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Preface


3. For an example of how women’s first-person wartime experiences can be used to comment on the broader landscape of political history, see Stephanie McCurry, Women’s War: Fighting and Surviving the American Civil War (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2019), 124–202.

4. Jean Friedman argues that unlike their Northern sisters, elite Southern white women’s kinship connections in their gender-integrated evangelical communities shaped their identities and preserved their traditional roles, thus limiting their individual autonomy. According to Friedman, this rural evangelical kinship system stunted Southern women’s reforming zeal through the nineteenth century and these women only played significant roles in benevolent and charity associations after the Civil War.

This book challenges this premise and shows the ways in which middle- and planter-class


6. Emily to Richard Noble: June 11, 1863, Richard G. Noble Correspondence, Special Collections, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia. Again, such written accounts require literacy from both their creators and recipients. In some episodes, like the Richmond bread riot, documentation composed and circulated by its participants is more limited as a result of these explicit education and implicit class constraints.


**Introduction**


the hospital on several occasions. See Judith White McGuire, *Diary of a Southern Refugee, During the War* (New York: E. J. Hale and Son, 1868).

3. “Robinson Hospital,” *Richmond Whig*, December 3, 1862. The Robertson Hospital is often mistakenly referred to as the Robinson Hospital in the press. There is no record of a Robinson Hospital, and the newspapers list the Robinson Hospital’s address as the same one as the Robertson Hospital. For more early wartime Richmond newspaper accounts of the Robertson Hospital, see “The Sick and Wounded,” *Richmond Whig*, August 6, 1861; “Another Hospital,” *Richmond Enquirer*, August 5, 1861; and Advertisement (Tompkins thanks St. Paul’s Church), *Richmond Dispatch*, August 8, 1862.


7. Commission of Sally L. Tompkins, September 9, 1861, VMHC.


10. The use of enslaved labor was standard in Confederate hospitals throughout the South.

11. For more on the Home for Needy Confederate Women, see chapter 5, this volume.


of Illinois Press, 2000) have both made significant contributions in recentralizing the experiences of lower-class white women and enslaved women to Confederate history.


21. Drew Gilpin Faust asserts that elite women’s commitment to Confederate nationalism waned after mid-1863 due to increasing battle losses and that the loss of Southern women’s morale played a decisive role in the Confederate defeat. See Drew Gilpin Faust, *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 238–47. This thesis has been contested. Gary Gallagher states women’s commitment to Confederate nationalism

22. Sewing Confederate soldiers’ uniforms was work often given to enslaved women and men. This was not just elite white women’s nationalistic labor. See Thavolia Glymph, *Out of the House of Bondage: The Transformation of the Plantation Household* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 113. Also, according to Anne Firor Scott, for the plantation mistress, “The experience of years of providing food and clothing for slaves was now applied to feeding and clothing an army.” See Anne Firor Scott, *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830–1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 82.


27. Glymph, *Out of the House of Bondage*; and Jones-Rogers, *They Were Her Property*.

28. McCurry, *Confederate Reckoning*, 87. While McCurry focuses on yeoman and poor white Southern women (i.e., soldiers’ wives) who made up the vast majority of the white Confederate home front, she also considers planter women (see McCurry, *Confederate Reckoning*, 100–132) and enslaved women (see McCurry, *Confederate Reckoning*, 218–309, especially 237–46).


34. Gallagher, Confederate War, 72–111. In a similar approach as Gallagher, the following chapters also examine the connections between the home front and front lines in Confederate nationalism. In their diaries and letters, women carefully chronicled battle news and praised military leaders. As chapter 2’s analysis of the Ladies’ Defense Association (LDA) shows, some women actively supported the military through fundraising efforts and the formation of gunboat societies.

35. For more on the relationship between the establishment of political legitimacy to the strength of nationalism, see Ernest Gellner, Nations and Nationalism (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983). On the importance of a shared culture to projects of nationalism, see Anthony D. Smith, Theories of Nationalism (London: Duckworth, 1971).


38. On the importance of print capitalism to nationalism, see Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism (London: Verso, 1983).


40. Kerber, No Constitutional Right, 305. Likewise, according to McCurry, “[Antebellum] women had a particular kind of citizenship and a secondhand relationship to the state.” McCurry, Women’s War, 20–24, (quote 24).
41. However, the legal doctrine of coverture was not always applied evenly in practice; some women continued to own property after they were married. Some women even continued to own enslaved persons after marriage. See Jones-Rogers, *They Were Her Property*, 29–31, 55.

42. Kerber, *No Constitutional Right*, xxiii. For a discussion of the relationship between the “patriarchal home” and its impediments to women’s claims to citizenship, see Glymph, *Women’s Fight*, 3.

43. Kerber, *No Constitutional Right*, 243. Of course, some women served in disguise in Confederate armies and some women served as Confederate spies, as discussed in chapter 4, this volume.

44. For a discussion of the Union’s gendered struggle to define civilians and combatants in the Confederacy, see McCurry, *Women’s War*, 53–54.

45. In the context of the American Revolutionary War, Kerber examines the uneasy relationship between women and treason (i.e., can a woman be convicted of treason?). See Kerber, *No Constitutional Right*, 3–46, *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980), 115–36, and *Toward an Intellectual History of Women* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 261–302. As McCurry notes, the historiography on gender and treason in the Civil War is not as developed. McCurry, *Confederate Reckoning*, 102, and *Women’s War*, 31–32. While my book does not engage with the relationship between gender and treason, the relationship between gender and loyalty is central to understanding Confederate women’s relationship to the state, as the following chapters will demonstrate.

46. Conservative is used in this introduction not to denote nineteenth-century European conservative movements, or later twentieth-century American conservatism, but as one of many ways to articulate the temporal (antebellum vs. wartime) and geographic (North vs. South) differences in women’s relationship to the state. Such a lexicon does not suggest a distinct conservative movement at this time but rather a relational consideration of women’s societal roles and power. This is consistent with how Michael O’Brien conceptualizes the conservative intellectual history of Southern women and gender, especially Louisa McCord, Augusta Jane Evans, and Mary Chesnut, in *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South*, vols. 1 and 2 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004). In this context, conservative is useful as a term as it highlights O’Brien’s importance of change and modernity to the South, and the ways in which Southern society moved beyond traditionalism. For more on the limitations of traditionalism (and the difficulties in defining conservativism in the antebellum North), see Adam I. P. Smith, *The Stormy Present: Conservativism and the Problem of Slavery in Northern Politics, 1846–1865* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016), 5–13. Also, for a classic study of the relationship of the Old South and conservative intellectual history, see Eugene Genovese, *The Slaveholders’ Dilemma: Freedom and Progress in Southern Conservative Thought, 1820–1860* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992), 10–40, especially 35–38. My definition of conservative
women is also consistent with Elizabeth Varon’s usage in *We Mean to Be Counted: White Women and Politics in Antebellum Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 9.


48. This conceptualization of political culture as including women’s actions outside of the electoral sphere was developed by Elizabeth R. Varon in her analysis of women’s conservative politicization in antebellum Virginia: Varon, *We Mean to Be Counted*, 2–4. More recently, Caroline Janney and Stephanie McCurry have applied a similar definition of political culture to include the work of postwar Ladies’ Memorial Associations and wartime lower-class women, respectively. See 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), 5–6; and McCurry, *Confederate Reckoning*, 3–7. Thavolia Glymph considers the home and plantation household as a “political space,” as well as the home as a site of “warring intimacies” and an “embattled workplace.” Glymph, *Out of the House of Bondage*, quotes 3, 37, 41. See also Glymph, *Women’s Fight*, 4, 9, 14. Jacqueline Glass Campbell also argues that during the war, elite white women saw themselves as “viable political actors with interests that extended beyond the immediate concerns of friends and family.” See Campbell, *When Sherman Marched*, 69. Linda Kerber sees women as part of national political culture from the revolution through the twentieth century. See Kerber, *No Constitutional Right*, especially 308. For another earlier engagement with women’s relationship to politics in the public sphere, see Mary P. Ryan, *Women in Public: Between Banners and Ballots* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 5–15.

performing labor (enslaved and paid) in the domestic private sphere, see Glymph, *Out of the House of Bondage*, 43. Most recently, Glymph moved away from the separate spheres approach to focus on “the contexts of previous wars, gender and class struggles, and slave resistance” in her groundbreaking study *Women’s Fight*, especially 11.

50. See Varon, *We Mean to Be Counted*; and Janney, *Burying the Dead*.


56. The First Battle of Bull Run was the first major battle to be fought in Virginia. Minor battles occurred in the state before the action in Manassas, such as the Battle of Big Bethel in June 1861.


59. Samuella Hart Curd, Diary: February 19, 1861, VMHC.


62. For more on Unionism in Virginia, see Barton A. Myers, *Rebels Against the Confederacy: North Carolina’s Unionists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2014), 1–15; Margaret M. Storey, *Loyalty and Loss: Alabama’s Unionists in the Civil War and Reconstruction*


66. For other works with a focus on wartime Virginia, see Aaron Sheehan-Dean, *Why Confederates Fought: Family and Nation in Civil War Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Peter S. Carmichael, *The Last Generation: Young Virginians in Peace, War, and Reunion* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005); Ayers, Gallagher, and Torget, eds., *Crucible of the Civil War*; and Blair, *Virginia’s Private War*. For a gendered focus on one community in Virginia on the eve of the Civil War, see Suzanne Lebsock, *The Free Women of Petersburg: Status and Culture in a Southern Town, 1784–1860* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1984); and for a gendered focus on the state of Virginia, see Varon, *We Mean to Be Counted.*

**Chapter 1**


3. Positioning itself within the legitimate legacy of the American Revolution was not the only rhetorical device used by the Confederacy to define, disseminate, and strengthen its nationalist message. Among the most frequently used strategies were the Confederacy’s claim that its republic was providentially sanctioned within a Christian tradition of covenant theology as well as its preferable benevolent paternalist model of
labor relations (through the institution of slavery) compared to the free labor industrialized North. See introduction, notes 21 and 32 for a discussion of the definition of Confederate nationalism.


11. In a similar vein, LeeAnn Whites asserts women’s postwar Lost Cause contributions needed to position themselves as working to strengthen masculinity. See Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis of Gender, Augusta, Georgia, 1860–1890* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995), 149–50. This wartime and postwar thematic connection in women’s work is even clearer in the discussion of the LDA in chapter 2, this volume.


15. Tracy to Cunningham: April 30, 1861, MVLA.


18. Tracy to Cunningham: May 2, 1861, MVLA.


22. See chapter 2, this volume.


27. Mary Chesnut to Ann Pamela Cunningham: April 3, 1860, Anna Pamela Cunningham Papers, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

28. Tracy to Cunningham: May 2, 1861, MVLA.


30. Tracy to Comegys: July 15, 1861, MVLA.

31. Tracy to Cunningham: Jan 29, 1861, MVLA.


34. Comegys to *Philadelphia Evening News*: May 16, 1861, MVLA.

35. Tracy to *National Intelligencer*: May 20, 1861, MVLA.


38. The MVLA had a strong relationship with the *Richmond Enquirer* in the 1850s; Anna Cora Mowatt Ritchie, the first vice regent of Virginia, was married to its editor, William Ritchie. In this context it is particularly striking the newspaper did not publish a letter or statement refuting these rumors. However, Ritchie stepped down as editor in 1860. (The same year, Ritchie left her husband and moved to Europe.)

39. Everett to Cunningham: May 30, 1861, MVLA.


41. Everett to Scott: May 24, 1861, MVLA.

42. In 1883, following the Supreme Court decision in *U.S. v. Lee* (1882) the U.S. paid George Washington Custis Lee $150,000 for the seizure without due process of Arlington House in the Civil War.

43. Winfield Scott, General Order 13 (handwritten copy), MVLA.

44. Tracy to *National Intelligencer*: August 1, 1861, MVLA.

45. Scott’s order did not completely eradicate dissent. Occasionally, the Northern press published articles critiquing Cunningham’s leadership of the MVLA after July 31, 1861. For instance, see “Mount Vernon to Be Confiscated,” *New York Times*, September 28, 1861. Still, after July 31, 1861, such articles were published with far less frequency and were the exception rather than the norm.

46. Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association, Annual Meeting Minutes, 1900, 17. I am indebted to Mary Thompson for pointing me to this memorial.

47. Clopton, 1864: Account Book, 8–12, Clopton Papers, CMLS, VHMC.

Chapter 2


2. Caroline Janney sees women’s membership and involvement in gunboat associations as a testament to the strength of women’s Confederate nationalism while Faust sees gunboat associations as symptomatic of the erosion of women’s commitment to Confederate nationalism. Caroline Janney, *Burying the Dead but Not the Past: Ladies’ Memorial Association and the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 21–26; and Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 28–29. Janney also claims the formation of gunboat associations foreshadowed the structure of Ladies’ Memorial Associations


4. Adelaide Clopton to Namie Clopton Nichols: July 12, 1862, Maria Gaistkell Foster Clopton of Richmond, VA Papers, 1862–1872, Confederate Memorial Literary Society Collection (CMLS), Virginia Museum of History and Culture (VMHC), Richmond, VA.


6. This kind of work is consistent with the restriction of elite Southern women’s activities and interests to their kinship groups and oriented around benevolent charities put forth in Jean Friedman, *The Enclosed Garden: Women and Community in the Evangelical South, 1830–1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985).


10. LeeAnn Whites explores the ways in which women’s postwar Lost Cause contributions could be seen as supporting and strengthening masculinity. Like women’s work with the wartime LDA, women’s postwar work could complement and augment, but never compromise, the work of men and constructions of masculinity. See Whites, *Crisis of Gender*, 149–50.


21. Duncan to Clopton: April 21, 1862, LDA.


25. For a wide-ranging thematic examination of the centrality of masculinity to Old South society, see Craig Thompson Friend and Lorri Glover, eds., *Southern Manhood: Perspectives on Masculinity in the Old South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004).

26. Wyatt-Brown demonstrates how the observation of violence against enslaved persons was an educational device for elite white men to train their sons in plantation management. See Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 149–74. Likewise, Stephanie E. Jones-Rogers shows how some slaveholding women taught their daughters the importance of violence against enslaved persons. See Jones-Rogers, *They Were Her Property*, 4–6, 10, 15. Jones-Rogers’s work suggests a more gender-integrated education in Southern values in childhood (leading to more gender-integrated models of power in the plantation regime in adulthood).


30. Vernon is only referred to as “Mrs. Vernon” or “Mrs. V.E.W. Vernon” in the archival record without any reference to her first name. She seems to have embraced conservative couverture culture in naming practices, while advocating for women’s expanded roles in civic society to support the Confederate cause. Women could support some conservative issues and some progressive issues at the same time.


32. Diary of Eliza Oswald Hill, Papers of Eliza Oswald Hill: March 5 1862 to June 31, 1863, Albert and Shirley Smalls Special Collection Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, entry dated April 18, 1862.
34. As discussed in Betty Herndon Maury Maury’s diary entry on April 20, 1862. For more on Maury and her diary, see chapter 4, this volume.
35. Minute Book, LDA, 8.
37. Minute Book, LDA, 7.
40. “Launching of the Ladies’ Gunboat,” *Richmond Enquirer*, June 30, 1863. This article also appears in the *Richmond Whig* (July 1, 1863), *Staunton Spectator* (July 7, 1863), and *Alexandria Gazette* (July 7, 1863).
41. Logan to Clopton: May 27, 1862, LDA.
42. “A Member” to Clopton: Undated, LDA.
43. Speed to Clopton: December 22, 1862, LDA.
44. Minute Book, LDA, 2–12.
45. “No. 8: Joint resolution of thanks to the patriotic women of our country for voluntary contributions furnished by them to the Army,” First Session of the Confederate Congress, approved April 11, 1862.
46. Catesby Jones to Clopton: April 27, 1862, LDA.
47. Logan to Clopton: May 27, 1862, LDA.
48. Berkeley to Clopton: Undated, LDA.
53. Letter: Augusta Jane Evans to P. G. T. Beauregard, August 4, 1862, 42.
54. Augusta Jane Evans, *Macaria; or, Altars of Sacrifice* (Richmond: West and Johnston, 1864), 137.
56. For information on how the rhetoric surrounding Spartan motherhood challenged Confederate masculinity in its rejection of male desire, see Bella Zweig, “The Only Women Who Gave Birth to Men: A Gynocentric, Cross-Cultural View of Women in Ancient Sparta,” in *Women’s Power, Man’s Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King*, ed. Mary DeForest (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1993), 47. Also, see Sarah Pomeroy on Simone de Beauvoir's analysis of the “almost” equal gender relations of Spartan society due to the rejection of Victorian, Christian standards of womanhood:

57. Pomeroy, *Spartan Women*, 62; Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 14–17. Sarah Pomeroy argues that Spartan women were the only women of ancient Greece whose thoughts, ideas, and concerns were considered worthy of citation; this is exemplified in Plutarch’s *Sayings of Spartan Women*. Pomeroy rejects the premise that Plutarch’s work is propaganda written by men, but insists that he recorded women’s actual words as they offer an intimate portrayal of familial attitudes markedly different from other societies.

58. For example, speaking to the United Daughters of the Confederacy in 1902, Lelia Claudia Pullen Morris of La Grange, Georgia, concluded her recollections of the war with a valorization of her Southern sisters. First, she praised the women of Sparta, “Ancient history awarded the Spartan women the honor of being the bravest and most patriotic in the world, urging on their husbands, fathers and sons to battle, and sacrificing them upon the altar of their country rather than suffer defeat.” Then, she positioned the women of the South in this revered legacy, “But my friends, modern history has awarded to Southern women, not only the honor of sacrificing their brave men, sires, and young boys, but given them the proud distinction of having the courage of defending their homes and firesides.” Lelia Claudia Pullen Morris, “Recollection, 1902 February 13,” CMLS, VMHC, 9.


62. This is not to preclude references to Roman culture in Civil War narratives. For instance, one of the most famous passages in Mary Chesnut’s diary is Louisa McCord’s retrieval of her son’s body from the Second Bull Run battlefield by chartering a special train. Chesnut referenced *Caius Gracchus* in her description of the event, “‘Mother of the Gracchi,’ we cried.” Mary Chesnut, *Mary Chesnut’s Civil War*, ed. C. Vann Woodward (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981), 428. The analysis here focuses on references to Spartan women in order to complement and extend Winterer’s examination of feminine classicism in eighteenth-and nineteenth-century America.

63. For more on the related concept of Republican Motherhood, see the introduction, this volume.

Chapter 3

Notes

2. See Stephanie McCurry, Confederate Reckoning: Power and Politics in the Civil War South (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), 178–217 (especially 192–93). In a wider frame encompassing issues outside of the bread riots, McCurry considers soldiers’ wives as formative local political actors who made demands on the Confederate state (even though they were still political dependents on their husbands). McCurry, Confederate Reckoning, 133–77 (especially 133–37).


5. Davis would issue nine days of fasting over the course of the war.


Notes


11. Barber, “Cartridge Makers and Myrmidon Viragos,” 211; and Glyph, Women’s Fight, 70.

12. Glyph, Women’s Fight, 70.

13. Instead, service of Northern women was often presented in the Northern pictorial press. For instance, a drawing in the Harper’s Weekly September 6, 1862, edition, “Our Women and the War,” succinctly demonstrates Northern women’s service in both the public and private spheres. In this image, women are captured in a variety of activities: sewing, nursing, providing spiritual support, and laboring on menial tasks for soldiers. In these depictions, Northern women are presented as industrious, self-sacrificing servants of the Union home front. See Brown, Beyond the Lines: Pictorial Reporting, Everyday Life, and the Crisis of Gilded Age America (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 49. For more on the wider culture of pictorial journalism in the Civil War, especially in the North, see Joshua Brown, Beyond the Lines; W. Fletcher Thompson Jr., The Image of War: The Pictorial Reporting of the American Civil War (New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1959); and William P. Campbell, The Civil War: The Centennial Exhibition of Eyewitness Drawings (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1961).

14. “Sowing and Reaping,” Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper, May 23, 1863. For these exceptional wartime images of Southern women, see Harper’s Weekly’s July 12, 1862, portrayal of New Orleans women’s response to General Benjamin Butler’s General Order 28. In the image, before the order, elite women spit in the face of a Union soldier. This first image conveys the idea that Southern women lack the decorum and subservience required of elite Southern women in the Old South. These women were engaging in crass behavior and challenging men in the public sphere. They were subverting the expectations of their gender and their class to express their support for the Confederacy. Their actions conflate deviant womanhood and Confederate womanhood. After the order, in the second image, the women acknowledge the Union soldier in a courteous manner. A November 15, 1862, image in Frank Leslie’s serves a similar function. The image, “The Chivalrous Behavior of a Sesch Lady,” shows a Southern woman lifting up her skirt, as a sign of disrespect, to a Union soldier. Furthermore, the Richmond bread riot is also depicted in the Northern press. The April 18, 1863, edition of Harper’s Weekly contains a brief article about the Richmond bread riot, but it is not accompanied by a sketch. Also, the September 7, 1861, cover image of Harper’s Weekly, “A Female Rebel in Baltimore—An Everyday Scene—,” shows an extravagantly dressed Southern woman brazenly walking through the street attracting the whispers and sneers of Union soldiers. The woman is oblivious to the volatile political context and the realities of war. She is carefree and cavalier, unlike hardworking and sensible Northern women.
15. It is also important to note that the Northern pictorial press omitted Southern women from representations of some events where they were intrinsic to the narrative. This is particularly clear in depictions of Sherman’s March to the Sea. Harper’s Weekly presented drawings of Sherman’s Atlanta Campaign and subsequent March to the Sea over a one-month period in the editions dated August 6, August 13, and September 3, 1864. Likewise, the August 6, 1864, edition of Frank Leslie’s includes a drawing of Sherman’s Georgia campaign. This process of selective memory implicitly recognized the potential of circulating images of vulnerable and victimized Southern women to a Northern audience; again, such images could humanize and illicit sympathy for the Southern cause. For more on the centrality of Southern women to Sherman’s campaign, see Lisa Tendrich Frank, The Civilian War: Confederate Women and Union Soldiers During Sherman’s March (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2015), and “Bedrooms as Battlefields: The Role of Gender Politics in Sherman’s March,” in Occupied Women: Gender, Military Occupation and the American Civil War, ed. LeeAnn Whites and Alecia P. Long (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2009), 33–48; Jaqueline Glass Campbell, When Sherman Marched North from the Sea: Resistance on the Confederate Home Front (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 58–92; and Anne Sarah Rubin, Through the Heart of Dixie: Sherman’s March and American Memory (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017), 45–68.

16. The Confederate bread riots share some striking similarities to the women’s march on Versailles in the French Revolution on October 5, 1789, from the route (first descending on the Hotel de Ville), the concern (acquisition of affordably priced bread), the target (the domestic government), and the “dress rehearsals” throughout the summer of 1789 to women’s leadership. Furthermore, in the aftermath of both riots, the participants were falsely declared to be prostitutes by journalistic and governmental accounts. To characterize these events as simply spontaneity driven by women’s emotional response to an inflationary economy would be to obscure the shrewd political insight of the women organizers and participants in both riots. For more on women in the march on Versailles, see Joan B. Landes, Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988); David Garrioch, “The Everyday Lives of Parisian Women and the October Days of 1789,” Social History 24 (1999): 231–49, and Women in Revolutionary Paris, 1789–1795, ed. Darline Gay Levy, Harriet Branson Applewhite, and Mary Durham Johnson (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1979). For more on the Richmond riot and prostitution, see Barber, “Cartridge Makers and Myrmidon Viragos.”


18. Manarin, ed., Richmond at War, 311–12.

19. Manarin, ed., Richmond at War, 311–12.

20. Manarin, ed., Richmond at War, 314.


22. Manarin, ed., Richmond at War, 320.

23. Randolph’s biographer, George Shackleford, claims his economic and political ideology can best be described as “pre-Marxist socialism.” See George Green Shackelford,

24. Mary Chesnut, A Diary from Dixie, ed. Isabella D. Martin and Myrta Lockett Avary (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1905), 105. Chesnut also accompanied Randolph on some of her hospital visits. In the 1905, 1949, and 1981 editions of her diary, the entry dated August 23, 1861, detailed the infamous anecdote of Chesnut fainting at Sally Tompkins’s Robertson Hospital while on a charity visit with Mary Randolph. See the introduction, note 2, p. 125.


31. McCurry links Confederate conscription policies that removed lower-class white laborers from smaller farms (while exempting plantation owners holding twenty or more slaves), as a motivating factor in the soldier wives’ bread riots. See McCurry, Confederate Reckoning, 203–4.


35. Judith White McGuire, Diary of a Southern Refugee, During the War (New York: E. J. Hale and Son, 1868), 203. Also see Jones, A Rebel War Clerk’s Diary, for further sympathy with the rioters.

36. White McGuire, Diary of a Southern Refugee, 204.


42. Glymph, Out of the House of Bondage, 38.

43. Jones-Rogers, They Were Her Property, 172–74. Jones-Rogers also notes that Confederate soldiers impressed enslaved persons from slaveholding women, and women petitioned for payment for the loss of their property. Again, this shows slaveholding women’s concerns with slavery as a means to ensure their own economic survival. See Jones-Rogers, They Were Her Property, 167–68.

44. Jones-Rogers, They Were Her Property, 175.


46. For an example of the usage of “rich man’s war, poor man’s fight” to describe the Confederate war effort, see Sam R. Watkins, Co. Aytch: A Confederate Memoir of the Civil War, 2nd ed. (Wilmington, NC: Broadfoot Publishing Co., 1987), 69.

47. The Statutes at Large of the Confederate States of America Passed at the Third Session of the First Congress; 1862, 158, https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=osu.32435001714492&view=1up&seq=155, last accessed October 1, 2021. The exemption became even more restrictive in February 1864.

48. In February 1864, the Twenty Slave Law would be amended again to apply only to plantations with fifteen or more, instead of twenty or more, enslaved persons. Also, planters would be required to give the government 100 pounds of bacon, or a comparable substitute, for each enslaved person on his plantation as recompense. Again, the Confederate government revised expectations of both military and financial service from the Confederate elite.

49. M. E. Caperton to G. H. Caperton: May 9, 1861, Caperton Family Papers, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

50. Chesnut, Diary, 33.


52. Faust, Mothers of Invention, 56–62.


55. Glymph, _Women’s Fight_, 60–69, 73–76. Glymph also examines interactions between wealthy lowcountry refugees in poor white mountain communities to show how poor whites also expressed class-based resentment. Wealthy refugees often endangered these communities with their demands on already scarce resources.


58. In such descriptions of their fears over the Union and lower-class whites, Southern women often referenced the French Revolution as a western touchstone for violent class warfare. For instance, in June 1862, two months before the Battle of Baton Rouge, Sarah Morgan reflected, “Here we two culprits [Miriam, her sister, and herself] stand alone before the tribunal of patriotism. Madame Roland, I take the liberty of altering your words and cry ‘O Patriotism! How many base deeds are sanctioned by your name!’ Don’t I wish I was a heathen! In twenty four hours the whole country will be down on us.” In aligning her subjectivity with that of one of the most famous women martyrs of the French Revolution, Morgan magnified the sense of imminent danger and class conflict on the home front. Morgan, _Diary_, 130.

59. Manarin, ed., _Richmond at War_, 312.

60. Manarin, ed., _Richmond at War_, 323.


63. Public and private charity associations and efforts were prevalent in the antebellum South. See Timothy James Lockley, _Welfare and Charity in the Antebellum South_ (Gainesville: University of Florida, 2007). For a study focused on charity in Richmond, Virginia, see Elna C. Green, _This Business of Relief: Confronting Poverty in a Southern City, 1740–1940_ (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2003), 40–84.

64. Elizabeth R. M. Callender, Unpublished Diary, Bird Family Papers, VMHC, 2.


66. Missouri did not grant pensions to widows; it only granted pensions to veterans. (Missouri was a border state in the war and never formally joined the Confederacy.)
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