

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate School

2010

Glory Stands Beside Our Grief: the Maryland United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Assertion of Their Identity

Amanda Mae Myers

Follow this and additional works at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Myers, Amanda Mae, "Glory Stands Beside Our Grief: the Maryland United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Assertion of Their Identity" (2010). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 206.

<https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd/206>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

“GLORY STANDS BESIDE OUR GRIEF’: THE MARYLAND UNITED DAUGHTERS OF
THE CONFEDERACY AND THE ASSERTION OF THEIR IDENTITY”

A Thesis
presented in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the
Department of History
The University of Mississippi

by

AMANDA M. MYERS

December 2010

Copyright Amanda M. Myers 2010
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

This project analyzes the position of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, Maryland Division as a Lost Cause organization in a border state, and argues how the women sought respect from the national UDC chapter and divisions of former Confederate states. Women of the Maryland UDC believed strongly in their wartime support for the Confederacy and their identity as southerners; yet, they struggled for an equal voice within a national association predicated on the values of the Lost Cause and having been from a state that had not seceded. Southern sympathizing discourse among Maryland UDC women had to be reaffirmed in their actions in order to convince the national UDC and individual Confederate state divisions of their identity.

Arguing that through the Daughters' commemoration efforts in erecting the Maryland Confederate Soldiers and Sailors Monument, the monument to Confederate Maryland women, and the Jefferson Davis monument, the Maryland UDC sought to identify themselves as vital and distinct while seeking acceptance within the national organization. The Maryland Daughters viewed their monuments and projects as a means to commemorate and memorialize fallen soldiers, perpetuate southern antebellum ideologies for future generations, and to align themselves with their southern sisters.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my dear friend, Dr. Michael A. Powell. His friendship, guidance, and belief in me as a historian made this work and so much more possible. I am forever grateful.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to graciously thank those who helped bring this thesis to fruition. I must first thank my thesis committee who believed in me and this project over my duration as a graduate student. Dr. John Neff, Dr. Charles Reagan Wilson, and Dr. Elizabeth Payne have endured various stages of this project and I am thankful for their patience and support. Also within the University Of Mississippi Department of History I would be remiss if I did not thank my fellow graduate students who listened to me espouse the countless stories about the women of the Maryland United Daughters of the Confederacy and argue many times that Maryland is in fact, a southern state.

I am grateful to the many research facilities and their knowledgeable archivists who made my experience sifting through folders, scrapbooks, and UDC applications somehow easier, enjoyable, and timelier. John Coski and the Museum of the Confederacy; The United Daughters of the Confederacy, Maryland Division; Mary Mannix and the staff at the Frederick County C. Burr. Artz Public Library, Maryland Room; Marie Washburn at the Historical Society of Frederick County; Howard County Historical Society, St. Mary's County Historical Society; Montgomery County Historical Society; Maryland State Archives, Hall of Records; Maryland Historical Society; Enoch Pratt Free Library, Maryland Room; University of Maryland, Special Collections and Maryland Archives; and the University of Mississippi, J.D. Williams Library and the staff of the InterLibrary Loan Department, who on more than one occasion, handled large volumes of materials and expedited resources during the times when my procrastination

caught up with me.

To my parents, Robert and Doris, who have always stood behind me and my goals even when they seemed lofty or took longer than anticipated to attain. Thank you for believing in me. I love you. To my Nan and Pop Pop, who although passed away while I worked on this project, are still very much a part of it and my life. They taught me the value of a good education and always encouraged me to go far and do my best. Our countless trips to Gettysburg during my childhood are the root of my love for the study of the Civil War. Their memory is woven in the work I produce. Thank you for everything. I love you both.

Anyone who knows me knows that I would not be able to write an acknowledgements page without recognizing the loyalty and companionship of my dogs while working on this project. The nights they lay by my feet while I sifted through documents and wrote drafts made this a more enriching experience.

I am also thankful to those who, personally and professionally, provided me with much support, advice and opportunities to fulfill my goals: Toby Bates, The Catocin Center for Regional Studies, Dean Herrin, Barbara Powell, Dan Carter, Anne Rubin, Kathy Carbone, Kelly Shufflebottom, Marti Schneider, and JoAnn Charnik.

Lastly, this project is dedicated to my wonderful friend, Dr. Michael A. Powell. He saw the makings of an historian in me long before I considered the study of history. His passion and dedication to the study of Maryland and the Civil War has encouraged me to do the same. The friendship, time, and energy that he has invested in me has enriched my life and given me the confidence to reach higher and go further.

This project would not have been possible without the culmination of the support of everyone mentioned. I am a better woman, daughter, friend, and historian because of the contributions and support of all those mentioned here. My apologies to those who have gone unnamed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
TABLE OF CONTENTS	
ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF FIGURES.....	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
I. THE RISE OF THE MARYLAND DAUGHTERS.....	9
II. APPLICANTS OF THE BALTIMORE CHAPTER NO. 8 AND FITZHUGH LEE CHAPTER NO.279.....	21
III. MARYLAND CONFEDERATE WOMEN'S MONUMENT.....	33
IV. JEFFERSON DAVIS MONUMENT.....	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	59
VITA.....	64

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. UDC Membership Based on Familial Relationship to Supporters of the Confederacy...24	
2. UDC Membership Based on Forms of Support Among Qualifying Relatives..... 28	
3. Baltimore Chapter No. 8 Military Units of UDC Familial War Participants.....29	
4. Fitzhugh Lee Chapter No. 279 Military Units of UDC Familial War Participants.....31	

Introduction

The closing decades of the Nineteenth Century brought about an awakening of Civil War memory in the hearts of northerners and southerners which facilitated a need to honor abolitionism and unionism in the North and for citizens of former Confederate states to defend the actions and values of the Confederacy. How people remembered the four years of war that tore apart a nation and forever altered the lives of many families differed on an individual level, yet the collective memory of a region's people often dictated how the war would be commemorated. In order to honor the memory of the lives and sacrifices of those who fought on each side, men created veteran organizations such as the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR) in the North and the United Confederate Veterans (UCV) in the South. Similarly, in the North women's memorial organizations including the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic (LGAR) commemorated Union war veterans, while in the South the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) honored the men and women of the Confederate cause. In the North, greater access to public funding and less physical destruction as a result of the war permitted earlier efforts of Union commemoration and memorialization. Conversely, due to defeat, financial distress, and physical ruin the South was not able to similarly honor its dead and the Confederate cause until the 1890s.

Men's and women's Confederate memorial organizations that developed in the decades following the war sought to uphold and perpetuate southern antebellum principles. The formation of the UDC in 1894 unified white, elite, southern women in order to commemorate a distinct history of the South rooted in Confederate heritage and to memorialize those who sacrificed their lives for the Confederate cause. As UDC membership grew over the ensuing years, the Daughters organized successful fundraising campaigns as a means to erect monuments

to Confederate men and women, support veterans, and to sponsor scholarships for children of Confederate descent. Their commitment to preserve southern history, commemorate the Confederacy, aid veterans and widows, and educate southern children made the Daughters the most effective and contributory organization to the memory of the Confederacy.

Although state UDC divisions shared sympathies and common goals as established by the national organization, variations in the degree to which the women commemorated the past and the recognition they sought to attain as a result of their efforts differed based on geographical location. Daughters who lived in states of the former Confederacy had a deep connection to the causes for which they believed the South fought, and as a result felt strongly about their identity as Confederate women. The assurance that Daughters of the eleven seceded states had in their identity led them perhaps to feel less compelled to search for validation and acceptance of their commitment to the Confederate cause from others, even from other southern UDC divisions. Daughters who represented UDC divisions in border states, however, wrestled with conflicting memories of Confederate heritage and the Civil War.

In order to understand the importance of the Maryland Daughters, a broader perspective of Civil War memory and the UDC's place within the field is necessary. In the last decade the burgeoning field of Civil War memory has motivated historians to understand the motives, commemorative activities, and memories as publically expressed by veterans' and women's memorial organizations. Through public projects such as monuments, organizations sought to offer specific commemoration of men who fought in the war and women who sacrificed family members or aided soldiers from the home front.

Upon soldiers' return home from the battlefield, how they and their families remembered the war led to a national movement of commemoration. While the movement extended across the

Mason-Dixon Line, how the war would be remembered had sectional differences. Memory historian Paul Buck stated that once the Civil War ended, “the country was called upon to deal with a disaffected people who had aspired to independence and failed. The situation was a perplexing one. Certainly he who essayed to rejoin the disrupted fabric of national life would learn in full measure how strong and unyielding the hatred of brothers.”¹ While Buck is accurate in his assertion that the Confederacy’s re-admittance into the Union was complex, he does not address the post-war dynamics in the divided border states. Divergent sympathies in close proximity defined the conflicted border region and contributed to opposing Civil War memories. For women in the South as well as those in the border states who held southern allegiances, Confederate men may have lost the Civil War on the battlefield, but southern sympathizing women sought to perpetuate the legacy of the Confederacy and wove its memory into the “fabric” of the nation.

This work touches on a vast array of histories including Civil War memory, the Lost Cause, southern women and commemoration, and border states. The broad field of Civil War memory studies has brought historians to discuss more specific areas such as memorial organizations, monuments, race, and the role of politics and culture. Within the realm of Civil War memory scholars assert that memory is an active agent that its creators are able to form, adjust, and control based on interpretations of the past that they want to perpetuate. This management allows for the depiction of war and its memory to be shared in specific ways to highlight the best and hide aspects that may have negative connotation. This thesis blends arguments from historian Thomas Brown who demonstrates the symbolism behind Confederate commemorative projects with conclusions drawn by historians John Neff and Fitzhugh Brundage who articulate the relationship between gender, politics, and memory. Civil War memory

¹ Paul Buck, *The Road to Reunion, 1865 – 1900* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1937), vii.

scholarship helps to better explain the struggle that border state women endured after the war and how they managed conflicting sentiments.²

A rich body of literature on southern women has strengthened scholars' understanding of the role women played during the conflict as well as in the memory of the Civil War and provides a framework for understanding Maryland women who held allegiances with the Confederacy. Southern women who belonged to memorial organizations such as the Ladies' Memorial Association (LMA) and the UDC sought to commemorate Confederate soldiers and perpetuate antebellum social values. Scholarly debates about membership in these organizations, who could belong to them, and how women validated their membership become important in chapter 2. The growing field of southern women's history helps scholars to negotiate the various relationships that women managed in their daily lives – with their families, slaves, and community. These relationships and their experiences during the Civil War shaped how they remembered and chose to share their memory of the war. Moreover, a study of southern women explains the struggle that perhaps many members of the UDC experienced when they attempted to retain their conservative values while trying to expand their place in the public sphere. Much like the assertive southern women that historian Anne Firor Scott describes, the Maryland Daughters also pushed the boundaries of the public sphere while seeking comfort in the standards of southern social and gender norms. Scholars such as Mary Elizabeth Massey and

² Carol Reardon, *Pickett's Charge in History and Memory* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); Kirk Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monuments in Nineteenth-Century America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999); David Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (N.Y.: Belknap Press, 2002); William Blair, *Cities of the Dead: Contesting the Memory of the Civil War in the South, 1865 – 1914* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); Thomas J. Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration: A Brief History With Documents* (N.Y.: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004); Alice Fahs and Joan Waugh, eds., *The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); John R. Neff, *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2005); W. Fitzhugh Brundage, *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005); Gary Gallagher and Joan Waugh, eds., *Wars Within a War: Controversy and Conflict in the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009).

Anne Firor Scott opened the door to appreciate southern women and the roles they played during the war. A growing field of post-war and memory studies about southern women has been bolstered by historians including Mary Poppenheim, Karen Cox, and Caroline Janney.³

Another expanding area of historiography that contributes to understanding the efforts of the Maryland Daughters to perpetuate the ideas of the antebellum South is the field of Lost Cause history. The Lost Cause thrived as an intellectual movement driven by white southerners in the fifty years after the Civil War who sought to preserve values of the Confederacy and white supremacy. It is commonly recognized as a period in which Confederate memorial organizations paid homage through monuments to those southerners who sacrificed their lives for the Confederate cause. The values that structured Lost Cause ideology were not strictly confined to those who lived in the former Confederacy; rather, the Lost Cause did not have geographical bounds and even permeated the preservation of Confederate culture in the border states. Scholars have taken an especially high interest in this period and their work synthesizes the history of Civil War memory, southern women, and memorial organizations. Themes of death, memorialization, commemoration, and religion commonly establish a framework for the study of the Lost Cause.⁴

³ For works on southern women during the Civil War see Mary Elizabeth Massey, *Bonnet Brigades: American Women and the Civil War* (N.Y.: Knopf, 1966); Anne Firor Scott, *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 1970); George Rable, *Southern Women and the Crisis of Southern Nationalism* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1991); Laura Edwards, *Scarlett Doesn't Live Here Anymore: Southern Women During the Civil War Era* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2004); Drew Gilpin Faust, *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); Catherine Clinton and Nina Silber, eds., *Battle Scars: Sexuality in the Civil War* (N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2006). For works on southern women in Civil War memory and memorial organizations see Mary Poppenheim, et al., *The History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy* (Richmond, Va.: Garrett and Massie, Inc., 1938); Karen L. Cox, *Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003); Caroline Janney, *Burying the Dead but not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

⁴ Charles Reagan Wilson, *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980); Gaines M. Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, Lost Cause, and the Emergence of a*

These issues and books help to put into context the history of the under-researched areas of Maryland and post-war border states. Literature on Maryland and contested border regions is sparse, yet most books explain the state's military participation in the Civil War or the 1861 secession crisis. Most recently, historians have taken an interest in the social history of Maryland during the period and have contributed a better understanding of the divided state's people.⁵ Although there has been an increase in research on Maryland's social history, there remains a dearth of scholarship on the state in the years after the war. Completely missing from the literature on Maryland's Civil War is the recognition of women, their struggles in state with divergent allegiances, and their contribution to commemorating Maryland's role in the war.

This work specifically contributes to the understanding of Maryland Civil War memory and the contribution of women to the state's Confederate landscape, and it seeks to explain how a state and region committed to the Union also held strong allegiances to the Confederacy during a time of national reconciliation. The story of the rise of the Maryland Daughters and the journey they take to attain national recognition of their Confederate identity is complex and multifaceted. Chapter 1 introduces a composite of conflicting Union and Confederate allegiances based on Maryland geography and explains how divergent sympathies defined public commemoration with the erection of monuments to both Maryland Union and Confederate soldiers and sailors.

For the Maryland Daughters the erection of a monument to the state's Confederate soldiers and

New South, 1865-1913 (N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1988); Gary Gallagher and Alan T. Nolan, eds., *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 2000).

⁵ For Maryland's military involvement in the Civil War, see Daniel Hartzler, *Marylanders in the Confederacy* (Silver Spring, Md.: Open Line Publications, 1986); Kevin Conley Ruffner, *Maryland's Blue and Gray: A Border State's Union and Confederate Junior Officer Corps* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1997). For Maryland's secession crisis, see Mark Neely, *The Fate of Liberty: Abraham Lincoln and Civil Liberties* (N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1992); Lawrence M. Denton, *A Southern Star for Maryland: Maryland and the Secession Crisis* (Baltimore: Publishing Concepts, 2005). For a social history of Maryland in the Civil War, see Barbara Fields, *Slavery and Freedom on the Middle Ground: Maryland During the Nineteenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984); Kathleen Ernst, *Too Afraid to Cry: Maryland Civilians in the Antietam Campaign* (Mechanicsburg, Penn: Stackpole Books, 2007); Charles W. Mitchell, ed., *Maryland Voices of the Civil War* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007); Jessica Cannon, "Lincoln's Divided Backyard: Maryland in the Civil War Era" (Ph.D. diss., Rice University, 2010).

sailors provided a way to exhibit their southern identity and support for the Confederacy. Lastly, this chapter sets up a framework for understanding why women of the Maryland UDC rooted their collective memory of the Civil War in the arrests of Maryland legislators and their belief that President Abraham Lincoln illegally thwarted the state's opportunity to secede.

Chapter 2 offers a personal glimpse into some of the women who formed two local chapters within the Maryland Division of the UDC – Baltimore Chapter No. 8 and Fitzhugh Lee Chapter No. 279. Evidence presented in four separate figures demonstrates the ways Maryland women gained access to the UDC: Familial relationships to those who served honorably in the Confederate army or navy, or who gave material aid to the Confederacy. Also, the Daughters' applications demonstrate the states for which their male family member fought. While some Maryland men fought in Confederate regiments formed in the state, commonly men who lived closer to the Potomac River often crossed to fight under the banner of Virginia. The Maryland UDC applications offer a glimpse into how the women justified their admittance into the organization and their familial military connections to the war.

In Chapter 3, the UDC's erection of the Maryland Confederate Women's Monument demonstrates the women's continued quest for national recognition of their southern identity from their southern sisters. A commemoration project originally spearheaded by the Maryland United Confederate Veterans, the Daughters' used the opportunity to complete the project as a means to prove their commitment to commemorating the Confederacy. Ironically, as much as the women sought unity through their Confederate identity with UDC members on a national level, the Maryland Daughters also used their state women's monument in order to set themselves apart from UDC chapters in states of the former Confederacy. While other UDC chapters discouraged

and turned down monuments to their state's Confederate women, the Maryland Daughters used this opportunity to draw attention to their Confederate commitment.

The quest for the Maryland Daughter's Confederate identity comes full circle in Chapter 4 when their commemoration efforts reached the national stage with the erection of the Jefferson Davis monument. The Maryland Daughters took great offense to a design created by the national UDC and monument commission that seemed to minimize their state's contribution to the war. The women believed their state's contribution of southern supporting men to the Confederate cause justified equal recognition on the Davis monument. Disagreement and discussion between the national and the Maryland UDC regarding the design of the monument ultimately led to Maryland's successful representation on the project and gave the women national validation and equality of their Confederate identity.

Collectively, the actions taken by the women of the Maryland UDC demonstrate a growing assertiveness of their Confederate identity. The expression of border state Civil War memory is more powerful than memory conveyed in states of the former Confederacy because border women sought to validate their identity and to convince southern states of the history they wanted told in their way. A study of a border state UDC division demonstrates how the region's memory of the Civil War differed from those in states of the former Confederacy. Common goals such as memorialization and veteran welfare united the Daughters on a national level, but how the women achieved those goals within their individual states varied. The ways in which the Maryland Division of the UDC sought to participate in larger patterns of southern memory, how the Daughters sought national respect through Maryland's participation in the Civil War, and roles of women as actresses in Confederate memorialization reveals the power of the Civil War in American memory.

I: THE RISE OF THE MARYLAND DAUGHTERS

At the turn of the Twentieth Century, the Maryland UDC sought to honor Maryland soldiers for their valor and sacrifice in the Civil War. Although Maryland did not secede like her neighbors to the south, she offered sons to fight for the Confederate Army and Navy. From the inception of Maryland's first UDC chapter in 1895, Baltimore Chapter No. 8, the Daughters based their Confederate identity on efforts of approximately 25,000 Marylanders in the Confederacy and the men's motivations to support the South.⁶ Drawing on the dedication of Confederate Maryland sons and the belief that Marylanders' efforts during the war had materially strengthened the Confederacy, the UDC understood themselves as equals with their southern neighbors. While they accepted that Maryland did not secede, the Daughters believed that the dedication of Confederate Marylanders and the influence of the state's relationship with southern politics and culture validated their southern identity. Typical of other UDC divisions, the Maryland Daughters commemorated their state's Confederate soldiers by erecting the Maryland Confederate Soldiers and Sailors monument. While this laudable form of commemoration permeated the South at the beginning of the twentieth century, an understanding of the history of Maryland during the Civil War demonstrates the unique qualities of the state's women.

The conflicting geographic, political, and cultural climates of Maryland bled into each other giving the state its multi-faceted, complex history during the period of the Civil War. Geographically, Maryland is situated between pro-Confederate Virginia to the South and pro-Union Pennsylvania to the North. The Potomac River acted as a natural, geographic feature that divided Maryland and Virginia as individual states and separated two nations: The United States and The Confederate States of America. Similarly, the Chesapeake Bay acted as a divider

⁶ Ruffner, *Maryland's Blue and Gray*, 55.

between Maryland's Eastern and Western Shores (the latter, commonly recognized as "Southern Maryland"). Support for the Union cause came predominantly from counties in Western Maryland's panhandle and in the Baltimore City and County areas where the state's highest concentration of freed blacks lived. Conversely, counties in Southern Maryland and on the Eastern Shore had deeply rooted ties to the institution of slavery because of its agrarian economy and tobacco production. Citizens of the region between Baltimore and the western counties, known as Central Maryland, were divided in their allegiances to the Union and Confederate causes. Historian Amy Murrell Taylor describes these differences and divisions in the border states as where "slavery and abolitionism, Democrats and Republicans, industry, and agriculture, urban and rural communities all existed side by side."⁷

Slaveholders and farmers of the eastern and southern regions' tobacco and agriculture economy commonly held Confederate sentiments. W. W. Goldsborough, a captain in Company A of the First Maryland Confederate Infantry, explained Maryland's geographic and cultural connection to the South: "Maryland, by reason of her geographical location, close commercial interests with the tobacco and cotton-raising States, similarity of institutions and intimate social and natural relations with the people south of the Potomac, was emphatically a Southern State." Additionally, Maryland historian Charles Mitchell, asserts that "proslavery Democratic legislators from these agrarian areas remained a potent political force, and they had long worked diligently both to insulate slavery from government meddling and to keep even Maryland's free black citizens in positions of servitude." He further observes that "it was small wonder, then, that Lincoln received only 2,249 Maryland votes (of 86,290 cast), finishing last of the four

⁷ Amy Murrell Taylor, *The Divided Family in Civil War America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 3.

candidates, and that in seven Maryland counties, he received not one vote.”⁸ Like their slaveholding brethren to the south, southern supporting Marylanders also sought to protect slavery and support the Confederacy as a means to sustain their lifestyles, perpetuate their personal finances, and to subjugate black Americans, both freed and enslaved. The complex decision of secession threatened many southern sympathizing Marylanders’ way of life.

Historians continue to explore the convictions and divisions in the South that spurred secession. For Maryland, however, the question of secession was not as obvious; it sat on the border of the two conflicting regions, benefited and shared aspects of both, and surrounded Washington, D.C. The secession crisis, political upheaval, and the onset of war in 1861 proved to be problematic for Marylanders and placed immediate pressures on the state during the war.

Problems that ensued in the spring of 1861 led to greater upheaval and divisions in Maryland. On April 19, 1861, after President Lincoln’s call for 75,000 volunteers, “a pro-Southern group of prominent citizens” instigated a riot in Baltimore and attacked the 6th Massachusetts Regiment of Volunteer Militia en route to defend Washington.⁹ Expressions of pro-Confederate sympathy and the Baltimore incident revealed to President Lincoln the increasing threat should Maryland secede. Lincoln had been rapidly losing states to the Confederacy and it was imperative that the Old Line State remain in the Union. The loss of Maryland would be more than just losing a state; it would risk the loss of Washington at war’s outset. To secure the Federal capital, Lincoln authorized troops to control Maryland and guard the railroads and pathways into Washington in order to keep materials and supplies of men flowing. With respect to the upcoming special session of the Maryland General Assembly on April 26, President Lincoln understood that he could not arrest the legislators unless they acted

⁸ W.W. Goldsborough, *The Maryland Line in the Confederacy* (1900; rpt. Ed., Gaithersburg: Butternut Press, 1983), 337; Mitchell, *Maryland Voices of the Civil War*, 3.

⁹ Denton, *A Southern Star for Maryland*, 69-70.

unlawfully, nor could the government hold them as prisoners. If the government had arrested the legislators pre-maturely then they could have re-assembled after their release. Instead, as a precautionary measure, Lincoln instructed General Winfield Scott, General-in-Chief of the Army, that should Marylanders “arm their people against the United States, [Scott] is to adopt the most prompt, and efficient means to counteract, even, if necessary, to the bombardment of their cities – and in the extreme necessity, the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*.”¹⁰

Although military occupation throughout Maryland deterred the General Assembly from voting on secession, President Lincoln suspended the writ of *habeas corpus* and instituted martial law. Mitchell explains that “the president’s actions allowed arrest and indefinite detention without charges and was to be applied only along the rail way lines to ensure they remained unimpeded for the movement of troop trains.”¹¹ President Lincoln’s suspension of the writ and institution of martial law in April 1861 laid the foundation for political unrest in Maryland later that year when pro-southern legislators revisited their attempt to secede. This time the president reacted with a heavier hand than he had in April.

Information surrounding a possible attempt of secession by southern sympathizing Maryland Legislators aroused a response by the federal government that ultimately led to the foundation of Civil War memory in the minds of southern Marylanders. At a meeting in late August with General George B. McClellan, Secretary of State William H. Seward, Assistant Secretary of State Frederick Seward, and General Nathan P. Banks, President Lincoln arranged for the arrests of southern sympathizing legislators in route to Frederick for the General Assembly meeting. In his memoir, Frederick Seward remembered the purpose behind the meeting and explained the discontent in Maryland. He stated that “the Secessionists had by no

¹⁰ Letter, Abraham Lincoln to Winfield Scott, April 25, 1861, in Roy P. Basler, ed. et al., *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1953) IV, 344.

¹¹ Mitchell, *Maryland Voices of the Civil War*, 12.

means given up the hope of dragging Maryland into the Confederacy. The Legislature was to meet in Frederick City on the 17th of September. There was believed to be a disunion majority, and they expected and intended to pass an ordinance of secession.” Lincoln and the members of his administration contended that arrests of secessionist legislators prior to the meeting of the General Assembly prevented a quorum and ultimately any vote on the issue of secession. “When the time arrived which had been appointed for the assembling of the Legislature,” asserts Seward, “it was found that not only was no secession ordinance likely to be adopted, but that there seemed to be no Secessionists to present one.” Departing Maryland Governor Thomas H. Hicks expressed his satisfaction and support for the charges and arrests of the pro-southerners in a letter to General Nathaniel P. Banks: “We see the good fruit already produced by these arrests,” proclaimed Banks, “we can no longer mince matters with these desperate people. I concur in all you have done.”¹²

Operating on authority stemming from President Lincoln’s suspension of *habeas corpus*, authorization of martial law, and the subsequent closure of southern supporting newspapers, Federal officers arrested and imprisoned Mr. John William Baughman of Frederick. According to his wife, Mary Jane, Baughman was incarcerated in 1861 “by the Federal Authorities for being a ‘Southern sympathizer’ and for upholding the cause of the South in the columns of his paper, *The Frederick Citizen*.”¹³ Confined in the Old Capital in Washington, Baughman was released on July 21, 1861, the day of the Battle of Bull Run in Manassas, Virginia. In the

¹² Frederick W. Seward, *Reminiscences of a War-Time Statesman and Diplomat, 1830-1915* (N.Y.: The Knickerbocker Press, 1916), 176-178; Letter, Gov. Thomas Hicks to Gen. Nathaniel P. Banks, 12 September 1861, *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*. Series 2, Vol. 1. (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1894): 685.

¹³ Although Mrs. Baughman refers to the newspaper press as *The Frederick Citizen*, during John Baughman’s tenure as editor the press was known as *The Republican Citizen*. The press was suspended from 1864-1865 but the name did not change until 1890. *The Frederick Citizen* remained in operation until 1895. Mrs. John William (Mary Jane) Baughman, Application of Membership, United Daughters of the Confederacy, May 30, 1901. University of Maryland, Special Collections, Maryland Room.

subsequent years after his release, Baughman continued to write for the *Republican Citizen* and held deep sympathies for the Confederate cause. Three years later, Baughman's continued southern allegiances led to his exile from Maryland by the provost marshal in 1864 who ordered him escorted into Virginia. One Frederick citizen proclaimed that "it was the clarion voice and pen of Mr. Baughman that caused the powers of the Northern side to know, that his was an influence in the cause of the South to be reckoned with."¹⁴ Notified of his banishment on July 24, 1864, John Baughman was first sent to Harpers Ferry, Virginia, where his wife and three children joined him the following week. While military participation in the Civil War and allegiances to the Union or Confederate cause divided families in Maryland and other border states, the Baughmans are an example of a family unified in the belief and love for the Confederacy even when exiled from their home for their public support of the South. Such sentiments had long consequences: Following the war, Mrs. Baughman became the first president of the Fitzhugh Lee Chapter No. 279 in Frederick and advocated soldier and veteran commemoration.

In the years following the war, southern sympathizing Marylanders continued to believe that their opportunity to secede had been illegally thwarted by President Lincoln. They carried raw emotions of betrayal through the end of the Nineteenth Century when the Lost Cause movement, a period when former Confederates and southern supporting citizens sought to perpetuate the legacy of the Confederacy and honor their fallen soldiers, garnered support and public recognition of commemoration. At the height of the Lost Cause no other group in Maryland publically expressed continued support for Confederate and pro-southern sentiment to the degree of the Maryland Daughters.

¹⁴ "In Memory of the Exile of the Late Mrs. John William Baughman of Frederick, Md." p. 1, in Box, "United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1912-1961," Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Md.

Typical of the UDC elsewhere, the Maryland Daughters also completed projects of soldier commemoration, mainly the erection of monuments. During the height of Lost Cause enthusiasm, whose pinnacle lasted from the closing decade of the Nineteenth Century through the beginning of the First World War, Maryland Civil War veterans, their sons, and the women who supported the Confederate cause asserted their Confederate identity through public acts of commemoration and memorialization. Specifically, the Maryland Daughters offered reverence to the Confederate soldiers who sacrificed for their families, state, and the Confederacy. To understand the work and motivations of the Maryland Daughters, it is important to investigate the men who they sought to honor and commemorate and their motivation to support the southern cause.

Because of incomplete Confederate files, an exact number of Marylanders who fought for the Confederacy is impossible to determine but perhaps as many as 25,000 devoted themselves to the South. More importantly, Maryland's soldiers were all volunteers because the state did not conscript troops for Confederate service, nor were they supported by the state. Under the banner of Maryland, Confederate soldiers furnished one infantry regiment, one infantry battalion, two cavalry battalions, and four batteries of artillery. Collectively, these companies became known as the "Maryland Line" within the Confederacy. By comparison, approximately 60,000 Marylanders served the Union army. According to historian Kevin C. Ruffner, "Maryland raised twenty infantry and four cavalry regiments for Union service, as well as six artillery units and several regiments of United States Colored Troops (USCT). Maryland furnished a total of forty-two units of various sizes to the federal government during the Civil War."¹⁵

Although biographical information on Confederate Maryland soldiers is sparse a look at the life of one famed Confederate officer reveals his wartime experiences and legacy as a

¹⁵ Ruffner, *Maryland's Blue and Gray*, 55, 210, 7.

proponent for veteran assistance and the perpetuation of the Lost Cause. Colonel Bradley T. Johnson of Frederick is an example of a Confederate officer who came from an affluent family and became well respected and honored in the Confederate army. Born in Frederick County, Maryland on September 29, 1829, into a well-known and respected family, his grandfather Col. Baker Johnson fought in the American Revolution and his brother, Thomas Johnson, “nominated [George] Washington as Commander in Chief of the American Army and was the first governor of Maryland.”¹⁶ Following the trend of educated officers, Johnson graduated from Princeton College in 1849 and from Harvard Law School two years later. Subsequently, he “became the state’s attorney for Frederick County and married Jane ‘Jeannie’ Claudia Saunders.”¹⁷ In Johnson’s post-war activities, he was most widely recognized by Marylanders for spearheading the volunteer efforts of Maryland Confederate soldiers.

In the years following the war, Johnson and his wife Jane acted supported the Lost Cause and participated in fundraising efforts for Maryland Confederate veterans. Describing Johnson’s post-war years, historian Steven Bernstein asserts that, “much of his time was also occupied founding and supporting Confederate veterans’ organizations, including the Association of the Maryland Line and the Society of the Army and Navy of the Confederate States. In 1886 the Association of the Maryland Line lobbied for and received an annual stipend from the state for the establishment of a rest home for the Confederate veterans in Pikesville.” Jane also played a pivotal role in Maryland’s Lost Cause movement, having contributed to the creation of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, Maryland Division and serving as an active member until

¹⁶ “Famous Confederate Officer; Gen. Bradley T. Johnson Now a Resident of Baltimore. He is a Descendant of Thomas Johnson of the Continental Congress – His Services During the War,” in *New York Times* Mar 3, 1895, 21.

¹⁷ Steven Bernstein, “Marylander Bradley T. Johnson Committed Himself to the Confederate Cause before and after the War,” in *America’s Civil War Magazine*, September 2005, 20.

her death in 1899.¹⁸ It was the Confederate cause and the Maryland soldiers in which Johnson and the Daughters believed that bolstered the efforts of the Maryland UDC.

At the turn of the Nineteenth Century, Baltimore Chapter No. 8 of the Maryland UDC began building a monument to the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors of Maryland. They believed that “the twenty thousand men of Maryland who bore that crimson flag with such dauntless courage *deserve* that the women of this State should rear a fitting memorial in testimony of their reverence and love.”¹⁹ At the 1901 national UDC Annual Convention, Maryland UDC president Louise Wigfall Wright proudly introduced the Maryland Division’s project and subsequent plans to host a bazaar as fundraiser for the monument. She stated that “we have already in the bank over five thousand dollars raised by private subscription, and we hope to increase this sum sufficiently to rear a monument worthy of the great city in which it will be erected, and which will testify by its existence to the undying love of the women of Maryland for the Confederate soldiers and sailors.” Wright continued her address describing the selflessness of Maryland troops and professed the Maryland UDC’s love for their state’s Confederate men. She said, “the Maryland man fought from principal, plain and simple; he had everything to lose and nothing to gain. Upon the fair fields of Virginia the flower of Maryland’s young chivalry laid down its life, and the women of the State have not forgotten.”²⁰

At a 1902 Maryland Division meeting, President Wright described to the Daughters the importance of the soldiers and sailors monument as the first of its kind erected by an UDC division. Wright contended, “this, to us shall attach in the future – to us, the members of the

¹⁸ Ibid., 20, 61.

¹⁹ “The Daughters of the Confederacy in the State of Maryland (Baltimore Chapter No.8, United Daughters of the Confederacy)” in, ed.Carolyn Billups, *Lady Louise Founder of the Maryland Daughters of the Confederacy: A Compilation of Official Records, Newspaper Articles and Book References on the Lives of Louise Wigfall Wright and Daniel Giraud Wright as well as David Gregg McIntosh and Virginia Johnson Pegram and their Descendants*, 2nd ed (n.p.: self pub., 2000), 39.

²⁰ “Minutes of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy,” Wilmington, N.C., November 13-16, 1901, p.75.

Maryland Division of the Daughters of the Confederacy – the peculiar honor that we are the first band of Confederate women to erect to our heroes a monument which embodies in itself an idealization of the Confederacy in an allegorical representation of the glory of the South in her defeat.”²¹ That the first Confederate soldiers and sailors monument erected by a UDC division came from Maryland, a border state, is indicative of the Daughters’ Confederate identity and their devotion to expressing that identity. Moreover, Wright’s statement is an example of how strongly the Maryland Daughters felt about being accepted as equals in their Confederate support; so much so that being the first to erect such a monument magnified their commitment.

At the same meeting, Wright recalled the labor and good deeds performed by the Daughters to assist the state’s Confederate veterans such as supplying gifts and money to those living in the veterans’ home, but she believed that the monument would be their greatest work to date. She proclaimed that “to-day [*sic*] is the day of days which sees us come together to announce the full fruition of our work – the crowning of the labors and the hopes of many years.”²² Wright and the Maryland Daughters viewed the Soldiers and Sailors monument as their crowning achievement and as their opportunity to gain respect early from the national UDC and sisters in former Confederate states.

Mrs. Wright reinforced the commitment of Confederate Marylanders to all other national UDC divisions at the 1902 national convention, and in so doing reified the Maryland Daughters’ southern identity. In her address to the convention, Wright invited fellow Daughters to the unveiling of the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors Monument so they could understand and pay respect to Maryland’s contribution to the Confederacy. She urged the convention “to come and rejoice with us, and by your presence at the unveiling of this monument to pay your tribute to the

²¹ “The Defeated South Idealized the Maryland Confederate Monument, Baltimore,” *Confederate Veteran*, 10, no. 10, (Oct. 1902): 10.

²² *Ibid.*, 10

men of Maryland who, not counting the loss, left home and loved ones to fight the battles of the South.”²³ The enthusiasm Wright and the Maryland Daughters held for their monument honored the commitment made by Confederate Maryland troops and gave the state UDC the opportunity to express their Confederate identity and to seek equal respect from their southern sisters.

In addition to the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors monument, Union supporting Marylanders also expressed their appreciation for Federal soldiers and sailors of the state. Following the dedication of Confederate Soldiers and Sailors monument the state continued to grapple with its divided past, and in April 1906 the Maryland General Assembly commissioned a monument to the Union soldiers and sailors of the state. The monument, located in Baltimore City, took three years to complete and cost \$ 25,000. At the dedication ceremony in November 1909, Governor Austin L. Crothers “praised the ‘fearless daring’ of the soldiers from Maryland, that whatever the differences were of the past, ‘the people of Maryland stand today as a united people.’” Importantly, by comparison, the earlier ceremony at the Confederate monument during which both the Federal and Confederate national anthems had played, only “The Star-Spangled Banner” played at the dedication of the Union monument.²⁴ This action supports Governor Crothers’ statement of Maryland’s unity, as playing only the Union national anthem indicated that all Marylanders now united under one banner. Additionally, playing Confederate songs or displaying Confederate imagery would have meant the Union supporters recognized the Confederacy as a nation and continued to honor beliefs different from their own. In the eyes of some Unionists, acknowledging the Confederacy at the Union monument’s dedication could have been perceived as treasonous in 1909. The response by the Maryland General Assembly to

²³ “Minutes of the Ninth Annual Meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy,” New Orleans, La, November 12-15, 1902, p.51.

²⁴ Susan Cooke Soderberg, *“Lest We Forget”: A Guide to Civil War Monuments in Maryland* (Shippensburg, Penn.: White Mane Publishing, 1995), 5.

erect a monument to the state's Union soldiers and sailors is indicative of the conflicting legacies that continued to haunt Marylanders and the quest by supporters of both sides to express their allegiances.

II: APPLICANTS OF BALTIMORE CHAPTER NO. 8 AND FITZHUGH LEE CHAPTER NO. 279

For Maryland women and perhaps women throughout the South, membership in their state's division of the UDC asserted an individual, self-declared relationship to the lost Confederacy. That relationship was often a personal one, for most women who eventually became Daughters had direct familial relationships with a Confederate soldier. Those intimate relations, therefore, shaped the ways in which Southern women confronted their uncertain future. Throughout the decades following war's end women gave their time and energies to various memorial and commemorative associations and activities. The UDC was widely accepted as the pinnacle of such statements about Southern identity and loyalty.

Of post-war commemorative activity among women, two groups have been dominant in historiography – the LMA and the UDC. An inclusive study of the women of the Virginia Ladies' Memorial Associations by historian Caroline E. Janney strives to understand the women who comprised the LMAs, their direct relationship to the Confederacy, and the vital civic duties they performed. She asserts that the women of the LMAs “were middle and upper-class, well connected white women” who, “joined LMAs between 1865 and 1870 [and] were overwhelmingly the wives and daughters of the cities' businessmen and civic leaders.” She further contends that “the LMAs executive boards generally included women whose husbands or fathers were politicians, physicians, insurance agents, merchants, tobacco manufacturers, and lawyers,” not soldiers.²⁵

Comparatively, those who later formed the UDC had different relationships with Confederate men and sought membership into the sorority most often through military connection. UDC historian Karen Cox contends that the Daughters “who joined the UDC within

²⁵ Caroline E. Janney, *Burying the Dead but not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 52.

the first decade of its founding belonged to the second generation of women active in the Lost Cause.” While Janney argues that the women of the Virginia LMAs generally were not the wives, daughters, or widows of men who gave military service to the Confederacy, Cox states that women who joined the UDC were “literally daughters of the Confederacy and often they were daughters of Confederate officers.” An examination of two Maryland UDC chapters helps to reveal their relationships to the Confederacy and how the Maryland Daughters’ membership compared to the general findings of Janney and Cox.²⁶

The UDC membership applications of Maryland Daughters explain their justification for admission based on their self-proclaimed relationship to the Confederacy, and often a relationship predicated on military information on the soldier through whom the applicant recognized as their connection to the Confederacy. The applications of two chapters within the Division, Baltimore Chapter No. 8 and the Fitzhugh Lee Chapter No. 279 in Frederick, help us better understand the women who formed the UDC in Maryland. The evidence does not speak to the entire Maryland Division, nor does it include the women of other state UDC divisions. It helps, however, to illustrate the Maryland Daughters’ personal or familial ties to those who offered direct support to the Confederacy, and the centrality of such relationships used to seek admission into the UDC.

Regarding acceptance into the organization, the UDC required specific familial lineage and evidence of their ancestor’s contribution to the Confederacy. The UDC specifies that “those eligible for active membership are women no less than 16 years of age who are blood descendants, lineal or collateral, of men and women who *served honorably* in the Army, Navy or

²⁶ Karen L. Cox, *Dixie’s Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003), 30, 37.

Civil Service of the Confederate States of America, or gave Material Aid to the Cause.”²⁷

Additionally, women who themselves offered aid to the Confederate cause qualified for admission into the sorority. Aid might have been in many forms, including but not limited to providing munitions, medical aid, or housing to soldiers.

²⁷ “United Daughters of the Confederacy Home Page.” <http://www.hqudc.org>.

FIGURE 1

UDC Membership Based on Familial Relationship to Supporters of the Confederacy

<u>Relationship to Soldier</u>	<u>Baltimore Chapter²⁸</u>		<u>Fitzhugh Lee Chapter²⁹</u>	
Marriage				
Wife	0	(0%)	1	(1.5%)
Widow	0	(0%)	3	(4.5%)
		(0%)		(6%)
Lineal				
Mother	4	(3.8%)	1	(1.5%)
Daughter	51	(49.5%)	31	(46.9%)
Grand-Daughter	27	(26.2%)	7	(10.6%)
		(79.5%)		(59%)
Collateral				
Sister	0	(0%)	4	(6%)
Niece	14	(13.5%)	12	(18.1%)
Great Niece	6	(5.8%)	1	(1.5%)
Cousin	1	(0.9%)	3	(4.5%)
		(20.2%)		(30.1%)
Self-Identification				
Self*	0	(0%)	3	(4.5%)

Total:	103		66	

<u>Personal Relationship</u>	<u>Baltimore Chapter</u>	<u>Fitzhugh Lee Chapter</u>
Wife of Confederate Sympathizer	0	1
Daughter of Confederate Sympathizer	1	1
Grand-Daughter of Confederate Sympathizer	1	0

*Some women self-identified their relationship with the Confederacy, specifically if they did not have a familial connection with the cause. They often used aid offered on the homefront as validation for admission into the UDC.

²⁸ Membership applications located in “United Daughters of the Confederacy, Maryland Division, [Membership applications 1895- to Baltimore Chapter Number 8.](#)” [Box 1, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Md.](#)

²⁹ Membership applications located in “Civil and Social Organizations’ Records, 1740-1950” in, Maryland manuscripts collection, series 6, box 1, folder 1, item 5484, Maryland Manuscripts Archives, University of Maryland, College Park.

An examination of one-hundred three membership applications for the Baltimore Chapter No. 8 from its charter in 1895 to 1927 (Figure 1) reveals specific information regarding the relationships between women who joined the charter. Not surprisingly, the largest representation of applicants identified themselves as lineal descendants of someone who had served the Confederacy in a military context or provided material aid. The lineal descendants who comprised the 79.5 percent of applicants are classified as mothers, daughters, or grand-daughters. Similarly, of the sixty-six applications for membership into the Fitzhugh Lee Chapter No. 279, lineal descendants represented the greatest percentage of applicants with 59 percent. In both chapters, women who classified themselves as daughters of a Confederate descendant comprised the greatest representation. The next closest blood descendants in the Baltimore chapter identified themselves as grand-daughters and accounted for twenty-six percent, nearly half of the lineal descendants in the applications reviewed. Those recognized as collateral descendants (niece, great-niece, sister, or cousin) formed 20.2 percent of the Baltimore chapter women in this study. Similarly, collateral in the Fitzhugh Lee chapter comprised the second greatest over all percentage of applicants. In both chapters, women classified as nieces comprised the largest percentage of collateral descendants.

Lastly, Widows and wives of those who contributed to the Confederate cause also qualified for membership into the UDC. While the Baltimore chapter applications do not contain any women who identified themselves as widows or wives of men who served in the Confederate military or gave material aid, three widows and one wife submitted applications to the Frederick chapter. This supports Cox's argument that the majority of the women in the UDC identified themselves as lineal descendants, specifically daughters, of men or women who served the Confederacy.

Women who self-identified with the Confederacy comprised a second option to qualify for membership into the UDC. While proof of familial ancestry of those who served the Confederacy was required along with the application, women who sought membership through their own contributions to the cause may not have been able to prove their aid. This category may emphasize how women wanted to be part of the UDC but were unable to verify their earnestness for the Confederate cause. On their applications women wrote that they provided medical aid or opened their homes to Confederate soldiers. While the UDC acknowledged these forms of aid in order to acquire members into the organization, the women's acts could not necessarily be proven. In this study, three women, or 4.5 percent of applicants gained admission into the Fitzhugh Lee chapter.

Lastly, aid or support contributed to the Confederacy by an applicant justified eligibility into the UDC. In this category "Support" was defined as any type of non-military assistance by men or women to the Confederacy including, medical aid, religious comfort, offering of sustenance, homespun clothing, housing, operation of a southern supporting newspaper, or a position as a southern sympathizing political participant. In both UDC chapters four applicants identified their relationship to the Confederacy as being related to a Confederate sympathizer. In the Baltimore chapter applications, two women specifically identified themselves as a daughter and a grand-daughter of Maryland legislators who had been arrested in 1861. Similarly, in the Frederick chapter's applications, two women identified themselves as relatives of arrested secessionist John Baughman – Mrs. Mary Jane Baughman, his widow and daughter, Ms. Corinne Baughman.

Specific information regarding military contributions to the Confederacy by an applicant's ancestor also appeared on UDC membership applications (Figure 2). Of the same

Baltimore Chapter No. 8 applications, a remarkable 78.6 percent of women identified their familial Confederate ancestor as a soldier, while an additional 7.8 percent stated that their descendant served as a Confederate officer. Closely paralleling those statistics, 72.7 percent of the Fitzhugh Lee Chapter No. 87 applicants declared their ancestor as a soldier, while 4.5 percent claimed that a family member served on the staff of a Confederate officer. Combined, 77.2 percent of the Daughters in the Frederick chapter applications identified their Confederate descendent as having served in the Confederate army or navy. In both chapters, women who identified through a family member's non-military contribution to the Confederacy garnered the second largest percentage of applicants. Only three women of nineteen identified themselves as not having a familial connection to the Confederacy and sought admission into the UDC through their own means of providing home-front aid to the Confederacy. Although this is a small sample of UDC applications, the evidence that the greatest percentage of these Maryland Daughters identified with fathers who served in the Confederate military reasserts Cox's conclusion that the women drew their connection through familial military involvement.

FIGURE 2

UDC Membership Based on Forms of Support Among Qualifying Relatives

<u>Other Forms of Support</u>	<u>Baltimore Chapter</u>	<u>Fitzhugh Lee Chapter</u>
Material Aid/Sympathy	12 (11.7%)	19 (28.7%)
Soldier	81 (78.6%)	48 (72.7%)
Military Staff	8 (7.8%)	3 (4.5%)
Arrested Secessionist	0 (0%)	2 (3%)
Arrested Maryland Legislator	2 (1.9%)	0 (0%)
TOTAL:	103	66

FIGURE 3

Baltimore Chapter No. 8
Military Units of UDC Familial War Participants

<u>Maryland</u>	<u>Virginia</u>	<u>North Carolina</u>	<u>Alabama</u>	<u>Mississippi</u>
1st Batt. Art. (4)	13th Batt. Art. (2)	56th Inf. Co. B (2)	3rd Inf. (1)	28 th Cav. Co. K (1)
2nd Batt. Art. (1)	27th Batt. Art. (2)	37th Regiment (1)		
4th Batt. Art. (1)	1st Cav. Co. G (1)	50th Regiment (1)		
1st Cav. Co E. (2)	1st Cav. Co. H (1)			
1st Inf. Co. A (3)	4th Cav. (2)			
1st Inf. Co. C (1)	7th Cav. Co. D (1)			
1st Inf. Co. E (3)	8th Cav. (1)			
	9th Cav. (1)			
	12th Cav. (2)			
	25th Cav. (1)			
	2nd Inf. (1)			
	5th Inf. (1)			
	15th Inf. (2)			
	21st Inf. Co. B (2)			
	26th Inf. (1)			
	30th Inf. (1)			
	40th Inf. (3)			
	47th Inf. (2)			
	55th Inf. Co. H (1)			
	67th Militia (1)			
	Unidentified (8)			
Total: 15 (18.5%)	Total: 37 (45.7%)	Total: 4 (4.9%)	Total: 1 (1.2%)	Total: 1 (1.2%)
<u>Texas</u>	<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>Georgia</u>	<u>Tennessee</u>	<u>Unidentified States</u>
14 th Inf. (1)	Palmetto Floating Battery (1) Unidentified (2)	Unidentified (2)	3 rd Inf. (1)	(16)
Total: 1 (1.2%)	Total: 3 (3.7%)	Total: 2 (2.5%)	Total: 1 (1.2%)	Total: 16 (19.7%)

TOTAL: 81 military participants

In addition to explaining the familial relationship and forms of aid offered to the Confederacy, women also frequently noted the state and military unit for which their men fought. 80.2 percent of the Baltimore Chapter No. 8 women who stated that their family member fought for the Confederacy identified the soldiers' state and unit (Figure 3). Surprisingly, the greatest number of soldiers with whom the Baltimore Daughters identified fought not for Maryland's Confederate regiments, but for Virginia. Forty-six percent of the identified soldiers fought in at least twenty different Virginia military units. Women who identified having a familiar relationship with a war participant but did not identify the military unit with whom they fought represent 19 percent of the applicants.

Drawing comparisons between the Baltimore Chapter No. 8 applications and the applicants from the Fitzhugh Lee Chapter No. 279, 39.6 percent of women in the latter chapter did not identify a military unit for their ancestor (Figure 4). Similar to the Daughters who simply stated that their ancestor participated as a soldier without offering any state or unit information neither did they give proof of military service. Fitzhugh Lee chapter applicants who identified their relative as having fought for Virginia recorded 35.4 percent, while those who fought for Maryland represented 18.9 percent. Regarding the greater percentage of Virginia soldiers recorded in the Fitzhugh Lee chapter applications, there may be an explanation for the higher Virginia percentages. Historian Rebecca Miller contends that "for Frederick County's volunteers, joining the Rebel army was hampered by Federal occupation. Prospective enlistees were forced to elude Union troops and make their way to Virginia. Harpers Ferry, Winchester, and Richmond all welcomed Frederick County men into Maryland regiments."³⁰ Proximity to the Potomac River meant easier access for Frederick men to reach Virginia than for men from Baltimore.

³⁰ Rebecca Miller, "Confederate Sentiment in Frederick County, 1861-1862," in Barbara M. Powell and Michael A. Powell, eds., *Mid-Maryland History: Conflict, Growth, and Change* (Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2008), 24.

FIGURE 4

Fitzhugh Lee Chapter No. 279
Military Units of UDC Familial War Participants

<u>Maryland</u>	<u>Virginia</u>	<u>Texas</u>	<u>Kentucky</u>	<u>South Carolina</u>
1st Cav (1)	9th Cav. (2)	6 th Cav. (1)	4 th Inf. (1)	12 th Reg. Vol. (1)
1st Cav. Co. E (1)	35th Batt. Cav. (6)			
Co. B Cav. (2)	43rd Batt. Cav. (1)			
Co. D Cav. (3)	5th Inf. (2)			
2nd Inf. Co. C (1)	VMI Cadet (1)			
Unidentified (1)	Unidentified (5)			
Total: 9 (18.9%)	Total: 17 (35.4%)	Total: 1 (2.1%)	Total: 1 (2.1%)	Total: 1 (2.1%)

Unidentified

(19)

Total: 19
(39.6)

TOTAL: 48 military participants

In Baltimore, on the other hand, numbers might have been inflated because migration to the city from southern states during Reconstruction ran high. Southerners sought to remove themselves from the turmoil and destruction in the aftermath of the war and hoped for better economic opportunity. Families from former states of the Confederacy, like Virginia, relocated to Baltimore and surrounding areas to seek a better life. Commonly, women of the former Confederacy who applied for membership into the Baltimore chapter identified with their former state for which their soldier fought. This might explain greater state diversity within the chapter and its representation as the highest number of chapter members in the state.

The rich, albeit complex, history of Maryland's geographic, political, economic, and cultural climate made the Old Line State a crossroads of contention. The state's southern sympathizing men believed deeply in their love for the Confederacy and defended their convictions by serving in the Confederate military. As represented in the evidence from UDC applications, Confederate men volunteered in their own state's military units and even crossed the Potomac River to enlist in Virginia to serve the Confederate cause. Similarly, the women of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, Maryland Division sought to uphold and perpetuate the Confederate ideals and beliefs with the same passion and devotion extended by their relatives and thereby glorified themselves through those connections.

III: MARYLAND CONFEDERATE WOMEN'S MONUMENT

Virtually simultaneous with the planning and fundraising for the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors monument, the Maryland Daughters agreed to begin another project of commemoration in their state. In 1918, the Maryland UDC erected a monument to the Confederate Women of Maryland. In addition to honoring wartime southern sympathizing women of Maryland, the state UDC used the monument as a means to gain respect from their sorority sisters outside the state. Although dedicating a monument to themselves was atypical of most UDC divisions, the Maryland Daughters intended to bolster their own status even as their work and actions differed from their sister states.

In 1902 the Maryland Division of the United Confederate Veterans appealed to its members to start a fund to erect a monument to the Confederate women of Maryland. It is uncertain why attempts by the Veterans to raise sufficient funds for the memorial failed, but the men remained committed to honoring their state's women. Frequently, southern women acquired projects that the men could not complete. Commonplace in the period of Lost Cause commemoration, southern women had stronger, more successful fundraising campaigns than southern men. The reason behind this gendered dynamic is uncertain although historians grapple with its meaning. Historian Fitzhugh Brundage asserts that "whatever the personal and social inspirations for women's activism, the influence that women sought might have remained beyond their reach had they not possessed the organizational fortitude to wield power in the public sphere. Above all, organized white women in the South possessed impressive fund-raising

acumen.”³¹ As a result of the Daughters’ success in raise money, the men of the UCV relinquished the monument’s fundraising to the women.

For the most part, the Daughters skillfully raised funds and performed tasks such as interring the dead and erecting monuments to honor fallen Confederate soldiers. These women successfully performed these tasks because they were not seen as performing a treasonous act against the United States government, nor were they viewed as making political statements. Southern women’s limited social position availed them the opportunity to make bold commemorative moves. Historian John Neff argues that “since they had no political life to protect, Southern women assumed the task of honoring Confederate veterans, not by default, but by strategy, and they took up their duties, quite literally, with a vengeance.” In 1899, an author for *Confederate Veteran* articulated the contribution of southern women since the years immediately following the war: “For the past thirty years the women of the South have been solicitous and tender in their care for our dead, and will not call on any alien hand to decorate and care for the graves of their fallen heroes. Devoted as the men of the Confederacy were to our holy cause, their devotion is excelled by the women of our Southland.”³²

For whatever reason, attempts by the men of the Maryland UCV to raise funds for a Confederate women’s monument faltered and forced them to seek assistance from the state’s UDC. Eight years after beginning the project, members of the state’s many chapters heard Major General Andrew C. Trippe, commander of the Maryland Division of the UCV, seek the co-operation of the Daughters to honor the Confederate women of Maryland. General Trippe of Baltimore led an active life in politics and the military. He acted as commander of the UCV

³¹ W. Fitzhugh Brundage, “Woman’s Hand and Heart and Deathless Love” in *Monuments to the Lost Cause: Women, Art, and the Landscapes of Southern Memory*, ed. Cynthia Mills et al. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2003), 73.

²⁷ John R. Neff, *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2005), 146-147, 148; “Caring for Our Dead: The Work of C. Irvine Walker Chapter, U.D.C., Summerville, S.C.” *Confederate Veteran* 7, no. 2 (February 1899): 84.

Maryland Division, Governor of the Society of Colonial Wars, general counsel for the Merchant and Manufactures' Association, Chairman of the 1897 City Democratic Convention, and counsel for the Democratic Central Committee from 1869 to 1871. During the first year of the Civil War, Trippe "went South and joined the Army of Northern Virginia, serving in the Shenandoah Valley, at Gettysburg, and before Richmond."³³

At the 1910 annual meeting, Trippe stated the project "should have the immediate and earnest support of the Southern people of our state." Trippe recognized that,

Among the noble women of whom history tells that have gone about doing good none have fairer or brighter record than the women of our city and State who were devoted to the Confederate cause. Intent on the service, no matter how exacting, they went their way . . . with a zeal, a woman's love and a steadfastness that no difficulty nor danger, nor requirements of self sacrifice could daunt or discourage. Their names live in blessed memory all through Southern land with the veterans for whose welfare they gave such labor and service. Let us now honor them in their home.³⁴

Trippe's stirring words recognized Maryland Confederate women as stepping beyond gendered assumptions that women were gentle, quiet, and passive. His description of the women as courageous and self-sacrificing coupled with the suggestion that their names be placed along with their veteran brethren placed men and women on a level plane in Civil War memory. Furthermore, that he and the men of the UCV turned the fundraising of the monument over to the UDC and sought to work aside the Daughters exemplified a unity among the organization as opposed to a gendered divide.

The Maryland Daughters enthusiastically accepted the opportunity offered to them by Trippe and the veterans to honor the women of their state who believed in and sacrificed for the

³³ "Gen. A.C. Trippe Dead," *The Sun* July 17, 1818, p.14. Trippe, the last surviving member of the Baltimore bar to be admitted before the Civil War died in 1818. Unfortunately, he did not survive to see the unveiling of the Maryland Confederate Women's Monument that he and fellow members of the state UCV and UDC worked to erect.

³⁴ "Daughters Asked to Aid" *The Sun* (date unknown), in Billups, *Lady Louise Founder of the Maryland Division United Daughters of the Confederacy*, p.66

Confederate cause. Mrs. Louise Wigfall Wright, president of the Maryland UDC, addressed her fellow Daughters speaking in support of the state's monument to Confederate women. Wright celebrated the project, stating, "when we graciously accept this tribute and sympathize and cooperate in the work we are adding new luster to the light of the past, which shall shine into the future of our beloved South and our beloved State, for these are Maryland women who are to have that honour conferred upon them."³⁵

The Maryland Daughters vigorously sought funds necessary for the women's monument. In order to complete the Maryland Confederate women's monument the Daughters needed \$15,000. Through traditional fundraising efforts the Maryland Daughters had already collected \$3,000, yet they ultimately needed access to public funds to meet the difference in cost. On February 10, 1914, UDC representative Mrs. B. J. Taylor of the Auxiliary Committee on the Monument to Maryland Confederate Women appealed to the Maryland Senate Finance and Ways and Means Committee for an appropriation of \$12,000.³⁶

The Daughters' meeting before the General Assembly inadvertently took them outside their gendered private sphere and availed them the opportunity to perpetuate the goals and work of the Maryland UDC and by extension their place as women in society. Atypical for women who sought to maintain their place in a patriarchal culture, the Daughters' public presence was a consequence of commemoration rather than a motive itself.

In ways that may be applied to the Maryland Daughters, historian Karen Rubin argues that "women in the UDC climbed down off of [their] pedestal to lobby legislatures, raise huge sums of money for monuments, and challenge men's memorial groups for hegemony in the field

³⁵ "Mrs. D. Giraud Wright speaking in support of the proposed monument to Confederate Women," in *Ibid.* 68.

³⁶ Maryland Senate Finance Committee, Minutes of the Finance and Ways and Means Committee, 1912-1914, Maryland Archives, S12266-1.

of Civil War commemoration.”³⁷ Similarly, Fitzhugh Brundage argues that “the earnestness and stamina displayed by white women’s associations in southern city centers demonstrated the potency of the ideology of public service that many women embraced. Inherited ideals of ‘republican motherhood’ and the cult of domesticity had long given women an important role in the transmission of culture within the home and had even encouraged them to assume an ever-widening range of public responsibilities.”³⁸

In the petition Mrs. Taylor presented to the Finance and Ways and Means Committee, the Daughters requested funding based on three reasons. First, the Daughters stated that other southern states had erected monuments to their Confederate women; therefore Maryland should honor its Confederate women who they argued deserved commemoration. Taylor asked, “shall it be said that Maryland places her noble women on a lower plane than her sister states in the South? Shall Maryland be the only State in that sisterhood of tragic suffering not to honor her Confederate women as they deserve?” Expanding on this idea, the Daughters noted that the few living Maryland veterans who remained wanted to honor the women, yet their dwindling numbers required assistance to accomplish their work. Next, the monument committee asserted in the petition that “the Confederate woman is worthy of such honor” based on the sacrifices they made to the state of Maryland and the country. The Daughters argued that “the piety of their lives, the high lessons of living taught to their sons, the sanctity of their home life, and their exalted virtues formed the honorable standards by which their sons and daughters were guided, and whatever good there is in this land today, we owe to them.” Lastly, the Daughters contended that memorialization of Maryland Confederate women and the sacrifices they made were a necessity in order to set an example for future generations of young women. Educating young

³⁷ Karen Rubin, “The Aftermath of Sorrow: White Women’s Search for their Lost Cause, 1861 – 1917 (Ph. D. diss., Florida State University, 2007), 155.

³⁸ W. Fitzhugh Brundage, “Woman’s Hand and Heart and Deathless Love” *Monuments to the Lost Cause*, 75.

Confederate descendants was important to the women of the UDC as recognized by their push for textbooks, scholarships, and homes for orphans. In their petition, the Daughters assured the Finance and Ways and Means Committee that, “the Maryland Confederate woman was the home lover, the loving wife, the devoted mother, who, when the day of trial came, rose to great heights of heroic endurance, self-abnegation and patriotism and left for all time her noble example to the young women of our land by which to form their standards of living and make our future women worthy of those who are the glory of the past.”³⁹

The Daughters concluded their appeal for funding:

For the monument to the soldiers and sailors of Maryland in the Confederate service, we asked for no appropriation, preferring to perform that labor of love ourselves unaided by outside help; but now, upon us, as upon the Veterans, the shadow of the years are falling and we are not equal to the work. We come before you today a body of conservative women, Daughters of the old South, and ask you by granting this appropriation to attest your own love and veneration for these noble women of your own state.⁴⁰

The selection of language by the Maryland Daughters is significant. Describing themselves as “a body of conservative women” speaks to the organization’s place in society as one perpetuating the gender and social norms rooted in the old South, even while the Daughters’ commitment to erecting a monument and their actions in the public sphere contradicted the gender and social norms they sought to uphold. During a time when some women and their civic clubs began to seek gender equality and more freedom, the women of the United Daughters of the Confederacy remained steadfast in their position as socially subservient. Recognizing themselves as “conservative women” they chose not to align themselves with the burgeoning suffragists and civil rights women of the period even as they sought recognition. Although their public presence

³⁹ “Address of the Auxiliary Committee on the Monument to Maryland Confederate Women, Delivered Before the Joint Committee of Finance and Ways and Means of the Maryland General Assembly,” in Billups, *Lady Louise, Founder of the Maryland Division United Daughter of the Confederacy*, 74.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 74-75.

was a consequence of their objectives as opposed to a motive, the Maryland Daughters actively pursued the opportunity to achieve goals set down by the division. Like their meeting before the State Legislature, the Maryland Daughters grappled with their place as conservative women while they made progressive statements.

The Daughters' appearance before the Maryland General Assembly proved successful. Approved on April 13, 1914, the General Assembly of Maryland responded in favor of the UDC's request for "the sum of twelve thousand dollars" and approved a bill entitled, "An act to erect a suitable monument in the city of Baltimore to commemorate the heroism, devotion, and self-sacrifice of the women of Maryland in their service to the wounded Confederate soldier who came under their care in the War between the States, 1861 – 65." In the Daughters' petition to the General Assembly they asked that the placement of the women's monument be on Mt. Royal Avenue in Baltimore City, the same area where the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors monument is located. For unknown reasons, the Confederate women's monument when erected was placed at the intersection of East University Parkway and North Charles Street in the city, a prominent location adjacent to Johns Hopkins University.⁴¹

In the UDC's argument to the General Assembly that Maryland Confederate women deserved a monument because their sisters in other southern states had received similar recognition, the Daughters highlighted specific cases. The delegation of women stated that "already in Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Arkansas the work has been completed; in other States designs are being made and plans formed for the same purposes."⁴² Similarly, Mrs. Wright, the monument committee's chairman, pointed to South Carolina as a

⁴¹ Maryland Senate Finance Committee, Minutes of the Finance and Ways and Means Committee, 1912-1914, Maryland Archives, S12266-1; Soderberg, "Lest We Forget, 7.

⁴² "Address of the Auxiliary Committee on the Monument to Maryland Confederate Women, Delivered Before the Joint Committee of Finance and Ways and Means of the Maryland General Assembly" in Billups, 74.

model. She stated that a poem she had written, “The Confederate Women,” had been “inspired by the monument to the South Carolina Women of the Confederacy and in the hope that Maryland will soon have a similar memorial.”⁴³ Yet, it is ironic that the Maryland UDC sought to draw comparisons between their women’s monument and those of South Carolina and other southern states. While the Maryland UDC welcomed and advocated a state Confederate women’s monument, the Daughters in some of these other states had opposed such recognition.

The reasons for women’s opposition varied. UDC chapters in Tennessee and Alabama opposed the erection of a state Confederate women’s monument and asked that money for the project be applied elsewhere. Historian Cynthia Mills notes that “in Tennessee, the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) asked the state to apply money to the payment of veterans’ pensions rather than appropriate \$6,000, as a state senator proposed, toward a women’s monument. In Alabama, UDC member Mabel Wrenn introduced a resolution, saying, ‘it is better to found scholarships than to erect monuments.’”⁴⁴

The case of the South Carolina women’s monument is of particular interest as it countered the motivations of the Maryland Daughters. The first monument of its type placed in a former Confederate capital, the Monument to South Carolina Women of the Confederacy stirred consternation between the state UDC, UCV, and General Assembly. Members of the UCV and the General Assembly had advocated the erection of the monument to honor women’s acts of Confederate nationalism. Women’s direct support that helped men’s efforts on the battlefield such as medical aid and uniform making, along with the sacrifices they had made on the home-front, justified men’s enthusiasm to erect the monument. Although the men advocated

⁴³“The Confederate Women,” published in unnamed newspaper, date unknown, in Billups, 72.

⁴⁴ “Tennessee Gives to Woman’s Monument,” *Confederate Veteran* 17, no.8, (Aug. 1909): 391, and, “Scholarships or Monuments,” *Confederate Veteran* 23, no.3, (March 1915): 131; Cynthia Mills, “Gratitude and Gender Wars: Monuments to the Women of the Sixties,” in eds. Mills and Simpson, *Monuments to the Lost Cause*, 186.

commemoration, the women to whom the monument was dedicated opposed its erection because the women wanted the funding to help Confederate veterans, widows, and southern children. Historian Thomas Brown contends the Confederate women's monument "exposed friction between men and women even as it honored their partnership." Furthermore, "white Southern women began to criticize the regional campaign for a monument to their beloved wartime women heroines almost as soon as the annual UCV meeting endorsed the idea in 1896."⁴⁵

The South Carolina Daughters believed that women's duties were worth honoring, but did not want their memory cast in bronze or stone. Instead of a monument, the Daughters sought commemoration through Confederate widow's homes, financial aid to complete a manuscript describing South Carolinian women of the Confederacy, and scholarships for children of Confederate descendants. Florence Barlow, editor of *Lost Cause* magazine, asserted that a public monument would not be proper commemoration for women's war time support; rather, a home for Confederate women would be more appropriate. In a 1903 *Lost Cause* essay Barlow argued in favor of a home for South Carolina women instead of a monument to them. As an example, she used Confederate women in poverty to argue that a monument would do nothing to help the women out of their situation. Barlow stated that instead of offering the women a place of refuge for the rest of their days, "a great monument of stone will be erected recording them as the bravest, most courageous, self-sacrificing women on earth."⁴⁶ Speaking more broadly, historian Karen Cox asserts that southern men "seemed to have turned a deaf ear to Barlow's criticisms, since they were rarely involved in the campaign to build homes for women."⁴⁷ One Columbia woman wrote to *The State* in March 1909, expressing that as a daughter of a Confederate family,

⁴⁵ Thomas J. Brown, "The Confederate Retreat to Mars and Venus" in *Battle Scars: Gender and Sexuality in the American Civil War*, ed. Catherine Clinton and Nina Silber (N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2006), 199.

⁴⁶ Florence Barlow, "No Home Yet for Widows of Confederate Veterans," *Lost Cause* (April 1902): 88; Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 78.

⁴⁷ Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 78.

she hoped the men of South Carolina would honor their state's mothers by more useful purposes such as women's homes or hospitals, rather than in monuments. Brown contends that "many women expressed less confidence in the influence of a monument to be commissioned by the UCV than in the establishment of a college for women, or if fund raising could not hope to achieve so much, the endowment of college scholarships. Women's dissatisfaction with the proposal, widely shared in South Carolina, made it plain that men's inflexible commitment to a monument as a form of commemoration constituted a defiance of women as much as a tribute to them."⁴⁸ The men, however, were successful in their commemoration of women's support during the war, despite the proclamations made by the South Carolina Daughters.

While there is not any documentation that suggests direct correspondence between the Maryland Daughters and those in the South Carolina UDC, it is possible that the Maryland women learned of their sisters' situation through personal connections within the UDC or publications such as the *Confederate Veteran* or *Lost Cause* magazines. While southern states maintained the patriarchal society that placed women's desires below men's, these strict rules did not necessarily apply in the border states. It is possible that the Maryland UDC wanted to make a bold, gendered statement when they sought appropriations from the General Assembly perhaps as a way to stand apart from South Carolina women. Because women of the South Carolina UDC came from a state secure in their Confederate identity, the Maryland Daughters may have wanted the women's monument to publically solidify their support for the Confederacy and to reify their identity as southerners devoted to the Confederate cause.

It is unlikely that the South Carolinian men of the UCV and state legislature were worried with placating the goals of the UDC due to their more politically powerful position. Rather, they

⁴⁸ Ibid., 200; "A Monument to Southern Women," *Lost Cause* (December 1902): 70; "Men Will Pay Tribute to Confederate Women," *The State* March 24, 1909, 1.

were more concerned with controlling the commemorative narrative and displaying a memorialization that reflected the men's "generosity." Monuments and public commemorative art explain more about those who commissioned the work than those whom they honor. By honoring the South Carolina women of the Confederacy with a monument, the UCV and General Assembly controlled how the state, its people, and the veteran organization would be remembered. Their work acted as a link to their Confederate past and the history they sought necessary to perpetuate. The Maryland UDC sought to do the same with the dedication of the monument to Maryland Confederate women.

The Maryland Division UCV and UDC unveiled the monument to the Confederate women of Maryland on November 2, 1918 to a Baltimore crowd that braved cold, bitter winter winds. A writer for *The Sun* described the scene as "a crowd of several hundred persons, composed of former supporters of the Confederacy, their friends and descendants" who came "to witness the unveiling of the monument." In an interesting contrast of national symbols, the ceremony commenced with the playing of "The Star Spangled Banner" followed by other patriotic selections including "Dixie," "Maryland, My Maryland," and "The Bonnie Blue Flag." Veiled with the Stars and Bars of the Confederacy and the Stars and Stripes of the Union, the flags were opened by Miss Mary Ringgold Trippe, granddaughter of the late Gen. Andrew C. Trippe. The Reverend William M. Dame, a former Confederate chaplain and rector of the Memorial Protestant Episcopal Church, delivered the invocation and introduced the event's main speaker. Judge James Trippe, son of the general, "paid an eloquent tribute, not only to the noble women of the Lost Cause of 50 years ago, but, also, to those who are helping to bring about victory in the common cause of right and humanity today."⁴⁹ The dedication ceremony represented the divided legacies in Maryland once again and exemplified how the Maryland

⁴⁹ "Monument Unveiled," *The Sun* November 3, 1918, p.10

Daughters acted as atypical agents of both Maryland and Civil War memory. While it is unlikely that the dual flags and patriotic songs of both the Union and Confederacy symbolized reconciliation among Marylanders, it is possible that the Union and Confederate images functioned as a blending of conflicting memories for the state's citizens at the ceremony.

Joseph Maxwell Miller, the monument's sculptor, was also present at the unveiling and recognized by Judge Trippe in his speech dedication. Miller, a Baltimore native born in 1877, won the monument's commissioned design. A young student and artist, Miller studied at the Rhinehart School of Sculpture associated with the Maryland Institute of Art and Design in Baltimore and the Julian Academy in Paris, France. His work became well-known in Maryland during the first two decades of the twentieth century. His design of the Confederate women's monument "represents a mother holding a dying hero in her arms, in form of a figure typifying the devoted women of the Confederacy." Lauding Miller and describing the beauty of the monument, Judge Trippe stated that Miller's talent brought to life "the most unique type of woman the world has produced," as portrayed in the "dignity, beauty, strength of character, loyalty, and passionate tenderness" in the two figures on the sculpture.⁵⁰

For the Maryland UDC, the opportunity to spearhead a monument for the state's Confederate women availed them the chance to assert their Confederate identity. That the women of Maryland could have a monument identical to others in some southern states reaffirmed their southern identity. Yet, the Daughters' earnest persistence in the public sphere, meeting with the State Legislature, and having sought to erect a monument to themselves set them apart from typical commemorative actions of their southern sisters. The quality the Maryland Daughters sought through commemorative projects transitioned from the local to national level in their contribution to the Jefferson Davis monument in Richmond, Virginia.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 10; Soderberg, "*Lest We Forget*," 8.

IV: JEFFERSON DAVIS MONUMENT

Simultaneous to their victorious efforts to memorialize Confederate women and soldiers and sailors at the state level, the Maryland UDC continued their work on the national stage. The Maryland Daughters joined with the national UDC to offer greatest reverence by erecting a monument in Richmond, Virginia to the President of the Confederate States of America, Jefferson Davis. Following the 1907 dedication of the Davis monument the Maryland UDC continued to provide the national chapter with funds to help erect Confederate and UDC monuments around the country, most notably, the Confederate monument in Arlington National Cemetery and the UDC monument at Shiloh National Battlefield. Maryland Daughters' continued efforts on the national stage aligned them with their southern sisters and situated them in a position to assert and fight for national recognition.

Honoring President Davis with a monument meant that the UDCs would be the first to commemorate on a national level the leader of the Confederate rebellion. One Daughter expressed in a newspaper article that as people of the former Confederacy, “we have not shown to the world and to his enemies, by our acts, that this martyr to our cause lived in the hearts of his people. Actions speak louder than words and monuments tell stories long after history has perished.”⁵¹ At the 1900 annual national UDC meeting, President Mrs. Edwin G. Weed, described the importance of erecting the monument in honor of President Davis: “Whenever the name Jefferson Davis is heard,” Weed announced, “it represents the Southern Confederacy. He

⁵¹ Mrs. Norman V. Randolph, untitled and undated newspaper clipping. Jefferson Davis Monument Association Records, Mrs. H.J. Randolph Collection, Eleanor S. Brockenbrough Library, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Va.

was our chieftain and our representative, and we point to him with pride and love – a soldier without cruelty, a statesman without reproach, a martyr without complaint.”⁵²

While the UDC propelled the efforts to erect the monument, they were not the first organization to attempt to the project. The United Confederate Veterans (UCV), who originally established the Jefferson Davis Monument Association (JDMA), had spearheaded the project and passed resolutions to design plans for the Davis monument in 1892.⁵³ After seven years of efforts by the Veterans to raise enough money to erect the Davis monument, the UCV conceded the project to the UDC. That the Veterans passed the project on to the Daughters exemplifies an understanding on the national level for the successful fundraising and commemoration efforts led by the UDC. In a statement from the UCV to its membership and the women of the UDC, the author stated that “at the last meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, held in Richmond, November 1899, the Committee of the Confederate Veterans in charge of the proposed monument to President Davis, asked that the women would accept the responsibility of this task which they had begun, but which they felt unable to complete.”⁵⁴ The Daughters did so enthusiastically and started their efforts in 1900. In an address to the Daughters, President Weed asserted that “this monument must be erected and as soon as possible. The [UCV] committee has worked faithfully, but we must help. I am sure you feel, as I do, that we must erect such a monument that coming generations will regard it with pride and wonder.”⁵⁵

Due to the Daughters’ fruitful fundraising campaigns the women successfully collected the necessary money for the Davis monument. General W. L. Cabell, Chairman of the UCV’s

⁵² “Minutes of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy,” 1900, Montgomery, Ala, p.40.

⁵³ “The Davis Monument,” *The Richmond Dispatch* November 12, 1895, p.2

⁵⁴ “United Confederate Veterans,” *Bulletin*, November 1899, Mrs. H.J. Randolph Collection, Eleanor S. Brockenbrough Library, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Va.

⁵⁵ “Minutes of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy,” 1900, Montgomery, Ala, p.40.

JDMA committee, pledged the Veterans' continued assistance to the women as well as the money they initially raised for the monument. When the Daughters assumed charge of the Davis monument, the UCV had collected \$ 20,590. While this amount was a hefty sum, it was not nearly the amount necessary to erect the monument all believed their beloved President deserved.

Chairman Randolph of the UDC's JDMA committee asserted that several reasons fed the UDC's desire to assume the erection of the monument. She stated that,

The disabled Veterans must be provided for, having no country to pension them; the cry of the widows and orphans of Confederate Veterans is ever in our ear; the unmarked graves of our 30,000 soldiers who died in prison beg for recognition at our hands. But the Veterans ask us to build this monument, promising their assistance – let us erect it AT ONCE, while they are here to see it. The ranks are fast thinning out, and there are no recruits.⁵⁶

In this passage Randolph conveys the need to erect the monument for the Veterans as one last chance for the men to honor and pay their respects to President Davis, the man who led the Confederate cause.

In a circular signed by Randolph addressed to the camps of the UCV, she requested that “to defray the cost of the monument” each veteran “donate \$10, or as much as possible on Mr. Davis' birthday, June 3d.” She further expressed her enthusiasm and commitment when she directed the Daughters to focus their fundraising efforts on the Davis monument and stated that “all work on local monuments be laid aside, and let us bend every energy to accomplish the erection of this monument.”⁵⁷ It is unknown the extent to which all UDC state divisions halted work on monuments at home, or even if they did. The Maryland Daughters, however, continued

⁵⁶ Typed report by the Jefferson Davis Monument Association, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Central Committee, sent to “all camps and chapters” in February 1900. “Jefferson Davis Monument Association” folder, Monuments and Memorials Collection, Box 2. Eleanor Brockenbrough Library, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Va.

⁵⁷ Letter by Mrs. Janet H. Randolph, Jefferson Davis Monument Association Records, Mrs. H.J. Randolph Collection, Eleanor S. Brockenbrough Library, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Va.

to labor on the Maryland Soldiers and Sailors Monument throughout the period, simultaneous to their efforts on the Jefferson Davis monument.

The Central Committee members of the UCV expressed similar statements to the Daughters regarding their respect for President Davis; they lamented the lack of a monument to Davis and directed their veteran brethren to offer aid to honor him. The Veterans' religiously charged statements compared President Davis to Jesus and implied that their work served a greater, higher power. The committee stated, "Mr. Davis was not only the chief executive and chosen leader of the Confederacy – he was our martyr – he suffered in his own person the ignominy and the shame our enemies would have made us suffer. This was thirty-five years ago, and his monument is yet to be built. The women of the South have solemnly sworn to wipe out this disgrace at once. Will you help us?" The Committee concluded their message with a quote and refrain from Rudyard Kipling's 1897 poem, "Recessional," encouraging the veterans to remember President Davis: "'Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet. Lest we forget. Lest we forget.'"⁵⁸ The strong religious undertones in the veterans' statements permeated the language of the Lost Cause. Historian Charles Reagan Wilson asserts that, "at the heart of the religion of the Lost Cause were the Confederate heroes who came to embody transcendent truths about the redemptive power of Southern society. In fact, the Lost Cause had symbols, myth, ritual, theology, and organization, all directed toward meeting the profound concerns of postwar Southerners."⁵⁹

An article in an August 1902 issue of *The Richmond Times Dispatch* described the importance in honoring President Davis and the Daughters' efforts to memorialize him:

⁵⁸ Typed report by the United Confederate Veterans, Central Committee, "Jefferson Davis Monument Association" folder, Monuments and Memorials Collection, Box 2. Eleanor Brockenbrough Library, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Va.

⁵⁹ Wilson, *Baptized in Blood*, 10-11.

While much has been accomplished, while the tireless hands of Southern women have not ceased in their work, and the generosity of Southern men has responded to each call for help, upon the hearts of both men and women has lain for years the burden of a duty unfulfilled; a duty, the rightful discharge of which they owe to themselves, to those who shall come after them, to the vindication of the Confederate Cause, the representative of the Southern people, the one who suffered for them, who survived the cruel stress of war and the horrors of imprisonment, who cast his lot with the South, who lived and died in the Southland and never by word or by deed swerved in his truth to his chosen allegiance or brought reproach upon the past which he embodied.⁶⁰

While other statements suggest the necessity of the completion of the Davis monument as a project for Confederate veterans, this author maintains a broader, more inclusive approach. He asserts that the monument is for the UDC and UCV members who contributed to the project, the men and women of the South who sacrificed for the Confederacy during the war, the memory of the Confederate cause, the soldiers who gave their lives, and President Jefferson Davis who embodied all that the Confederacy represented and never deviated from his commitment or allegiance.

After the war Richmond continued to hold many treasures of the Confederacy that helped southerners celebrate the memory of their lost cause. Locations including the White House of the Confederacy and the Confederate Museum profited from efforts of the UDC that helped share and perpetuate Confederate history. In addition to the state camps of Veterans and divisions of Daughters from whom the national organizations requested to contribute financial offerings, the ladies of JDMA sought additional funds by holding a public bazaar in Richmond. At the 1902 meeting of the Board of Directors of the JDMA, the Central Committee agreed “that a bazaar be held in Richmond in the spring, together with the Confederate Memorial Association to raise funds for completing the monument” and to sustain the Museum of the Confederacy. Held from April 15 to May 2, 1903, in Richmond’s Masonic Temple, the bazaar represented “every

⁶⁰ “Confederate Bazaar to Open April 15th,” *The Times Dispatch*. [Richmond, Va.] 12 April 1903.

Southern State where the State tables will display their State colors and shields.” The table representatives sold tea, flowers, dolls, home wares, and other sundry items. Every day special events accompanied the bazaar, including music, tea parties, and children’s entertainment. ⁶¹

At the bazaar, the Maryland Daughters decorated their table, named “The Day’s Work,” with striking and memorable furnishings as a means to draw interest and buyers. According to the editor of *The Times Dispatch*, Maryland’s table “catches the eye at once, standing in a prominent place on the right-side of the hall, draped in Maryland orange and black, with the coat of arms of the State in front and crossed Maryland flags at each point of the pagoda-shaped cover on the booth.” Describing the table and its items for sale, the editor wrote that, “it would be an endless task to enumerate the articles which have been contributed by the Baltimore merchants, the Maryland Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and the hundreds of individuals interested in this great work.” The items included “pin cushions, work bags, fancy articles of every kind, aprons, collars and cuffs, blankets, lamps, bric-a-brac, furniture and dozens of other fascinating wares are seen at every turn.”⁶² Although table representatives were not in competition with each other at the event, their goal to acquire as much funding as possible for the Davis monument was ubiquitous.

At the conclusion of the near two-week fund-raising event, the bazaar proved to be a successful and lucrative affair for the Jefferson Davis Monument and the Museum of the Confederacy. The bazaar raised a total of \$ 22,013.38 and from that the JDMA received \$ 15,000 and the difference of \$8,013.38 benefited the Confederate Museum. While the monument association “expected” in the weeks after the bazaar that the Maryland Table would “bring

⁶¹ Minutes of the Meetings of the Board of Directors of the Jefferson Davis Monument Association, Richmond, Va, June 3-6, 1902, Third Meeting, June 6, 1902, p. 12; “Confederate Bazaar to Open April 15th.”

⁶² “Confederate Bazaar to Open April 15th,” *The Times Dispatch*, April 12, 1903, p.2.

\$500,” the Daughters doubled the anticipated amount and cleared an impressive \$1,002.00 according to director of the Maryland delegation to the JDMA, Miss Elizabeth W. Hall.⁶³

In addition to the funds originally raised by the UCV and the bazaar, state camps and divisions of the Veterans and Daughters and private donations helped the JDMA accumulate enough money to erect a proper memorial to honor President Davis. Describing the Daughters’ enthusiastic fund-raising efforts, former UDC President Mary Poppenheim asserted that “every Southern State and U.D.C. chapter responded to the call to work. Every Confederate reunion, every U.D.C convention, has made the occasion for securing pledges for this great work, chapters and Divisions vying to see who could pledge the most.” She described the zeal of the Daughters to fund-raise and erect the Jefferson monument: “How hard the organization worked for almost a decade,” Poppenheim celebrates, “to complete a fund of \$70,000.00 to erect a suitable memorial to their beloved leader!”⁶⁴ With money in hand, the JDMA now turned to design.

At the November 1903 UDC annual meeting, the JDMA presented a blueprint for the Davis monument accepted by all state divisions except one - Maryland. The committee had commissioned architect William Churchill Noland and sculptor Edward Virginius Valentine, best known for his famed “Recumbent Lee” statue at Washington and Lee University, to design the Davis memorial. Valentine described the memorial as,

A semi-circular colonnade, with dimensions across the open end of about fifty-two feet, the columns supporting an ornamental cornice, the top which would be eighteen feet from the ground level. This colonnade, or architrave, will carry a half circle seat, and this on a platform about three steps above ground. In the center of this half circle will stand a bronze statue

⁶³ Mrs. Norman V. Randolph, “Made Lots of Money,” unidentified clipping, Jefferson Davis Monument Association Records, Mrs. H.J. Randolph Collection, Eleanor S. Brockenbrough Library, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Va.; Statement on Bazaar totals as reported by the Jefferson Davis Monument Association, United Daughters of the Confederacy.

⁶⁴ Poppenheim, et al., *The History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy*, 49-51.

of Jefferson Davis, and behind him a Confederate column, fifty-six feet high will rise, the top to carry a bronze statue of a woman.⁶⁵

After presenting the design, many Daughters asked questions about cost, dimension, and state representation on the monument. Concerned about the symbolism of the thirteen pillars on the monument, “Mrs. A. W. Rapley, of Missouri, asked the names of the States to be represented by the columns.” UDC President, Mrs. James A. Rounsaville, responded, “that the thirteen columns represented those states which sent representatives to the Confederate Congress, including the eleven which seceded, and Kentucky and Missouri.” This declaration aroused a response from Maryland representative Mrs. Anne Johnson Poe. She acknowledged that the Maryland UDC donated funds for the Davis monument and was “sorry her State could not do more,” but it “grieved her to think that her State was not represented [in the memorial].” A local newspaper reported that “Maryland thinks that there should be a column for her also, and her Daughters today made things lively on the floor of the convention when they found that she was not in the picture.”⁶⁶

In an attempt to assuage Poe’s concern for Maryland’s lack of representation on the monument, President Rounsaville offered the Old Line State a special place on a bronze plaque for their contribution to the Confederacy and the Davis monument. Rounsaville explained “that Maryland would be represented – not by a column because these were to stand for the States represented in the Confederate Congress, but Maryland was to have an inscription on a space which had been especially assigned to her.”⁶⁷ The President’s offer to represent Maryland on a

⁶⁵ “Minutes of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy,” 1903, Charleston, S.C., p.82-83.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 84; “Maryland Daughters Indignant,” *The Times Dispatch* November 12, 1903.

⁶⁷ “Minutes of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy,” 84.

plaque as opposed to granting them a pillar had more to do with upsetting Confederate symbolism than acknowledging the state's wartime devotion to the Confederacy.

Drawing on the symbolism of the number thirteen, the Confederacy drew parallels between the thirteen states represented in the Confederate Congress and the thirteen original colonies and states. To maintain the imagery and importance of the number thirteen to those who sought to perpetuate the Confederate legacy, the UDC sought to demonstrate this in the Davis monument. The national UDC did not consent to a fourteenth column because it would have upset the symbolic importance thirteen columns brought to the project. President Rounsaville responded to Poe's concern, that "the committee was trying to make every part of the monument symbolic, and the thirteen States composing the Congress were to be represented by thirteen columns, just as they were represented by thirteen stars on the flag." Continuing her opposition to a column for Maryland, Rounsaville stated: "it would not be symbolic of the Congress if another column was added;" instead a plaque bearing "an inscription and the coat-of-arms of Maryland would be on the monument."⁶⁸

UDC division representatives from various states responded to the President's position on the monument's symbolism in a myriad of ways. Mrs. W. C. N. Merchant, of Virginia and wife of a Maryland soldier, said "that no slight had been put upon Maryland," and Mrs. A. T. Smythe, of South Carolina believed that the monument designers and the national UDC did not intend to disrespect Maryland with the thirteen pillar design. She further suggested that "the easiest way of disposing of the matter is to have no meaning to the columns whether we have ten or fifty." Mrs. L. E. Williams, of Kentucky and Mrs. E. G. Weed, of Florida "championed the cause of Maryland" and believed that "Maryland should be represented in a distinctive way." One Daughter, Mrs. D.A.S. Vaught of Louisiana, even suggested a change of design in the monument

⁶⁸ Ibid.,84.

and the addition of an extra column. President Rounsaville “ruled this out of order, as the design had been accepted by the Convention.” To the President’s comment, Poe responded sharply, “if Maryland could not be represented as the other States, she would rather not be represented at all.” In response to debates about Maryland’s place in the Confederacy in comparison to other states, Poe suggested that “some special arrangement should be made for Maryland. After the war there was no city in a more impoverished [*sic*] condition than Baltimore, and Maryland should have some special place.” *The Times Dispatch* reported on the debate about the columns and explained that, “though [Maryland] did not secede, though it did not have representation in the Confederate Congress, it is claimed for it that it furnished fifteen thousand soldiers and sailors to the South. Some of these rose to high distinction, and as a body they were as faithful and gallant men as ever drew a blade in a worthy cause.”⁶⁹

As the discussion on Maryland’s representation within the Davis monument came to a close, President Rounsaville sought to negotiate with Mrs. Poe and the Maryland contingent. Rounsaville stated that “the Convention fully recognized Mrs. Poe’s position and is in full sympathy,” and that there “is not a Daughter in this room who does not think of Maryland as *her* Maryland.” Conversely, in the same announcement, the President asserted that “Mrs. Poe was laboring under some misapprehension, and if she would confer with the Committee, it could satisfactorily explain.”⁷⁰ Poe and the Maryland Daughters sought equal representation with a column in the Davis monument, but Rounsaville and the national UDC remained committed to the design because adding a fourteenth pillar would simply disrupt the Confederate tradition and symbolism behind the number thirteen.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 85; “Maryland, My Maryland,” *The Times Dispatch* [Richmond, Va.], November 13, 1903.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 86.

Mrs. Louise Wigfall Wright, President of the Maryland Division, passionately responded in a speech to Maryland's lack of equal representation at her state's UDC convention later in 1903. Wright, who had not been in attendance at the national UDC's annual meeting in Charleston earlier that year, believed it improper for her to speak further on the monument design approved by the committee. But she suggested that it was "permissible for me to say what directly bears on the subject; what my heart dictates; what justice demands, and what love impels me to say however inadequat[ly], to the glory of the State of [Maryland] and her service to the Confederacy, as shown by the deeds of her sons and daughters by the part they bore in the war between the States." In her address, Wright explained passionately the war duties performed by Confederate Marylanders and aid given to the South. She asserted, "the men of Maryland answered her call, and like the knights of old rushed into the conflict, their battle cry on their lips: 'A rescue! A rescue! Virginia and the South!' And there, 'wherever death's brief pain was quickest and the battle's wreck lay thickest,' there old Maryland's flag was held aloft by her dauntless sons." Wright continued her argument that Maryland soldiers gave to the Confederate cause with equal, if not greater dedication than her southern brethren. "The Maryland soldier," said Wright, "in life and in death clung with unconquerable tenacity to principle; and dying bequeathed to his people and his State the glorious face of his service to the Confederate States." As Wright concluded her emotional address, she asked rhetorically, "Is it a wonder, that, standing as we do, encompassed with the memories of the sufferings and glories of the past, that we should accept for Maryland no smaller recognition of heroic endurance and sacrifice for the South than that accorded to her sister States in suffering?"⁷¹

⁷¹ "Address of Mrs. D. Giraud Wright, President of the Maryland Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy to the State Convention Held in Baltimore, December 7, 1903," in Billups, 57.

The Times Dispatch offered a similar statement defending Maryland's place as a southern state that sacrificed for the Confederacy and concurring with the Maryland Daughters' desire for a fourteenth pillar: "It is gratifying to the Southern public," wrote the article's author, "to know that the Maryland ladies wanted to have a column in the monument for their State. It shows that they are the South – blood kin! It speaks of an attachment that has withstood the rack of war and the flight of time, and it makes us understand why all Southern hearts should thrill at the sound of 'Maryland, My Maryland.'" In the column's description of the "glorious cause" for which men and women sacrificed so much, it contended that "no wonder the noble daughters of Maryland desire that their State shall be remembered among the Commonwealths of the South, which composed the Confederate States of America; and all honor to them."⁷²

At the 1904 annual national UDC convention, the JDMA and the Maryland Daughters reconciled their differences about the state's representation on the monument. JDMA President, Mrs. McCullough assured the Daughters that, "as an evidence of the courtesy, patience, and generosity of all concerned, I announce the happy settlement of the misunderstanding with the Maryland Division, since she is perfectly assured she stands on an equal footing with every other State upon the Jefferson Davis Monument." The letter, signed by Chairwoman of the Maryland Delegation to the JDMA Ms. Elizabeth W. Hall, President of the Maryland Division UDC Louise Wigfall Wright, and Anne Johnson Poe, Vice-President of the Baltimore Chapter UDC, stated that the design changes proposed by President McCullough and Noland, the architect, had been shared with the Maryland UDC and the Daughters recognized that, "they are satisfied with Maryland's claim to equal representation." Regarding the changes to the monument, President McCullough explained to the Maryland UDC that,

This Association (the Jefferson Davis Monument Association) withdraws

⁷² Maryland, My Maryland," *The Times Dispatch* November 13, 1903.

all symbolism from the thirteen columns in the colonnade. They are not named and do not represent any particular State, but, as every State represented, Maryland included, will be represented (only) by its coat-of-arms, Maryland will have exactly the same individual representation that any other State will have. The number of columns only gives (with two end pillars) fourteen spaces for the fourteen coat-of-arms.

President McCullough's letter is a declaration of triumph on behalf of the Maryland Daughters' push for equal recognition on the Davis monument. Although the JDMA was not willing to trade the harmony and tradition found in the relationship between the Confederacy and the original American colonies, the JDMA retracted the symbolism of the thirteen pillars as representative of the seceded states in order to make them impartial symbols on the monument.⁷³

The withdrawn symbolism of the thirteen pillars and the alteration of the monument design to include fourteen bronze state seals is likely the only place in Confederate memory where such a change was made. As a result of the dedication and persistence of the Maryland Daughters, the Jefferson Davis monument is the first national monument to demonstrate equal representation of all the states that contributed sons to the Confederate cause. Their work at the local level on the monuments to Maryland Confederate Soldiers and Sailors and Maryland Confederate women came full circle on the national stage with the Jefferson Davis monument and earned them the equal representation they deserved.

⁷³ "Minutes of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy," 1904, St. Louis, M.O., October 5, p. 129.; Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Directors of the Jefferson Davis Monument Association, Louisiana Hall, St. Louis, Mo., October 3,5, and 8, 1904, p. 4-5, Eleanor S. Brockenbrough Library, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Va.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts

Eleanor S. Brockenbrough Library, Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Va
Jefferson Davis Monument Association Papers
Monuments and Memorials Collection
Mrs. H.J. Randolph Collection

H. Furlong Baldwin Library, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Md.
Membership Applications 1895- to Baltimore Chapter Number 8
Minutes of the Annual Convention of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, Maryland
Division
UDC, Maryland Division Scrapbooks, 1800-1940

Hall of Records, Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, Md.
Maryland Senate Finance Committee, Minutes of the Finance and Ways and Means
Committee, 1912-1914

Maryland Manuscripts Archive, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.
Civil and Social Organizations Records, 1740-1950
“Glory Stands Beside Our Grief”

Published Primary Sources

Basler, Roy P., ed. et al. *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*. New Brunswick: Rutgers
University Press, 1953.

Billups, Carolyn, ed. *Lady Louise Founder of the Maryland Daughters of the Confederacy: A
Compilation of Official Records, Newspaper Articles and Book References on the Lives of
Louise Wigfall Wright and Daniel Giraud Wright as well as David Gregg McIntosh and
Virginia Johnson Pegram and the Descendents*. Self Publication, 2nd ed., October 2000.

Minutes of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1900,
Montgomery, AL. Nashville, TN: Press of Foster and Webb, 1901.

Minutes of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1901,
Wilmington, NC. Nashville, TN: Press of Foster and Webb, 1902.

Minutes of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1902,
New Orleans, LA. Nashville, TN: Press of Foster and Webb, 1903.

Minutes of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1903, Charleston, SC. Nashville, TN: Press of Foster and Webb, 1904.

Minutes of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1904, St. Louis, MO. Nashville, TN: Press of Foster and Webb, 1905.

The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies and Navies. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1894.

Periodicals

*America's Civil War
Confederate Veteran*, 1895-1919.
Lost Cause Magazine
New York Times
The Richmond Dispatch
The Sun
The Times Dispatch

Monographs

Blair, William A. *Cities of the Dead: Contesting the Memory of the Civil War in the South, 1865-1914*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Blight, David W. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. New York: Belknap Press, 2002.

Brown, Thomas J. *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration: A Brief History with Documents*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004

Brundage, W. Fitzhugh. *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Buck, Paul. *The Road to Disunion, 1865 – 1900*. Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown, and Company, 1937.

Clinton, Catherine and Nina Silber, eds. *Battle Scars: Sexuality in the Civil War* New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

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

Denton, Lawrence M. *A Southern Star for Maryland: Maryland and the Secession Crisis*. Baltimore, Md.: Publishing Concepts, 2005.

- Edwards, Laura. *Scarlett Doesn't Live Here Anymore: Southern Women During the Civil War Era*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2004.
- Ernst, Kathleen. *Too Afraid to Cry: Maryland Civilians in the Antietam Campaign*. Mechanicsburg, Penn.: Stackpole Books, 2007.
- Fahs, Alice and Joan Waugh, eds. *The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2004.
- Fields, Barbara. *Slavery and Freedom on the Middle Ground: Maryland During the Nineteenth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.
- Foster, Gaines M. *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, Lost Cause, and the Emergence of a New South, 1865-1913*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Gallagher, Gary and Alan T. Nolan, eds. *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 2000.
- and Joan Waugh, eds. *Wars within a War: Controversy and Conflict in the American Civil War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.
- Goldsborough, W.W. *The Maryland Line in the Confederacy*. Gaithersburg, Md.: Butternut Press, 1983.
- Hartzler, Daniel. *Marylanders in the Confederacy*. Silver Spring, Md.: Open Line Publications, 1986.
- Janney, Caroline. *Burying the Dead but not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Massey, Mary Elizabeth. *Bonnet Brigades: American Women and the Civil War*. New York: Knoph, 1966.
- Mills, Cynthia. *Monuments to the Lost Cause: Women, Art, and the Landscapes of Southern Memory*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2003.
- Mitchell, Charles, ed. *Maryland Voices of the Civil War*. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- Neely, Mark. *The Fate of Liberty: Abraham Lincoln and Civil Liberties*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

- Neff, John R. *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2005.
- Poppenheim, Mary B., et.al. *The History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy*. Richmond, Va.: Garrett and Massie, Inc., 1983
- Powell, Barbara and Michael A. Powell, eds. *Mid-Maryland History: Conflict, Growth, and Change*. Charleston, S.C.: The History Press, 2008.
- Rable, George. *Southern Women and the Crisis of Southern Nationalism*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1991.
- Reardon, Carol. *Pickett's Charge in History and Memory*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Ruffner, Kevin Conley. *Maryland's Blue and Gray: A Border State's Union and Confederate Junior Officer Corps*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1997.
- Savage, Kirk. *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monuments in Nineteenth Century America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1999.
- Seward, Frederick W. *Reminiscences of a War-Time Statesman and Diplomat, 1830-1915*. New York: The Knickerbocker Press, 1916.
- Soderberg, Susan Cook. *"Lest We Forget": A Guide to Civil War Monuments in Maryland*. Shippensburg, Penn: White Mane Publishing, 1995.
- Scott, Anne Firor. *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 1970.
- Taylor, Amy Murrell. *The Divided Family in Civil War America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.
- Wilson, Charles Reagan. *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980.

Dissertations

- Cannon, Jessica. "Lincoln's Divided Backyard: Maryland in the Civil War Era," Ph.d. Diss., Rice University, 2010.
- Rubin, Karen. "The Aftermath of Sorrow: White Women's Search for their Lost Cause, 1861-1917," Ph.d. Diss., Florida State University, 2007.

Websites

“United Daughters of the Confederacy,” < <http://hqudc.org> >

VITA

Towson University (Towson, MD), 2006, Bachelor of Arts

Honorifics: *Magna Cum Laude*

Major: History

Minor: American Studies

Frederick Community College (Frederick, MD), 2003, Associate of Arts,

Major: General Studies