In 1870, notorious bushwhacker Samuel Hildebrand published an account of the guerrilla war in Missouri and Arkansas as he claimed to have experienced it. *The Life of Samuel Hildebrand* presented readers with explicitly violent and allegedly unfiltered tales of theft, vendetta, and homicide. Composed in the immediate aftermath of the war, Hildebrand’s gritty, vainglorious autobiography—many pages of which were focused squarely on his knack for violence and killing in the bush—lacked any apposite connection to later manifestations of the Lost Cause or the New South; the book maximized violent imagery and backwoods sentimentalism to forge a memory narrative of the guerrilla war that might turn Hildebrand’s “irregular” skill set into postwar distinction and line his pockets in the process. In this light, Hildebrand’s narrative shared many of the basic ideas and tropes offered by John Newman Edwards throughout the 1870s, but in memoir form. Both Hildebrand and Edwards remained wholly unapologetic about atrocities committed by bushwhackers on behalf of the Confederate cause in Missouri and celebrated the irregular nature of guerrilla warfare.¹

Subsequent guerrilla memoirs, however, would introduce narratives pillared by new themes that were designed to update and replace the novelty and divisiveness of guerrilla war interpretations conceived by Edwards and Hildebrand. Ex-Missouri bushwhackers Coleman Younger (1903), William H. Gregg (1906), Andrew Walker (1910), Hampton Watts (1913), John McCorkle (1914), Kit Dalton (1914), Joseph Bailey (1920), Harrison Trow (1923), and George Cruzen (1930) penned their own memoirs to establish a place for guerrilla memory (that is, for themselves) in the conservative-dominated, tradition-oriented hierarchy of early-twentieth-
century southern society. Hildebrand could offer no rebuttal to these revisionists; he had been unceremoniously gunned down in Pinckneyville, Illinois, amid a booze-fueled brawl with town marshals in 1872. Perhaps fittingly for an old bushwhacker like Sam Hildebrand, the same bullet that plowed through the side of his head also spared him from witnessing the gradual obsolescence of the memory narrative that had sprung from it.

With southern extra-legal and political violence at its apogee in the 1870s, John Newman Edwards had wielded guerrilla memory with great effect in the aid of Missouri’s Democratic Party. As noted in chapter two, Edwards harnessed William C. Quantrill and his guerrilla company as memorial spokesmen to provide Missourians with a falsely collective, politically-viable narrative of their guerrilla-plagued Civil War experiences. But with Redemption throughout the South achieved well before the dawn of the new century, Edwards’s creation—the hyper-violent guerrilla detached completely from the failures and legacy of the Confederacy proper—began to fall out of vogue with ex-guerrillas. Many of these former bushwhackers had, in fact, hailed from relatively affluent and politically active families prior to the war; thus, as the political usefulness of Edwards’s message waned, so too did ex-guerrillas’ satisfaction with the outsider or novelty stigma appended to them by *Noted Guerrillas*. In the simplest terms, guerrilla memory had to update and adapt—it had to *reboot*.

Given the notorious exploits of bushwhackers-turned-bandits like Jesse James and Cole Younger during and after the war, most historians of the guerrilla conflict have focused so much attention on wartime barbarism or postwar demystification of social banditry that the evolution of guerrilla memory in the twentieth-century has gone virtually unnoticed. Lost in the mix of revisionism and skepticism that typically surrounds the use of guerrilla memoirs is how brightly they illuminate the process through which understandings of the past and present are
permanently interwoven—that is, developed simultaneously and dependently upon one another. These memoirs literally reflect how ex-guerrillas, once touted for their separation from the regular war effort and social norms, adapted to a gamut of socio-economic, political, and cultural trends in the early twentieth-century South and sought to integrate their own wartime narratives into more mainstream southern society.

Not surprisingly, responses to changes in gender roles, race relations, and commemorative attitudes—stemming from emancipation, shifts in the Lost Cause intellectual movement, and the traction of the New South industrial movement—each appear prevalently in the memoirs of ex-guerrillas. This chapter will examine how guerrilla narrators gradually acclimatized their stories to remain relevant as patterns of pro-Confederate remembrance and daily life changed around them. Any attempt to repackage their memory for southern audiences in the twentieth century required a calculated move to infuse narratives with pseudo-independent women to correspond with the ascent of the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) to the elite tiers of leadership within the Lost Cause movement. The role of women in guerrilla accounts underscored their strengthened position within southern culture, but still accented the gendered boundaries of space inherent to early-twentieth-century conservatism. The authors of these memoirs were also quite aware of the need to spin the South’s “race problem” as it related to both the mythology of the Lost Cause and the economic platform of the New South.

On one hand, for the purposes of this chapter, the Lost Cause is generally defined as a regional (southern-bred) intellectual movement designed to help southerners justify secession, to explain Confederate defeat in honorable terms, and to preserve alleged cultural features of the “Old South” (for example: a racial hierarchy previously pillared by the institution of slavery and the idea that African Americans were happy as slaves and loyal to their pro-Confederate
masters). On the other hand, the New South (or the New South Creed) is defined broadly as a regional (again, southern-bred) economic movement that advocated modernization, industrialization, and a quick process of sectional reconciliation to allow for much-needed northern capital investment. Naturally, one movement seeking preservation and one movement seeking modernization would seem to be at odds, and their ideologies did often clash. That said, it is important to note that for guerrilla memoirists in the twentieth century, picking and choosing from the most attractive qualities of both sides—essentially, cherry-picking from each platform—actually represented the best way for ex-guerrillas to ingratiate themselves with the widest possible swaths of southern society.

With that in mind, former guerrillas adopted popular methods of presenting African Americans in the Jim Crow-dominated South. By way of including caricatured black characters as either lustful predators or loyal, Remus-type figures, guerrilla narrators tailored their reminiscences to tap patterns that might appease both sides—proponents of the Lost Cause and the New South—as best they could. Likewise, these ex-guerrillas looked to the Spanish-American War (1898-1900) and World War I (1917-1918) as opportunities to emphasize new notions of national citizenship and attitudes concerning commemoration in their memoirs. In other words, ex-guerrillas were quick to laud the physical might of America’s newest warriors, but also manipulated cries for a return to antebellum chivalry to reshape their own fighting pasts in an up-to-date context.

This chapter is less concerned with whether or not these memoirs are true than with how, and, ultimately why, they were designed and composed. So before proceeding further, a few words on the role of accuracy and veracity are in order. At least on the surface, this sample of guerrilla memoirs published between 1903 and 1930 present a slew of interpretive issues related
to literary self-service, outside influence, and outright concoction. We should be especially mindful of this when dealing with ardently pro-Confederate depictions of enslaved or runaway African Americans found in these memoirs. Such instances may be indicative of guerrillas having been duped by clever slaves or even highlight a willingness to be duped by those slaves—but most likely, they are exaggerations and fabrications designed to resonate with Lost Cause mythologies and to tell white audiences what they want to hear. Even so, that same self-serving desire to comply with newer, more fashionable social mores and strains of remembrance are precisely what makes these memoirs such a valuable addition to the study of Civil War memory more broadly conceived. In sum, chapter two laid bare how guerrilla memory was constructed in a partisan laboratory; the work of these guerrillas-turned-biographers underscores with equal importance how ex-bushwhackers themselves attempted to take the helm and steer guerrilla memory anew after its initial importance for Democratic politics in Missouri had all but disappeared.

REMAKING GENDER ROLES
While Confederate guerrillas like Quantrill, Anderson, Younger, Hildebrand, Wilson, James, Todd, and Holtzclaw are undoubtedly Missouri’s dominant Civil War memory export, the state was also home to the first branch of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Debates among historians over when the UDC ultimately usurped leadership of the Lost Cause movement from their male counterparts in the Southern Historical Society (SHS) or the United Confederate Veterans (UCV) are still ongoing. According to historian Gaines Foster, the Daughters rose to prominence in the late-1890s as the organizational power of the UCV gradually declined (due to a rapidly aging population of veterans) and the Sons of the Confederate Veterans (SCV) showed little interest in carrying on the Confederate tradition as had the previous generation. Through
commemorative activities related to decoration days, funeral organization, monument building, care for destitute veterans, educational programs for children, and most of all fundraising, Foster contends that the UDC did, in fact, takeover leadership of the Lost Cause—but only after its purpose had been fulfilled and enthusiasm for it began to decline sharply in the early twentieth century.4

Historian Karen Cox counters that women had been a vital part of Lost Cause leadership from the beginning; and, with the establishment of the UDC in 1894, women took on an active role in the formation of the postbellum southern social hierarchy. She argues that as a result of their fundraising efficiency, the Daughters controlled the financial sector of the Lost Cause and, from 1894 to 1919, were immensely powerful brokers within the framework of southern culture. As an example, Cox offers the case of Laura Talbot Galt in 1902. As a child in Kentucky, Galt openly disobeyed her northern-born instructor and refused to sing “Marching through Georgia” out of respect for her Confederate forebears. When the UDC caught wind of the conflict, Galt was paraded as a hero and the Daughters ramped up their efforts to police school curriculums, textbook content, and to place Confederate flags and portraits in every southern classroom.5

Most recently, in Burying the Dead But Not the Past, historian Caroline Janney asserts that Ladies Memorial Associations (LMAs) and the first generation of Confederate women that founded them have been erroneously overshadowed by the UDC. Janney maintains that LMAs had been quite powerful in the 1870s and 1880s (a period typically known for male Lost Cause leadership) because of their success at the local and community levels. When the UDC was founded in 1894, she boldly claims that the LMA generation refused to simply cede power and that the Daughters did not open a significant power gap over their LMA predecessors until 1915.6 Despite their differences, Cox and Janney, writing in 2003 and 2008, respectively,
supplement Foster’s male-driven history of the Lost Cause with much needed gender analysis. And while Cox and Janney disagree strongly on how and when the UDC rose to power, the fundamental conclusion necessary for this chapter has already emerged: the United Daughters of the Confederacy and what remained of the Ladies Memorial Associations were a legitimate political force throughout the South by the time Cole Younger published his memoir in 1903 and remained so well into the 1920s. One case in point was the Jefferson Davis monument unveiled in Richmond, Virginia, in 1907. Of the estimated $70,000 price tag appended to the marble likeness of the Confederacy’s one and only president, the Daughters claimed to have covered $50,000. According to the Consumer Price Index, that translates into approximately $1,200,000 in 2011.

At the state level, Missouri had failed to officially join the Confederacy in the 1860s—but it suffered no corresponding dearth of female-led commemoration. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, chapters of the UDC sprang up all across Missouri. Higginsville, Sedalia, St. Louis, Columbia, Kansas City, Springville, Booneville, Marshall, Slater, Jefferson City, Moberly, Independence, Mexico, Bridgeton, St. Joseph, Hannibal, Keytesville, Clinton, Warrensburg, and Cape Girardeau were all home to at least one chapter; larger venues like St. Louis often hosted several simultaneously. Despite their westerly location, members of these Missouri chapters considered themselves very much a part of the national organization and its commemorative mission.

According to literature published by the John S. Marmaduke Chapter of Columbia (which listed 83 active members in 1924), the “business” of the Daughters was at once “historical, benevolent, educational, and social.” They sought to “honor the memory of those who served and those who fell in the service of the Confederate states”; to “protect and preserve the material
for a truthful history of the War Between the States”; to “assist descendants of worthy Confederates in securing proper education”; and, not coincidentally, to “record the part taken by southern women in patient endurance and hardship and patriotic devotion during the struggle as in [their] untiring efforts after the war during the Reconstruction of the South to fulfill those sacred duties of benevolence toward the survivors and toward those dependent upon them.” With those objectives in mind, the UDC in Missouri compiled wartime histories, spearheaded fundraisers for monuments and assistance programs, helped operate the Confederate Veterans Home at Higginsville, maintained and decorated gravesites, hosted annual conventions and banquets, and even performed matronly duties for the Order of Kappa Alpha—a fraternity at the University of Missouri founded on the principles of Robert E. Lee and the southern cavalier.7

Unlike women in most other ex-Confederate states, the unpredictable nature and domestic setting of irregular warfare in Missouri had mandated that the mothers, daughters, sisters, aunts, and wives of bushwhackers live and work on the front lines of the guerrilla war. A slew of historians including Victoria Bynum, LeeAnn Whites, John Inscoe, Michael Fellman, Joseph Beilein, Barton Myers, and Daniel Sutherland have all illustrated how women not only lived amidst guerrilla warfare, but were often willing participants in the violence. Whites and Beilein, especially, are at the forefront of a growing number of historians who interpret Missouri’s guerrilla war as a “household war” in which women operated in the capacity of quartermasters and intelligence gatherers. Both Whites and Beilein illustrate how mothers, wives, sweethearts, and even female cousins equipped their men in the bush with clothing, food, ammunition, information, and emotional support. And these women, many of them Daughters, had no intention of letting their own service to the Confederate cause be neglected or forgotten in
the postwar period. “Few monuments,” women of the UDC in Missouri lamented, “have arisen to tell future generations of the heroism and grandeur of the women of the South.”

To that end, in the 1920s, the Missouri Branch of the United Daughters of the Confederacy published a collection of seventy-four essays entitled *Reminiscences of Women in Missouri During the Sixties*. As one might expect, contributions covered a wide range of topics—but the vast majority of them revolved around events that had transpired on the home front, several of which had stemmed from the guerrilla war. Mrs. William H. Gregg recalled that her mother-in-law wore her jewelry concealed in the breast of her clothing to avoid rampant acts of theft committed by Union men. Eventually, though, “they finally discovered the watch chain about her neck,” “tore her dress open,” and “robbed her.” Mrs. M. E. Lewis remembered the day that General James Lane and his men “loaded six mules and horse wagons with the good from the stores in town” and then torched the town before returning to Kansas. Mrs. J. A. B. Adcock recollected that because of his friendship with Quantrill, Federals had twice attempted to execute her father in the brush—but that he escaped both times before taking up permanent exile in the woods to avoid capture. Mrs. N. M. Harris cited an encounter between a pro-Union jayhawker and a young girl in which the intruding Kansan ordered the girl to stop crying because “if she uttered another sound he would cut her head off.” As evidenced by these *published* reminiscences, women had experienced the hardships of the guerrilla war and they were also in an excellent position to dictate what elements of it would and would not become part of the Lost Cause narrative they managed.

Published well before this volume or even the advent of the UDC, *The Life of Samuel Hildebrand* sporadically cast southern women in a positive light—mainly Hildebrand’s wife and mother—but made no concerted effort to honor them as a collective group. And, while Cole
Younger also died before *Reminiscences of Women in Missouri* went to press, by 1903, when he published his own memoir, the UDC and other southern women had achieved new standards of public power. *The Story of Cole Younger as told by Himself* acutely noted the newly-prominent place of women in conservative space. Unlike Hildebrand, whose tale placed women in an auxiliary capacity, Younger bluntly stated that, “I should like to say something of the ladies who have honored me with their presence. But as I have been a bachelor all of my life I scarcely know what to say. I do know, though, that they are the divine creatures of a divine creator; I do know that they are the high priestesses of this land; and, too, God could not be everywhere, so He made women.” Later in the memoir, Younger included an anecdote telling of his desire to appease women in power:

> Perhaps you have heard of banquets “for gentlemen only.” Well, it was upon one of these occasions that one of the guests was called upon to respond to a toast—“The Ladies.” There being no ladies present, he felt safe in his remarks. “I do not believe,” he said, “that there are any real, true women living any more.” The guest opposite him sprang to his feet and shouted: “I hope that the speaker refers only to his own female relations.” I never could understand, either, when a man goes wrong it is called “misfortune,” while if a woman goes wrong it is called “shame.” But I presume, being in prison twenty-five years, I am naturally dull, and should not question a world I have not lived in for a quarter of a century. I tell you, my friends, that I know very little of women, but of one thing I am morally certain: If the front seats of Paradise are not reserved for women, I am willing to take a back seat with them. ¹⁰

Penned following his release from prison, Younger’s tribute to southern ladies immediately revealed that he understood their cultural prowess and that to ingratiate guerrilla memory with the mainstream Lost Cause, he needed to appease the female guardians of Confederate tradition. ¹¹ Appropriately, then, as the first guerrilla to publish a major memoir after the turn-of-the-century, Younger freely confessed his inability to set down adequately elegant prose in honor of women. At first glance, Younger’s description of women as “divine” or “high priestesses” may call to mind terminology designed to constrain women to “the pedestal” and their duties to the
domestic realm. But as proclaimed by C. Vann Woodward, the Lost Cause failed to operate in a “religious” capacity until the conservative women of the UDC ascended to lead it. Thus, Younger’s homage to women fit snugly within the context of powerful Daughters serving as the directors of a civic religion rooted in Confederate tradition. The nature of Younger’s praise for women does, in some ways, still link them to traditional gender norms as embodiments of feminine virtue and purity—but the fact that Younger and all proceeding guerrilla memoirists paid their obligatory dues to women suggested that they were well aware of the role women would play in determining the fate of guerrilla memory.

William H. Gregg’s 1906 memoir, entitled A Little Dab of History Without Embellishment, also included a section of text that specifically and explicitly targeted southern women. “Heaven bless the women,” he wrote, for “they were friends in need and indeed. No braver than the southern ladies of Missouri, we owed our lives to them. So, to say again, heaven bless them.” Unlike Younger’s account, however, Gregg’s manuscript was never published. During the war, Gregg had served as one of William C. Quantrill’s most trusted and deadly lieutenants. After the war, financial woes influenced Gregg to sell his story (and full publication rights) to amateur historian William Elsey Connelley—a resident of Kansas and perhaps Quantrill’s harshest biographer. Even still, the value of Gregg’s memoir should not at all be discounted because it was penned with publication in mind.

Gregg takes the importance of women a step further than Younger through this explanation of the 1863 raid on Lawrence, Kansas, in which some 200 men and boys were gunned down by Quantrill and his men. According to Gregg, “wholesale killing was repugnant to many of the men” at Lawrence but they fought on in great part because “Anderson’s sisters had been murdered, Crawford’s sister’s, had been murdered, and, any day, any of our sisters were
liable to be murdered.” Bloodlust withstanding, Gregg also reported that a Union man held hostage in the Eldridge Hotel during the massacre would honestly testify that “if there was a woman or child harmed by Quantrill’s men, I never heard of it.” Gregg offered southern women the best of both worlds: guerrillas had waged a savage campaign to protect them, but they had also respected womanhood and not harmed women during the most controversial battle of the entire guerrilla war.14

More than any of his predecessors, Hampton Watts wrote in his 1913 memoir, The Babe of the Company, as if he could literally feel the passage of time chipping away at guerrilla memory. He included a roster of all the men from William “Bloody Bill” Anderson’s guerrilla company that he could remember (even if it was only a last name); took care to record when and where lesser-known guerrillas had fallen in battle; and, on more than one occasion, noted where “over a lapse of forty-eight years” some guerrillas had simply been forgotten once and for all. Watts ended his memoir with a poem that he hoped would remind his grandson of the glorious sacrifices that guerrillas—men like Hildebrand, Younger, and himself—had made during the war:

“Rest on, embalmed and sainted dead!
    Dear as the blood ye gave;
No implous footstep here shall tred
    The herbage of your grave.”

On the surface, very little of Watts’ account has to do with women. In fact, they are virtually absent from his descriptions of battles fought by guerrillas in 1863 and 1864. But Watts’ fear of being forgotten—a sentiment clearly verified by the subtitle of his book: An Unfolded Leaf from the Forest of Never-To-Be-Forgotten Years—suggests that securing a long-term place for guerrilla memory within the female-led Lost Cause was a serious concern. As had Younger and Gregg before him, Watts paid homage to the women of Missouri, but also became the first
guerrilla memoirist to specifically honor the UDC by name. On the very first page of his account, Watts wrote: “To the Ladies of Fayette Richmond Greys Chapter No. 148, United Daughters of the Confederacy, who will erect a monument to the memory of the ‘Brave and Fallen Guerillas’ in the Fayette battle, September 20, 1864. Over the graves it decorates, the brave comrades it ennobles, and the dear women who are made angelic by their deed, I give this truthful story.” Watts clearly understood that while he could record his narrative in print, the Daughters could immortalize it publically in marble.¹⁵

John McCorkle published *Three Years with Quantrill* a year later in 1914. The memoir marked a significant break from the dedications to southern women by Younger, Gregg, Watts, and Dalton; rather than a stand-alone paragraph or even a chapter dedicated to women, McCorkle infused his personal story with strong female characters throughout. During the war, McCorkle’s sister was among the women imprisoned in and then killed by the collapse of a Union prison in Kansas City. According to McCorkle, this incident, along with the threatened kidnapping of his cousin, Mollie, should he not join the Union militia, prompted McCorkle to become a guerrilla. He explained that, “When we returned from the singing school, Mollie Wigginton told us that there had been a company of Federal soldiers there that evening, leaving an order for George and me to come to Independence the next Monday to join the State Militia, and that unless we did report, that they would come back and take Mollie and put her in prison and hold her until we did report.” Later in the book, McCorkle described how various women had aided the guerrilla cause and, unlike Younger, added an element of danger shared between the sexes in his narrative. His cousin Millie, he maintained, risked severe punishment to help arm guerrillas in the bush. Using luggage designed specifically for smuggling, she travelled to Illinois and revealed a bounty of 35,000 percussion caps upon her return. Importantly, McCorkle does
not replace men as the primary figures of combat, but implies that Mollie, as a quartermaster of the guerrilla war, helped make that combat possible in the first place.\textsuperscript{16}

Toward the end of his account, McCorkle recounted the story of a woman who had been “outraged” by two men. After authorities tried for several days to apprehend the culprits, Frank James told the captain in charge “that he could take six of his men and capture these two fiends.” James and his posse supposedly caught the two men—and executed them both. By coupling these events with the bravery of his cousin Mollie, McCorkle exhibited a conflicted understanding of how to portray women in the New South. On one hand, strong women like Mollie had taken on important roles during the war and were, in more ways than not, steering the Lost Cause ship in 1914. On the other hand, though, McCorkle was still compelled to include an example that would, at least theoretically, serve as an example of the protection that “pure, innocent” women needed from men to avoid imprisonment in a “Northern Dungeon” where they could have met a fate “more terrible than death itself.” The conundrum, then, amounted to including women adequately enough in his memoir to curry favor with the Daughters while not destroying the hyper-masculine component of guerrilla memory in the process. If McCorkle’s treatment was to be representative or in any way universal, the southern damsel in distress would not disappear completely from guerrilla memory, but with powerful women helping to shape the development of the New South, she would no longer be nearly so helpless.\textsuperscript{17}

Also published in 1914, Kit Dalton’s brief memoir, \textit{Under the Black Flag}, included a pair of separate encounters with women—one pro-Confederate, one pro-Union—that again connected female characters directly to the dangers of irregular warfare. Following a fierce skirmish with federal troops, Dalton, then an enlisted soldier in the regular war, was forced to hide under the eaves of a nearby house. As night fell, Dalton made contact with the residents of the home—a
woman and her infant. The woman asked Dalton to identify himself. “A stranger, madam,” he answered, “who wants to get into the Connersville road, if you will be kind enough to direct me.” When the young woman asked where Dalton hailed from, he confessed that he was a “Confederate soldier in distress.” With that, the woman identified herself as Mrs. Stone, invited Dalton into her home, tended to his wounds, provided him with a new shirt, and fixed him something to eat. She also provided Dalton with information: the rest of his Confederate companions had been killed in “cold blooded murder” after surrendering. Before leaving her home, Dalton remembered Mrs. Stone saying “I hope you will live to even up matters with those brutes, Mr. Dalton,” thus strongly implying that he resort to the sort of activity that would enable him to even his vendetta with the federals. So began, Dalton recounted, his career as a guerrilla shortly thereafter.¹⁸

Later in the memoir, while commanding his own band of Confederate guerrillas, Dalton wrote about capturing a vessel on the Cumberland River. Initially, the captain of the ship refused to surrender himself or his passengers to Dalton’s men. After an exchange of gunfire and promises from Dalton that the captain’s passengers would not be taken hostage or murdered, the crew and cargo were captured. Then, Dalton wrote, “One of our lady prisoners, having a pretty keen sense of the ridiculous, approached me and said: ‘And you don’t eat ‘em alive, captain?’” The rest of Dalton’s flirtatious exchange with the young lady (an avowed Unionist) went as follows:

Dalton: No, they are too tough, but if I were a cannibal chieftain, your fate would certainly be an unhappy one.

Female Prisoner (after uttering a “merry chuckle”): Aren’t you Captain Dalton, of those terrible guerillas [sic]?

Dalton: Guerillas eat ‘em alive, don’t they?
Female Prisoner: *We read all sorts of things about the guerillas but I don’t believe they are as bloodthirsty as they are represented.*

Dalton: *No, they are not savages or cannibals. Look around you and see if there’s a man in my command who impresses you as a demon.*

Female Prisoner: *No, they seem to be pretty genteel fellows, but you are Captain Dalton, now, aren’t you?*

Dalton: *I am his friend, madam, and am a guerilla—as terrible as the word may sound to you. You have seen a band of guerillas in action. They have treated you and your companions as rudely as they ever treated captives in their whole career. You can judge better now what a guerilla is.*

Female Prisoner: *I think better of them, captain, and as a souvenir, I want a cutting of that drake’s tail on your forehead. I will cherish it as a souvenir.*

Dalton’s use of the two major female encounters in his memoir cleverly communicated two main ideas to readers. First, that a woman, Mrs. Stone, had seemingly encouraged his transition from regular soldier to guerrilla out of wartime necessity. And second, that another woman, this time an unnamed Unionist, had vouched for his honorable behavior and the way he treated women after he had become a guerrilla. So at the same time Dalton included female characters in his story who shared the risks of war with men, he also conveyed how those women had both supported and approved of his resume of bushwhacking. This underlying message alluded to the hope that women in the twentieth century should continue the support of Mrs. Stone and the unnamed prisoner in the form of their joint efforts.¹⁹

The prominence of women in narratives penned by Younger and McCorkle (and to a lesser extent, Dalton) notwithstanding, Joseph Bailey’s *Confederate Guerrilla: The Civil War Memoir of Joseph Bailey* (1920) arguably sheds the greatest light on the relationship between an evolving guerrilla memory and the rise of female Lost Cause leadership. Bailey, the husband of a prominent officer in the UDC, actually gave a copy of the memoir to his wife’s local chapter as a
gift. Like McCorkle before him, Bailey included memories of the guerrilla war that displayed an element of shared danger and risk between men and women. In one case, he described how a company of Union soldiers approached himself and a female companion. “Amid a shower of bullets,” he recalled, “the danger from which was shared equally by my sweetheart and me, I mounted my horse and began the race for my life.” Elsewhere in the book, Bailey reported how southern women like his wife had trekked miles to procure food and supplies during the war. They “walked that distance crossing mountains and wading swiftly flowing mountain streams; bought half a bushel of corn each and carried it home on their shoulders to make bread for hungry children,” he wrote.

After expounding the virtues of Confederate women throughout his memoir, Bailey still included an entire dedication entitled “Heroism of Southern Women.” In it, he remembered the story of a young southern maiden that carried a wounded Confederate boy to a “secluded place in dense woods over a mile distant” and then braved foul weather and fear to wait all night with the boy until he died. He added that, “Miss Baines volunteered to keep a lone vigil over his lifeless form” while two other women went to find help. Despite being alone in the dark with the boy’s corpse, “her courage never faltered.” Bailey concluded the dedication with the affirmation that “This incident, one of many heroic acts of southern women, will portray in some measure the fortitude and courage of women in the War Between the States.” In many ways, Bailey’s account metaphorically conceded the leadership role taken by women after the war to watch over and commemorate the Confederate dead. In short, Joseph Bailey fully understood that updating guerrilla memory in a manner that would allow for its integration into the mainstream Lost Cause meant not just injecting women into his wartime narrative—it meant paying the commemorative piper.
NEW SOUTH VS. LOST CAUSE: PLAYING BOTH SIDES OF THE “RACE PROBLEM”

Late in 1886, Henry W. Grady addressed the New England Society in New York; the motif of his speech: race and the economy of the New South. Often dubbed the “spokesman” of the New South, Grady began his remarks by offering that, “There was a South of slavery and secession – but that South is dead. There is a South of Union and freedom – that South, thank God, is living, breaking, [and] growing every hour.” In a calculated bid to attract the support of northern investors and their all-important capital for southern industrialization and market development, Grady outlined a duplicitous framework in which the South was not particularly sorry, or ready to apologize for slavery, but, would at least acknowledge and embrace the new economic opportunities revealed by emancipation. “The South found her jewel in the toad’s head of defeat,” he declared, but maintained that the region “had nothing to take back.”

Next, Grady quickly turned to racial discord, the issue that most alarmed potential investors and remained as the largest potential impediment to the southward flow of much-needed northern capital. Grady petitioned his audience: “But what of the negro?” Have we solved the problem he presents or progressed in honor and equity towards the solution?” The question was rhetorical; Grady’s answer was a resounding yes. Of black southerners, he opined, “We have found out that in the general summary the free negro counts more than he did as a slave,” and that every citizen of the New South needed to “put business above politics.” The rosy portrait Grady painted of New South race relations more or less ignored the truth of the matter—that militant white supremacy had generated racial violence in every state of the ex-Confederacy (as well as states like Missouri and Kentucky that had not even seceded). Even so,
Grady’s explanations for defeat, remorse, and the future found critical acclaim with both northern and southern audiences.

The “New South” situation on the ground in Missouri mirrored much of what Grady espoused at the New England Club about the rest of the South. In *Paths of Resistance: Tradition and Dignity in Industrializing Missouri* (1986), David Thelen argues quite convincingly that during the Civil War in Missouri “no family or home was safe from a sudden visit by guerrillas or militiamen who demanded food, property, sex, lodging, and even lives.” And in the postbellum period, Thelen continues, a resultant “popular crisis of law and authority” created by wartime chaos morphed into “new leaders” in Washington and Jefferson City “who were determined to use law to create a large-scale market economy.” According to Thelen, the “old order”—marked by “family, work, leisure, friends, community, natural surroundings, and worship”—clashed fiercely with the “new order.” This newer order would live and die by set of economic imperatives rooted in market competition and rapid industrial growth. And, while the book notes stiff resistance from some traditional Missourians set on the preserving folk memories and traditions, Thelen decries the changes as largely inevitable: railroads expanded competition and shipping, refrigeration battered down old agricultural marketing impediments, women and children entered the workforce, and artisans “soon learned how cost had replaced skill as the guiding principle of labor.”

In *White Man’s Heaven: The Lynching and Expulsion of Southern Blacks in the Ozarks, 1894-1909* (2010), state historian and archivist Kimberly Harper details how changing population demographics in post-war Missouri complicated the rise and achievement of New South economic ideals. After the war, Harper contends, a small group of ex-slaves remained in the Ozarks and freedpeople immigrated to the area because, unlike Little Dixie, it had not been a
stronghold for human chattel. In addition to African Americans, white Union veterans from Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio along with Confederate veterans from Virginia, Arkansas, and Kentucky also flooded into the region. The combination of native Missourians, newly-freed blacks, and immigrants from both sides of the war quickly created “a cauldron of racial disharmony.” Harper asserts that southwest Missouri, still entrenched in a “southern mindset,” turned to wide-scale lynching and outright expulsion of African Americans to help solve a problem without a straightforward legal or electoral solution. But Harper is careful to note that, in the context of the New South, whites in the Ozarks did not view blacks as economic or political competitors. As “whites and blacks were drawn together in ways that whites were not prepared to accept”—therein, white Missourians in the Ozarks viewed African Americans as a collective threat to white authority and especially to white women in their post-war understanding of the world.24

While pro-market boosters in Missouri and elsewhere busied themselves with the economic foundations of the New South, Joel Chandler Harris, a newspaper editor in Atlanta, was providing them and other southerners with the tools needed to cover up racial strife: Uncle Remus, Br’er Rabbit, Br’er Fox, Br’er Bear, and the infamous Tar-Baby. Known for his mastery of the “negro dialect,” Chandler’s stories of Uncle Remus involved the elderly ex-slave telling folk stories to a young white boy about the Old South. Through Remus and his Aesopian stories (one of which involved Remus saving his white master from a Yankee sharpshooter during the war), Harris constructed for a national readership the archetype of a loyal, but above all else, sexually docile black man to explain that the South’s race problem had never really been a problem at all.25
The supposed loyalty of Uncle Remus and company notwithstanding, danger, (as Kimberly Harper has already shown in the Ozarks) lurked around every corner for black residents of the New South. Between 1899 and 1903, 455 African Americans were lynched; between 1914 and 1918, 264 African Americans were lynched; and, between 1919 and 1923, 273 African Americans became the victims of lynch mobs. As noted by historian Glenda Gilmore in *Gender and Jim Crow*, accusations of rape against black men functioned as an excuse for political violence. The “politics of rape,” then, represented an effective way to curb the political agency of newly-enfranchised black men and to preemptively regulate potential miscegenation among lower-class white women. Southern men in lynch mobs were cheered on by the likes of Rebecca Latimer Felton, who openly challenged the ability of white men to protect their women and declared that white farmers were “soft on the rape of white women by black men.”

D. W. Griffith’s *The Birth of a Nation*—which made the southern brand of white supremacy an international sensation following its 1915 release—only made matters worse for black southerners as political fire-eaters like James K. Vardaman, Coleman L. Blease, and “Pitchfork” Ben Tillman “built careers around ‘The Crime of Rape.’”

So how did southerners—whose race problem was anything but solved at the turn-of-the-century—make sense of this racial paradox? How did they reshape African American identity to fit within the requirements of the New South economic model while still maintaining rigid ideals of white supremacy in social, cultural, and political arenas? Simply put, they harnessed crude, but exceedingly powerful, identity models that cleverly pitted the loyal, Uncle Remus figure against the disloyal, lustful, interracial rapist. And not surprisingly, ex-guerrillas in Missouri writing between 1900 and 1930 took quick notice of these popular stereotypes and put the dichotomy to work in their own narratives.
In 1870, Samuel Hildebrand happily recounted the wartime executions of numerous black men, free and slave, always under the justification that they were dishonest, disloyal, murderous, or otherwise subhuman. Toward the end of The Life of Samuel Hildebrand, he updated readers on the state of a young black child he had abducted after killing the boy’s father. After the war ended, he wrote, “The negro boy I had taken from Free Jim in St. Francois county still remained with me; he was free, I suppose, but he seemed to prefer good living and light work to ‘free starvation.’” While few if any Missouri bushwhackers were advocates of “progressive” race relations, Hildebrand’s hard stance is critical for two reasons. First, he includes zero instances of black men cast as sexual predators or interracial rapists. Second, he was unready to concede any merits of emancipation, which in his mind only resulted in “free starvation.” Ex-guerrillas writing in the twentieth century would gravitate toward prominent Lost Cause thematic structures and amend both of these ideas substantially.29

In his 1903 memoir, Cole Younger admitted that emancipation had been a just end to slavery, but also qualified his confession by discrediting the true motives of Jayhawkers. According to Younger, most of the raiding Kansans had shown little genuine interest in abolishing slavery and had spent most of their time plundering the private property of law-abiding, slave-owning families like his own. The Story of Cole Younger recalled the account (one quite familiar to James-Younger enthusiasts) of a twelve-year-old-boy being tortured and eventually murdered by Union troopers for refusing to divulge the whereabouts of his father (a well-known Confederate sympathizer). But in Younger’s version of the story “[a] negro servant who had witnessed the seizure of his young master, had fled for the timber, and came upon a party of a dozen of us, including Quantrill and myself. As he quickly told us the story, we made our plans, and ambushed at the ‘Blue Cut,’ a deep pass on the road the soldiers must take back to
Independence.” Only with the help of a loyal slave, Younger noted, were Quantrill and his men able to avenge the boy’s death.

Younger later recounted how a “faithful negro servant” named “Aunt Suse” had been interrogated and tortured in the family’s barn by Unionists seeking anti-guerrilla intelligence. Despite the ordeal, the she allegedly refused to give up information about the Younger brothers’ activities or whereabouts. Yet again, a slave remaining loyal to a Confederate master—even when confronted by potential freedom or mortal danger—was meant to imply that black slaves and white masters had lived together harmoniously before and even during the Civil War. As such, Younger’s memoir also implied that southern race relations in the postwar period were equally harmonious.\(^3^0\)

Andrew Walker’s 1910 memoir, *Recollections of Quantrill’s Guerrillas*, continued with the trend of loyal, even pro-Confederate, African American characters. Early in his account, Walker recounted an incident involving a pair of hated abolitionists named Ball and Southwick that pre-dated the formation of Quantrill’s guerrilla band or even the beginning of the war. Walker offered that anti-slavery forces (from across the border in Kansas) had been patrolling slave-laden areas of Missouri and then emancipating—that is, stealing—enslaved blacks from white masters. In response, slaveholders and their neighbors established posses or counter-patrols to protect their human chattel. “We had been home only a few minutes,” Walker wrote, “when neighbor Liggett came, bringing word that Ball and Southwick had been discovered skulking in the brush.” In this particular case, the alleged source of Liggett’s intelligence turned out to be much more interesting than the information itself. “Liggett owned an idiotic negro,” Walker continued, who had seen the two men in the woods and then “whipped for home as if pursued by devils” and upon arriving “announced: ‘Mars’ Jim, I’s found dem bobolionists.’”
Andrew Walker decided to set out looking for the abolitionists discovered by Liggett’s loyal slave and to take his “best and most trusted slave,” Ben, with him on the hunt. Walker remembered that “on arriving in the woods a wicked impulse seized me.” He recalled the exchange as follows:

Walker: *Ben, don’t you want to go with me and bushwhack them Feds?*
Ben: *Yes, Mars’ Andy*
Walker: *Will you shoot one?*
Ben: *Yes, I doan lak’ ‘em nohow.*

According to Walker, when the shooting started, Ben’s nerves got the better of him and he fled. “Ben was full of regrets that he hadn’t stayed with me,” Walker noted, continuing that Ben’s “intentions were good, but his legs just wouldn’t stand.”

Later in his memoir, Walker addressed the connection of John Noland—an enslaved African American man—to Quantrill’s band of guerrillas and the infamous raid on Lawrence, Kansas, in August 1863. Many accounts, including Walker’s, contend that Noland served as an advance scout for Quantrill’s forces before they descended upon Lawrence. Because of Noland’s race, Quantrill and his lieutenants believed he would not draw the same degree of suspicion as other bushwhackers. With that in mind, Walker characterized Noland as “a negro, and a brave, resourceful fellow.” No black men, he continued, “ever fought with us as a regular member of the band, but John would have done so had Quantrill consented.” Walker’s narrative implied that Noland wanted to fight full-time with Quantrill’s men but Quantrill valued him too highly as a spy to allow it and concluded that “so John operated with us only as a trusted spy; but he is today a member of our organization.” In this way, Walker’s memoir promoted a specific portrait of
enslaved African Americans: trustworthy, loyal, and, at times, willing to spill blood on behalf of the men like Walker who literally owned them.\textsuperscript{31}

Writing just a few years after Walker, John McCorkle imbued his memoir with much the same sentiment, including a story about a faithful “negro woman” saving Cole Younger from a Union ambush. But while Younger and Walker only included stereotypes in keeping with the tradition of loyal slaves and amicable race relations, McCorkle composed his narrative to feature both halves of the dichotomy. \textit{Three Years With Quantrill} matched Rube, the loyal Remus-figure, against “the notorious negro” Jack Mann. According to McCorkle, while chasing a supply wagon, several bushwhackers captured a free black man named Rube. Before they could execute him, Rube pleaded to speak with Captain George Todd who, by chance, was in command of the guerrilla company. As Todd caught sight of him, he proclaimed “by God, it’s Rube!” and added “Boys, the first man that hurts this nigger, I will kill.” Todd later explained that Rube, a local barber, had saved him from Union capture in 1862.

On the same page that readers are introduced to Rube, whom the bushwhackers referred to as Todd’s “pet nigger,” Jack Mann also makes his first appearance. McCorkle offered that Mann was well-known to white southerners for aiding Jayhawkers in Missouri and, more important, for being “exceedingly insulting to the Southern people and especially the women.” In one case, McCorkle even suggested that Mann had undressed himself before the wife of Dick Maddox—one of Quantrill’s most faithful followers. Insults directed specifically at southern women undoubtedly implied crimes of a sexual nature. Shortly thereafter, McCorkle reported that Mann’s guards could not stand his presence and shot him. The execution apparently prompted a brawl among the other guerrillas—several of whom had wanted to personally dispatch the “black fiend.”\textsuperscript{32}
Penned in 1923, Harrison Trow’s memoir provided guerrilla memory with a clearly differentiated example of the racial themes presented by Younger and McCorkle. He recalled that, “The only prisoner I ever shot during war was a ‘nigger’ I captured on guard at Independence, Missouri, who claimed that he had killed his master and burned his house and barns.” Trow wrote that he “shot him in the forehead just above the eyes.” And, to make sure the runaway slave was dead, he shoved his finger into the bullet hole and then shot the slave again in the foot. Years later, Trow recounted that he “met the ‘nigger’ whom I thought dead” in a saloon and joked that the two shared a friendly drink. The event—unbelievable as it seems—illustrated that the South had moved past slavery; that, as Henry Grady had remarked in 1886, southerners needed to place business before politics and old grudges.

Not to be outdone by McCorkle, Trow also included the story of a loyal slave saving the life of Cole Younger. According to Trow, while a company of Union soldiers descended upon the Younger homestead, “an old negro woman—a former slave—with extraordinary presence of mind blew out the light, snatched a coverlet from the bed, [and] threw it over her shoulder. She ordered Younger to “Get behind me, Marse Cole, quick,” and then snuck him out of the surrounded house. In Trow’s estimation, the loyal slave became a hero: “Unquestionable a rebel negro, she was persecuted often and often for her opinion’s sake, and hung up twice by militia to tell the whereabouts of Guerrillas. True to her [Confederate] people and her cause, she died at last in the ardor of devotion.”

Written in 1930, George Cruzen’s manuscript, “The Story of My Life,” preserved and built upon the dichotomy of stereotypical black characters forged by McCorkle, Trow, and company. Cruzen’s narrative included multiple examples of African American men serving the capacity of “extras”—as cooks, stewards, and field hands. But on more than one occasion, even
these seemingly unimportant characters were critical to constructing a comparative statement concerning race and guerrilla memory. The first African American characters to appear in Cruzen’s account are loyal at best and ignorantly harmless at worst. For instance, readers encounter a “faithful negro man” who, with the aid of his enslaved wife, “always fed us [Cruzen and his fellow bushwhackers] and helped us the best they could” on behalf of their white, pro-Confederate master. Later, however, Cruzen recalled a night in which “some white Feds with two cannons,” accompanied by “about 1000 nigers [sic]” came looking for him and his men. Luckily for Cruzen, the guerrillas’ camp was mostly empty when the group of black and white Union men arrived. But, he fondly remembered, “our negro boys there said they were scared to death and shure glad when we got back that night.” In other words, Cruzen suggested that the “negro boys” owned or held captive by the guerrillas were glad that they had not been rescued by an interracial assemblage of federal troops. For their loyalty, these men, along with the would-be black quartermaster mentioned above, were the ideal variety of southern African Americans. For their apparent disloyalty, the 1000 black men who helped invade the guerrilla camp are the only African American characters that Cruzen labeled “nigers [sic]” instead of “negros.”

A far cry from the racial rhetoric of Samuel Hildebrand, ex-guerrillas writing in the twentieth century responded directly to their socio-political and economic environments. With disparate cues delivered by the likes of Henry Grady, Joel Chandler Harris, prominent UDC officers, and even Rebecca Latimer Felton, guerrilla memoirists eagerly employed African American identity models that had been specifically constructed by the economic boosters of the New South, the cultural leaders of the Lost Cause, and the partisan figureheads of Jim Crow politics. In doing so, Younger, Walker, Watts, McCorkle, Trow, and Cruzen all hoped to
preserve their place—and the place of the Missouri guerrilla in general—within the collective memory of the twentieth-century South.

**COMMEMORATING THE “OTHER” WARS**

As a consequence of women like the Daughters venturing out of the domestic realm and into the public affairs of the New South, many turn-of-the-century Americans noted a perceived decline in male chivalry. Historian Kristin Hoganson contends that, “Many of those who fretted about a decline in chivalry regarded the assertive new woman as evidence of that decline, for at the heart of chivalry was the juxtaposition of feminine vulnerability and masculine power.” The short-lived Spanish-American War provided an attractive remedy for such deficiencies of masculinity in 1898. In the Cuban revolutionaries struggling to break free of Spanish imperial power, American war hawks found a viable underdog; an underdog for whom martial aid might equal a restored sense of American civil valor and chivalry. So as southerners rushed to claim their share of this newly-rehabilitated American masculinity, ex-guerrillas took care not be left out of the mix.

Following the conclusion of the Spanish-American War—which lasted for all of five months—satisfied Americans forgot all about their Cuban allies and utilized the quick, total victory as a catalyst for revamped notions of manhood, commemoration, and chivalry. The sight of ex-Union and ex-Confederate soldiers fighting under the same flag spurred positive feelings on both sides of the Mason-Dixon line. To ex-Union men, ex-Rebels carrying the American flag reiterated their victory in the Civil War. To ex-Confederates, the Spanish-American War was an invaluable opportunity to renew their status as citizens of the United States once and for all. But as Hoganson cleverly points out, the war also spawned a shift in the commemoration of
American veterans as a new generation of returning heroes not only started to replace the aging Civil War generation, but more important, as their service in Cuba altered the criteria for remembrance in the first place. Rather than noble causes and honorable intentions, the new wave of commemorative attitudes focused more explicitly on physical abilities and feats of military power.\(^{35}\)

In his autobiography, Younger included this tract on Cuba and the Spanish-American War:

I am not exactly a lead man, but it may surprise you to know that I have been shot between twenty and thirty times and am now carrying over a dozen bullets which have never been extracted. How proud I should have been had I been scarred battling for the honor and glory of my country. Those wounds I received while wearing the gray, I've ever been proud of, and my regret is that I did not receive the rest of them during the war with Spain, for the freedom of Cuba and the honor and glory of this great and glorious republic. But, alas, they were not, and it is a memory embalmed that nails a man to the cross. I was in prison when the war with Cuba was inaugurated, a war that will never pass from memory while hearts beat responsive to the glory of battle in the cause of humanity. How men turned from the path of peace, and seizing the sword, followed the flag! As the blue ranks of American soldiery scaled the heights of heroism, and the smoke rose from the hot altars of the battle gods and freedom's wrongs avenged, so the memory of Cuba's independence will go down in history, glorious as our own revolution—'76 and '98—twin jewels set in the crown of sister centuries. Spain and the world have learned that beneath the folds of our nation's flag there lurks a power as irresistible as the wrath of God. Sleep on, side by side in the dim vaults of eternity, Manila Bay and Bunker Hill, Lexington and Santiago, Ticonderoga and San Juan, glorious rounds in Columbia's ladder of fame, growing colossal as the ages roll. Yes, I was in prison than, and let me tell you, dear friends, I do not hesitate to say that God permits few men to suffer as I did, when I awoke to the full realization that I was wearing the stripes instead of a uniform of my country. Remember, friends, I do not uphold war for commercial pillage. War is a terrible thing, and leads men sometimes out of the common avenues of life. Without reference to myself, men of this land, let me tell you emphatically, dispassionately, and absolutely that war makes savages of men, and dethrones them from reason. It is too often sugarcoated with the word “patriotism” to make it bearable and men call it “National honor.”

In his tribute to the victorious servicemen of the Spanish-American War, Younger sought to situate himself within the newly-drawn boundaries of twentieth-century commemoration. While
Younger remained proud of wearing “the gray,” he focused extensively on the physical merits of his service—the startling number of wounds he survived—rather than the nobleness of the cause that had prompted him to accumulate them. At fifty-four years old, Younger’s regret that he could not participate in the conflict underlines two key points: first, that ex-Confederates, even former guerrillas, viewed the Spanish-American War as an excellent means of re-establishing not only their personal claims to citizenship, but also their personal claims to chivalry. Second, Younger understood that Civil War service no longer held a monopoly on commemorative activities. Therefore, while he could not fight in Cuba, Younger could at least reframe his Civil War record and recast guerrilla memory in a way that would help preserve it against the tide of newer veterans seeking to displace it (and James himself).36

The conclusion of Younger’s thoughts on the war in Cuba highlighted both the complexity of the political situation that surrounded it and the virtual tightrope Younger walked to preserve his own guerrilla memory narrative for the broadest audience possible. Hoganson notes that many Americans disapproved of intervention in Cuba as a protest against jingoism and to impede the industrialists and politicians who stood to line their pockets by providing the materials of war. With this in mind, Younger’s assertion that he did not “uphold war for commercial pillage” and his subsequent explanation of war and its terrors only accented that the war not unanimously supported by all Americans. Younger’s disclaimer to the war’s dissenters ultimately emphasized a desire for his memory narrative, as a commemorative representation of himself, to be accepted in the twentieth century South.

Much like Younger, Harrison Trow devoted a section of his memoir to foreign wars and commemoration. Unlike Younger, however, Trow refused to acknowledge that other, subsequent wars (such as World War I) had unseated the memory monopoly once enjoyed by the Civil War
generation; rather, he made a full-on attempt to reframe the bushwhacker experience as service worthy of remembrance even when pitted against the horrors of modern, mechanized warfare. Ironically, then, Trow essentially attempted to update guerrilla memory for southern audiences in the twentieth century by contending vehemently that guerrilla memory did not actually need to be updated. On the very last page of his memoir which, perhaps not surprisingly plagiarized large tracts of text from Edwards’ Noted Guerrillas, Trow opined:

During the World War, in conversation with friends, I told them to take away from Germany her airplanes, gases and machine guns, and if it were possible to call Quantrill’s old band together, of which at no time were there over three hundred and fifty men, all told, under Todd, Poole, Yager, Anderson, Younger, Jarrett, Haller, Quantrell, and myself, I could take these three hundred and fifty men and go to Berlin in a gallop, for history does not now and never will know the power there was in the Quantrell band. It has been given up long ago that they were the most frightening devils the world has ever known or ever will know.

Because he was writing several years after Younger, Trow had to grapple with two new waves of veterans—opponents for commemorative attention—as opposed to just the Spanish-American war generation, a decent portion of whom were ex-Confederates anyway. Brazen to the point of absurdity, Trow’s declaration that Quantrill’s “old band” could have conquered the German Empire with Civil War era weaponry broadcasted a pair of critical ideas. First, the fact that Trow felt obligated to include this anti-tribute to the soldiers of World War I illustrated that shifts in commemoration took a real toll on ex-guerrillas in the New South—none of whom wanted to become forgotten relics of the Old South. Second, and perhaps most important, Trow was clearly not interested in renegotiating the requirements or criteria for veneration and commemoration. While Younger understood that newer waves of veterans would eventually replace the Civil War generation and that ex-bushwhackers needed to preserve what they could, Trow not only scoffed at resetting himself or his comrades within the context of “new commemoration,” but he bluntly
countered those models by stating that older meant better and that the South would “never know” another group of veterans as worthy of remembrance as Quantrill’s guerrilla band.37

By composing tributes and anti-tributes to the Spanish-American War and World War I, Cole Younger and Harrison Trow again illuminate how the content of guerrilla memoirs evolved to meet the commemorative requirements of the twentieth century South. It is curious, however, that while Younger and Trow each accentuated the physical nature of their service to comply with new social and cultural standards, each took a very different route to upgrade guerrilla memory for the twentieth century. Younger attempted to reset guerrilla memory in a way that would allow it to cope with changing maxims of chivalry and manhood. Trow cleverly sought to modernize guerrilla memory by arguing that no such modernization was necessary in the first place. Either way, Younger and Trow each advanced a version of a guerrilla memory in which the ex-bushwhacker theoretically fell within the bounds of the mainstream Lost Cause—a position that would more effectively preserve their memory narratives for posterity.

IN CONCLUSION

In a conscious attempt to reequip guerrilla memory for survival in the twentieth-century South and to reposition themselves securely under the umbrella of the Lost Cause, ex-guerrillas Cole Younger, William H. Gregg, Andrew Walker, Hampton Watts, Kit Dalton, John McCorkle, Joseph Bailey, Harrison Trow, and George R. Cruzen broke away from the standards of the nineteenth-century guerrilla accounts constructed by John Newman Edwards and Samuel Hildebrand. After the war, Edwards and Hildebrand had employed the Missouri bushwhacker’s hyper-violent, individualistic image to verify Missouri’s Confederate credibility and its inclusion in postwar Democratic politics. By 1903, however, guerrilla memoirists had started piecing together new interpretations of the guerrilla war designed to account for shifts in southern gender
roles, commemoration attitudes, and race relations. From newly empowered conservative women to positioning guerrilla memory with and against the changing tides of chivalry and commemoration to the contradictory and utilitarian qualities of New South and Lost Cause racial attitudes, ex-guerrillas desperately sought to establish and preserve a position for themselves within the folds of mainstream collective memory. Put another way, the evolution of guerrilla memory represented self-preservation at its absolute finest and most fascinating.
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