Did Women Have a Reconstruction? Gender in the Rewriting of Southern History

by

Nancy A. Hewitt
Duke University

In European history, the Renaissance holds pride of place as the transformative moment in the intellectual, artistic, scientific, political, and economic development of the West. It is a long moment, stretching from the mid-fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries and spreading from Italy across central and northern Europe. As R. R. Palmer and Joel Colton, authors of the enormously popular A History of the Modern World, note, "What arose in Italy in these surroundings was a new conception of man himself. . . . what captivated the Italians of the Renaissance was a sense of man's tremendous powers." In northern Europe, they claim, it was the belief in "man's power to understand and control physical nature" that most clearly signified the new Renaissance mentality.[1]

In the history of the American South, war and reconstruction defined a similarly transformative moment. Though less sweeping in its global impact than the Renaissance, the Civil War focused national attention on man's power to understand the physical and psychic forces loosed by four years of bloody combat. In the South, the sense of man's tremendous powers which had dominated western thought since the Renaissance needed to be regained under Reconstruction as defeated Confederate soldiers returned home to devastated landscapes, destitute families, and defiant laborers. In these surroundings, new conceptions of man, of manhood, and of male citizenship emerged, but they were borne of daily struggle rather than of intellectual refinement.

In this context, the now classic question posed by Joan Kelly in the 1970s--"Did Women Have a Renaissance?"--echoes back to us as "Did Women Have a Reconstruction?" To answer the original question, Kelly examined women's economic and political roles, the regulation of female sexuality, the cultural activities of women, and ideologies about women in the years 1350 to 1550. She concluded that "to take the emancipation of women as a vantage point is to discover that events that further the historical development of men, liberating them from natural, social, or ideological constraints, have quite different, even opposite, effects upon women."[2] In the much more geographically and chronologically contained context of Reconstruction, the very definition of Kelly's vantage point--"the emancipation of women"--proves astonishingly complex. Should we take this to mean the legal emancipation of African American women from slavery in the immediate postwar period? Or should we consider the process of self-emancipation, stretching from at least the efforts of Harriet Tubman in the antebellum era through the war and all the way up to the "Second Reconstruction" of the

post-World War II years? And how, from either of these vantage points, do we incorporate the emancipation of white women who, as a result of wartime depredations, acquired greater economic, political, and personal autonomy? And can we trace a direct line from that wartime autonomy to the blossoming of women's educational, occupational and civic opportunities in the late nineteenth century South? Or if we assume, with Kelly, "that events that further the historical development of men . . . have quite different . . . effects on women," then should we focus on the relative deprivation experienced by women, black and white, in the face of, first, black male enfranchisement and, later, white male redemption?[3] And how did class cross-cut these developments? Did the wives and daughters of sharecroppers and tenant farmers as well as of newly registered voters reject gendered vantage points altogether, seeing their own emancipation defined through the rights accorded or denied to male kith and kin? Or did some (secretly) share with such northern abolitionist-feminists as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Sojourner Truth the fear that putting the word male in the Constitution--even to advance the rights of black men--would jeopradize the rights of women?

The future of Southern history lies, I think, in this cauldron of convoluted questions--in the move, that is, from the cataloguing of women's contributions to a range of southern institutions and developments to immersion in the nitty gritty details of how women and men, blacks and whites, workers and owners shaped a new future in the post-Civil War South, a future that has now begun to shape a new understanding of the past. Certainly studies of women have been critical in re-envisioning southern history in the colonial and antebellum eras as well. The works of Virginia Gearhart Gray in the 1920s, Julia Cherry Spruill and Guion Griffiths Johnson in the 1930s, and Eleanor Boatwright in the 1940s, along with the more recent contributions of Lois Green Carr, Lorena Walsh, Alan Kulikoff, Cheryl Cody, Deborah Gray White, Jacqueline Jones, Suzanne Lebsock, Catherine Clinton, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, Whittington Johnson, and Theda Perdue, among others, demonstrate the rich legacies of women for early southern history.[4] In 1987, when Anne Firor Scott and Jacquelyn Dowd Hall co-authored their densely documented historiographical essay on "Women in the South" for a volume in honor of Sanford W. Higginbotham, perhaps one third of the hundreds of books, articles, and dissertations they cited covered this early period.[5]

Still, it is the post-Civil War South that has received the greatest attention from women's historians and that has fostered the greatest interest in the field. Yet if, as historical actors, women were central to the New South from its birth; as historical subjects, they have only gained serious attention in the past thirty years--since the publication in 1962 of Anne Scott's essay on the "New Woman and the New South" in the South Atlantic Quarterly. Much work remains before we can answer seemingly simple questions--did women have a Reconstruction, or how new was the New South for women?--and much remains to be done before we can assume that any respectable study of Reconstruction, Redemption, or the New South will, naturally, incorporate the experiences of women as well as men.[6] But let us at least begin to explore how far we have come.

If Reconstruction is the transformative moment of Southern history, the Civil War is still its mainstay. Had regiments of women fought at Antietam, Gettysburg, or

Manassas, we would no doubt be much further along in our pursuit of sexual parity in Southern historiography than we are. And certainly one early entry point for women into the historical narrative (one that is still very effective in undergraduate courses) is the story of their heroism in Confederate campaigns. From Rose O'Neal Greenhow, the Washington hostess turned spy, to Ella Newsom, a wealthy war widow who used her inheritance to establish hospitals across the South, to Betsy Sullivan, who followed her husband to war and ended up laboring as a nurse and cook to Confederate troops in Union prisoner-of-war camps, to Loretta Janeta Velasquez, the wife of a Louisiana planter killed early in the war who raised an entire cavalry company at her own expense, disguised herself as a soldier, and served under General Polk in Kentucky and Tennessee, the legend of white women's commitment to the cause has offered one avenue to historical recognition.

More recently, in the work of Drew Gilpin Faust and George Rable, these tales of sacrifice and self-denial have been refashioned into a narrative of subversion in which women ultimately rejected the "war story" presented by Confederate leaders, choosing the preservation of life and family within the Union over the continued sacrifice of both to the Confederate cause. As Faust concludes, "It may well have been because of its women that the South lost the Civil War."[7] This apparently new narrative was an old story among African American women. Margaret Mitchell, Scarlett O'Hara, and their legions of admirers longed to believe that slaves were willing to die for their mistresses (if not their masters), but the historical record--now richly documented in the volumes published by the Freedmen and Southern Society Project--is quite clear: black women and men emancipated themselves when the opportunity arose and in the meantime, like Faust's female subversives, focused on preserving their lives and those of their families until peace prevailed.[8] The central difference may have been that whereas white women's support seems to have deteriorated along with the success of the Confederate armies, black women's supposed devotion to the cause probably always masked their deep desire for a Confederate defeat.

From Mary Elizabeth Massey's Bonnet Brigades, published in 1963, to Drew Faust's "Altars of Sacrifice" and George Rables' Civil Wars, the study of women in wartime has offered an important and easily opened window into the southern experience. And yet even this story is not yet complete. We need to know much more about how the self-emancipation of black women and men contributed to Union victory, about the home-guard units established by white women in dozens of local communities, about those affluent white women in Richmond who at the end were more militant defenders of the cause than their male counterparts, about the differences between them and the women who rioted for bread in Richmond in 1863 or those in more rural areas who simply ended their active support for the war at about the same time.[9] Each of these groups of women took greater control of their lives, made more public displays of their opinions, demanded increased attention from Confederate officials than in the pre-war years, and in this sense all were furthering their own emancipation. Still, some saw that emancipation as enhanced by the Confederacy's victory and others by its defeat.

Regardless of their stance during the war, it was from out of the refuse and remnants of defeat that southern women and men would have to craft new gender, race,

and labor relations. Few versions of this tale attended to women at all before the 1970s and, even today, we know more about black and white women's roles in forging the Second Reconstruction than we do about their efforts to shape the First. Still, work on women in the civil rights era has been critical in reshaping how we think about sex, class and race (SCAR for short) in the postbellum world. From civil rights studies we have come to recognize the myriad ways that women shaped social movements and social change in local communities even when they remain relatively invisible at the level of state and national leadership.[10]

Just as importantly, studies of the Old South have now demonstrated the fallacy of our early notions of nineteenth-century southern women's isolation from the public sphere, a presumed isolation that made us see any postbellum public activity as a sign of sex advancement. Through the work of Deborah White, Jacqueline Jones, Marli Weiner, Stephanie Shaw, and others, we now recognize the ways that African American women created and sustained communities under slavery, and we are thus better able to trace the continuities and changes in their initiatives and agendas after emancipation.[11] Others have traced the benevolent, reform, and partisan political activities of white southern women in the antebellum years, reminding us that it was not war alone that led to women's entry onto the public stage.[12] Finally, the efforts of several scholars to reconstruct patterns of landholding and marketing among black and white women on farms and in cities in the early nineteenth century provide the basis for understanding their search for economic security and autonomy in later decades.[13]

The earliest histories of post-Civil War womanhood did not, however, trace the trajectories of these prewar developments across the terrain of Reconstruction, but instead skipped over the immediate postwar period to analyze women's social activism in the 1890s and beyond.[14] Perhaps southern white women's insistence on establishing memorial societies in the 1870s and '80s to commemorate the lost cause made it more difficult for feminist scholars of the 1970s and '80s to take their activities seriously. Only as they founded women's clubs, agitated for women's education, established temperance societies, promoted social welfare activities, and cautiously entered the suffrage fray in the 1890s and early 1900s did we find a legacy of their wartime labors that seemed worth preserving. And this is a critical legacy. Darlene Roth, who studied women's clubs in Atlanta between 1890 and 1940 provided "the first comprehensive local study" to test out Anne Scott's thesis that wartime experiences produced long-term changes in southern women's social and political mobilization.[15] Concentrating on women's clubs and patriotic societies, Roth traces white and black women's activism from war relief efforts in the 1860s through an array of institution-building and public welfare activities that peaked in the 1920s. She documents the centrality of women's organizations to the emergence of Atlanta as a premeire New South city, the class condescension and racism that characterized the activities of organizations run by white women, and the special meaning of black women's institutions, like the Atlanta Neighborhood Union, to African American communities "systematically excluded from public services."[16]

In 1987, Hall and Scott concluded that the degree of difference between black and white women's activism found by Roth was a product in part of her focus on more conservative women's clubs and patriotic societies "rather than on the suffrage groups,

YWCAs, League of Women Voters, and interracial associations that addressed themselves to more controversial issues."[17] In 1993, women's historians are less certain whether these relatively more progressive white women's organizations do provide a substantially different story. In Tampa, Florida, for instance, it was white women advocating a Jane Addams-esque style of southern social housekeeping who promoted child labor laws, built juvenile detention centers, ran women for seats on the school board, and supported commission government and at-large elections, efforts which taken together encouraged the state to intrude into the lives of African American (and, in this case, immigrant Latin) women and yet excluded such women from meaningful participation in electoral politics. Or to focus on suffrage more specifically, there were white women in the South like Rebecca Latimer Felton who sought the ballot only for white women and who combined support for white women's suffrage with support for lynching as a means of protecting white womanhood.[18]

Suzanne Lebsock, who argues that it was anti-suffragists who infused white supremacy into debates over whether southern women should wield the ballot, nonetheless notes that it was the rare white woman, no matter which organizations she joined, who spoke out forcefully for universal suffrage. Moreover, when the vote was won, both white women and men feared the power of black women at the polls, whose persistence in registering had, according to Lebsock, "an unsettling and ultimately positive impact on thoughtful whites, not unlike the new militance of African American soldiers home from the war."[19] During the 1920s, some of these white suffragists were among those joining black women activists, many of whom were also former suffragists, in the South's first sustained interracial movements.[20] Such new research only reinforces Darlene Roth's 1978 claim that "the consciousness of race so permeates the public lives of women, that any discussion of their modern-day, post-1865 lives must include consideration of both racial experiences."[21]

Those racial experiences, rooted in slavery, were modified if not transformed in the heat of postwar realignments, and thus we cannot adequately comprehend the flowering or the fragmentation of black and white women's activism from the 1890s on without closer attention to the critical Reconstruction decades. It has been students of African American women who first and most forcefully demanded our return to Reconstruction as we searched for the meaning of emancipation among southern women.

Two recent dissertations are especially important in providing the basis for rethinking gender, race, and Reconstruction politics. Tera Hunter covers the entire sweep of African American women's lives in Atlanta from 1861 to 1920, while Laura Edwards' study of Granville County, North Carolina offers a detailed portrait of the political and personal struggles through which women and men of all racial and class groups reconstructed their lives in the years between 1865 and 1900.[22] Hunter focuses on the specific experience of women as it illuminates the broader patterns of the period; Edwards on gender relations as they intersect with race and class. Still, both focus on the "dialectic of repression and resistance," demonstrating how women, especially black women, forged freedom amid the chaos of Reconstruction, and then tracing how even the most modest forms of freedom were almost immediately challenged, constricted, and sometimes eradicated as elite whites regained power in the South.[23] For Edwards, the story of

of his times were enlisted against him. . . . many circumstances connected with the case," Avery concluded, "tend to throw doubt upon the fairness of his trial and the measure of his guilt."[26] Just days before the scheduled hanging, Cooper's sentence was revoked by the Commissioner of the Second Military District in Charleston, South Carolina. Edwards goes on to illustrate the ways that poor blacks and whites, women as well as men, used the North Carolina courts between the mid-1860s and the mid-1880s, particularly around issues of sexual violence, to "challenge the attitudes and patterns of power that justified the devaluation and exploitation of poor women of both races," and of black men. She demonstrates how issues of sexuality and sexual control "shaped the political world of county residents" and thus how "issues of gender, in addition to those of race and class, were central to Reconstruction politics."[27] In the end, Edwards argues, the use of the courts by blacks and whites reinforced the power of patriarchy as poor women and men accepted dominant ideas about female frailty and male protection. Such ideas eased the process of Redemption in the 1880s, during which "elite white men in the county were able to argue that just as women's interest were dependent on and subsumed by those of men, so also were the interests of black and poor white men dependent on and subsumed by those of elite white men." [28]

So, did women did have a Reconstruction? Yes. And does it look differently from the vantage point of women's emancipation than the traditional tale would have us believe? Again in many ways the answer is a qualified yes, and for all of those women who defied masters, celebrated weddings, obtained literacy, found work, and received a measure of justice, the answer was an unqualified yes. Moreover, as Edwards suggests, the whole process of reconstructing race and class relations was infused with gender ideals, images, and assumptions just as political redemption was rooted in regaining control of the intertwined threats of sexual and racial emancipation.[29]

At the same time, unlike Joan Kelly whose work on the Renaissance introduced this essay, neither Hunter nor Edwards, would argue that rewriting Reconstruction is simply a matter of differentiating men's and women's experiences, for race and class can no more be subsumed under sex than the reverse. Our SCARs are not reducible one to the other, but form tissued layers where each remains visible even as one may provide the freshest sign of victimization, or resistance.

The full complexities of the SCARs left by Reconstruction are now being explored from a variety of perspectives as we rethink the meaning of black and white women's turn-of-the-century activism in light of the preceding decades. We are redefining Southern progressivism to account for the "womanist consciousness" discovered among African American women in Richmond by Elsa Barkley Brown, the labor feminism discovered in Atlanta's Ola Delight Smith by Jacquelyn Dowd Hall, and the double-edged domestication of politics I discovered in Tampa.[30] The Tampa project also reflects a reworking of geographical boundaries to incorporate more fully the borderlands histories of the Sunbelt, an effort to which I was introduced by Julie Kirk Blackwelder's book on women in San Antonio. This expansion was encouraged as well by those rewriting of Southern history to include the experiences, first, of Native Americans, reflected particularly in the work of Theda Perdue, and, then, of Latin Americans from Florida to Texas.[31]

The early explorations of women, gender, and sexuality on this expanded Southern

terrain have complicated the portrait of southern womanhood and manhood, of class, race, and gender relations. For the decades after 1880, feminist scholars have more often focused on the triumphs than the tragedies of women's efforts, on the expansion of women's social, economic and political labors, on the centrality of women to grassroots movements of farmers, factory workers, and freedom fighters, on the flaunting of moral codes and the manipulation of gender conventions. These stories contribute to a rewriting of Southern history that provides us with a sense of the South's past (and future) vitality, with a legacy that suggests possibilities rather than limits. Yet just below the surface, and increasingly shaping the main story line, lies the memory of those ever more intricate SCARs revealed in gendered versions of Reconstruction. They remind us of how abruptly, even after periods of massive upheaval, man's power to understand and control physical nature and political authority--passed down from the European Renaissance--can be resurrected and reinstated, and therefore how stunningly resistant to change the South can be, for women, for African Americans, and for workers. Fortunately, southern historians have proved far less resistant to change. As a result, the Renaissance of women's history that has marked the last twenty years, offers the real possibility of reconstructing southern history and, in the process, emancipating women along with African Americans, Native Americans, poor whites, Latins, and even elite white men, from the long reach of the past.

NOTES

1. Palmer and Colton, A History of the Modern World, 4th edition (New York: Knopf, 1971), 54-55, 67.

2."Did Women Have a Renaissance," in Joan Kelly, Women, History, and Theory: The Essays of Joan Kelly (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 19. This essay was first published in 1977, just a hundred years after the "end" of Reconstruction.

3. Ibid.

4. See, for example, Virginia Gearhart Gray, "Activities of Southern Women: 1840-1860," South Atlantic Quarterly (July 1928): 264-79; Julia Cherry Spruill, Women's Life and Work in the Southern Colonies (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938); Guion Griffiths Johnson, Ante-bellum North Carolina: A Social History (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1937); Eleanor M. Boatwright, "The Political and Civil Status of Women in Georgia: 1783-1860," Georgia Historical Quarterly (December 1941): 301-24; Lois Green Carr and Lorena S. Walsh, "The Planter's Wife: The Experience of White Women in Seventeenth-Century Maryland," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series (October 1977): 542-71; Alan Kulikoff, "The Beginnings of the Afro-American Family in Maryland," in Aubrey C. Land, Lois G. Carr, and Edward C. Papenfuse, eds., Law, Society, and Politics in Early Maryland (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977); Cheryl Ann Cody, "Naming, Kinship, and Estate Dispersal: Notes on Slave Family Life on a South Carolina Plantation, 1786-1833," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series (January 1982):192-211; Deborah Gray White, Ar'n't I A

Woman? Female Slaves in the Plantation South (New York: Norton, 1985); Jacqueline Jones, Labor of Love, Labor of Sorrow: Black Women, Work and the Family from Slavery to the Present (New York: Basic Books, 1985); Suzanne Lebsock, The Free Women of Petersburg: Status and Culture in a Southern Town, 1784-1860 (New York: Norton, 1984); Catherine Clinton, The Plantation Mistress: Woman's World in the Old South (New York: Pantheon, 1982); Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988); Whittington Johnson, "Free African-American Women in Savannah, 1800-1860: Autonomy and Affluence Amid Adversity," Georgia Historical Quarterly (Summer 1992): 260-83; and Theda Perdue, "Southern Indians and the Cult of True Womanhood," in Walter J. Fraser, Jr., et al, eds., The Web of Southern Social Relations: Women, Family and Education, and "Cherokee Women and the Trail of Tears," Journal of Women's History (Spring 1989):14-30.

5. Scott and Hall, "Women in the South," in John B. Boles and Evelyn Thomas Nelson, eds., Interpreting Southern History: Historiographical Essays in Honor of Sanford W. Higginbotham (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1987): 454-509. A recent issue of Georgia Historical Quarterly (Summer 1992) is devoted to "The Diversity of Southern Race and Gender: Women in Georgia and the South," providing a good sense of the vitality of the field since Hall and Scott wrote their breathtakingly comprehensive essay.

6. It is important to note here that though there has been much specialized work done on southern women, there is still significant opposition to incorporating gender and race into the main narrative of Southern history. Women's historians, like African American historians, can rarely imagine a South without planters, politicians, and generals. There are, however, still plenty of preservationists, popularizers, and even professional scholars who continue to portray the South without women or blacks, or, what is almost worse, to populate the region with caricatures of belles and mammies popularized in the post-Civil War period.

7.Faust, "Altars of Sacrifice: Confederate Women and the Narratives of War," Journal of American History (March 1990), 1228. See also, George C. Rable, Civil Wars: Women and the Crisis of Southern Nationalism (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), esp. chpts. 7-11.

8. See, for instance, Ira Berlin et al, eds., Freedom: A Documentary History of Emancipation, 1861-1867. Series 1, volume 1: The Destruction of Slavery (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), Series 1, volume 3: The Wartime Genesis of Free Labor: The Lower South (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), and Series 2: The Black Military Experience (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982). Though these volume contain considerable material on the activities of African American women, unfortunately, they are not indexed in a way that allows for the easy retrieval of this information.

9. In addition to the works cited above, see Amy Murrell, "Two Armies: Women's Civil War Activities in Richmond, Virginia" (Honors Thesis, Department of History, Duke University, 1993), and John C. Inscoe, "Coping in Confederate Appalachia: Portrait of a Mountain Woman and Her Community at War," North Carolina Historical Review (October 1992):388-413.

10.See especially, Charles Payne, "Ella Baker and Models of Social Change," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society (Spring 1989):885-99, and Vicki L. Crawford, Jacqueline Anne Rouse, and Barbara Woods, eds. Women in the Civil Rights Movement: Trailblazers and Torchbearers, 1941-1965, in the Black Women in United States History series, ed. by Darlene Clark Hine (Brooklyn, NY: Carlson Publishing Inc., 1990).

11. See White, Ar'n't I A Woman?; Jones, Labor of Love; Marli F. Weiner, "Plantation Mistresses and Female Slaves: Gender, Race, and South Carolina Women, 1830-1880" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Rochester, 1986); and Stephanie Shaw, "Cussin', Fightin' and Rarin': Female Slave Resistance in the Antebellum South,"

Ppaper presented at the Southern Historical Association Annual Meeting, 9 November 1989, Lexington, Kentucky.

12. Suzanne Lebsock's work, The Free Women of Petersburg was most important in recognizing the antebellum activism of southern women. See also, James L. Leloudis II, "Subversion of the Feminine Ideal: The Southern Lady's Companion and White Male Morality in the Antebellum South, 1847-1854," in Rosemary Skinner Keller, Louise L. Queen, and Hilah F. Thomas, eds., Women in New Worlds: Historical Perspectives on the Wesleyan Tradition (2 vols.; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1982): II, 60-75; Anne Firor Scott, Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History (Urban: University of Illinois Press, 1991); and, most recently, Elizabeth Varon, "Counted in the Muster Roll of Men: White Women and Politics in Antebellum Virginia" (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1993).

13. See, for instance, Loren Schweninger, "Property-Owning Free African-American Women in the South, 1800-1870," Journal of Women's History (Winter 1990):13-44; Stephanie McCurry, "Defense of Their World: Gender, Class and the Yeomanry of the South Carolina Low Country, 1820-1860" (Ph. D. dissertation, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1988); and the earlier work by Elizbeth Rauh Bethel, Promiseland: A Century of Life in a Negro Community (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981), and Kay Day Young, "Kinship in a Changing Economy: A View from the Sea Islands," in Robert L. Hall and Carol B. Stack, eds., Holding On to the Land and the Lord: Kinship, Ritual, Land Tenure, and Social Policy in the Rural South (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1982): 11-24.

14. An important exception is Suzanne Lebsock, "Radical Reconstruction and the Property Rights of Southern Women," Journal of Southern History (May 1977).

15. Darlene Rebecca Roth, "Matronage: Patterns in Women's Organizations, Atlanta, Georgia, 1890-1940" (Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1978), discussed in Hall and Scott, "Women in the South," pp. 491-93. For Scott's thesis, see The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970).

16. Roth quoted in Hall and Scott, "Women in the South," p. 493. Beth Wenger adds to Roth's portrait by exploring the activities of Jewish women and women's rights in Atlanta in the same era. See Beth S. Wenger, "The Southern Lady and the Jewish Woman: The Early Organizational Life of Atlanta's Jewish Women," (honors paper, Wesleyan University, 1985), and idem., "Jewish Women of the Club: The Changing Public Role of Atlanta's Jewish Women (1870-1930)," American Jewish History 76 (March 1987): 311-333.These analyses of mainly middle-class and affluent female reformers are complemented by studies of working-class women. For Atlanta, see especially, Gretchen E. Maclachlan, "Atlanta's Industrial Women, 1879-1920," Atlanta History (Winter 1993):16-23; Tera W. Hunter, "Household Workers in the Making: Afro-American Women in Atlanta and the New South, 1861 to 1920" (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1990); and Jacquelyn Dowd Hall, "O. Delight Smith's Progressive Era: Labor, Feminism, and Reform in the Urban South," in Nancy A. Hewitt and Suzanne Lebsock, eds., Visible Women: New Essays on American Activism (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, forthcoming).

17. Hall and Scott, "Women in the South," p. 492.

18. On Felton, see Marjorie Spruill Wheeler, New Women of the New South: The Leaders of the Woman Suffrage Movement in the Southern States (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); and LeeAnn Whites, "Rebecca Latimer Felton and the Wife's Farm: The Class and Racial Politics of Gender Reform," Georgia Historical Quarterly (Summer 1992), 354-372, and "Rebecca Latimer Felton and the Problem of 'Protection' in the New South," in Nancy A. Hewitt and Suzanne Lebsock, eds., Visible Women: New Essays on American Activism (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, forthcoming).

19. Lebsock, "Woman's Suffrage and White Supremacy in Virginia," in Hewitt and Lebsock, eds., Visible Women.

20. One of the most important of these interracial movements became the battle against lynching. On southern black and white women's separate and collaborative efforts in this cause, see Paula Giddings, When and Where I Enter: The Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America (New York: William Morrow, 1984); Jacquelyn Dowd Hall, Revolt Against Chivalry: Jessie Daniel Ames and the Women's Campaign Against Lynching, 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), and Mildred I. Thompson, Ida B. Wells-Barnett: An Exploratory Study of an American Black Woman, 1893-1930, in Black Women in United States History series.

21. Quoted in Hall and Scott, "Women in the South," p. 493.

22. Tera W. Hunter, "Household Workers in the Making," and Laura Edwards, "The Politics of Manhood and Womanhood: Reconstruction in Granville County, North Carolina" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1991).

23. Quote is from Hunter, "Household Workers in the Making," p. 290.

24. Ibid., pp. 6-7.

25. Ibid., chpt. 1.

26. Edwards, "The Politics of Manhood and Womanhood," pp. 1-4.

27. Ibid., introduction. Quotes are from Laura F. Edwards, "Sexual Violence, Gender Reconstruction, and the Extension of Patriarchy in Granville County, North Carolina," North Carolina Historical Review (July 1991), p. 239. This article is based on her dissertation research.

28. Edwards, "Sexual Violence," p. 259.

29. This point is reinforced by Mary Frances Berry, "Judging Morality: Sexual Behavior and Legal Consequences in the Late-Nineteenth Century South," Journal of American History (December 1991):835-56.

30. See Elsa Barkley Brown, "Womanist Consciousness: Maggie Lena Walker and the Independent Order of St. Luke's," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society (Spring 1989):610-633; Jacquelyn D. Hall, "O. Delight Smith's Progressive Era" and Nancy A. Hewitt, "Politicizing Domesticity: Anglo, Black and Latin Women in Tampa's Progressive Movements," in Noralee Frankel and Nancy Shrom Dye, eds., Gender, Race, Class, and Reform in the Progressive Era (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1991):24-40.

31. Blackwelder, Women of the Depression: Caste and Culture in San Antonio, 1929-1939 (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1984); and Perdue, "Southern Indians" and "Cherokee Women." Much new work is being published on Hispanic women and Chicanas in the Southwest, and scholars also need to consider the extent to which this work should be incorporated into Southern history.