These statues, as well as the other memorialization efforts taken on by the Maryland Division, allowed Confederate sympathizers within the state to work towards their ultimate goal of the vindication of Confederate culture.

This is in contrast to Union memorialization of the war, which, although beginning at the same time as Confederate memorialization, took place for very different reasons. Whereas ex-Confederates were working to memorialize their dead and commemorate their lost cause, the North organized their commemoration exercises and efforts around a mournful victory celebration. Maintaining elements of celebration and victory, Union commemoration also focused on the memorialization of those individuals who had "died to suppress the late rebellion."[1] Both sides used memorialization efforts to mourn; however, two different undertones remained within their memorial process: anger over defeat and a celebration over victory. These undertones would carry over into how the federal and state governments would handle various memorialization efforts on either side.[2]

As the Civil War intensified, people on both sides of the conflict had no choice but to drastically reevaluate the way in which they responded to death.[3] Traditionally in the Victorian era, female relatives of the deceased would carry out a series of elaborate

---

[1] General John A. Logan, as quoted by David Blight, *Race and Reunion*: *The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap University Press of Harvard University Press, 2001), 71.
[2] Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 65. Blight argues that although memorialization was largely a spiritual process, it would develop very political connotations as time went on. Many of these connotations deal with the relationship between the government and memorial processes on either side.
[3] Caroline Janney, *Burying the Dead but Not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 30.

rituals in order to facilitate mourning. As hundreds of men began to die each day, thousands of miles from home, traditional mourning rituals and customs were interrupted, forcing women's groups to take one many of these roles in place of family members.[4] They would take on these important traditions themselves, writing letters to the families of dead and dying soldiers and organizing their burials, even if they were far from home. After the war had ended, women's memorial organizations on both sides continued the burial of Civil War dead. Monuments were erected in these cemeteries, using symbols and imagery to create common messages and themes across both Union and Confederate memorialization. As women's memorial groups moved beyond interring the dead, and towards later vindications and commemorations, the purpose of monuments changed.

The ways in which women's memorialization organizations used physical markers to commemorate war within a public space demonstrate how they cultivated a specific public memory. However, memorialization efforts needed to employ a specific set of methods in order to be successful—methods represented within the UDC's main objectives listed in their Constitution.[5] According to Susan Soderberg, a monument is not "just a work of art, a sign-post, or a landmark. It is a message, a message infused with emotion and tinged with deep seated values."[6] The Baltimore Confederate Soldiers and Sailors monument was more than just a eulogy to fallen Confederate soldiers. Rather, its creation was an expression of identification by a large group of Baltimore citizens, despite how the city may have officially fallen during the war. Thousands of people appeared for its dedication, surrounded by the fanfare that was common for similar

---

[4] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 32.
[5] Mary B. Poppenheim et al., *The History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy* (Richmond, Virginia: Garrett and Massie Incorporated, 1938), 4 and 5.
[6] Susan Cooke Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget" A Guide to Civil War Monuments in Maryland* (Shippensburg, PA: This White Mane Publishing Company, Inc, 1995), xi.

monuments in the Carolinas and Deep South. Baltimore Confederates identified with the monument and the message it was portraying-a true vindication of the Confederacy and the Lost Cause.

This thesis uses the Maryland Division of the UDC and the Baltimore Confederate Monument as a focal point. By so doing, it engages with three main areas of recent historiography, including the study of women's memorial organizations, the role of monuments within commemoration activities, and the broader topic of Civil War memory.

Following in the tradition of twenty-first century historians who study Confederate memorial groups, I have narrowed my focus to deal specifically with women's groups. Examining how local groups transformed into national organization, my thesis uses the Maryland Division as an example of how women used commemorative actions to expand themselves politically and socially. The Maryland Division began as a local organization, based in Baltimore, before formally joining a national group and expanding themselves into an organized system of chapters. Although I mostly discuss the Maryland Division after this restructuring and joining of the national UDC, its past as a localized mourning institution is inherently connected. Historians of women's memorial groups, however, are generally divided into two sides, debating whether focus should remain on national or local groups. Southern historian Karen Cox, who wrote a comprehensive history of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, heads the first of these.[7] Cox, and those that came after her, argue that the development of national organizations moved the memorialization movements away from ideas of mass

[7] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* book and Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 3. No page number is listed for Karen Cox's book, considering *Dixie's Daughters* focused exclusively on the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

burials and mourning rituals and instead focused on a "vindication of the Confederate cause" as a whole.[8] This is the same idea that Soderberg expresses in her three stages of memorialization, but from the side of the organizations rather than of the monuments. This challenges historian Gaines Foster's earlier argument that women's organizations were unable to connect beyond their local regions; the United Daughters of the Confederacy is an example of how a women's organization restructured themselves in order to vindicate the "Lost Cause" movement on a national level.

The second camp of Confederate women's memorialization historians also pushes against the ideas of the 1980s. However, these historians argued against the idea that only national women's organizations were capable of effectively organizing and commemorating the Confederacy. Caroline Janney, and historians like her, centered their argument on the idea that the local organizations that came before the United Daughters of the Confederacy were just as important at propagating the "Lost Cause" movement as national organizations were, years before these national groups formed.[9] These historians argue that the local Ladies' Memorial Associations were "responsible for remaking military defeat into a political, social, and cultural victory for the white South."[10] Essentially, these historians are taking the same arguments made by the veteran historians of the immediate post war years and giving the credit for these successes to the Ladies' Memorial Associations.

Caroline Janney's *Burying the Dead but not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause* chronicles the formation of, rise, and subsequent demise

---

[8] Joan Marie Johnson, "Remember the Ladies: Ladies' Memorial Associations, the Lost Cause, and Southern Women's Activism, a review of *Burying the Dead"*, *Reviews in American History* 36, no. 4 (December 2008): 531.
[9] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 3.
[10] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 3.

of the Ladies' Memorial Associations that came about in the years following the fall of the Confederacy. These individually organized groups, founded well before the more nationalized organization of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, were dedicated to maintaining the memory of the Confederate dead."[11] Janney explores her topic using a series of case studies, looking at and comparing the actions of a select group of Ladies' Memorial Associations, all of which were based in Virginia.[12] Although Janney disagrees with historians, such as Civil War historian George Rable, about the work of southern white women after the war, they agree on the importance of women's actions during wartime itself. During the war, these women knew that they had an important role to play; in order to put the feelings of deep loyalty that many of these Virginian women felt towards the Confederate war effort to good use, they began to set up a series of organizations and associations to take action.[13]

Through these organizations, mostly in the form of sewing circles, women actually paid attention to what was happening within a larger political environment.[14] Some, like the sewing circles, worked to supply soldiers through local efforts, while others helped to develop larger regional supply networks.[15] Whether these local groups maintained their focus on their neighborhood soldiers or based their efforts on a regional scale, the efforts of these wartime associations "foreshadowed" the "organizational networks used by the LMAs following the war."[16] The inclusion of these early, wartime organizations is important because it provides important background knowledge of the

---

[11] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 30-33.
[12] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 8-11.
[13] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 15.
[14] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 16.
[15] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 25.
[16] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 23.

wartime actions taken by these women and how these were, according to Janney, crucial to the organization and activism of the Lost Cause movement.[17]

Following the end of the Civil War, the support that Confederate women provided to the South did not end. According to Karen Cox, Southern white women played a vital role in the formation of the New South. The women's organizations of the war reshaped themselves into postwar commemoration groups. Women's memorialization efforts can be divided into three distinct stages: the funeral stage, the reconciliation stage, and the commemorative stage.[18] As public art memorials moved away from the funeral stage of honoring the Confederate dead, the UDC focused on vindicating Confederate men and preserving white southern values in the commemorative stage.[19] Monuments of the commemorative stage are characterized by the emphasis of historical interpretation, not emotional attachment.[20]The UDC, direct descendents of the women's relief organizations of the war, used monuments as a way to validate a "truthful" history of the Confederacy.[21]

Both Janney and Cox—as well as the historians who follow in their tradition—primarily discuss the founding members and chapters of each group, before expanding into their objectives and actions across a wide scale. There is no defining work done on the role of women's memorial organizations within Maryland, a border state during the war. My research takes the arguments and ideas laid out by these two historians and apply it to a location whose role was not clearly defined within the war. Most historians focus on groups firmly situated within the Deep South, who were former and official

---

[17] Janney*, Burying the Dead*, 16.
[18] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget"*, xiv-xvi
[19] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 49.
[20] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget"*, xvi
[21] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 39.

members of the Confederacy, whereas I focus on how a state formally a part of the Union works to commemorates the Confederacy.

As the post-war period provided new opportunities for southern women to expand themselves socially and politically, groups such as local Ladies' Memorial Associations and the United Daughters of the Confederacy took responsibility for building and maintaining a specific historical memory of the Confederacy. Using physical, stone markers-such as cemeteries, monuments, and statues-to build up and expand upon the ideals of white solidarity that they believed exemplified the Confederacy as a whole, the women who formed and ran these memorialization organizations gained tremendous amounts of power within post-war Southern society. Commemorating the heroism of fallen Confederate soldiers, these statues featured symbols and iconography that helped to build and expand on the ideals of the Confederacy and white supremacy.

Susan Soderberg identifies three stages of monument building: the Funeral stage, the Reconciliationist stage, and the Commemoration stage.[22] The first of these stages argues that the monuments of the immediate post-war period memorialized the individuals who fought and died in battle. Growing from this is the Reconciliationist stage, in which women's memorialization organizations, who had taken over the Confederate commemoration process, focused their attention towards the visual and symbolic image of the statue. [23]

Soderberg's final stage of the Confederate memorial effort is the Commemoration Stage. Arguing that this stage is still in effect well into the twenty first century, she states that the commemorative stage places a heavy emphasis on history and education. No

[22] Soderberg, "*Lest We Forget,"* xiv.
[23] Soderberg, "*Lest We Forget,"* xv.

longer having the immediate emotional impact of the monuments of the Funeral and Reconciliation Stages, these monuments instead were designed to be works of public art.[24]

Confederate memorials can be placed within the confines of these three stages. Building off the idea that a Southern centered history needed to be created, the LMAs that funded and built these monuments designed them to facilitate the process of mourning and honoring of Southern heroes.[25] Usually, the leaders and members of LMAs had been directly affected by the war, dedicating monuments and statues to soldiers who died defending the Confederacy. After the initial period of interment and burials, the purpose of monuments shifted. Rather than strictly facilitating mourning, these statues fostered reconciliationist ideas between the North and South, working to unify the country instead of focusing on who died defending the Confederacy and Confederate values. When examining the Commemoration stage, emphasis is placed on historical interpretation and the women's memorial organizations that designed them used the monuments to build long-term interpretations and memories of the Confederacy. The monuments of the Commemoration Stage were created not to mourn the dead or reconcile the regions of the nation, but rather to vindicate the Confederacy and the Confederate culture.

When examining the Baltimore Confederate Monument, I am placing it directly within Soderberg's Commemoration stage. Developed as a work of public art, the goal of the monument was to engage its audiences in the vindication of Confederate culture and ideals, rather than mourning the dead or unifying the country. My research uses the

[24] Soderberg, "*Lest We Forget,"* xvi.
[25] Soderberg, "*Lest We Forget,"* xiv.

Baltimore Confederate Monument to examine how monument builders, to expand on Confederate ideals, use symbols and iconography. The public space in which the Baltimore Confederate monument was erected was neither truly Union nor Confederate. Although officially a part of the Union, there remained a significant number of Confederate supporters within the city. Although Kirk Savage also discusses the role controversy plays in the development of monuments within a public space, he specifically deals with the topic of race following the end of the war.[26] As slavery ended and the nation transformed, a reevaluation of how nationhood would be expressed within a public space took place.[27] Although the Baltimore Confederate Monument does provide insight into how politics plays a role in public space commemoration, it focuses on the tensions between Confederate sympathizers and state government, rather than individuals and the concept of race.

Both the discussion of Confederate monuments and women's organizations plays into a larger discussion on Civil War memory. The physical markers that were designed as memorials were crafted with the intent to perpetuate the same history that historians were doing in the 1870s. As historians moved later into the nineteenth century, into the 1890s, the rationales behind Civil War memorialization efforts shifted dramatically. While historians of the 1870s used Confederate memorialization as a way to shape a regional definition of what the Confederacy meant-and of mourning those who died for it-historians of the 1890s used the Confederate memory as a political warning.[28] Turn of the century politicians used the war to send a nationalistic message. David Blight studies

---

[26] Kirk Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1997), 3.
[27] Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 3.
[28] Patrick J. Kelly, "The Election of 1896 and the Restructuring of Civil War Memory," in *The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture,* edited by Alice Fahs and Joan Waugh (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 181.

how nineteenth century historians understood and interpreted the war. By the 1896 election, sectionalism was still very much an issue.[29] Historians of the 1890s wrote Civil War history to be reconciliatory in nature, helping to "facilitate the sectional reunion by World War I."[30] The Civil War and Confederate memory warned against the sectional division that was still apparent in the decades following the end of the Civil War.

Reconciliation is one of three views, or visions, of Civil War memory that historian David Blight identifies. The reconciliationist vision developed as people, in both the North and the South, worked to find ways to deal with the sheer numbers of Civil War dead.[31] Although the idea of reconciliation was a positive one attempting to unify a divided people, particularly those divided through such a violent and tragic process-a series of unseen consequences came into play.[32] Southerners and Northerners bonded over the shared loss of those who died in the war. As they attempted to find meaning in the deaths of thousands of individuals, a national collective memory of the war began to form.[33]

Many white Southerners were initially against the idea of reconciliation between the two regions and sides. When the war ended, white Southerners felt a deep sense of loss and anger, a feeling that would continue to shape their collective memory for generations.[34] As many white Southerners struggled to manage a sense of the psychological trauma of defeat that many felt, they pushed back against the early ideas of reconciliation and reconstruction. Feeling as if they were losing power and control over their lives, white Southerners pushed back against the growing power of blacks in the

[29] Kelly, "The Election of 1896", 182-3.
[30] David W. Blight as quoted in Kelly, "The Election of 1896," 181.
[31] Blight, *Race and Reunion,* 2.
[32] Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 3.
[33] Blight, *Race and Reunion,* 19.
[34] Blight, *Race and Reunion,* 39.

South in an attempted to maintain a semblance of antebellum cultural normality.[35] However, as the political climate in the post war American continued to shift, the need for reconciliation between the two regions became more and more important. Combining the ideas of a mutual shared loss with economic reasons for a complete reunification of the North and the South, a deliberate concession to exclude blacks, and other race relations, from national politics all together took place. Having appeased whites in both the North and the South, the inherently white supremacist reconciliationist view took hold in the nation.[36]

The large numbers of historians arguing the importance that women held in the memorialization process, whether by organizing locally or national, were pushing against a distinct trend in Civil War commemoration historiography. Arguing that the two most commonly used terms with discussing commemoration are memory and identity, John Gillis claims that the central meaning of any identity is sustained by their memory of a particular time and place. Rather than using their identity as "Confederates" to construct a collective memory of an event, Gillis argues that the collective memory that forms within the community helps them to identify as being "Confederate."[37] Nineteenth century monuments were designed *for* the public, not *of* them. According to Gillis, most Civil War statues focused on elite figures of abstract ideas, whether famous generals or the winged figure of Glory. This pushed the public to identify with these monuments on an ideological level.[38] Compared to other historians of nineteenth century memorialization and monuments, Gillis argues the role of women to be mostly allegorical. Abstract

---

[35] Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 110.
[36] Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 138.
[37] John R. Gillis, ed, *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Univeristy Press, 1994) 3.
[38] Gillis, *Commemorations*, 9.

women, such as the Glory figure in the Baltimore monument, are the central point of Gillis' argument, not real women joining memorial organizations.[39]

Immediately after the war, it was common for Southerners to view the end of the war not as a defeat for the Confederacy—many former Confederates argued that rather than losing it, they simply ran out of the resources necessary to continue fighting. However, despite its central goal being the complete preservation of antebellum South and Confederate values, the UDC did not try to argue that the Confederacy was not defeated. An 1899 letter between two members of the Maryland Division discusses this in detail. The letter spoke at length over the role that Marylanders had in the Lost Cause, explicitly stating that the cause was "Lost," but continues on to say it was "ever cherished."[40] This emphasizes the importance of maintaining the Confederacy culture to the Maryland Division and the UDC. The Confederacy did lose, but the UDC did not believe that was any reason to not continue educating Southerners about its history and values.

This same mentality is what served as the basis for the development of the Lost Cause movement. By the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth, a new generation had taken over and struggled to come to terms with the Confederacy's defeat during the war.[41] Despite accepting defeat, this new generation used the Lost Cause movement, and the writings and postwar activities that came with it, as a way to interpret the war in a way that did not villainize them. The UDC used their objectives, educational initiatives, and monuments like the Baltimore Confederate monument, as a way to achieve this.

---

[39] Gillis, *Commemorations*, 10.
[40] Jenkins to King, December 13, 1899, United Daughters of the Confederacy Papers, SC140.
[41] Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*4.

This thesis is divided into three separate chapters, plus a conclusion. Chapter One details the histories of both theLMAs and the UDC. This chapter argues that the women's memorial groups that emerged following the end of the war provided women with new opportunities to engage themselves socially and politically. Elite white southern women designed their memorial groups to be nonthreatening, particularly to men, and also to expand their roles within society. This can be seen by analyzing both the institutional history and the various ways in which both the LMAs and UDC worked towards Confederate memorialization and vindication. The second chapter hones in on the role of the Maryland Division of the UDC. The Maryland Division's role in commemorating and vindicating the Confederacy within Baltimore will serve as the main narrative for this chapter. Specifically, this chapter will discuss how the role that Maryland held within the Civil War affected their Confederate commemoration efforts in the decades following it. This chapter will examine how commemoration within a public space, particularly the contested space of Baltimore, affects a specific branch of the UDC.

The third, and final, chapter focuses on the Baltimore Confederate Monument— also known as the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors Monument— located on the corner of Mount Royal Avenue and Mosher Street. [42] This chapter traces the monument building process, beginning with the unanimous passing of the United Daughters of the Confederacy's Monument Ordinance and continuing to its dedication day.[43] Using elements of art history and sculptural design, special attention is paid to what the design elements of the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors monument mean symbolically. The

---

[42] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget"*, 9.
[43] "City Council-First Branch Passes the Daughters of the Confederacy's Monument Ordinance. All Opposition Withdraws-Unfavorable Report of Committee on Parks Rejected" *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, January 24, 1899.

Maryland Division used these design elements and symbols to lead their audience into interpreting the monument in a specific way, without providing explicitly stated scaffolding to assist this interpretation.

The conclusion argues that the Maryland Division specifically used symbology to tell their message, rather than written word, further. By not focusing on specific individuals or arguments, but rather common, ideological symbology, the Baltimore Confederate Monument remained free of much of the controversy that surrounds other Confederate monuments in the country. The conclusion will follow the Baltimore Confederate Monument into modern day, discussing its current standing within the city and how over time it has been forgotten and neglected not only by the city, but also by the very organization that created it.

Chapter 1: Remembering the Dead, Exulting the Past

Following the end of the Civil War, elite white southern women took up the role of public memorialization and commemoration of the Confederacy. Designed to memorialize the dead, women's memorial organizations hoped to address the Northern anxiety that any form of living commemoration would be a sign of rebellion or a willingness to renew the struggle.[44] These organizations gained tremendous power within the post-war society, quickly becoming the most important part of the Lost Cause movement and memorialization efforts. Originally organizing themselves into lesser known, locally run groups, these women refused to take the oaths of loyalty required of them in the Reconstruction South and organized the first Southern Memorial Day in 1866.[45] Predating the nationally acknowledged and influential United Daughters of the Confederacy, these locally run groups were responsible for the organization of burials for the remains of Southern soldiers. Finally, they were able to gain enough support to erect the first monuments and statues of Confederate memorialization-including plaques and statues of various important leaders.[46] This chapter will discuss a brief history of the Ladies' Memorial Associations and the United Daughters of the Confederacy, focusing on the institutional and memorialization history of these two commemoration groups.

The post-war period provided new opportunities for elite white southern woman to expand their participation in both the political and social spheres. Women's clubs and organizations focused on Confederate memory began to spread across the South, taking

---

[44] Janney, *Burying the Dead,* 27 and E. Merton Coulter, *The South During Reconstruction, 1865-1877*, in vol. 8 of *A History of the South*, edited by Wendell Holmes Stephenson and E. Merton Coulter (Louisiana State University Press and the Littlefield Fun for Southern History, The University of Texas, 1947), 115 and 177-178.
[45]Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 27 and Coulter, *The South During Reconstruction*, 178.
[46] Coulter, *The South During Reconstruction*, 179.

on the responsibility of building and vindicating Confederate memory. These women played a vital role in the shaping the cultural and political landscape of the New South. National organizations such as the UDC took it upon themselves to not only memorialize and pay homage to Confederate dead, but also to transform their loss into a victory.[47] Advocating for continued existence of white supremacy and the sanctity of state's rights, the UDC's goals became more focused on the vindication of Confederate culture, not just memorialization of the war.[48] Confederate culture, as defined by historian Karen Cox, is "those ideas and symbols that the Lost Cause devotees associated with the former Confederacy."[49] Specifically, the Lost Cause refers to the perpetuation of white antebellum values, or the preservation of the pre-Civil War way of life, based on the systemization of white supremacy, class, and an honor culture, which dictated interactions and relationships amongst whites.

The vindication of Confederate men and preservation of the white Southern values associated with the Lost Cause began with the local Ladies' Memorial Associations (LMAs) that formed immediately following the end of the Civil War. These locally organized groups, founded well before the more nationalized organization of the UDC, were dedicated to "perpetuating the memory of the dead."[50] The LMAs were the first to step into more politically active positions within their local communities, simultaneously rejecting more traditional domestic roles that they were expected to fall into when the war ended.[51] One of the biggest roles that LMAs took on was the

---

[47] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 1.
[48] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 1.
[49] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 1.
[50] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 1.
[51] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 5-6.

responsibility for the reburial and memorialization of Confederate soldiers whose bodies had been left in the battlefields once the war was over.

Local LMAs began by building on the antebellum tradition of women-led benevolent societies.[52] Having first transformed their charity and reform groups into wartime aid societies, white Southern women participated in a variety of benevolent activities, including joining sewing circles, volunteering for hospitals, and organizing donation drives to collect supplies for Confederate troops.[53] Not only was their participation in these wartime aid societies considered patriotic, but also feminine. By participating in activities traditionally considered to be, female oriented, white Southern women reinforced their identity as a Confederate mother, sister, and/or wife.[54]

However, as the war continued well beyond the expectations of both the Union and the Confederacy, these patriotic societies evolved and developed new roles. The sheer magnitude of the war was brought on by a several factors, including the scale of the conflict, new military technologies, and a new ability to resupply and deploy armies faster and more efficiently than ever before.[55] These factors all combined to result in a death toll that far outweighed anything the United States had faced in such a short period. As the death toll rose, Confederate women extended their wartime efforts into the development and management of soldier's graves; wartime women's organizations acted as intermediates between the impersonal and institutionalized burials of soldiers and traditional Victorian mourning rituals.[56]

---

[52] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 15.
[53] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 15.
[54] Anne Sarah Rubin, *A Shattered Nation: The Rise and Fall of the Confederacy, 1861-1868* (Chapel Hill, North Caroline: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 56.
[55] Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York, New York: Vintage Civil War Books, 2008), 3-4.
[56] Rubin, *A Shattered Nation,* 56 and Janney, *Burying the Dead,* 32-33.

After the war ended, these patriotic societies continued, focusing themselves almost exclusively on the mourning and memorialization of Confederate dead. LMAs formally began in 1865, initially forming in Virginia before quickly spreading to other Southern states. Taking the task not only of burying fallen Confederate soldiers, they also became responsible for memorializing them. The first LMA formed in response to a public invitation by Colonel Thomas A. Ellis for citizens to assist with the Hollywood Cemetery Corporation and Fund in Virginia. The women who responded, many of whom had been members of the wartime Soldier's Aid Society, organized themselves into the first official LMA.[57] Not only carefully designed to facilitate remembering the dead, monuments and cemeteries also allowed audiences why soldiers died.[58] These ceremonies were done through highly organized and ritualized Memorial Days and Decoration Days, taken from black memorial traditions that appeared in South Carolina in 1865.[59]

The memorial organizations that were lead by women gained a significant amount of power within the post-war Southern society. Many women involved in these groups refused to take the oaths of loyalty that were required of them during Reconstruction, allowing them to transform into the most important aspect of the Lost Cause movement.[60] Their gender, considering that women were not typically involved within the political world during this time, allowed them to not only get away with not taking the oath, but to also take on other memorial actions that men were not allowed to do[61]. These efforts included the burial and public mourning rituals, such as the first Memorial Day in 1866,

[57] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 48
[58] Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 65.
[59] Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 71.
[60] Janney, *Burying*, 27
[61] This concept is discussed in both Rubin's *A Shattered Nation* (2005) on pages 94-100 and Janney's *Burying the Dead* (2008) on pages 27-28.

for soldiers and moved on to the UDC's commemoration monuments.[62] Southern women played important roles in the development of the Lost Cause mentality and continued vindication of Confederate culture.

The Southern women's organizations that formed at the end of the Civil War shunned the reconciliation attempts by the federal government, only accepting them when certain concessions were made in order to continue facilitating ideas of white supremacy and Confederate values. [63] In refusing to take the oaths of loyalty that were required of them, Confederate women chose to continue to foster feelings of Confederate nationalism within the Southern population. According to the *Southern Opinion*, an anti-Reconstruction newspaper, the women involved with memorialization organizations such as the UDC were the only people that were keeping Confederate values and beliefs alive.[64]

LMAs became active participants in their local political realm well into the 1880s.[65] According to historian Caroline Janney, Union officials overwhelmingly agreed that Confederate, or "non loyal," soldiers should be given honorable burials.[66] Ex-Confederates, naturally, "deeply resented the decision" to leave their dead unburied, prompting many women to take action in the burials and commemorations of these soldiers.[67] As a result, the men in charge of reburial programs recognizing that having women from the LMAs take control over these controversial actions would be significantly less threatening to the federal government.[68]

---

[62] Coulter, *The South During Reconstruction*, 178.
[63] Janney, *Burying*, 27
[64] Janney, *Burying*, 2
[65] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 2.
[66] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 45-46.
[67] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 46.
[68] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 48.

Only then did women's Confederate organizations begin the shift from local groups to a national phenomenon. This shift was a direct response to the desire of LMAs to take on larger and more complex projects. As projects grew is scope and scale, a higher level of organization was needed in order insure success.[69] Although this shift would eventually take place throughout the South, it began with three small groups in Missouri, Tennessee, and Georgia.[70] The actions of these of these few groups would jumpstart the rapid and widespread expansion of pro-Confederate activities amongst Southern women by 1894.

In 1890, one of the local Confederate women's organizations in Missouri took up the task of converting an old farm into a home for disabled Confederate veterans.[71] When it became apparent that the work needed to get the institution into full working order was much higher than previously anticipated, the group reached out to the interests of the white Southern women of Missouri. This new association took on the name Daughters of the Confederacy, representing a statewide Southern women's organization oriented towards the protection and honoring of Confederate veterans.[72] This new title is in reference to the lauding of Varina Anne "Winnie" Davis, Jefferson Davis' daughter, as "The Daughter of the Confederacy." Southern women deeply identified with this moniker, eventually adopting it as their own with the formation of Missouri's Confederate women's group.[73]

At the same time that Missouri LMAs reorganized themselves into a statewide group, Tennessee women began a similar process. As various individual groups joined

---

[69] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 2.
[70] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 2.
[71] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 2.
[72] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 2.
[73] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 2.

together to build a Confederate Soldiers' Home in Davidson County, Tennessee, the state chartered a statewide women's organization known as the Auxiliary Association of the Confederate Soldiers' Home. While this organization eventually became known as the Ladies' Auxiliary Association, as women broke off from the main group to form their own, they still maintained many of the original duties and objectives.[74]

These two groups acted as the standard by which statewide women's Confederate groups formed across the country. Beginning with Georgia, other states looked to Missouri and Tennessee, using them as a model for their own growing objectives and goals. Soon, all women's Confederate organizations took the moniker of the Daughters of the Confederacy. These groups, however, were still very locally based and lacked the national cohesion that the UDC would eventually have. Within four years, talk began of developing a national organization that united Confederate women under the same central objectives. This sentiment is expressed in the 1894 letter that Mrs. Lucian Hamilton Raines of Savannah, Georgia wrote to the president of the Nashville Daughters of the Confederacy. This letter expressed a growing desire by both her and other women that "[Confederate women] should have one name and one badge, all over the South."[75]

Karen Cox argues that an emotional aspect was involved in the decision to join the UDC. To become one of the "ladies," women had to make a commitment to the organization and agree that their involvement would be more than a hobby for them.[76] For most members, this would not be a problem. Southern women who felt strongly connected to the Confederacy during the war carried this loyalty into the post-war years, influencing their dedication to memorial organizations. By joining the UDC, white

---

[74] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 4 and 5.
[75] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 8.
[76] Cox, *Dixie's Daughter*, 32.

Southern women pledged themselves to a form of sisterhood with their other members, focused on the preservation of Confederate culture.

This prompted a flurry of active between Savannah and Nashville as both groups worked to arrange a meeting of all Southern women interested in memorializing the Confederacy. This included the drafting of a Constitution and set of By Laws, a draft that was loosely based on that of the United Confederate Veterans. The first constitution listed five central objectives and purposes: social, literary, historical, monumental, and benevolent.[77] In addition to these five objectives, a series of three mandates were developed. The first of these mandates encouraged the unification of "all bodies of Southern women" into a long lasting federation.[78] This unification would be used to "cultivate ties of friendship" among all of the women who could boast having familial ties to the Confederacy, and to "perpetuate [the] honor, integrity, valor and other noble attributes to true Southern character" that was expected of "true" Confederate Southerners.[79] The final mandate had the most long reaching goals: to "instruct and instill into the descendents of the people of the South a proper respect for and pride in the glorious war history."[80] This would be achieved by properly following the five objectives laid out by the Constitution.

As the UDC gained influence and grew across the country, forming chapters even outside of the South, changes were made to the objectives listed in Article II of the Constitution. The five central objectives would eventually become memorialization,

---

[77] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 10. (Quoting Article II of the Constitution)
[78] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 10. (Quoting Article II of the Constitution)
[79] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 10 and 11. (Quoting Article II of the Constitution)
[80] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 11. (Quoting Article II of the Constitution)

benevolence, history, education, and social by 1895.[81] Although these objectives would gain different titles in later generations—by 2015, their websites lists: historical, educational, benevolent, memorial, and patriotic—their purpose remains the same.[82] The objectives are designed to facilitate the vindication of the Confederate generation.

The unification of the various Ladies' Memorial Associations located across the country is reflective of a general trend that can be seen in Confederate memorialization efforts-whether done by women or men. While the efforts to build a Confederate memory in the 1870s used memorialization to shape regional definitions of what the Confederacy meant—and to mourn those who had died for this reason—by the 1890s, Confederate memory was used as a political warning.[83] Fearing that sectionalism may become an issue again, politicians used the 1896 election as a way to perpetuate a nationalistic message.[84] Historians of the 1890s wrote Civil War history to be reconciliatory in nature, helping to "facilitate the sectional reunion by World War I."[85] The Civil War and Confederate memory warned against the sectional division that was still apparent in the decades following the end of the Civil War. As local LMAs joined into a national organization, they began to push back against these Reconciliationist histories, rather working to build long-term interpretations and memories of the Confederacy. The UDC was not founded or designed not to mourn the dead or reconcile the regions of the nation, but rather to justify the Confederacy and its culture.

---

[81] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 26.
[82] "Objectives of the UDC," *United Daughters of the Confederacy*, http://www.hqudc.org/objects/ (accessed March 21, 2015).
[83] Kelly, "The Election of 1896", 181.
[84] Kelly, "The Election of 1896", 182-3.
[85] David W. Blight as quoted in Kelly, "The Election of 1896," 181.

By the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the UDC, although largely an urban phenomena, was active at all levels—local, regional, and national.[86] This tiered organizational structure can be clearly seen through the development of the Maryland Division. At the top of the tier is the General Organization, or the name given to the national board. Each of the regional divisions was expected to hold themselves responsible to the standards and expectations set by the General Organization. The phrase "the Maryland Division" references the one of these many regional and state level groups. Each division was comprised of multiple local chapters. The first two chapters to form within the Maryland Division were the Baltimore Chapter and the Harford Chapter.[87] Each level had its own executive board and president, which responded directly to the executive board of the level above them.

This tiered organizational structure allowed the UDC women to view themselves as a "sisterhood of earnest, womanly women, striving to fulfill the teaching of God's word in honoring our fathers."[88] They become a close-knit network of women, each striving for the vindication of a Confederate culture and the honoring of their "fathers"-referencing those family members whose lineage they trace themselves back to. The formation of the UDC as a national organization demonstrates how white southern women began to view themselves as the "natural leaders of a tradition whose focus was on vindicating the Confederate generation."[89] By the time the Maryland Division began to fully organize, many of its members were born after 1850. This means that the Civil

---

[86] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 29.
[87] Minutes of the Thirtieth Annual Convention, 1927, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F6, Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, MD.
[88] "Daughters of the Confederacy", *The Confederate Veteran* 5(January 1897), Digitized by Duke University Libraries on the Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/confederateveter5conf (accessed Jan 31, 2015).
[89] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 20 and 21.

War memories of these women were almost entirely based on those of their parents, which was reflected in their goals and objectives.

The awarding of scholarships to those individuals who could provide proof of lineal ancestry to a Confederate soldier is a major way in which the Maryland Division, and the UDC as a whole, contributed to their educational movement. In order to be considered for a UDC Scholarship, not only was proof of a direct family connection to a Confederate soldier or veteran required, but also in many cases, applicants were asked to write essays regarding important aspects of Confederate leaders and history. All of these scholarships were funded through the "noble" efforts of local Chapters and State Divisions.[90] These scholarships, covering anything from costs of tuition to living expenses, were not limited to Southern universities, colleges, and institutions. Rather, scholarships were available in any state in which a UDC Division existed. Divisions worked together in order to properly fund each of the hundreds of scholarships offered over nineteen-year period. In Maryland, a partial scholarship was offered to a student at St. John's University in Annapolis.[91]

Scholarships could, however, also be a point of debate and tension between Divisions and the General Organization. Education, which for many students was supplied with financial assistance and scholarships, was considered an important part of the memorialization process to the UDC.[92] In order to be considered a proper education, Southern children had to be taught on a pro-Confederate standard. When the 1908 winner of the United Daughters of the Confederacy Prize Essay went to a young individual whom the General Organization did not accurately represent Southern history, the board

[90] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 99.
[91] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 119.
[92] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 95.

wrote to the Maryland Division urging them to "use their influence" to take the prize away.[93] Seeing as the essay had already been published in the December issue of the *Confederate Veteran*, clearly it had already been approved by a Division, despite its "contortion of Southern History."[94]

With an increased concern over education came a focus on the importance of history. A major element of the educational reforms planned by the UDC directly related to the desire for an "authentic" history of the "War between the States."[95] Believing that current textbooks used in Southern schools were "improper, unfair, and sectional histories," the UDC and its various Divisions worked to create a "proper history" that could be taught to Southern children.[96] One of the biggest complaints that the UDC had over children's education was the way Southern history had been interpreted, which is demonstrated in the 1908 United Daughters of the Confederacy Essay Prize controversy. As with educational concerns, the UDC's concerns over a "biased" history of the South began to gain national attention during the National Conference in Baltimore, in 1897. As various committee members presented reports of so-called unfair history being presented at public school across the South, it was determined that the group needed to take immediate action in order to preserve a "fair" history.[97]

The vindication of Confederate history and culture, although never explicitly stated within the organization's constitution, remained the main long-term goal of the UDC. The organization believed that the formation and standardization of a central

---

[93] Mrs. J. Ende. Robinson to Mrs. Mary Hall, February 15, 1909, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F12, Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, MD.
[94] Mrs. J. Ende. Robinson to Mrs. Mary Hall, February 15, 1909, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F12.
[95] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 94.
[96] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 135.
[97] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 135.

history would help them to achieve this goal. In order to connect Confederate culture to history, the General Organization determined that the first step would be to shift away from the strictly military history that had been commonplace.[98] By paying close attention to the political and social aspects of the Confederate war effort and home front, women organizers of the history committees felt they could reach a wider, and younger, audience. In 1933, the UDC compiled an official record of their history. In this, they paid close attention to their roles in history. They identify history as a woman who holds a mirror in one hand and a pen in the other. As she observes the events taking place behind her, in the past, she records them down for future generations. The women of the UDC considered themselves to this figure personified.[99]

UDC members were disappointed in the Northern-focused histories that were available, and thus decided that it was their duty to "collect and preserve [the] true history."[100] In a direct tie between education and history, the UDC and its various Divisions took it upon themselves to write a series of textbooks to be used in the public school classroom that would encourage the "true" and "accurate" history of the Civil War-or a pro-Confederate history.

UDC members' insistence and dedication to the development of an "accurate" history—or at least a history that they perceived to be accurate—forms the basis of their argument that they are not women of a "New South."[101] In her 1912 address to the UDC, Mildred Lewis Rutherford—the Historian-General of the organization—claimed, "there

---

[98] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters*, 139.
[99] Poppenheim, et al., *History of the United Daughters*, 141.
[100] Poppenheim, et al., *History of the United Daughters*, 141.
[101] Fred Arthur Bailey, "Mildred Lewis Rutherford and the Patrician Cult of the Old South," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 74, no. 3 (Fall 1994), 509 and Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 2-5. In *Burying the Dead*, Janney pushed against a common historiography that states that women immediately returned to their antebellum gender roles, but rather formed politically and socially active groups in a "New South." Bailey, by quoting Rutherford, claims that the UDC did not subscribe to the idea of a "New South."

is no new South…The South of today is the South of yesterday remade to fit the new order of things."[102] Rutherford continued, making bold statements that argued in favor of rewriting the war's history in favor of the Confederacy. By rewriting history in their own favor, the UDC—and other ex-Confederates—advocated that although they may have formally lost the battle, the Confederacy was still victorious.

As the UDC gained national importance, they inherited several of the projects that had been the responsibility of their LMA predecessors. One of these was the Museum of the Confederacy, located in Richmond, Virginia. When the city of Richmond announced plans to demolish the Confederate White House in 1889, the local LMA, the Ladies' Hollywood Memorial Association (LHMA), immediately took action.[103] Winning the petition for the building's title, the LHMA began the transformation of the building into a museum. As Virginian LMAs joined the UDC, the responsibility for the maintenance of the museum fell to the national organization. Each Division was given responsibility over a room within the museum, designed to allow each state to display their own role within the Confederate war effort. A committee was to be appointed from each Division, tasked with protecting the interests of the museum. The biggest expectation was that not only would each Division maintain an active role in the development of the museum, but would also represent their state in an honorable and accurate way.

Although the steps taken to assist students with educational concerns and in the development and maintaining of a standard "accurate" history could be considered a part of the benevolence objective-members of the UDC believed that it was a part of their

---

[102] Mildred Rutherford, *Address* [before the United Daughters of the Confederacy Convention, Washington, D.C.] (no place, no publisher 1912), 19, as quoted in Bailey, "Mildred Lewis Rutherford," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly*, 509.

[103] "The Extended History" *The Museum of the Confederacy,* http://www.moc.org/about-us/extended-history (accessed February 1, 2015).

civic duty as Confederate women to assist younger generations in any way that they could, so long as it would raise them to be proud Confederates. There were, however, many other ways in which the UDC committed benevolent acts.

Amy Heyse, a historian writing in 2010, argues that women proactively placed themselves at the center of the movement, using traditional ideals of Southern womanhood to their advantage.[104] Both local Ladies' Memorial Associations and the UDC self-consciously presented themselves as mothers of the Confederacy, using the ideals of republican motherhood, true womanhood, and the Southern late to give themselves agency within commemorative culture. Rather than using the memorialization and monument movement to become more politically engaged, Heyse argues that commemoration efforts reinforced traditional Southern women's roles. This contrasts the view that while women became chief advocators for the control of Confederate history and memory, this involvement forced them to step outside of traditional gender roles.

When discussing the UDC, the issue of race does not come up as often as one might expect when dealing with an organization that ultimately bases their objectives around the vindication of a white supremacist Confederate culture. Confederate memorialization groups, male and female, largely ignored Southern blacks in their narratives, unless focusing on the idea of the "faithful black servant."[105] The UDC was responsible for the development of the "Faithful Slave" memorial just over the Maryland line, in Harper's Ferry, West Virginia.[106] By controlling the ways that slaves could be interpreted, whether through specific histories, publications, and monuments, the UDC

---

[104] Amy Heyse, "Women's Rhetorical Authority and Collective Memory: The United Daughters of the Confederacy Remember the South," *Women and Language* 33, issue 2 (Fall 2010), 31-32.
[105] Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 140.
[106] Interestingly, despite being geographically close to the Faithful Slave Monument, the Maryland Division files in both the Maryland State Archives and the Maryland Historical Society do not discuss the inception of this particular monument.

and other Confederate memorial groups worked to maintain the same racial divisions as existed before the Civil War.

This does not mean, however, that black memorialization groups did not exist. Interestingly, both black and white Southern women's organizations were advocates for using carefully collected and developed histories to facilitate the creation of a national past.[107] Here, the term "national past" is not synonymous with "country," but rather refers to any form of collective identification made by a group of people. While black women of the 1950s built their version of a national past around the idea of a unified black race, the elite white women who made up the UDC built their collective identity around the memory of the Confederacy.

Memorialization efforts, especially those organized and funded by women's groups, took many forms. Each goal plays an important role in the vindication of the Confederate culture. This vindication became the ultimate goal of women's memorialization organizations throughout the later portion of the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth. Even the local Ladies' Memorial Associations of the immediate post war years sought to validate the Confederacy by honoring its dead. A major goal of the Confederate memorialization process is education. The UDC developed educational and historical curriculum, which encouraged a pro Southern history of the Civil War, a process that was fully supported throughout the Reconciliationist period. Supplementing the curriculum as an outside source, monuments were carefully designed to reflect the social, political, and racial identities of its community. Though the Maryland Division, and the UDC as a whole, carefully divided each of their actions and efforts into firm

---

[107] Francesca Morgan, *Women and Patriotism in Jim Crow America* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 2.

categories of objectives, it is clear that these objectives are not as separated as the UDC Constitution lists them.

The later decades of the nineteenth century provided new opportunities for southern white women to play a larger role socially and politically, and these groups began to organize on a larger, national scale. By taking on the responsibility for building and maintaining a specific historical memory of the Confederacy, women's groups moved from simply remembering and mourning the dead, to the complete exoneration of the Confederacy and Confederate culture. By using specific, concrete markers-such as cemeteries, monuments, and statues to build up and expand upon the ideals of white solidarity that they believed exemplified the Confederacy as a whole, these women were able to gain a significant amount of power within the post-war society.

The phrase "Lost Cause Motherhood" has been coined, most notably by Karen Cox, to describe the ways in which Southern women participated within the political culture of the post-war South.[108] Although it would not be the only way, many Southern women participated in the Lost Cause movement through their membership in the UDC. The UDC used its five objectives of history, education, benevolence, memorials, and patriotism to advocate for the Lost Cause movement. By advocating for a "true" Southern interpretation to history, memorializing Confederate dead, and commemorating the Confederate culture, UDC members completely immersed themselves in the Lost Cause.

As membership grew, the topic of race and black participation within the UDC constantly remained in question. According to the official membership guidelines of the

---

[108] Glenn Robins, "Lost Cause Motherhood: Southern Women Writers," *Louisiana History: Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 44 no. 3 (Summer 2003), 276. In this article, Robins cites Cox as the historian to originate the phrase "Lost Cause Motherhood." Robins cites Karen Cox's "Women, the Lost Cause, and the New South: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Transmission of Confederate Culture, 1894-1919" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1997), Chapter VII.

UDC, in order to be eligible and individual must be a female of at least 16 years of age. In addition, they must be able to trace, through the bloodline of a biological parent, a direct connection to any man or woman who "served honorably in the Army, Navy, or Civil Service of the Confederate States of America, or who gave Material Aid to the Cause….also eligible are those women who are lineal or collateral blood descendents of members of former members of the UDC."[109]

Although these guidelines lay out a very strict membership application guideline, nothing is formally stated that prevents blacks from joining the organization. However, by the time of the sesquicentennial celebration of the Civil War began in 2011, only two black women in history had been admitted membership into the UDC.[110] Overwhelmingly, UDC membership was comprised of the white elite, largely because the membership dues and fees that were required for all members to pay yearly were higher than middle and lower class whites could afford. The high cost of membership dues, combined with a variety of other reasons factor into the exclusion of black women from the UDC. The first of these is the obvious elements of white supremacy and racism present within the organization. As previously discussed, the vindication of traditional Southern values and Confederate culture is a key part of the UDC's objectives and goals; the systemization of white supremacy is inherently a part of these cultural values.

Preservation organizations ultimately worked towards the protection of regional and local traditions. For the UDC, these traditions were steeped in the mythology of the

---

[109] "Membership Eligibility," *United Daughters of the Confederacy*, http://www.hqudc.org/membership/ (accessed February 20, 2015).
[110] Jessica Jones, "After Years of Research, Confederate Daughter Arises" *NPR*, August 7, 2011, http://www.npr.org/2011/08/07/138587202/after-years-of-research-confederate-daughter-arises (accessed February 21, 2015).

Lost Cause.[111] Female preservationists used their work to participate in a national discussion to "redefine national unity as a privilege of whiteness".[112] As the end of the war brought about significant social change, most notably in the treatment of blacks within national politics, women's memorial and preservation groups worked to preserve the Old South and keep the status quo of which many were accustomed.[113] As African Americans began to commemorate the war in their own ways, many white organizations feared an increasing amount of radical, uncontrollable social change taking place within the country.[114] This lead to groups like the UDC simultaneously ignoring the presence of African Americans within their own history—and excluding black women from their organization—and the careful rewriting of history to place blacks at the center of a pro-Confederate narrative.

An example of this is the debate within popular culture about the presence of black soldiers within the Confederacy.[115] Despite the UDC and other Confederate organizations preventing African Americans from joining their organization until well

---

[111] Denise D. Meringolo, *Museums, Monuments, and National Parks: Toward a New Genealogy of Public History,* (Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012), 30.
[112] Meringolo, *Museums, Monuments, and National Parks*, 30, referencing W. Fitzhugh Brundage, ed., *Where These Memories Grow: History, Memory, and Southern Identity* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), esp. 79-218.
[113] James M. Lindgren, "'For the Sake of Our Future': The Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities and the Regeneration of Traditionalism," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 97, no. 1 (1989): 47-74, 53. Although here I am specifically referring to the UDC, this phenomenon is not exclusive to this organization. Many women's preservation and volunteer organizations identified the maintenance of national unity of the basis of whiteness and exclusion of blacks as a key element of their organizational goals, including the Mount Vernon Ladies and the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities.
[114] Meringolo, *Museums, Monuments, and National Parks*, 31.
[115] When referring to "popular culture" here, I am referring to those outside of academia who make arguments either for or against the presence of black Confederates historically. In 2010, historian Bruce Levine posted an editorial in the Washington Post discussing the "myth of the black confederates." In this, he discusses how popular it is within popular culture to believe that black Confederates existed during the Civil War, despite not having sufficient historical evidence to support this. The myth of the black Confederate is also referred to in Glen Brasher's *The Peninsula Campaign and the Necessity of Emancipation* (2012) on pages 5 and 89.

into the twenty-first century, a large number of amateur, Lost Cause oriented historians continue to argue for the existence of black Confederates.

When examining Confederate sources for evidence of black Confederates, many amateur historians and popular media organizations either misread or do not notice qualifying nuances within the language. This allows them for support the argument that black Confederates voluntarily joined the army voluntarily.[116] This argument, which is largely supported by the academic community, is questioned by those who cannot rationalize how the Confederacy, famous for its institutionalization of slavery and racism, would allow blacks to become armed soldiers. However, according to historian Kevin Levin, the belief in what he calls the "Black Confederate myth," is not limited to just amateurs or popular media. Rather, he argues, there is a small contingency either of trained academics who continue to argue in favor of black Confederate's existence, misinterpreting primary source documents like those that Brasher argues or by adopting a loose definition of what "soldier" entails.[117]

These debates demonstrate how complicated of a role race played with women's preservation groups. On one side, the UDC supported the institutionalization of white supremacy within their own organization by denying black women membership. On the opposite side, however, a key argument of the UDC was that the war was not about

---

[116] Glenn David Brasher, *The Peninsula Campaign and the Necessity of Emancipation: African Americans and the Fight for Freedom* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina, 2012), 5.
[117] Kevin Levin, "Black Confederates Out of the Attic and Into the Mainstream," *The Journal of Civil War Era* 4, no. 4 (December 2014): 627-628. In addition, Levin runs a Civil War memory blog that discusses the current debate over the existence of black Confederates several times over a multiple year period. The blog itself, called "Civil War Memory," does this primarily through the reviewing and critiquing of other historical works arguing in favor of the existence of black Confederates. Various blog posts discuss black Confederates mention these historians, before working to discredit their argument by providing counter facts and discussing flaws within their own argument. He also references his own article, "Black Confederates Out of the Attic and Into the Mainstream" (2014). This blog can be found at http://cwmemory.com/.

slavery, supported by the supposed presence of African Americans who voluntarily fought for the Confederacy. However, ultimately, the UDC's goal of maintaining antebellum and Confederate values, particularly those based on race, would influence the decision to exclude black women from their organization.

The lack of black women within well-known Southern women's memorial organizations, like the UDC, leads to the belief that many black women were not involved in these types of groups at all. This argument, however, does not take into account women's clubs from the 1950s. Whereas most historians focus on the roles these women's clubs held in the Progressive Movement, Joan Marie Johnson examines how they developed and perpetuated an honorable Southern tradition.[118]Johnson uses South Carolina as a case study that women were essential to the promotion of a distinct Southern identity. Women became chief advocators for the control of Confederate history and memory, stepping outside of traditional gender roles. Comparing both black and white clubwomen, Johnson argues that by advocating for a uniform interpretation of Confederacy history, women's clubs developed a tool to maintain economic, political, and social domination over African Americans once the war is over.[119]

Whereas Johnson argues that white women used memorialization techniques as a way to maintain dominance over emancipated blacks, Francesca Morgan identifies both white and black women as important leaders in the development of a collective Southern memory. Morgan states that Southern women, of both races, of the late nineteenth century advocated for a national past.[120] The collective memory of a "nation," Morgan

---

[118] Joan Marie Johnson, *Southern Ladies, New Women: Race, Region, and Clubwomen in South Carolina, 1890-1930 (*Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida, 2004), 2.
[119] Johnson, *Southern Ladies*, 3.
[120] Morgan, *Women and Patriotism,* 2.

notes, does not necessarily mean "country," but rather can refer to any form of collective identification made by a group of people. Where white women built a collective identity around the memory of the Confederacy, black women built theirs around the idea of a unified black race.[121]

How a collective memory of a "nation" is formed is largely based on the political interactions between various institutions at different levels. Although both black and white women would use their club organizations as ways to propagate their "collective" Civil War memory and national identity, the political climate of the nation would determine which of these memories and identities would be viewed.[122] In the 1950s and 1960s, black women began to form their own memorialization organizations, comparable to groups like the UDC. These organizations pushed back against the Reconciliationist vision of history, advocating instead for an Emancipationist vision, which would not push the issue of race into the background of national politics and Civil War memory.[123] However, since the dominant political climate controls the public memory of the Civil War, these black women's groups were not able to gain enough influence to sway this historical memory. As a result, dominate groups like the UDC and their memorialization efforts and monuments would gain control over Civil War and Confederate public memory.

Although politics affected which Civil War memory would become dominant in the post-Civil War climate, women were largely expected to stay out of the political realm. However, despite the fact that "both political and military matters were the

---

[121] Francesca, *Women and Patriotism*, 1-2.
[122] Paul A. Shackel, *Memory in Black and White: Race, Commemoration, and the Post-Bellum Landscape* (New York, New York: Altamira Press, 2003), 21.
[123] Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 138.

provinces of men," Maryland women were encouraged to step beyond the bounds of the so-called "cult of womanhood" and take more active political roles, especially as the war continued and they became the dominate portion of the population.[124] Participation in the LMAs and the UDC became a socially acceptable form of female political activism and engagement, breaking out of pre-war gender norms. Although many still had qualms about taking public action, political action became a form of empowerment and helped Confederate sympathizing women in Maryland to develop a powerful sense of self worth. UDC members no longer viewed themselves as passive members of society, but rather as political activists who could take on new expectations for themselves and new forms of resistance, while simultaneously maintain traditional feminine expectations.[125] In many ways, women used the belief that they were innocent and naïve to their advantage, shaping their roles as traditional maternal figures into ways that they could effectively aid the Confederate war effort.[126]

---

[124] Floyd, *Maryland Women*, 68-69.
[125] Rable, "Missing in Action," in *Divided Houses: Gender and the Civil War,* eds. Catherine Clinton and Nina Silber, 137.
[126] Claudia Floyd, *Maryland Women in the Civil War: Unionists, Rebels, Slaves, and Spies* (Charleston, South Carolina: The History Press, 2013), 70-71.

Chapter 2: Honoring and Commemorating Maryland's Heroes

On December 13, 1899, Mrs. Kennedy Jenkins wrote a letter to Miss King regarding adding names to a list of Marylanders who fought for the Confederacy in the Civil War. In this letter, Jenkins refers to the Marylanders who "risked life and all they held dear for the Lost Cause, Lost but ever cherished."[127] Jenkins mentions that King has been collecting various names of individuals from Maryland who fought for the Confederacy, as well as their personal histories. She, through the words of others, identifies King as the "representative of [69] who left home to join the Cause."[128] This single letter between two members of the Maryland Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) demonstrates how Confederate memorial organizations were willing to work with one another in order to achieve their vindication goals for the Confederacy.

The Maryland Division, however, did not emerge fully formed as the country moved into the twentieth century. Rather, the locally based memorial associations in Maryland that formed immediately following the war served as the basis for a more formal group that organized a generation later. These local groups, collectively known as the Daughters of the Confederacy, used their activism as a way to express feelings of loyalty that many Marylanders had towards the wartime Confederacy.

When the Civil War began, Maryland had largely moved away from the plantation system of agriculture that was so popular in the Deep South. Although the Chesapeake region as a whole would become deeply involved in the domestic slave trade,

---

[127] Mrs. Kennedy Jenkins to Miss King, December 13, 1899, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F1, Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, MD.
[128] Jenkins to King, December 13, 1899, United Daughters of the Confederacy Papers, SC140.

Maryland became increasingly less economically dependent on slavery.[129] However, slavery remained an important part of Marylander's social reality; secessionists in the state hated the idea of giving up their property to the "lying, stealing, treacherous Yankees."[130] As slavery was threatened, elite white Maryland women became concerned that their existing social structure was unraveling. These secessionist women hated the idea of giving up their property (slaves) to the "lying, stealing, treacherous Yankees."[131] It was never a question that secessionist women would get involved, rather it was a question of how. Unable to ignore the war taking place around them and unwilling to stand by and passively allow their core social institutions, female southern sympathizers in Maryland took a variety of actions to support the Confederate war effort.

As a border state, Maryland remained divided throughout war. The state occupied an unusual wartime position, at least compared to those states located firmly on either side of the geographical dividing line. As Southern states began to secede from the Union, the federal government began to move troops from Pennsylvania on April 19, 1861.[132] As these troops moved through Baltimore, a large group of Confederate sympathizing individuals confronted them; fearing what the federal government and troops planned to do in Maryland and the rest of the South, these individuals engaged the troops in conflict.[133] The result was the Pratt Street Riots. The federal government quickly acted against the strong Confederate presence within Baltimore by suspending

---

[129] Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998), 264.
[130] Floyd, *Maryland Women* 45.
[131] Floyd, *Maryland Women*, 45.
[132] Harry A. Ezratty, *Baltimore in the Civil War: The Pratt Street Riot and A City Occupied* (Charleston, South Carolina: The History Press, 2010), 27.
[133] Daniel Carroll Toomey, *The Civil War in Maryland* (Baltimore, Maryland: Toomey Press, 1983), 11.

the writ of *habeas corpus* and enacting a full federal occupation of Maryland by the Union army.[134]

On August 23, 1862, the Baltimore *Sun* listed the names of seven individuals arrested for treasonous activity against the Union. These seven people refused to take the oath of loyalty to the Union government and consequently "confined to the in the debtors apartment of the county jail."[135] Although they eventually did take this oath, paid their "required bond," and were discharged, the original action demonstrates their refusal to align themselves with the Union.[136] The article itself is titled "Female Secessionists" and although it was tucked away in a small section of the paper amongst other war news, it shows one of the ways that Southern sympathizing women in Maryland would proclaim their loyalty away from the Union and towards the Confederacy.

In Maryland, Confederate activists took on many of the same activities that women within the Confederacy itself did. The contributions of women to the Southern war effort have become deeply entrenched in the ideas of Confederate nationalism. Southern literature is rich with accounts of women's heroic actions, creating an entire "genre of women's war stories".[137] The modern nature of the Civil War led to the founding of a strong home front in the South, which resulted in the massive mobilization of women for civilian purposes.[138] These ranged from historically feminine tasks such as

---

[134] Toomey, *The Civil War in Maryland*, 72 and 93.
[135] "Female Secessionists," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, August 23, 1862.
[136] *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, August 23, 1862.
[137] Faust, "Altars", ed. Clinton and Silber, *Divided*, 172
[138] Stephanie McCurry, *Confederate Reckoning: Power and Politics in the Civil War South* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2010), 89-94; Faust, *Mothers of Invention*; and Faust, "Altars", ed. Clinton and Silber, *Divided*, 172. Each of these books discusses the ways in which women participated in the war effort, largely the engagement in activities that were considered to be appropriate for civilian women to participate in, such as sewing circles.

nursing and sewing to more masculine ones such as smuggling supplies, spying, and joining protest mobs and riots.[139]

Forming sewing circles was not the only ways in which Southern sympathizing women in Maryland proved their loyalty to the Confederacy. As can be seen with the sneaking of the flag from Baltimore to Richmond, many also acted as smugglers, sneaking supplies into prisons to help feed and clothe incarcerated Confederate sympathizers. While Maryland remained occupied, President Lincoln gave permission to arrest and imprison any potential Confederate sympathizers while the war was taking place.[140] Lincoln suspended these civil liberties for Marylanders within just a few months of the war beginning, meaning that these southern sympathizers immediately felt its effects. Although Congress officially gave Lincoln the authority to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* on March 3, 1863-which would go into effect nationwide later that year-Maryland had already had these conditions in place for nearly two years by this point.[141]

As with their counterparts in the Deep South, Maryland's women wartime aid societies helped to lead the way for the formation of memorialization groups following the end of the war. During the years immediately after the war, and throughout Reconstruction, Maryland women who had supported the Confederacy worked to maintain some of the political activism that they had gained during wartime to continue to provide support for Confederate soldiers and to help memorialize the Confederate cause. Maryland's position as border state made it more difficult to encapsulate Civil War memory, versus Deep South states. This makes Maryland a contested state within Civil War memory and commemoration. Although Union memorial organizations did exist

---

[139] Floyd, *Maryland Women*, 75.
[140] Toomey, *The Civil War in Maryland*, 19.
[141] Toomey, *The Civil War in Maryland*, 72 and 93.

within the state, the two rarely clashed. Rather, the areas of conflict were largely between Confederate groups and the state government, where regional memory and officially sanctioned memory clashed.

By its third annual convention, the national UDC, having expanding beyond localized LMAs, had experienced rapid expansion; 140 chapters were in existence across 16 states and territories, both Southern and Northern, including the Maryland Division.[142] Developing from regional and local groups, members often were known as "the ladies," referencing the types of elite white women who joined. Those who joined the UDC typically were members of the white elite, largely because the membership dues and fees that were required for all members to pay yearly were higher than middle and lower class whites could afford. By gaining membership, their already considerable social standing increased, allowing them to command a significant amount of influence over the development and perpetuation of white supremacy and conservative ideology.[143] It is this placement into the political culture of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century that leads to historians referring to UDC members as "New Women" of the "New South." This term, however, was not well-liked by the so-called ladies of the Lost Cause, who argued that there was nothing wrong with the "Old South" to warrant the formation of a "new" one.[144]

Although the Maryland Division is listed as one of the divisions to have formed by the third annual convention in 1896, there are questions within the Division itself as to its official founding. The official minutes of the thirtieth annual convention of the

---

[142] "Women of the South: Annual Convention of the United Daughters of the Confederacy Will Meet Here Tomorrow" *The Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, November 9, 1897.
[143] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 29.
[144] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 4 and 44.

Maryland Division in 1927 depicts a moment when some debate broke out to the appropriateness of referring to it as the "thirtieth" convention. Mrs. Paul Iglehart, the Division President from 1926 to 1928, put this debate to rest by arguing that while the organization was first discussed in 1897, the General Organization did not officially recognize it until 1898.[145] This is in contrast to the official Maryland Division of the UDC's website, which cites May 1895 as the formation of the Division.[146] Although the precise reason for the varying dates is unclear, a potential explanation is that the contemporary Maryland Division is directly tying the founding of their Division to its predecessors, the coalition of loosely organized LMAs based in Maryland, rather than strictly relying on the national organization's standards.

Despite the general unification of state divisions and local chapters on a national level, some difficultly remained in getting each individual organization to take on uniformly decided symbols and names. In 1910, the General Organization wrote a letter to the Maryland Division complaining about its current name.[147] In this letter, the woman stated that she had been looking over the Baltimore Blue Book of 1908 and noticed that the Division was still going by the "Daughters of the Confederacy in the State of Maryland," not the Maryland Division of the UDC.[148] By not adhering to national standards, a sense of disunity develops across the organization. Although disunity could be a problem that the General Organization faced across all division and chapter lines,

---

[145] Minutes of the Thirtieth Annual Convention, 1927, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F6.
[146] "Maryland Division: A Brief History," Maryland Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, http://www.mdudc.org/divisionhistory.html (accessed February 2,2015).
[147] C.P.O to Mrs. Poe, December 11, 1910, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F1, Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, MD.
[148] C.P.O to Mrs. Poe, December 11, 1910, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F1.

Maryland's position as a border-state provides another explanation.[149] Having never been a formal member of the Confederacy, Maryland lacked the same official unity that the rest of the South had. The Maryland Division also attempted to push against national standards in terms of the organization's symbolic flag. In 1928, the then president of the Maryland Division, Iglehart, wrote to the General Organization asking if it would be appropriate to use a different version of the Stars and Bars than the General Organization did.[150] As with the uniformity of titles and names, the General Organization expected all Divisions and Chapters to follow the same standard as the national executive board.

Some of these uniformity and consistency issues across the UDC were a direct result of a lack of effective communication between the divisions, chapters, and General Organization. Given that the UDC spread across the country, there needed to be some consistent way for each Division to communicate with the others on a wide scale. Although Divisions could correspond easily with individual letters and responses to each separate group, at the time of the inception of the Maryland Division, there was no uniform way for one Division to contact the entire UDC without sending multiple versions of the same correspondence. The first incarnation of a mass communication forum is in the *Lost Cause: The Warrior's Banner Takes Its Flight to Greet the Warrior's Soul.* Designed as a monthly-illustrated journal of history, the UDC used this publication as a way to share the records, anecdotes, and other reminiscences of the war that each Division collected from their veterans.[151] In 1899, the *Confederate Veteran,* the official

---

[149] C.P.O to Mrs. Poe, December 11, 1910, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F1.
[150] W.C.N. Merchant to Iglehart, MSA September 25, 1928, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F3, Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, MD. Although this particular letter is the response from the President General W.C.N Merchant to Iglehart, the context of the letter makes it apparent what the original request was.
[151] The Lost Cause, May 27, 18--,United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F1, Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, MD.

journal of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, granted the organization a small section, making long distance, mass communication significantly easier.[152]

The Maryland Division did not just communicate via these various publications, although it did make it significantly easier. Members of the Maryland Division were constantly in contact with other divisions, asking and giving advice for different commemoration activities. In 1902, another chapter wrote to the Maryland Division, asking for their design advice on a monument for the Confederate White House.[153] This demonstrates that despite Maryland's position as a border and contested space, the Maryland Division was still considered a loyal and important part of the UDC. The Maryland Division considered themselves to be truly "patriotic, cultural and unselfish[ed] women," relating themselves to the standards of the rest of the organization. [154]

While maintaining a close relationship with the General Organization, the members of the Maryland Division used their influence to communicate with groups outside of the state, all in the name of the Confederate legacy. State Divisions and local Chapters were directly responsible for many of the buildings and roads across America named for or dedicated to Confederate heroes. When the UDC nominated General Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson's name to be the new title for NYU's Hall of Fame in 1955, the Maryland Division immediately took action. The executive board reached out to various public officials across the state, encouraging them to endorse the UDC's bid for the new Hall of Fame name. When Thomas D'Lasandro, Jr., the Mayor of Baltimore at the time, wrote his letter of endorsement, he argued that Jackson's name was a natural

---

[152] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 173.
[153] New York Chapter to Maryland Division, May 2, 1902, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F1, Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, MD.
[154] History of the Harford Chapter, No. 114,1904-1905, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, Harford County Historical Society, Bel Air, MD.

choice, since "history and the hearts of all Americans already have enshrined the immortal "Stonewall" Jackson."[155] Other public officials that also endorsed the UDC's bid, demonstrating the ways in which the UDC was successful in maintaining a culture of Confederate heroism, shared this sentiment.

Despite discrepancies that remain regarding the Division's founding, it quickly gained acceptance within the larger national structure.[156] Baltimore hosted the third annual National Conference in 1897.[157] Twenty-three members of the Maryland Division attended, helping to bring various educational concerns to the forefront of the conference's discussion.[158] Although education was informally one of the five main objectives of the UDC by the middle of the twentieth century, the third convention marked its consideration as an official objective.[159] The women of the UDC believed that it was part of their civic duty as Confederate descendants to educate and bind generations together in a single memory-the memory of a white male Confederate past.[160]Monuments played an important role in the UDC's educational goals. When designing monuments, the UDC worked to create explicit connections between past and current communities-with a strong emphasis placed on reaching younger generations.[161]

---

[155] Maryland Division Minutes Executive Board, 1958-1961, Maryland Historical Society, MS2846 Box 1, Baltimore, MD.
[156] Minutes of the Thirtieth Annual Convention, 1927, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F6 and History of the Harford Chapter, No. 114,1904-1905, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers. Although Mrs. Paul Iglehart argues that it formally began in 1898, the Harford County Division states in their own history that they began in 1897.
[157] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 43.
[158] LeeAnn Whites, *Gender Matters: Civil War, Reconstruction, and the Making of the New South* (New York, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 95.
[159] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 26 and MSA SC140-B1-F15 Constitution and By Laws 1931
[160] Whites, *Gender Matters*, 95 and 96.
[161] Jordan Smith, "The Confederate Women of Maryland," *The Antioch Review: Varieties of Literary Expression: A Gallimaufry* 40 No. 1 (Winter 1982): 85. Although this poem is referring to the Confederate Women's Monument, her interpretation of this memorial reinforces this idea.

The first of these statues is the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors Monument, dedicated in 1902.[162] Baltimore is the only city in the country that has monuments to both Union and Confederate soldiers and sailors within its boundaries, and the Maryland Daughters of the Confederacy hoped that this monument would help generations to see the challenges of living in a border state during the Civil War, especially if you were a Southern sympathizer. Privately raising money for both this statue and the other Confederate monument within the city, the Maryland Daughters of the Confederacy worked to acknowledge and memorialize the Confederate cause within the state far after its defeat. The second monument is the Confederate Women's Monument, formally called the "Mothers of the Confederacy Memorial" at the time of its unveiling, dedicated in 1903. Designed to memorialize the actions taken by Confederate women within the state of Maryland, its dedication ceremony made it clear that "the coals of civil strife die[d] slowly."[163]

However, when the Maryland Daughters of the Confederacy unveiled their "Confederate Soldiers and Sailors Memorial," and the "Mothers of the Confederacy Memorial," few groups outside of other Confederate groups displayed interest, despite them being the most permanent commemoration activities that the Maryland Division has produced.[164]Although the Division continues to exist in modern times, with an active membership, nothing of the same scale has since been achieved, particularly when discussing permanency.

---

[162] Cindy Kelly, *Outdoor Sculpture in Baltimore: A Historical Guide to Public Art in the Monumental City* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), 181.
[163] Kelly, *Outdoor Sculpture*, 182.
[164] Cynthia Mills, "Gratitude and Gender Wars: Monuments to the Women of the Sixties," in *Monuments to the Lost Cause: Women, Art, and the Landscapes of Southern Memory*, edited by Cynthia Mills and Pamela H. Simpson (Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee Press, 2003), 196.

Although the largest and longest lasting examples of the Maryland Division's commemoration efforts are their two monuments, they also raised money to contribute to a variety of scholarship funds. Current descendents of the Maryland Division are still eligible to receive scholarships, despite the organization not being as publically active as it once was. According to the Maryland Division's website, there are five scholarships, each lasting four years, which are open to student applications.[165] Interestingly, the application requirements do not require students to be members of either the Children of the Confederacy or the UDC, although it would be surprising if any who applied were not, given the strict familial requirements all applicants must reach. These requirements are stricter than even those to join the UDC are. In order to gain membership into the UDC, applicants have to be able to prove that they are blood descendents of a Confederate, either lineally or collaterally.[166]

In addition to helping students to pay for higher education, the Maryland Division supported local schools in a variety of ways. When a Maryland French school asked for donations from the community in the 1930s, the various chapters of the Maryland Division worked together to collect clothes, shoes, supplies, and candy for the school's students. Although citing that these contributions honored a French Confederate who served during the war, these actions also directly fall under the objectives of benevolence and education.

---

[165] "Scholarship Information," *Maryland Division United Daughters of the Confederacy,* http://www.mdudc.org/scholarships.html (accessed March 12, 2015).

[166] "Membership Eligibility," *United Daughters of the Confederacy*, http://www.hqudc.org/membership/ (accessed February 20, 2015). To be lineally related to someone means that there is a direct line of relation, such as parents, great grandfathers, or great great grandmothers. To be collaterally related to someone refers to those family members that are not immediately related to you, such as a great uncle, second cousin, or distant aunt.

When another school, to which the Maryland Division contributed, Western Female High School, considered placing a Copley print of General William T. Sherman in their classrooms, the Maryland Division immediately took action.[167] They argued that the placement of the print within public classroom was not only an insult to the UDC and those Confederate descendents, but also would create a learning environment unfit for students. In a unanimously adopted resolution, the Maryland Division claimed that the print of Sherman statue was offensive not only to those, like the Division, who supported the local schools, but also to the students themselves.[168] The statue itself, represented in the print, depicts Sherman as a conqueror over the South, reminding Southerners of his march to the sea and the "cruel ravages and desecration[s]" that he committed to the South while doing so.[169]

The Maryland Division was also actively involved in the UDC's campaign to rewrite Civil War histories and textbooks in favor of the Confederacy.[170] Concerned with how Southern history was being interpreted, particularly in children's education, the UDC wrote their own versions of textbooks specifically designed to refute what they considered to be historical inaccurate, including "the Lincoln myths and propaganda."[171] Although many textbooks were throughout the early twentieth century, one of the more well-known ones to the Maryland Division was Tilley's book titled "Facts the Historians

---

[167] "'Insult,' Says U.D.C.-'Daughters' Put Ban On St. Gaudens' Statue of Sherman." *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, December 8, 1908.
[168] "'Insult,' Says U.D.C.-'Daughters' Put Ban On St. Gaudens' Statue of Sherman." *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, December 8, 1908.
[169] "'Insult,' Says U.D.C.-'Daughters' Put Ban On St. Gaudens' Statue of Sherman." *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, December 8, 1908.
[170] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 94.
[171] Rutherford Historical Committee to Maryland Division, May 1925, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F2, Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, MD.

Leave Out," which were presented as gifts to the sub organization of the Children of the Confederacy in 1955.[172]

The process of writing new pro-Confederate histories was highly commended by members of the Baltimore community. In 1911, Mr. Daniel Smith Gordon wrote a letter to the editors of *The Sun*, praising the UDC's fight against "the histories that slander the south."[173] Gordon argues that by condemning these histories, the Maryland Division is setting a high standard of patriotism. The North and South should then carry out this standard throughout the country. He continues, arguing that the public should assist the UDC by taking all slanderous materials and texts and immediately removing them. This would allow more accurate—at least, accurate according to the standards of the UDC—to take their place. By writing this editorial piece, Gordon is demonstrating that there is an audience within Baltimore for the Maryland Division's ideology. It is not just a group of women with biological ties to the Confederacy, but rather an entire community of individuals who share the same ideology.

Keeping with the mourning traditions of the local LMAs, the Maryland Division continued to participate in Memorial and Decoration Days within local Confederate cemeteries throughout the twentieth century and into the twenty-first.[174] These Memorial Day observances involved LMA and UDC members travelling to various Confederate cemeteries and placing flowers on the graves of those soldiers and veterans who had

---

[172] MDUDC Report of the Historian, Annual Convention, October 28 1959, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, Maryland Historical Society MS2846 Box 1, Baltimore, MD.
[173] Daniel Smith Gordon, "Mr. Daniel Smith Gordon Commends Action of Daughters Of The Confederacy In Condemning Histories That Slander The South," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, march 27, 1911.
[174] Floyd, "Baltimore's Confederate Women," *The Maryland Historical Magazine,* 54 and 58.

died.[175] By continuing with the LMAs' tradition, the Maryland Division is directly tying themselves to not only their personal ancestors, but also the history of the organization.

In 1888, a group of Baltimore women founded the Baltimore Confederate Home for Mothers and Widows.[176] Although founded nearly a decade before the Maryland Division officially came into being, the Confederate Home for Mothers and Widows clearly marks a desire by Confederate women to protect their past. At the time of its founding, the desire to protect widows and address many of their unmet needs was becoming more commonplace in major cities than ever before. According to the Baltimore Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, the Civil War resulted in many families losing their main supporter, causing a substantial increase in the number of Baltimoreans who lived on the edge of poverty.[177] Due to the large number of poor widowed women within Baltimore, often many did not receive the level of attention that they should have. This is, however, not the case for the mothers and widows of Confederate soldiers. Through the actions of the Ladies' Confederate memorial and Aid Association, which would eventually become the Maryland Division of the UDC, a small group of widows was given a comfortable home until its closing in 1906.[178]

Although they would not formally be associated with the Confederate Veterans Home in Pikesville, the Maryland Division would still maintain an active relationship with it. The UDC considered veterans essential to the creation of a "truthful" history of the war. Parts of their duties were to honor not only those who fell in service to the

---

[175] "Tributes To Brave Men—Memorial Day Observances—Marylanders and Virginians," *The Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, June 7, 1889.
[176] "To Close The Home Soon-Mothers and Widows of Confederates Will Be Scattered." *The Sun*: Baltimore, MD, July 27, 1906.
[177] S.J. Kleinberg, *Widows and Orphans First: The Family Economy and Social Welfare Policy, 1880-1939* (Illinois: Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, 2006), 79.
[178] Kleinberg, *Widows and Orphans*, 80.

Cause, but also those who lived to contribute their memories to the histories of the Confederacy.[179] By the 1920s, the home had lost most of its original organization and funding, relying instead on outside assistance. Although half of this assistance would come from leaders within the home and hospital itself, the other half came directly from the Maryland Division, who raised funds to pay for half of the nurses' salary each year.[180]

In a 1906 Baltimore *Sun* article, an individual known only as "a rebel" wrote an article praising the actions that Maryland women had taken to support Confederate veterans within the state.[181] According to the anonymous author, the Confederate women of Maryland were one of the first southern states to start a home for disabled Confederate veterans. The author is quick to note that not only did Maryland women become some of the first to found a veteran's aid home for Confederates, but also that these women did so entirely without funding from the state. [182] Combining this with the belief that the Maryland Division's Confederate monument is also the first built by the UDC to commemorate the idea of the Confederacy, rather than an actual person, the author implies that the Maryland Division's actions are truly representative of an organization committed to and leading the way in Confederate memory.

In addition, "Rebel" implies that the Maryland Division not only founded the first Confederate Home for disabled soldiers, but they were also responsible for the upkeep and financial maintaining of these homes.[183] As a result, despite supposedly having enough soldiers volunteer for the Confederacy to warrant over twenty, only one veteran's home remained in Maryland. The founding and funding of the Maryland Confederate

[179] "Daughters of the Confederacy" *The Sun:* Baltimore, MD*,* November 9, 1897.
[180] Georgie G. Bright to the MDUDC, February 14, 1920, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F2, Annapolis, MD.
[181] Rebel, A, "Maryland Confederate Home," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, July 6, 1906.
[182] Rebel, "Maryland Confederate Home," *The Sun,* July 6, 1906.
[183] Rebel, "Maryland Confederate Home," *The Sun,* July 6, 1906.

Home demonstrate that the Maryland Division is an effective part of the UDC, showing that they are capable of memorializing and protecting those elements of Confederate history—including veterans—that is important to them. However, it also highlights the differences in how the federal government handled Confederate versus Union memorialization.

Many in the South felt bitter towards the federal government, given that they did not receive the same aid and support in burial and memorialization efforts the Union did. Instead, the precursors to the UDC, the LMAs, would take on this role. Privately raising funds, the LMAs would work towards the preparation, funding, filling, and maintaining of Confederate cemeteries across the South. This work would be done entirely through their own efforts and fundraising, without the assistance of the federal or state governments.

The Maryland Division would face similar bias, at least in their opinion, from the federal government in their own memorialization efforts. The Maryland Division entirely organized and funded the two monuments, as well as the Maryland Confederate Home. Although they had to gain permission from the city, the Maryland Division had sole responsibility of each. These, however, would not be the only Civil War monuments built within Maryland. On the corner of West 29th Street and North Charles Street stands the Union Soldiers and Sailors Monument.[184] This monument shares several iconographic symbols with the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors monument, including the presence of a soldier to represent all those Marylanders who fought for the Union and two winged figures. These monuments, although designed by opposing sides, invoked similar

[184] "Union Soldiers and Sailors Monument in Charles Village," *Monument City Blog*, http://monumentcity.net/2009/04/14/union-soldiers-sailors-monument-baltimore-md/ (accessed February 22, 2015).

emotions.[185] In fact, one of the few differences between them, besides what they each represent, is that the government commissioned the Union monument.[186]

Although a Union memorialization group would take on the design and dedication, the state government had supplied the formal commission for the monument. This involvement would carry over into the appointment of a formal commission by the governor in order to oversee and supervise the monument's development.[187] As with the cemeteries and interment of the Civil War dead, the Union and Confederate monuments of Baltimore demonstrate the ways in which the federal and state governments supported Union memorialization and ignored Confederate efforts.

All of the work done by the UDC, whether in educational reform, memorial projects, or benevolence projects, needed funding. Most of the funds were individually raised through various collections and fundraisers, although in some cases the Maryland State government would provide some funding, such as with the Maryland Confederate Veterans Home. Each chapter was required to pay dues both to their Division and to the national organization; these funds went directly to their many projects. However, these dues would often not be enough to cover some of the larger projects, such as the various monuments to Confederate values, heroes, and memory dedicated by the UDC.

Wanting to engage in larger projects—larger projects mean larger results and a chance to share Confederate culture with a larger audience—required Divisions to organize their own fundraisers. The lack of federal support made this particularly true.

---

[185] Scrapbook #7, 1908-1910, Benjamin Franklin Taylor Collection, Maryland Historical Society, MS1863 Box 2, Baltimore, Maryland. This information comes from a series on unmarked newspaper articles held within Benjamin Franklin Taylor's personal scrapbooks. These newspaper articles do not contain any dates, evidence of which newspaper they are from, or in many cases even a title of the article.
[186] Scrapbook #7, 1908-1910, Benjamin Franklin Taylor Collection, Maryland Historical Society, MS1863 Box 2.
[187] Scrapbook #7, 1908-1910, Benjamin Franklin Taylor Collection, Maryland Historical Society, MS1863 Box 2.

Some fundraisers were relatively small in nature: putting together small, local production, hosting bake sales, and having collection drives within their community.[188] Others, however, were much larger in scale, such as community socials, bazaars, and other ticketed events. Similar to a yard sale, a bazaar was a combination of a craft fair and a shopping market, usually for the holidays; various tables would be set up and sponsored by different groups, selling goods and services for a profit.

The Confederate Bazaar was one of the most lucrative fundraising techniques that the Maryland Division employed. In 1901, they organized a bazaar to raise money for the building of the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors Monument, yielding a profit of about $10,000.[189] Fundraising bazaars the various Divisions of the UDC cooperate with one another. There were at least seventeen tables at the 1901 bazaar, each sponsored and manned by representatives from different states' Divisions.

Bazaars, as a fundraising technique, did more than just raise funds for the Maryland Division's monument effort. Knowing that bazaars had the potential to raise thousands of dollars for Confederate causes, the Maryland Division hosted several over the course of about two decades.[190] It was common knowledge to the public that the government provided Union veterans with pensions following the end of the war, while denying these same funds to Confederate veterans, a trend that happens often when it comes to the ways in which the government deals with the former Confederacy.[191] Knowing that there were many Confederate veterans still living in the state that were not

---

[188] Poppenheim, *History of the UDC*, 49.
[189] "Bazar Clears About $10,000-Definite Returns Not Yet All Received," *The Sun*: Baltimore, MD, December 12, 1901.
[190] Claudia Floyd, "Baltimore's Confederate Women: Perpetuating a Culture of War," *The Maryland Historical Magazine, Special Issue*, 106, no. 1 (Spring 2011): 49.
[191] Claudia Floyd, "Baltimore's Confederate Women," *The Maryland Historical Magazine, Special Issue*, 49.

receiving any form of governmental aid—and could potentially be neighbors of those Union veterans that were, given that Maryland did officially remain a state loyal to the Union—bazaars were a lucrative charity event.[192]

As the Civil War Centennial approached, the Maryland Division became deeply involved in the UDC's celebration preparations. Tensions rose between the North and the South over how to celebrate the centennial. Many southerners felt that the institution of segregation, which had remained a powerful force throughout the first half of the twentieth century, came under direct attack as federal centennial memorialization groups began to begin their planning.[193] The historical memory of the region-which the UDC had a large role in the careful constructing-was based on a distinctive sense of white supremacy and racial superiority that was challenged during this organizational process.[194]

When federal legislation instituted the Civil War Centennial Commission (CWCC) in 1957 in order to organize and coordinate all commemorative events that would take place during the celebration, many Southern memorial groups used it as the opportunity to push back against the threat to segregation.[195] White southerners flocked to the different events, looking forward to the opportunity to openly commemorate and celebrate the events that lead to the founding of the Confederacy. The Maryland Division openly stated that the centennial was:

---

[192] Claudia Floyd, "Baltimore's Confederate Women," *The Maryland Historical Magazine, Special Issue*, 49.
[193] Robert Cook, "(Un)Furl that Banner: The Response of White Southerners to the Civil War Centennial of 1961-1965," *The Journal of Southern History*, 68, No. 4 (November 2002), 879.
[194] Cook, (Un)Furl that Banner," *Journal of Southern History*, 881.
[195] Cook, (Un)Furl that Banner," *Journal of Southern History*, 882 and 892 and Robert Cook, *Troubled Commemoration: The American Civil War Centennial 1961-1965* (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 2007), 194 and 195. In Cook's *Troubled Commemoration*, this is primarily discussed in the section titled "Segregation Now, Segregation Forever," which begins on page 194.

> An opportunity…to honor our Maryland heroes and to tell the true story of Maryland's people-those who resisted the un-constitutional [underlining is done in a heavy blue ink after the documents printing] Federal demands and offered their services to the South-men and women of courage and honor, integrity and faith. The Centennial observances are a challenge to the Daughters of the Confederacy to educate the public concerning Maryland history of the 1861-1865 period.[196]

This, of course, refers to popular post-Civil War Southern belief that slavery had been a harmless, if not compassionate, institution, which the aggressive, Northern abolitionists ruthlessly attacked.

The Maryland Division remains active throughout the twenty-first century. In addition to holding regular meetings and maintaining the Children of the Confederacy, to which the UDC acts as a parent organization to, the Maryland Division also participates in at least one large-scale public display of Confederate pride each year.[197] In January, the Maryland Division, although primarily made up of those chapters located within Baltimore, meet the Maryland Division of the Sons of Confederate Veterans to pay homage to the Lee and Jackson monument in Baltimore.[198] Following similar patterns to the dedication ceremonies organized during the unveiling of Baltimore's Confederate monuments, these two groups march towards the monument and listen to a series of speeches that praise the two Confederate leaders and Confederate culture.

The continuation of twentieth century traditions into recent years has sparked a great deal of controversy surrounding Baltimore's Confederate memorialization groups. For years, the Maryland Division would meet at Johns Hopkins' Homewood Campus in order to socialize after their meeting at the Lee and Jackson monument. However, in

---

[196] UDC Maryland Report of the Historian Annual Convention, October 26, 1960, Maryland Historical Society MS2846 Box 1, Baltimore, Maryland.
[197] "Home," *Maryland Division United Daughters of the Confederacy,* http://www.mdudc.org/ (accessed March 12, 2015).
[198] Claudia Floyd, "Baltimore's Confederate Women," *The Maryland Historical Magazine, Special Issue*, 37.

2009, university president William R. Brody denied them access to the campus.[199] Reacting to student complaints of the Confederate flag being visible on campus, as well as acknowledging the upcoming inauguration of the nation's first African American president, the campus exercised its right to refuse facilities rental to the Maryland Division.[200]

Members of the Maryland Division argued that they were "victims of political correctness run amok," stating that the university has never had an issue renting space to them in the past. Rather, according to G. Elliot Cummings, they are "being singled out for being the descendents of Confederate soldiers."[201] Cummings continues to state that both the Maryland Divisions of the UDC and SCV are simply trying to remember and honor the service of their ancestors, denying all claims of the two groups having a deeper political agenda.[202]

However, memorial organizations as a whole tend to be highly political in nature, as a general trait of their existence. What the Maryland Division chooses to memorialize and commemorate allows audiences to interpret historical events on their own. The information provided in the memorial action serves as the basis for the interpretation. This creates a public view of the monument that becomes the standard interpretation across the larger audience, creating political ramifications. In addition, the denial of these

---

[199] Floyd, "Baltimore's Confederate Women," *The Maryland Historical Magazine,* 37.
[200] Stephen Kiehl, "Hopkins Balks at Confederate Banner: Changing Course After 20 Years, University Tells Groups It Won't Rent Them Space for Jan. March," *The Baltimore Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, November 20, 2008.
[201] G. Elliott Cummings, as quoted in Kiehl, "Hopkins Balks at Confederate Banner: Changing Course After 20 Years, University Tells Groups It Won't Rent Them Space for Jan. March," *The Baltimore Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, November 20, 2008.
[202] G. Elliott Cummings, as quoted in Kiehl, "Hopkins Balks at Confederate Banner: Changing Course After 20 Years, University Tells Groups It Won't Rent Them Space for Jan. March," *The Baltimore Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, November 20, 2008.

political ramifications is a part of the Lost Cause movement, in which individuals and groups work together to perpetuate antebellum white values and Confederate culture.

Chapter 3: "Glory to the Vanquished" and Baltimore Commemorative Monuments

On May 2, 1903, at the intersection of Mt. Royal Avenue and Mosher Street, the Maryland Division unveiled what would become its longest-lasting achievement.[203] Standing at nearly twenty feet, including an impressive red granite pedestal, the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors monument is Baltimore's contribution to the fifth and final objective of the UDC: memorialization.[204] Designed to commemorate the heroism of fallen Confederate soldiers, specifically those from Maryland, the statue features the winged figure of Glory, standing proudly with a wounded Confederate soldier in one arm and a laurel wreath in the other hand.[205] Also known as the Baltimore Confederate Monument, the statue, as with other physical markers funded and built by the UDC, expanded on the ideals of the Confederacy and white supremacy. However, the Baltimore Confederate Monument is more than just a physical landmark of memorialization. Rather, the statue was a way for elite white southern women to build and vindicate a specific Confederate historical memory. Using physical markers to build and expand on the ideals of the Confederacy and white supremacy, the women who organized and ran memorial groups gained a significant amount of power within the post-war South.[206]

Civil War monuments can be divided into three categories based both on the period in which the monument was built and the purpose it held in memorialization. Although the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors monument of Baltimore falls under the

---

[203] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget"*, 9
[204] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget,"* 9.
[205] Soderberg, "*Lest We Forget,"* 10.
[206] The idea that women's memorial groups gained political power within the post-war South is discussed by both Karen Cox in *Dixie's Daughters* (2003) and Caroline Janney in *Burying the Dead* (2008). Specifically, see Cox, 26-27 and Janney, 60-62 for more details regarding how this political power came to be, the ways in which it was manifested, and how others—namely men—responded to it.

third and final category, that of commemoration, it is important to trace the evolution of women's groups Confederate monuments. The monuments built immediately following the end of the war specifically memorialized the individuals who fought and died in it. Building monuments to memorialize the dead, the UDC continued the memorialization traditions that the LMAs started in an effort to facilitate a system of mourning.

The UDC actively worked to create a Southern centered history with their "education" objective; the organizations that funded and built Confederate monuments designed them to facilitate the process of mourning and honoring of Confederate dead.[207] These groups refused to allow the histories of these soldiers be forgotten. Instead, by dedicating monuments and statues to the soldiers who had died to defend the Confederacy, organizers worked hand in hand with historians to develop an explicit history of the Civil War South. Designed as memorials, the physical markers were crafted with the intent to perpetuate the same history that Southern historians wrote in the 1870s. By dedicated monuments and statues to the soldiers who had died to defend the Confederacy, organizers worked hand in hand with historians to develop an explicit history of the Civil War South. These historians used Confederate memorialization as a way both to shape a regional definition of what the Confederacy meant, and to mourn those who died for it.[208]

One can observe a close relationship between women's memorialization efforts and the histories developed by former Confederate officers and generals; as one group shifted their perspective, so too would the other. Towards the end of the nineteenth

---

[207] Soderberg, "*Lest We Forget,"* xiv.
[208] Kelly, "The Election of 1896", 181 and Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 35-36. Although Kelly discusses the political implications of this carefully developed version of Civil War history, Janney specifically discusses the importance of mourning rituals to Confederate women's memorialization efforts.

century, while these former officers, who wrote the initial post-war Southern histories, shifted their narratives towards the concept of reconciliation, so did monuments. Rather than mourning the dead and honoring those who fought for the Confederacy, monument designers instead turned towards what historian Susan Soderberg has identified as the Reconciliationist State of monument building.[209] Developing out of the previous Funeral Stage, women's memorialization organizations, like the LMAs and early forms of the UDC, focused their attention towards the visual and symbolic image of the statue. Designed to facilitate Reconciliationist ideas between the North and South, these statues did not focus explicitly on who died defending the Confederacy and Confederate values.

The UDC, despite clearly laying out the vindication of Confederate culture as a primary goal within their organization, subscribed to the reconciliationist vision at one point in time in their history. Following World War I, the UDC did not focus on monument building as they had in previous decades. Rather, a shift occurred in which work was done in order to facilitate a "reunited country."[210] Here, the organization's focus shifted away from monument building and towards educational goals. However, the UDC had not always put aside monuments in favor of reconciliation. Prior to World War I, the UDC actively participated in the national debates over reconciliation, believing that the only way it would be successful in America was if the Confederate generation continued to be vindicated and exonerated.[211] Although initially the UDC was fiercely against the idea of reconciliation, choosing to instead focus entirely on the vindication of

[209] Soderberg, "*Lest We Forget,"* xv.
[210] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 157.
[211] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 142-143.

the Confederacy, eventually they would shift to using monuments to achieve both—although this would not be until much later.[212]

The idea of the Baltimore Confederate monument first came from the Baltimore chapter of the Division, known as the Baltimore Chapter 8.[213] Although initially the Chapter 8's idea to create a memorial to all Maryland soldiers and sailors, the meeting held in a local YMCA quickly laid out a plan to invite all of the chapters in the state to participate in the fundraising, design, and unveiling of the statue. Not only was the monument to be the first monument that the Maryland Division would put together, but the Division further claimed that it would be the first of its kind in the entire UDC.[214] The Baltimore Confederate monument was not designed to mourn individuals or to evoke feelings of sorrow from their audiences. Instead, the design of this particular statue commemorated the "heroism of that martyr band" which "embodies the idealization of the Confederacy."[215] The design elements, symbols, and inscriptions of the monument were geared towards commemoration and glorifying the Confederacy, rather than mourning it.

Once approved by the entire Division, the idea needed to go before the City Council. Although the Division would officially present the ordinance to the Council twice over a three-month period, it would not technically make it to voting until January of 1899. When brought before the First Branch of the City Council for the first time, the ordinance went directly to the committee on parks, given that the original plan had the

---

[212] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 157-158.
[213] "The Confederate Monument-Daughters of the Confederacy Organize Committees to Raise Funds For It," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, April 5, 1899.
[214] "The Defeated South," *The Confederate Veteran,* 439.
[215] "The Defeated South," *The Confederate Veteran,* 439.

monument going into Druid Hill Park.[216] Having just denied the Grand Army of the Republic's plan to place a Union monument within Druid Hill Park, the committee quickly vetoed the Division's ordinance. Three months later, the ordinance would once again make its way before the First Branch and the committee on parks. When voted down for a second time, the committee reported their decision the Council.

Despite the negative vote by the parks committee, Councilman Reinhart spoke out in favor of the monument, suggesting that the council take a vote to substitute the unfavorable committee vote.[217] Reinhart claimed that although it is true that if you look at simply the narrow, immediately local political ramifications of the monument, it may have been a good idea to veto it. However, the council needed to consider a larger audience to make a proper decision.[218] Rather than facilitate sectional division, Reinhart instead argued the monument would represent the "broad standpoint of humanity and patriotism and the spirit of fraternity."[219] With these thoughts in mind, the Council unanimously passed the ordinance that allowed the Division to begin formal planning for the monument

Once their proposal was approved by the First Branch of the City Council, the Maryland Division needed to begin fundraising efforts in order to raise money to build the monument. After getting approval, the Division held a special meeting to discuss the

---

[216] The Confederate Monument-Daughters of the Confederacy Organize Committees to Raise Funds For It," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, April 5, 1899.
[217] The Confederate Monument-Daughters of the Confederacy Organize Committees to Raise Funds For It," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, April 5, 1899.
[218] The Confederate Monument-Daughters of the Confederacy Organize Committees to Raise Funds For It," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, April 5, 1899.
[219] The Confederate Monument-Daughters of the Confederacy Organize Committees to Raise Funds For It," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, April 5, 1899.

formation of a monument committee.[220] Not only would this committee be responsible for all of the technical aspects of the monument, such as its design and the unveiling ceremony, but it would also be responsible for many of the official fundraising efforts. This discussion first took place in October of 1898, although the monument ordinance would not be passed until January of the following year. Demonstrating the amount of long term planning the Division engaged in, the ladies met in April of 1899, just a few months after the formal acceptance of the ordinance by the City Council, to finalize fundraising committee plans.[221]

This committee organized a series of fundraisers in order to meet the high cost that the monument building demanded. Since the UDC, and consequently the Maryland Division, was, and still is, a private organization, all fundraising was done through private channels, without the assistance of the state government.[222] Although each chapter was expected to donate to the general fund, some chapters either had the means or felt the obligation to donate more. For example, the Baltimore Chapter 8, located locally to the monument project and the originators of the idea, donated approximately $1000 by May 21, 1900. This is compared to the Wicomico Chapter, located much further away on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, which donated just over $105.[223] In

---

[220] "Daughters of the Confederacy-Start a Fund for a Monument to Maryland Soldiers and Sailors-Delegate to National Body," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, October 27, 1898.
[221] "The Confederate Monument-Daughters of the Confederacy Organize Committees to Raise Funds For It," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, April 5, 1899.
[222] "For Confederate Monument-Nearly $4,500 Now Pledged for the Erection of the Shaft," *The Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, May 21, 1900.
[223] "For Confederate Monument-Nearly $4,500 Now Pledged for the Erection of the Shaft," *The Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, May 21, 1900.

addition, individuals both connected to the UDC and not were encouraged to donate to the fund, ranging anywhere from $5 to $200.[224]

Although donations were an effective way for the committee to raise money, they were far from the only method employed. Chapters across the state began to organize a series of ticketed events, in which all profits when to the monument benefit. Many of these events involved some form of public entertainment, such as concerts, teas, and musicals. The May 21, 1900 edition of the *Baltimore Sun* listed not only these, but many other methods, such as a dance that was put together by Mrs. H.C. Painter, to be held in her barn.[225] The Division women, however, were not the only ones to organize fundraisers. The same list in the *Sun* discusses two different fairs put on by children, specifically "two little girls" and "four little boys."[226] Although listed as being children, these individuals were most likely youth involved with the Children of the Confederacy, a youth organization under the direct leadership and guidance of the UDC. UDC Divisions were directly in charge of the Children of the Confederacy, a group similar to the Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV) and the UDC but, as the name suggested, geared entirely towards minors.[227] An auxiliary of the UDC, members would then grow into subsequent memberships of the SCV and the UDC. By assisting in the monument fund, the six children that organized benefit fairs were taking an active responsibility within the larger Confederate community of Maryland.

---

[224] "For Confederate Monument-Nearly $4,500 Now Pledged for the Erection of the Shaft," *The Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, May 21, 1900.
[225] "For Confederate Monument-Nearly $4,500 Now Pledged for the Erection of the Shaft," *The Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, May 21, 1900.
[226] "For Confederate Monument-Nearly $4,500 Now Pledged for the Erection of the Shaft," *The Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, May 21, 1900.
[227] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 157.

Of the many fundraisers organized both formally by the monument committee and privately by individuals, one stands out as being the most lucrative. The Confederate Bazaar of 1901 raised over $10,000 to support the building of the monument, combining the efforts of UDC Chapters and Divisions across the country. Held during the holidays, the bazaar was a combination of holiday shopping and open-air market that encouraged individuals and groups to rent tables, for a small fee, in order for them to sell their goods. In return, the Division would receive not only the table rent money, but also a portion of the table's profits and the money made from ticket sales into the event.[228]

After several years, the monument committee would raise the necessary funds to complete the project. The Maryland Division hired sculptor F. Wellington Ruckstuhl, best known for his work on the Union Soldiers and Sailors Monument in Major Mark Park in Queens, New York. This monument was completed in 1896, about six years before the Baltimore monument would be unveiled. The Queens monument bears several striking similarities to the design that Ruckstuhl would develop for Baltimore, such as a winged figure holding a laurel wreath proudly in the air.[229] The only difference is the inclusion of the wounded soldier in the Baltimore monument, in which he is the one, depicted holding the standard, not the winged figure. It is in this particular design that the Maryland Division's monument falls into the idea of mass produced monument building of the nineteenth and twentieth century's. Although Ruckstuhl's monuments do not have the same mass produced designs of obelisks and solitary soldiers that was so common in

---

[228] "Bazaar Clears About $10,000-Definite Returns Not Yet All Received," *The Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, December 12, 1901. SHORTENED VERSION

[229] "Major Mark Park: Soldiers and Sailors Monument," *NYC Parks: Official Website of the New York City Department of Parks & Recreation*, http://www.nycgovparks.org/parks/major-mark-park/monuments/1464 (accessed February 14, 2015).

the era, they do still fall into the same cycle of a single monument designed mass-produced across the country.

The monument unveiling and dedication ceremony took place on May 2, 1903.[230] Thousands of men, women, and children lined the streets, pressing as close to the big stand and the monument as they were able to.[231] On the big stand itself were as many of the Division ladies as could fit, described as "overflowing" by the *Baltimore Sun*.[232] The dedication ceremony followed a very specific program, geared towards the complete vindication of Confederate culture and history. "Dixie" and other southern songs played as Confederate veterans marched down Mount Royal Avenue and lined up beside the monument.[233] As flowers from Children of the Confederacy and Division chapters across the state offered and placed flowers before the monument, prominent Confederate members of the community spoke, such as Major-General Andrew C. Trippe, Commander of the Maryland Division of the United Confederate Veterans and Captain McHenry Howard.[234]

When twenty-first century historians study Civil War monuments, they tend to focus on those monuments built during the Commemoration Stage.[235] According to Susan Soderberg, the Commemoration Stage immediately follows the Reconciliation Stage. Although the two share many of the same symbols, Reconciliation Stage monuments tend to focus on the visual image as a well to facilitate the "active reconciliation between the

---

[230] Scrapbook #5, 1902-1905, Benjamin Franklin Taylor Collection.
[231] "To Confederate Valor-Monument on Mount Royal Avenue is Unveiled.," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, May 2, 1903.
[232] "To Confederate Valor-Monument on Mount Royal Avenue is Unveiled.," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, May 2, 1903.
[233] Scrapbook #5, 1902-1905, Benjamin Franklin Taylor Collection and "To Confederate Valor-Monument on Mount Royal Avenue is Unveiled.," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, May 2, 1903.
[234] Scrapbook #5, 1902-1905, Benjamin Franklin Taylor Collection.
[235] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget,"* xvi.

Union and the Confederate soldiers and their supporters."[236] This is in contrast to the Commemoration Stage, which features design elements that allow monuments to become works of art that facilitate historical interpretation from their audiences.[237]

The Maryland Division's monument falls on the crossover line between these two stages. Although fundraising and planning for the monument began in what is typically associated with the Reconciliation Stage of monument building, its dedication in 1903 firmly falls within the timeline of the Commemoration Stage.[238] In addition, the symbols that are present within the monument facilitate audience interpretation—although there are inscriptions, much of the monument's message is displayed through its figures and symbology.

The UDC used the monument to tell the "truth" about a specific event.[239] The design of the Baltimore Confederate monument, which used many of the same symbols that were present within multiple commemorative monuments, worked to achieve the ultimate vindication of Confederate culture.[240] However, monuments designed to tell the "truth," albeit a carefully designed truth molded by the Maryland Division and the UDC ultimately portrayed a series of "untruths" that either oversimplified historical events or organized around a false collective memory.[241] The UDC claimed that that for them, monuments were a way to give glory to all men who fought for them. Self-proclaimed monument builders, the UDC used monuments and other memorials as a way to

---

[236] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget,"* xv.
[237] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget,"* xvi.
[238] Soderberg, "*Lest We Forget,"* 9.
[239] Melanie L. Buffington, "Stories in Stone: Investigating the Stories Behind the Sculptural Commemoration of the Confederacy," *Visual Inquiry: Learning and Teaching Art* 2, no. 3 (2013), 300 and Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 49.
[240] Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 2.
[241] Buffington, "Stories in Stone," 300.

demonstrate their own version of the war, claiming that the "hallowed memory" of the Confederacy should not die in the wake of Confederate defeat.[242]

By using monuments to write a specific history of an event, a history that becomes commonly associated as the truth to a wide audience, transforms itself into a form of collective memory. The idea of collective memory, and how collective memory plays into a group's heritage and identity, is a common one when looking at the ways in which monuments are used within a public space. Historian Kirk Savage alludes to collective memory as he discusses how tensions can arise over who will control public spaces and events commemorated within them.[243] When monuments become a form of public art, situated within a public space, controversy tends to form not only over who will control the space, but also the story told there.[244] As discussed before, the story told by a monument is important because it can shape the way the monument's audiences views and interprets a specific event.

David Blight argues that "the concepts of history and memory . . . represent two attitudes toward the past, two streams of historical consciousness that must at some point flow together;" the Maryland Division used the monument to not only create a specific history, but also a specific memory of Marylanders in the war.[245] Beginning in the late eighteenth century, a local public art movement began to take hold in many major public cities. As Baltimore became an important leader in this movement, especially towards the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century's, observable examples of individual citizens and citizens groups erecting forms of monuments and art for "permanent place in

---

[242] Poppenheim et al., *History of the United Daughters,* 49.
[243] Savage, *Standing Soldiers*, 5.
[244] Savage, *Standing Soldiers*, 5.
[245] David Blight, *Beyond the Battlefield: Race, Memory & the American Civil War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 1.

public spheres" exist.[246] Baltimore's citizens, often lead by groups such as the Maryland Division, used this public art as a way to celebrate not only their heroes, but also their heritage, histories, and memories.[247]

These examples of public art, including the Baltimore Confederate monument, appear to be eclectic at first glance. Within a single city, there are monuments to Richard Wagner, William Wallace, and George Washington; this wide variety of unique monuments has become a part of Baltimore's identity, even going so far as to include the phrase "Monument City" as one of its many nicknames.[248] When looked at separately, each of these monuments tells an individual story. However, once examined as examples of a larger public art movement within the city, it becomes apparent that they represent the community's pride in their history.

The location of the Baltimore Confederate monument is an important part of its story. With the nineteenth century, being one of the greatest eras of monument building, largely due to the actions of the UDC, memorial organizations used monuments to tell a carefully constructed and cultivated history of an event. Since it is difficult, if not impossible, to tell the entire history of a specific event in one monument, many monument organizations designed their memorials to focus on just a portion of the story.[249] Using the public space as a presentation forum, the UDC used specific design elements, such as universally understood symbols, to construct their audience's interpretation of the monument so that its story becomes *the* story of that event.

---

[246] C. Kelly, *Outdoor Sculpture in Baltimore*, 4.
[247] C. Kelly, *Outdoor Sculpture in Baltimore*, 1 and 8.
[248] "Baltimore Monuments," *Monument City Blog*, http://monumentcity.net/ (accessed March 13, 2015). This blog is known as a "human-scale geotagging project," in which groups of people put together a full online profile of various monuments within the city. This profile includes histories and images of each monument that is "tagged." The variety of monuments represented on the blog help to give credence to Baltimore's nickname as "Monument City."
[249] Savage, *Standing Soldiers*, 3.

The Baltimore Confederate monument is a good example of the ways in which symbology created a collective memory of a specific event. The monument features two figures. While the first figure is that of a wounded Confederate soldier, the second is that of a winged figure.[250] Although observers might identify the figure as an angel, given its wings and long flowing robes, both of which are symbols commonly associated with angelic figures, the Maryland Division identified the figure as the winged figure of Glory.[251] The Maryland Division used the design of the figure, and the symbols represented within it, to ferment this interpretation. Not only is the figure wearing a laurel wreath on her head, but she is also holding one high in the air. Symbolically, the laurel wreath represents victory, and is not a part of common angelic iconology. Represented twice, both physically on the figure's body, but on also raised high in the air, the laurel wreath informs the audience that the Confederacy was victorious in spirit, if not historically.

The use of the Glory figure combined with the laurel wreaths was a way for the Maryland Division to use the Baltimore Confederate monument as a way to cultivate a collective memory of Marylanders participation in the Confederacy. The UDC used commemoration monument to teach their public audience that although the Confederacy may have technically lost the war, they were metaphorically victorious. This victory is largely through the vindication of Confederate culture and various educational efforts that encouraged the belief that the Civil War was fought against a Northern aggressor who not only had more resources, but also a larger and more formally trained army, and that was the only reason why the Confederacy lost the war. Not destroyed by the federal

---

[250] Scrapbook #5, 1902-1905, Benjamin Franklin Taylor Collection, Maryland Historical Society, MS1863 Box 2, Baltimore, Maryland.
[251] Soderberg, "*Lest We Forget,"* 10.

government, many Southerners considered the Confederacy very much alive, especially culturally.[252]

Although the winged figure represented in the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors monument is that of Glory, it has several elements characteristic of angelic figures. These include both the flowing robes and the large wings; both are religious iconography related to angels. Although the Maryland Division argued that the statue's figure was that of Glory, if the audience were to interpret it as an angel, it would not work against the UDC's attempt at creating a glorified Confederate history.[253] The figure is standing behind a wounded Confederate soldier, supporting and holding him up. If members of the public audience were to interpret the figure as an angel, having her support the soldier demonstrates that God was on the Confederacy's side.

The second figure within the monument is the soldier himself. Clearly wounded, the soldier presses his own hand against his chest, positioning his body against the winged figure for support. However, despite his wound, the soldier still holds his standard firmly in his left hand. The standard, although held low against his side, remains firmly in his grip with both edges off the floor. Although wounded, the soldier still appears to be willing to stand his ground and act bravely.

The design of the soldier of the Baltimore monument is unique because it goes against standard design practices of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century's. The end of the nineteenth century sparked the emergence of a mass consumer society not seen

---

[252] Martha E. Kinney, "'If Vanquished I am Still Victorious': Religious and Cultural Symbolism in Virginia's Confederate Memorial Day Celebrations, 1866-1930," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 106, no. 3 (Summer 1998): 262.

[253] Mrs. AJ Emerson to Miss Mary Hall, May 21, 1908, United Daughters of the Confederacy papers, SC140-B1-F1, Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, MD. In this piece of correspondence, Emerson, from Colorado, refers to the figure as being an angel. Despite not identifying it as the figure of Glory as the Maryland Division had designed it to be, it was still very clear to Emerson what it was supposed to represent. In particular, Emerson focused on how the angel was holding and supporting the fallen soldier.

in the United States to date.[254] As the nation began to urbanize and industrialize at a rapid pace, so did the rate of mass advertising and mass consumption, allowing for the development of brands that would become common household names. Monuments built during the commemoration stage showed similar patterns. Companies whose sole commodities were monuments began to form across the country, with large concentrations in the North. Although mass-produced, each monument made changed small details to meet the needs of the buyer.[255] The Baltimore Confederate monument, however, does not follow the pattern that many standardized monuments do: an obelisk or a solitary soldier demonstrating the "ideal of classic beauty through his relaxed stance and intent expression."[256] In these monuments, the types of hat worn by soldiers' distinguished their allegiances; Union soldiers typically depicted a private's cap while Confederates wore wide brimmed "Southern" style hats.[257] The soldier portrayed in the Baltimore monument, however, is bare headed, his standard and the inscriptions on the monument the only thing demonstrating his allegiance.

A detailed examination of the Baltimore Confederate monument is important because it helps to demonstrate how important the design of a monument was to the goals of the UDC. Commemoration monuments had specific purposes, only portrayed through what their audiences witnessed visually. There were no interpreters posted near the monument to explain to visitors exactly what they were supposed to see. Rather, the monument itself had to tell the story. Commemoration monuments, specifically the Baltimore Confederate monument, are unique because they are not dedicated to

---

[254] Karen Cox, *Dreaming of Dixie: How the South was Created in American Popular Culture*, (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of Chapel Hill Press, 2011), 37.
[255] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget,"* xxv.
[256] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget,"* xxiii.
[257] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget,"* xxv.

individual, like the monuments of the previous two stages. Rather, the Confederate monument in Baltimore is instead more generalized. They represent all Marylanders who fought for the Confederacy.[258]

In the early 2000s, historians began to shift in the way they studied monuments. For the first time, focus shifted towards the political implications of both the war and post war commemoration; historians need to consider these concerns when examining their subjects.[259] As political events and interpretations intersect with history and memory, political events have the power to transform and reshape the meanings placed on contested public spaces. Given the role Maryland played within the Civil War, Baltimore is a contested public space. Monuments represent the politics of the age in which they were created. Taking this a step further, monuments in public spaces, like the Baltimore Confederate monument, demonstrate the controversies around that space.

The Baltimore Confederate monument is a prime example of how politics play into monument building. The Maryland Division first had to appear before the City Council and request approval.[260] The First Branch of the City Council unanimously approved this proposal on January 2, 1899. Not only was it a unanimous decision, but all opposition to the monument withdrew their concerns and argument, completely freeing the Maryland Division to do what they wanted. Not only does this help to demonstrate controversies that existed around the space, but it also demonstrates the political climate that existed in Baltimore during this time.

---

[258] Henry and Caroline Naylor, *Public Monuments and Sculpture of Baltimore,* ([Writer's Center, Bethesda MD], 1987), 10.
[259] Daniel J Walkowitz and Lisa Maya Knauer, eds, *Memory and the Impact of Political Transformation in Public Space*, (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2004) 2.
[260] "City Council-First Branch Passes the Daughters of the Confederacy's Monument Ordinance. All Opposition Withdraws-Unfavorable Report of Committee on Parks Rejected" *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, January 24, 1899.

Maryland's role in the Civil War is what makes their monuments particularly important to the study of collective memory. Maryland was often described as an "America in Miniature," due to not only its middle placement geographically speaking, but also its highly "middle of the road" temperament.[261] While many Marylanders held themselves to particular Southern traditions and ideals, the state demonstrated loyalties to Northern economic and political ambitions. Susan Soderberg argues that while Maryland was "bound to the South by its tradition, agricultural economy, and history," it was simultaneously "bound to the North by its increasing commercialization and industrialization."[262] This division of loyalties would affect Maryland intensely. Old communities and ways of life fell apart, forcing new ones to build and develop in their places. The UDC was a part of this new social and political arrangement, using their political involvement and public displays to achieve their goals.[263]

For Marylanders, Civil War monuments were ways in which individuals and groups attempted to demonstrate their feelings and experiences of the war. The Civil War monuments erected here, both Union and Confederate, centered themselves on ideas of "sorrow and regret and with reconciliation of Northern and Southern values, as well as with pride and honor."[264] Designed to evoke an emotional response, nineteenth century monuments often fell into the commemoration stage.

At face value, the presence of the Baltimore Confederate monument seems to demonstrate the ways in which controversy continues to exist within a public space.

---

[261] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget"*, xvii.
[262] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget"*, xvii and Claudia Floyd, "Baltimore's Confederate Women," *Maryland Historical Magazine: Maryland in the Civil War (Special Issue)*, 39. Floyd's article discusses the general economic state of Maryland at the beginning of the war, as well as their relationship with both the North and the South, economically and culturally.
[263] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget"*, xix.
[264] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget",* xi

However, the unanimous decision of the city council to approve the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors monument demonstrates that heavy pro-South and anti-Reconstruction feelings continued to exist within the city, even within its central governing system. This means that not only does the monument reflect the ideals of the Maryland Division and the UDC, but at a certain level, it also reflects the ideals of the city. Although Maryland, and consequently Baltimore, was not purely pro-Confederate and Southern sympathizing during the war-the presence of a Union Soldiers and Sailors Monument is evidence of this-it can still be seen that there existed a large pro-Confederate culture population within the city.

Although an important aspect of the commemoration stage monument is its role as a public art, it is important to remember that it is not the monument's only role. In addition to be being a work of art, monuments are explicit messages from their creators to their audiences. These messages are, according to Susan Soderberg, "infused with emotion and tinged with deep-seating values."[265] Essentially, the purpose of a monument like the Baltimore Confederate monument is to remind people of something. Monuments were designed so future generations would still interpret the original meaning.[266] In many cases, the meaning of a monument can change over time. Symbols and other iconography change over the years and may gain or lose meaning to the audience. When designing their monuments, the UDC needed to work out what the symbols they used meant and how they could reinforce these meanings through ceremonies and rituals.

By reinforcing symbolic meanings, monuments become a way for groups of people to represent a collective memory and identity. Individual memories are not the

[265] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget,"* xi.
[266] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget,"* xi.

focus of commemoration monuments like the Baltimore Confederate monument, but are rather a collective version of history-where "true" or "untrue"-that will unify a community.[267] However, the reinforcement of symbols through ceremonies and rituals is not the only way that the Maryland Division worked to guarantee that their monument's meaning would stay the same across generations. To the Maryland Division, the inscriptions were just as important to the monument as the symbols represented. These inscriptions help audiences to gain a better understanding of that the monument is telling them.

The Confederate Soldiers and Sailors Monument of Baltimore rests on a large granite pedestal, standing at nearly eighteen feet high. Each of the four sides of the pedestal bears an inscription, two in Latin and two in English.[268] The front of the monument features the inscription "*Gloria Victis/*[Space]*/To the/Soldiers and Sailors/of Maryland/in the Service of the Confederate States of America/1861-1865*."[269] This inscription, although only nineteen words long, tell its audience a great deal about why the monument is located there and what its purpose is. As the public reads the inscription, they learn the monument is dedicated to all Maryland soldiers and sailors who fought for the Confederacy; it does not just represent a select group of people or a single individual who acted bravely during the war. Rather, all Marylanders who held some connection to the Confederation were welcome to connect to this monument on a spiritual level.

In addition to the identification of whom the monument is for, the front inscription bears the Latin phrase "Gloria Victis," meaning "Glory to the Vanquished."[270]

---

[267] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget*," xii.
[268] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget*," 9.
[269] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget*," 9.
[270] C. Kelly, *Outdoor Sculpture in Baltimore*, 181.

By choosing to use the word "Glory" in this phrase, the Maryland Division is making it very clear that the winged figure represented within the monument is that of "Glory," and not an angel. By doing this, the Maryland Division attempted to insure that audiences would interpret the monument in the "right" way. The rear panel of the pedestal, which states *"Glory/Stands Beside/Our Grief,"* reinforces this.[271] The Maryland Division wanted the public to look at the monument and come away with the impression that although the Confederacy lost the war, a fact that devastated and humiliated a large number of the white Southern population, it was not through any fault of their own. For them, the Confederacy fought bravely, an aggressive Northern powerhouse outmaneuvered them.

In addition, the Maryland Division makes a deliberate connotation by using the word "vanquished."According to the Webster's Student Thesaurus, there are several different synonyms to the word "vanquish," including "conquer," "crush," and "trounce."[272] Each of these words holds the implication that one group completely dominated over the other in some form of competition or conflict. In the case of the Civil War, a part of the "true history" that the UDC advocated for argued that the Confederacy lost the war due to the overwhelming size and power of the aggressive North. This word choice permanently reinforces these feelings.

The Maryland Division further enforced the connection between Marylanders and the Confederacy through the two Latin phrases written on the sides of the monument's pedestal. On the right is "*Deo Vindice,"* meaning "Under God, Our Vindicator" and on

---

[271] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget*," 9.
[272] *Webster's Student Dictionary and Thesaurus,* (New York, New York: Reader's Digest Association, Inc., 2007), 679.

the left is *"Fatti Maschi/Parole Femine,"* meaning "manly deeds, womanly words."[273] By proclaiming that God is vindicating the Confederate cause, the Maryland Division reinforces their belief that the Confederate cause was righteous and deserving of the vindication efforts the UDC put forth in the post-war years. The second phrase, "manly deeds, womanly words" works as a way to legitimize the actions of the Maryland Division, and the UDC, as a female memorialization group. They, as the descendants of Confederate mothers, sisters, and wives, have determined that it is their duty to protect the sacrifices of Confederate men. However, both of these inscriptions are important in not only what they say about the monument itself, but also where they originated. The right side inscription is the motto of the Confederacy, while the left side is that of the state of Maryland. By placing both together, the Maryland Division is drawing a clear connection between themselves and the state as a whole.

Every detail of the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors monument of Baltimore was designed to portray a specific message, to idealize and vindicate the Confederacy. In October 1902, only seven months before the monument would be unveiled, an article in the *Confederate Veteran* quoted the president of the Maryland Division.[274] In this article, Mrs. D. Girard Wright claims not only is the Baltimore Confederate monument the first monument that the Maryland Division was responsible for, but it was also one of the first statues of its kind made by the UDC.[275] While the Maryland Division had organized and

---

[273] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget*," 9; "The Confederate States of America : 22 February 1862 - deo vindice," Library of Congress, 1911, http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/2014645208/, (Accessed February 14, 2015); Jeff Barker, "NO longer manly, state seal uses gentle words," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, January 21, 2001, http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2001-01-12/news/0101120020_1_deeds-motto-english-translation (accessed February 14, 2015).

[274] "The Defeated South Idealized in the Maryland Confederate Monument, Baltimore," *The Confederate Veteran* 10(October 1902), Digitized by Duke University Libraries on the Internet Archive, http://www.archive.org/details/confederateveter10conf (accessed Feb. 2, 2015), 439.

[275] "The Defeated South," *The Confederate Veteran,* 439.

participated in a series of pro-Confederate efforts in the years since their founding, they had not yet organized something as large and widespread as a monument.

This is not to say that the Maryland Division felt that the pro-Confederate actions that the Maryland Division had taken part in prior to the monument idea gaining traction were not important. Wright says herself that the Division chapters had come together many times in order to do important things that would not otherwise be done, such as care for homeless Confederate veterans and widows and advocating for Southern oriented education. However, she immediately adds to this claim by saying that the chapters have never come together to complete something as important as the monument.[276] By amending her earlier claim, interesting insight about the role and importance of memorialization to the Maryland Division becomes known. Memorialization is one of the five objectives that the UDC has formally listed within their constitution. By stating that the Baltimore Confederate monument's planning and future inception is the most important role that the Maryland Division, Wright implies that memorialization is not only the most important of these objectives, but for a Division to engage in it is one of the greatest things that they can do.

The monument was presented from the "Maryland Daughters of the Confederacy", the localized name for the Maryland Division which drew from the organizations past as a Ladies' Memorial Association, to the City of Baltimore.[277] The Maryland Division presented the monument was presented to the city as whole, not to Maryland or Baltimore Confederates. The Division desired for the monument to be a symbol the entire city could see and learn from, not just a Confederate one.

---

[276] "The Defeated South," *The Confederate Veteran,* 439.
[277] Scrapbook #5, 1902-1905, Benjamin Franklin Taylor Collection.

Conclusion

Politics play an important role in the development and understanding of Civil War monuments, particularly Confederate monuments. Not only do the national and regional reactions to Confederate monuments give insight into the political debates taking place at the time of the statue's inception, but how the audience's interpretations change over time, the political ramifications of future decades are also represented.[278] This is particularly true when examining controversies around Confederate memory and memorialization. The Lost Cause movement, and the UDC's role in it, has caused a great deal of controversy, particularly in the twenty-first centuries. Although much of the academic world views the Lost Cause as being highly romanticized, elements can still be seen within Southern political and popular culture.[279] Confederate symbols, an important piece of the Lost Cause movement, are particularly surrounded in this controversy. This is sparked by the adoption and affiliation of these symbols, such as the Confederate flag and specific Confederate monuments, with many extremist racist groups. [280] As Southern state legislatures became involved in the discussion, making the decision to display Confederate symbols in public—and often political—spaces, the controversy surrounding them continued to grow.

One of the best-known controversies, based on its presence within mainstream national news, involved the Confederate battle flag flying over the South Carolina state house. In July 2000, the Confederate flag was officially removed from the State House in

---

[278] Daniel J Walkowitz and Lisa Maya Knauer, eds, *Memory and the Impact of Political Transformation in Public Space*, (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2004), 2.
[279] Foster*, Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 4.
[280] J. Michael Martinez and William D. Richardson, *Confederate Symbols of the South,* ed. J. Michael Martinez, William Richardson, and Ron McNinch-Su, (Tampa: University Press of Florida, 2000), 3

Columbia, South Carolina, only to be raised as a part of the South Carolina Confederate Soldier monument, also on State House grounds, on the same day.[281] It would not be until 2014 that that flag would be formally removed from the State House grounds and housed within the State Museum.[282] However, although major advocates of the flag's continued placement within the South Carolinian State House, the UDC was not formally a part of this controversy. Their involvement in the twenty first century debates over the Lost Cause and Confederate commemoration would most notably involve statues and monuments.

However, despite the controversy over the Maryland Division, related to Johns Hopkins University barring the organization from meeting on campus grounds following the end of one of their annual commemoration events, and the general debate that Confederate monuments have incited over the twenty-first century, the Baltimore Confederate Monument has remained relatively overlooked. The monument falls into enough standard guidelines and common symbolism that, although audiences are welcome to interpret it in multiple ways, it ultimately represents Confederate culture rather than any specific individual. In addition, there is a Union Soldiers and Sailors monument within Baltimore, creating a balance between the two sides. The Baltimore Confederate Monument was also dedicated significantly earlier than many of the other monuments that sparked controversy. Dedicated in 1903, in the heart of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century Lost Cause movement, thousands of

---

[281] Cynthia Roldan, "South Carolina capitol's Confederate flag is campaign issue," *The Post and Courier*: Charleston, South Carolina, October 1, 2013, http://www.postandcourier.com/article/20141001/PC1603/141009948 (accessed February 19, 2015).
[282] South Carolina Code of Laws, "Title 1-Adminsitration of the Government Chapter 10-Removal and Placement of the Confederate Flag," Section 1-10-10, http://www.scstatehouse.gov/code/t01c010.php (accessed February 23, 2015).

people lined the streets to celebrate; demonstrating a significant population of the city still supported Confederate culture.

This is in comparison to other, more recent Confederate monuments, which due to their design and the time in which they were dedicated have not been able to escape the same criticism. In 2011, a Confederate monument to General Nathan Bedford Forrest in Selma, Alabama was scheduled for renovation, only to fall under a community dispute.[283] The renovation, which had been planned following its theft early that year in order to combat future attempts, was sponsored by two different organizations: The Friends of Forrest and the UDC. The nature of the controversy arises largely over the content in which the monument depicts. In contrast to most commemoration monuments, like the Baltimore Confederate monument, the Forrest monument features an individual, "heroic," and historical figure from the Civil War. Although some consider Forrest to be one of the better military generals of the Confederacy, he is also considered to be an "extreme racist" responsible for the massacre of approximately 250 black soldiers at Fort Pillow.[284] In addition, he would eventually help to found the Ku Klux Klan and serve as its first grand wizard.[285]

---

[283] "Monument to Civil War general, Ku Klux Klan leader triggers controversy," *NBC News*: *U.S. News*, August 22, 2012, http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/08/22/13415785-monument-to-civil-war-general-ku-klux-klan-leader-triggers-controversy?lite (accessed February 20, 2015).
[284] Mark Pitcavage, as quoted in Miranda S. Leitsinger, "Monument to Civil War general, Ku Klux Klan leader triggers controversy," *NBC News*: *U.S. News*, August 22, 2012, http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/08/22/13415785-monument-to-civil-war-general-ku-klux-klan-leader-triggers-controversy?lite (accessed February 20, 2015).
[285] Robbie Brown, "Bust of Civil War General Stirs Anger in Alabama," *The New York Times*: New York, New York, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/25/us/fight-rages-in-selma-ala-over-a-civil-war-monument.html?_r=0 (accessed March 12, 2014)

Although the monument was originally dedicated in 2000, its location on city property prompted its move within the year.[286]As parts of the community spoke out, often by vandalizing the monument and surrounding property, against its location, it was moved to land that was owned by the UDC. Here, it would remain for eleven years before a petition advocating for its immediate removal argued that the monument "celebrat[ed] violent racism and intolerance."[287] However, considering that it was a privately funded monument that was located on property owned by the UDC, it was no longer a city monument. As a result, the monument, despite its controversy, remained.

The controversy around the Forrest Monument in Alabama is certainly not the only monument controversy in the country. In her article "Confederate Rock and Roll," LeeAnn Whites discusses her personal experiences as a historian in dealing with matters of Civil War memory.[288] She argues that controversy and conflict are not exclusive to the time period in which monuments are dedicated, which can be seen in the Alabama Forrest Monument. Specifically, Whites uses the example of a monument in Boone County, Missouri. The Boone County monument, which had been funded and dedicated by the local chapter of the UDC in 1935, followed the trend of the commemoration stage to have Civil War monuments be a symbolic form of public art.[289] There was no explicit meaning applied to the monument, which was a large stone boulder placed in the middle of the University of Missouri's Columbia camps. Instead, audiences were allowed to

---

[286] "Monument to Civil War general, Ku Klux Klan leader triggers controversy," *NBC News*: *U.S. News*, August 22, 2012, http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/08/22/13415785-monument-to-civil-war-general-ku-klux-klan-leader-triggers-controversy?lite (accessed February 20, 2015).
[287] "Monument to Civil War general, Ku Klux Klan leader triggers controversy," *NBC News*: *U.S. News*, August 22, 2012, http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/08/22/13415785-monument-to-civil-war-general-ku-klux-klan-leader-triggers-controversy?lite (accessed February 20, 2015).
[288] LeeAnn Whites, "Confederate Rock and Roll: Civil War Commemoration and Lived History," *Journal of Midwest Modern Foreign Language Association* 45, number 1 (Spring 2012), 11-15.
[289] Whites, "Confederate Rock and Roll," 11.

interpret it as they wanted. However, by the early twenty-first century the monument would come under fire by groups within the community. It had been moved from its original location on the Columbia campus in 1974, instead being placed in front of the county courthouse.[290] Although the county courthouse displayed a variety of wartime monuments, they were almost universally dedicated to all of the men who fought and died in them from that county. The only exception was the Civil War monument, in which it only featured the Confederate dead, having been built and designed by the local UDC chapter.[291]

Both the Alabama Forrest Monument and the Boone County monument were open to controversy due to their design. Whereas the Alabama Forrest monument was too specific, focusing on an already highly controversial figure, the Boone County monument was too vague. Featuring a boulder about five and a half tons in size, there were no discernible marks on the monument that allowed for interpretation.[292] The only thing that the audience was able to get out of it was that it was for the Confederate dead and not for anybody else. In the case of the Forrest Monument, the time period also played an important role in ways that was not the case for the Baltimore Confederate Monument. The Forrest monument was built and dedicated in 2000, right in the middle of the first Confederate flag dispute in South Carolina. The political climate was already ripe for controversy over Confederate symbols and when this is combined with the subject of the monument itself, it is left open for debate.

---

[290] Whites, "Confederate Rock and Roll," 11.
[291] Whites, "Confederate Rock and Roll," 11.
[292] Whites, "Confederate Rock and Roll," 11.

The Baltimore Confederate monument, due to its standard design, has faded into the background of the city.[293] According to the popular vacation planning and booking site, Trip Advisor, lists the Baltimore Confederate Monument as #167 of 316 things that visitors to Baltimore should do.[294] However, despite only being about halfway down this list, the monument has only one review. Although the reviewer rates their experience of the monument as "Excellent," upon further examination, the review itself is not for the Baltimore Confederate monument.[295] Rather, it is for the Confederate Monument of Jackson and Lee, located on Museum Drive and Howard Street and funded by private donor J. Henry Ferguson in 1948.[296] In March 2015, when I went back to see the monument, it appeared neglected and forgotten. Overgrown weeds covered the base and bits of trash and debris littered around it. As I spend several minutes taking pictures, several Maryland Institute College of Art (MICA) students gave me curious and confused looks before asking their friends why anyone would take pictures of the "War of 1812 Monument." The Maryland Division, while still active within the community, has neglected the monument and the community has forgotten why it was even there. Unlike the Boone County Missouri and Alabama Forrest monuments, which have received a great deal of public attention in recent years, Baltimore has ignored and forgotten the Baltimore Confederate monument.

---

[293] Claudia Floyd, "Baltimore's Confederate Women," *The Maryland Historical Magazine, Special Issue*, 37.
[294] "Confederate Soldiers and Sailors Monument," *Trip Advisor: Plan and Book Your Perfect Trip*, http://www.tripadvisor.com/Attraction_Review-g60811-d116827-Reviews-Confederate_Soldiers_and_Sailors_Monument-Baltimore_Maryland.html (accessed February 2, 2015).
[295] "Confederate Soldiers and Sailors Monument," *TripAdvisor: Plan and Book Your Perfect Trip*, http://www.tripadvisor.com/Attraction_Review-g60811-d116827-Reviews-Confederate_Soldiers_and_Sailors_Monument-Baltimore_Maryland.html (accessed February 2, 2015).
[296] Soderberg, *"Lest We Forget,"* 2.

By remaining unnoticed and forgotten, the Baltimore Confederate monument has avoided the same fate that many other Confederate memorials have. Reconciliationist monuments often replaced those specifically dedicated to either the North or the South. They honored the dead simply because they fought, not based on what side they fought on. The Maryland Monument at Antietam was the first in a series of Maryland monuments dedicated to "the Blue and the Gray," referring to all soldiers who fought on both sides. Called the "Monument to Maryland Heroes," it was erected to "her sons of both armies who were engaged in the battle," not distinguishing any particular side.[297]

It was not uncommon for monuments like the Antietam monuments to replace other, more controversial monuments. Controversial monuments, usually Confederate monuments, are often placed by the wayside for reconciliationist monuments that advocate for both sides coming back together. This was the case for the Boone County Missouri monument, which only gained controversy within the local community again because it was the only Civil War monument in the town. As the local chapters of both Union and Confederate memorial groups gathered together, the plan was to replace the Confederate Rock monument with one to "the Blue and the Gray."[298]

The replacing of Confederate monuments with reconciliationist monuments demonstrates what the UDC would consider a level of governmental bias. Whereas reconciliationist monuments are white supremacist in nature—reconciliationists believed that the only way to unify the country was to write slavery and black people out of Civil War histories—these monuments, as well as those dedicated to the Union, kept full governmental sponsorship. Confederate memorial organizations, however, held full

---

[297] Scrapbook #3, 1897-1903, Benjamin Franklin Taylor Collection, Maryland Historical Society, MS1863 Box 3, Baltimore, Maryland.
[298] Whites, "Confederate Rock and Roll," 12.

financial responsibility for their own monuments. Since Southern women had largely taken up roles within the political memorialization sphere, groups like the UDC were the forerunners in their monument building and left to raise funds entirely on their own.

By the end of the war, battlefields were littered with the bodies of both Union and Confederate soldiers who had died during battle, forcing a debate on what to do with the bodies. In 1866, Congress began to provide financial aid to groups, usually women's groups, to gather the remains of the dead and rebury them in formal cemeteries.[299] This aid, however, was only provided to the Union. With the beginning of Reconstruction, the federal government established themselves within the South in highly visible, often hated, ways; one such way was through the establishment of the National Cemetery System, which, in the words of Catherine Zipf, served as a "permanent, systematic embodiment of Federal authority within the former Confederacy."[300]

Ex-Confederates were not provided with the same aid and support in the burial and memorialization of their dead as the Union was, something that left many in the South extremely bitter towards the federal government. Instead, the precursors to the UDC, the LMAs, would take on this role. Privately raising funds, the LMAs would work towards the preparation, funding, filling, and maintaining of Confederate cemeteries across the South. This work would be done entirely through their own efforts and fundraising, without the assistance of the federal or state governments.

This was not, however, always a negative thing. By not being provided with equal governmental assistance and funding as their Union and "Blue and Gray" counterparts

---

[299] Janney, *Burying the Dead*, 44.
[300] Catherine W. Zipf, "Marking Union Victory in the South: The Construction of the National Cemetery System," *Monuments to the Lost Cause: Women, Art, and the Landscapes of Southern Memory*, eds. Cynthia Mills and Pamela H. Simpson (Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee Press, 2003), 27.

were, the UDC was left with the freedom to portray whatever argument they want to their audiences. This is why the Maryland Division was able to use their monuments to portray a sense of glory and victory to the Confederacy, even if they formally lost the war. This did not, however, make the Baltimore Confederate Monument immune to controversy of a different sort, however. This controversy, however, tended to be more localized and between the various Confederate groups. In August of 1912, the *Sun* received a letter to the editor in response to an article that had been previously written to commemorate the anniversary of the monument's dedication.[301] This letter was written by W.M. Pegram, a member of the Division Staff of the United Veterans and accuses the newspaper of leaving out one of the most important facts of the monument's inception. Although he claims that all of the technical details of the monument are accurate, key details involving the role of Confederate veterans have been ignored.[302]

This complaint demonstrates an attempt to place the monument fully within the boundaries of the UDC, without having help from outside sources. By not formally acknowledging the assistance that the Maryland Confederate Veterans claim they gave, the Maryland Division develops a specific history of the monument's inception. The implication is made that if the Maryland Division would not gain the assistance of the government, then they would instead complete the project entirely on their own. Over time, this narrative became best known, despite veterans arguing that they were important figures in the monuments dedication.

---

[301] W.M. Pegram, "The Unveiling of the Confederate Monument on Mount Royal Avenue May 2, 1903: Letter to the Editor," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, August 10, 1912.
[302] W.M. Pegram, "The Unveiling of the Confederate Monument on Mount Royal Avenue May 2, 1903: Letter to the Editor," *The Sun*: Baltimore, Maryland, August 10, 1912.

Despite not ever being the subject of a widespread debate, the Baltimore Confederate monument did face some questioning by Baltimore citizens over its appropriateness. Before the monument even began to be built, there were those in the city that believed that the monument would be ultimately detrimental to the reconciliation of the nation. In 1880, Mr. Charles T. Crane wrote to the *Sun* to discuss the possibility of a Confederate monument being erected in Baltimore. In this letter, Crane argues that, as a Confederate veteran, he was obviously loyal to the Confederate cause.[303] However, this does not automatically make him loyal to the Confederate monument. Crane argues that the monument would be:

> …impolitic, inexpedient and injudicious in the highest degree. Whatever the sentiments and sympathies of the people of Maryland may have been or may be now, there was and is a very respectable minority of them who did not sympathize with the South during the civil war.[304]

Crane continues on to say that although thousands of Marylanders did fight for the Confederacy, ultimately the state was forced to stay within the Union, implying that to then erect a monument to the Confederacy would be in poor taste.

Crane, however, was not entirely against Confederate memorialization in Maryland; he did not wish for the monument to be replaced with a reconciliationist version, but rather felt there was simply a time and place for such commemoration efforts, including Civil War battlefields and cemeteries.[305] It is when the monument is placed within a public space, particularly within the contested space of Baltimore, that the monument inherently becomes problematic. By placing a monument within a public space, the Maryland Division would force the surrounding community to accept the

[303] Charles T. Crane, "The Proposed Confederate Monument," *The Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, March 27, 1880.
[304] Charles T. Crane, "The Proposed Confederate Monument," *The Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, March 27, 1880.
[305] Charles T. Crane, "The Proposed Confederate Monument," *The Sun:* Baltimore, Maryland, March 27, 1880.

message of the monument, even if they did not necessarily agree with it. However, the general climate within the city at the time planning began allowed it to continue—and its carefully planned design allowed it to stay out of the Confederate memory controversies of the twenty first century.

As the Civil War ended and women's aid societies transformed into women's memorialization groups, controversy over Baltimore commemoration tactics began. The UDC, and other Confederate memorial groups, was placed under a great deal more scrutiny than Union groups were; Confederate groups formed as a way to facilitate the maintenance of traditional Southern culture and "honor[ing] the Confederate cause." [306] The efforts of the UDC, being highly pro-Confederacy and anti-federal government, particularly as Reconstruction set in the South, had to be completely funded by themselves, without the assistance of governmental aid. In Baltimore specifically, despite formally being occupied by the Union, many Confederate sympathizers continued to actively support the war effort. As the war ended, and memorialization efforts began, new tensions arose between the types of stories told and where the telling took place.

[306] Janney, *Burying*, 2.

Bibliography

Bailey, Fred Arthur. "Mildred Lewis Rutherford and the Patrician Cult of the Old South." *The Georgia Historical* Quarterly 74, no. 3 (Fall 1994).

Benjamin Franklin Taylor Collection, MS1863. Maryland Historical Society. Baltimore, MD.

Berlin, Ira. *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998.

Blight, David. *Beyond the Battlefield: Race, Memory & the American Civil War*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002.

Blight, David. *Race and Reunion*: *The Civil War in American Memory.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap University Press of Harvard University Press, 2001.

Brasher, Glen. *The Peninsula Campaign and the necessity of Emancipation*: *African Americans and the Fight for Freedom*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2012.

Brown, Robbie. "Bust of Civil War General Stirs Anger in Alabama." *The New York Times*: New York, New York. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/25/us/fight-rages-in-selma-ala-over-a-civil-war-monument.html?_r=0. Accessed March 12, 2014.

Brundage, W. Fitzhugh, ed. *Where These Memories Grow: History, Memory, and Southern Identity*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Buffington, Melanie L. "Stories in Stone: Investigating the Stories Behind the Sculptural Commemoration of the Confederacy." *Visual Inquiry: Learning and Teaching Art* 2, no. 3 (2013).

Clinton, Catherine and Nina Silber, editors. *Divided Houses: Gender and the Civil War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

"Confederate Soldiers and Sailors Monument." *TripAdvisor: Plan and Book Your Perfect Trip*. http://www.tripadvisor.com/Attraction_Review-g60811-d116827-Reviews-Confederate_Soldiers_and_Sailors_Monument-Baltimore_Maryland.html. Accessed February 2, 2015.

Cook, Robert. *Troubled Commemoration: The American Civil War Centennial 1961-1965*. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 2007.

Cook, Robert. "(Un)Furl that Banner: The Response of White Southerners to the Civil War Centennial of 1961-1965." *The Journal of Southern History*, 68, No. 4 (November 2002): 879-912.

Coulter, E. Merton. *The South During Reconstruction, 1865-1877*. In vol. 8 of *A History of the South*. Edited by Wendell Holmes Stephenson and E. Merton Coulter. Louisiana State University Press and the Littlefield Fun for Southern History, The University of Texas, 1947.

Cox, Karen. *Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture.* Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida Press, 2003.

Cox, Karen. *Dreaming of Dixie: How the South was Created in American Popular Culture*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of Chapel Hill Press, 2011.

"Daughters of the Confederacy." *The Confederate Veteran* 5(January 1897). Digitized by Duke University Libraries on the Internet Archive. https://archive.org/details/confederateveter5conf (accessed Jan 31, 2015).

"The Defeated South Idealized in the Maryland Confederate Monument, Baltimore." *The Confederate Veteran* 10(October 1902). Digitized by Duke University Libraries on the Internet Archive.

Ezratty, Harry A. *Baltimore in the Civil War: The Pratt Street Riot and A City Occupied*. Charleston, South Carolina: The History Press, 2010.

Faust, Drew Gilpin. *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War.* Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Faust, Drew Gilpin. *The Creation of Confederate Nationalism: Ideology and Identity in the Civil War South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988.

Faust, Drew Gilpin. *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War*. New York, New York: Vintage Civil War Books, 2008.

Floyd, Claudia. "Baltimore's Confederate Women: Perpetuating a Culture of War." *The Maryland Historical Magazine, Special Issue*106, no. 1 (Spring 2011).

Floyd, Claudia. *Maryland Women in the Civil War: Unionists, Rebels, Slaves, and Spies.* Charleston, South Carolina: The History Press, 2013.

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

Gillis, John R,. ed, *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Heyse, Amy. "Women's Rhetorical Authority and Collective Memory: The United Daughters of the Confederacy Remember the South." *Women and Language* 33, Issue 2 (Fall 2010).

Janney, Caroline. *Burying the Dead but Not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause.* Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

Johnson, Joan Marie. "Remember the Ladies: Ladies' Memorial Associations, the Lost Cause, and Southern Women's Activism, a review of *Burying the Dead." Reviews in American History* 36, no. 4 (December 2008): 529-536.

Johnson, Joan Marie. *Southern Ladies, New Women: Race, Region, and Clubwomen in South Carolina, 1890-1930.* Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida, 2004.

Jones, Jessica. "After Years of Research, Confederate Daughter Arises." *NPR*. August 7, 2011. http://www.npr.org/2011/08/07/138587202/after-years-of-research-confederate-daughter-arises. Accessed February 21, 2015.

Kelly, Cindy. *Outdoor Sculpture in Baltimore: A Historical Guide to Public Art in the Monumental City*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

Kelly, Patrick J. "The Election of 1896 and the Restructuring of Civil War Memory." In *The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture.* Edited by Alice Fahs and Joan Waugh. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Kinney, Martha E. "'If Vanquished I am Still Victorious': Religious and Cultural Symbolism in Virginia's Confederate Memorial Day Celebrations, 1866-1930." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 106, no. 3 (Summer 1998).

Kleinberg, S.J. *Widows and Orphans First: The Family Economy and Social Welfare Policy, 1880-1939*. Illinois: Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, 2006.

Levin, Kevin. "Black Confederates Out of the Attic and Into the Mainstream." *The Journal of Civil War Era* 4, no. 4 (December 2014): 627-628.

Levin, Kevin. *Civil War Memory.* http://cwmemory.com/.

Lindgren, James M. "'For the Sake of Our Future': The Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities and the Regeneration of Traditionalism." *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 97, no. 1 (1989): 47-74.

Martinez, J. Michael and William D. Richardson. *Confederate Symbols of the South.* Edited by. J. Michael Martinez, William Richardson, and Ron McNinch-Su. Tampa: University Press of Florida, 2000.

Maryland Division United Daughters of the Confederacy. http://www.mdudc.org/. Accessed February 20, 2015.

McCurry, Stephanie. *Confederate Reckoning: Power and Politics in the Civil War South.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Meringolo, Denise D. *Museums, Monuments, and National Parks: Toward a New Genealogy of Public History.* Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012.

Mills, Cynthia and Pamela H. Simpson, editors. *Monuments to the Lost Cause: Women, Art, and the Landscapes of Southern Memory*. Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee Press, 2003.

Monument City Blog. *http://monumentcity.net/2009/04/14/union-soldiers-sailors-monument-baltimore-md*. Accessed February 22, 2015.

"Monument to Civil War general, Ku Klux Klan leader triggers controversy." *NBC News*: *U.S. News*. August 22, 2012. http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/08/22/13415785-monument-to-civil-war-general-ku-klux-klan-leader-triggers-controversy?lite. Accessed February 20, 2015.

Morgan, Francesca. *Women and Patriotism in Jim Crow America*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.

Naylor, Henry and Caroline. *Public Monuments and Sculpture of Baltimore.* [Writer's Center, Bethesda MD], 1987.

Poppenheim Mary B., et al. *The History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy*. Richmond, Virginia: Garrett and Massie Incorporated, 1938.

Robins, Glenn. "Lost Cause Motherhood: Southern Women Writers." *Louisiana History: Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 44 no. 3 (Summer 2003).

Roldan, Cynthia. "South Carolina capitol's Confederate flag is campaign issue." *The Post and Courier*: Charleston, South Carolina. October 1, 2013. http://www.postandcourier.com/article/20141001/PC1603/141009948. Accessed February 19, 2015.

Rubin, Anne Sarah. *A Shattered Nation: The Rise and Fall of the Confederacy, 1861-1868*. Chapel Hill, North Caroline: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005.

Savage, Kirk. *Standing Soldier, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Shackel, Paul A. *Memory in Black and White: Race, Commemoration, and the Post-Bellum Landscape*. New York, New York: Altamira Press, 2003.

Smith, Jordan. "The Confederate Women of Maryland." *The Antioch Review: Varieties of Literary Expression: A Gallimaufry* 40 No. 1 (Winter 1982): 82-85.

Soderberg, Susan Cooke. *"Lest We Forget" A Guide to Civil War Monuments in Maryland* (Shippensburg, PA: This White Mane Publishing Company, Inc, 1995

South Carolina Code of Laws. "Title 1-Adminsitration of the Government Chapter 10-Removal and Placement of the Confederate Flag." Section 1-10-10. http://www.scstatehouse.gov/code/t01c010.php. Accessed February 23, 2015.

"The Confederate States of America: 22 February 1862 - deo vindice." Library of Congress. 1911. http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/2014645208/. Accessed February 14, 2015.

The Confederate Veteran, Volume 5 Issue. Digitized by Duke University Libraries on the Internet Archive. https://rchive.org/details/confederateveter5conf (accessed Jan 31, 2015).

"The Extended History." *The Museum of the Confederacy.* http://www.moc.org/about-us/extended-history. Accessed February 1, 2015.

Toomey, Daniel Carroll. *The Civil War in Maryland*. Baltimore, Maryland: Toomey Press, 1983.

United Daughters of the Confederacy papers. Harford County Historical Society. Bel Air, MD.

United Daughters of the Confederacy papers. SC140. Maryland State Archives. Annapolis, MD.

United Daughters of the Confederacy. http://www.hqudc.org/. Accessed February 20, 2015.

Walkowitz, Daniel J. and Lisa Maya Knauer, editors. *Memory and the Impact of Political Transformation in Public Space*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2004.

Webster's Student Dictionary and Thesaurus. New York, New York: Reader's Digest Association, Inc., 2007.

Whites, LeeAnn. "Confederate Rock and Roll: Civil War Commemoration and Lived History." *Journal of Midwest Modern Foreign Language Association* 45, number 1 (Spring 2012): 11-15.

Whites, LeeAnn. *Gender Matters: Civil War, Reconstruction, and the Making of the New South*. New York, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.