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ABSTRACT

The Confederate flag is well known as a controversial American symbol and it has a long history in South Carolina’s politics that demonstrates the volatility of that controversy. This senior thesis examines the political and cultural contexts in which the Confederate flag was raised and lowered on the South Carolina State House grounds in 1961 and 2015, respectively, putting these two historical moments—one during the Civil War Centennial and the other after the Charleston shooting—in conversation to determine the necessary conditions for the furling of the flag. In particular, this project examines the roles of South Carolina politicians John Amasa May and Nikki Haley in the raising and lowering of the flag, analyzing the level of accountability they had to the nation through the media and their personal motivations.

My research seeks to assess the political rhetoric of these two historical moments to understand the context in which these politicians acted as well as determine how that rhetoric influenced the decisions that were made. In order to study this rhetoric, I analyzed speeches by May and Haley, newspaper articles from the State—a local South Carolina newspaper—and other culturally significant documents from those time periods such as civil rights legislation from the 1960s and the manifesto of the Charleston shooter, Dylann Roof, from 2015. I found that the driving forces behind May’s decision to raise the flag were grounded in his support for
Confederate ideals and his opposition to the Civil Rights Movement. Haley, on the other hand, had a lot less agency in furling the flag and she was compelled by the tragic outcome of the Charleston Shooting and the connection of the shooter to the Confederate flag and racist rhetoric to call for the removal of the flag. Though their actions and motivations were entirely opposite of one another, a comparative analysis of John Amasa May’s raising the Confederate flag and Nikki Haley’s call for its removal reveals the necessity of the tie between the Confederate flag and a violent trigger event to prompt action against the flag’s political use.
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Introduction

T-shirts, bumper stickers, NASCAR, country and rock music, license plates, belt buckles, and posters. These are just some of the most common settings for displaying the Confederate flag in modern popular culture. Websites like the ConfederateShop.com sell merchandise that is “All Confederate, all the time—no apologies.”¹ Confederates, the losers of the Civil War, were reintegrated into American society and, with the exception of the federal government imposition during Reconstruction, they were not asked to abandon their beliefs or symbols. This has created a culture that has incorporated Southern symbols for a long time and has given pro-Confederate Southerners the platform to perpetuate their support for the Confederate cause.² The use of these symbols, most notably the Confederate flag, are most often associated with “redneck” culture and, therefore, rural white Americans.³ Flag supporters are then generally characterized as being poor and uneducated relative to the majority of the white population in America, so their usage of the Confederate flag is excused or at least ignored. The placement of the Confederate flag on the State House grounds in South Carolina, however, is something that has confused many people who oppose the flag for decades. The Confederate flag became closely associated with racism during the Civil Rights Movement, and since the 1970s and 1980s people have questioned how it stayed on public display near a building that houses the government that


represents all South Carolinians, a population that is about 28 percent African American. This thesis seeks to answer that question by examining the context of and reasons for the raising of the Confederate flag in 1961 and its removal in the summer of 2015.

As a well-known national symbol with its roots in the Civil War, the Confederate flag continues to be a source of contention concerning issues of race and regional pride. Though it has been the same flag for over 150 years, the national significance of the flag has changed along with the political climate. The flag represents many different histories and meanings to Americans that are often determined by factors such as regional location, ancestry, and race. There are especially large numbers of Americans whose ancestors were either users of the flag in the Civil War or involved in the slave trade in some way in the South. People across the country, however, have their own interpretations of the Confederate flag and those interpretations are informed by the variety of experiences of the flag that Americans have. While some consider it a symbol of hate and have negative feelings toward people who use it, other people think of it as a crucial element of their cultural history. Within the group that supports the flag there is also a distinction between people who recognize its connections with slavery but utilize it anyway and people who say they are ignorant to those connections but use the Confederate flag as a symbol of rebellion. This is the premise of the debate on a cultural level, yet over time South Carolina lawmakers have made the Confederate flag an issue of public policy debate.

There are two politicians who are most notably associated with the rise and fall of the Confederate flag on the South Carolina State House grounds. John May was the main actor in the raising of the flag in 1961, and Nikki Haley was the most prominent figure associated with its
controversial removal in 2015. The differences between these two political actors centered on their interactions with the media and accountability to the American people. In 2015, the shooting of nine black parishioners in Charleston by a white supremacist directly tied the symbolism of the Confederate flag to a racist action, whereas that connection was never made in 1961. While it would seem that people would have pointed to the relationship between the raising of the flag and the ongoing Civil Rights Movement, that never happened in a way that prompted any change in its display at the South Carolina State House. The contexts in which John May and Nikki Haley were political leaders provide valuable evidence for how the change in the flag’s significance to the public affects the actions of politicians. In this thesis I will argue that a comparison of the national media attention focused on John May and Nikki Haley reveals that the power of the Confederate flag’s symbolism to incite a national outcry against the flag depends on its direct association with a racist trigger event, such as the Charleston Shooting of 2015.

---------- Literature Review ----------

The Confederate flag has been a symbol of particular interest to scholars, journalists, politicians, and Americans in general for a very long time. For this reason, there is extensive scholarship, in addition to more popularly consumed media coverage, on the many iterations of the Confederate flag and its various symbolic meanings over time. Such scholarship relevant to my thesis research is relatively sparse and therefore I will discuss the scholarly writings most important to the scope of my project in detail below. As I began to explore this area of study, I looked for the most frequently referenced Confederate flag scholar. This search was difficult because many people write about the Confederate flag as it relates to other events or cultural
traditions. However, John M. Coski’s book, *The Confederate Battle Flag: America’s Most Embattled Emblem*, is the most comprehensive study on the Confederate flag, its symbolism, and its uses over time. It also has served as my starting point for understanding the evolution of the Confederate flag. One benefit of Coski’s work, for the purposes of my research, is its chronological history of the Confederate flag, spanning from its first use in the Civil War to the local disputes over placement of the flag in Southern states in the 1990s and early 2000s. However, the book was published in 2005 and therefore does not discuss the more contemporary Confederate flag disputes. Two chapters were of great relevance to my topic: Chapter Seven, “Symbol of White Race and White Supremacy,” placed the Confederate Flag in the context of the 1950s and 1960s in order to demonstrate the racism associated with it at that time. Also, Chapter Eight, “The Perverted Banner,” was also crucial because it dove more deeply into the centennial commemoration of the Civil War in South Carolina and spoke specifically of the Confederate Flag’s role in that historical moment. My project explores that centennial commemoration and how one particular voice, John Amasa May, played a crucial role in actually raising the Confederate flag and how his own beliefs within his cultural context made this possible. While Coski does acknowledge the role that May played in the Civil War centennial in his book, he does not examine May as the sole actor, nor does he connect May’s actions to more recent calls for the flag’s removal, as I do in my project.

Another text crucial in the formation of my knowledge of the Confederate flag was Robert E. Bonner’s “Flag Culture and the Consolidation of Confederate Nationalism,” which

---

5 Coski, *The Confederate Battle Flag*. 
was published in the *Journal of Southern History* in 2002.\(^6\) In this article, Bonner provides intricate details about the use of the Confederate flag during the Civil War, both in battle and on the home front. He emphasizes the emergence of intense patriotism that formed around this flag to the point that it eclipsed any devotion to the American flag in the South. This study focuses heavily on the appearance of the flag and the development of the various flags of the Confederacy. He also speaks extensively about the memorialization of the Confederate flag in music and poetry. This article was crucial to my understanding of the Confederate flag in its most basic use, as a battle flag, but it provided an exclusively historical account of the evolution of the flag during the Civil War and soon after the war. Though the information that Bonner provided informed my research interests in how the symbolism of this battle flag evolved, it did not explore the same historical or contemporary time periods as my project.

Several scholars have also done extensive research on the Civil War centennial and the various people and events that comprised it, and also analyzed the event to assess its successes and failures. The two most helpful studies of this nature are Robert Cook’s book, *Troubled Commemoration*, and Kevin Allen’s article, “The Second Battle of Fort Sumter: The Debate over the Politics of Race and Historical Memory at the Opening of America’s Civil War Centennial, 1961.”\(^7\) Both of these studies centered their research on this particular event in history. They provided extensive information on the actual events of the Civil War centennial, but they did not


place it within a broader narrative about the Civil War in memory, especially not of the
Confederate flag as it relates to that narrative. John May features importantly in both of these
works, but his role in their analyses is more auxiliary than central. While these studies examine
the same cultural historical context on which my project focuses, they do not place the same
emphasis on John May or the Confederate flag as central figures in this time period.

My project also explores a much more recent time period—summer 2015 and the furling
of the Confederate flag. This event is so current, though, that very little has been written about it
in a scholarly medium. There are, however, some constants in the conversation of the
Confederate flag that were crucial for me to read about prior to the start of my own primary
research. The conversation about symbolism is inherently necessary in any account of the role of
the Confederate flag in American culture because the varying symbolism of the flag is what
determines its significance in a particular time and place. Two pieces of scholarship are
particularly important in this conversation about Confederate flag symbolism. The first one
focuses more specifically on politics in South Carolina as they relate to the Confederate flag,
“The South Carolina Confederate Flag: The Politics of Race and Citizenship.” The authors,
Laura Woliver, Angela Ledford, and Chris Dolan, all at the University of South Carolina,
provided a localized study of the Confederate flag. This study enriched my research because it
provided me with the terms in which I framed the racial and political aspects of my analysis. The
limitations of its time frame do not allow it to connect the broader political conversation of the

---

8 Laura Woliver, Angela Ledford, Chris Dolan, “The South Carolina Confederate Flag: The Politics of Race
Confederate flag to the most recent developments in that story, but it provides guidelines that I
drew upon in order to write about the political evolution of the Confederate flag.

The second work crucial in the discussion of the symbolism of the Confederate flag is
*Confederate Symbols in the Contemporary South*, edited by Michael Martinez, William
Richardson, and Ron McNinch-Su. Through a series of essays by a variety of contributors, this
compilation provides a comprehensive collection of academic perspectives on Confederate
symbols in relation to their placements on monuments and public spaces, their uses in informing
ideologies, and the importance of Confederate symbols in perpetuating racial divisions in
America. The content of this book provided diverse understandings of the different symbolic
meanings the Confederate flag has in the South and how those meanings relate to interpretations
commonly held in other parts of the country. The essays in this book also caused me to wonder
what contextual conditions were necessary for any given interpretation of the Confederate flag to
dominate the popular conversation. Though this book provides multiple ways of interpreting this
symbol, it does not delve very deep into attempts to answer it, nor does it connect these theories
to the contemporary focus of my research.

The final crucial element I lacked was a deeper understanding of Southern culture itself,
that is, as a framework for the creation of the Confederacy myth and the use of the Confederate
flag in maintaining a belief in that myth. The leading scholar in studying the South as a cultural
and political region in the United States is sociologist John Shelton Reed. Though Reed has
written extensively on the South, covering topics from Southern barbeque to racial violence, I

---

found that two of his works were particularly informative in determining my research focus. In his essay “The South: Where Is It? What Is It?” from his book, My Tears Spoiled My Aim, Reed addresses the definitive boundaries of the cultural community that forms “the South.”

He defines the socioeconomic, cultural, and institutional mechanisms that are most often associated with the South, but he also says that the definition of the South is ever changing based on the evolution of these characteristics. In this sense, he also says, “the South is an idea . . . that people can have feelings about.” Reed also directly addressed the importance of the Confederate flag and Confederate ideals in his work. A notable example of this is his chapter in his book, Minding the South, entitled “The Banner that Won’t Stay Furled.” In this chapter, Reed discusses the disputes over the public placement of the Confederate flag and how those disputes and the Southerners involved in them interact with traditional Southern values and ever-evolving Southern culture. This examination of the relationship between Southerners, Southern culture, and the Confederate flag is prominent in most of the works that I explored prior to the beginning of my research, but there is still a question that remains after examining all the aforementioned texts: How, specifically, does the change in culture—and the way in which political actors reflect that cultural shift—affect interpretations of the Confederate flag over time?

---------- Methodology ----------


In order to understand the effect of cultural context on the meaning of the Confederate flag, I chose to examine the two of the most notable, distinctive time periods in the public debate about the placement of the Confederate flag on the South Carolina State House grounds: the raising of the flag in 1961 and the furling of the flag in 2015. As I mentioned before, I determined early in my research that the voices of South Carolina Representative John Amasa May and Governor Nikki Haley seemed to be the two most prominently associated with the raising and lowering of the flag and, therefore, that they would be representative of these events. I chose May because he was the chair of the South Carolina Confederate War Centennial Commission and he was credited with raising the Confederate flag above the State House in 1961. Governor Haley was the most visible face in the fight to have the Confederate flag removed in 2015 because she became the representative of South Carolina in the eyes of the nation. Through researching these two voices, I hoped to answer the question, “How do the voices of the 1961 and 2015 political leaders involved in this controversy in South Carolina reflect the changes that have occurred in the conversation about race relations?”

My expectation was that the words and political actions of these two leaders would be the main determinants in raising or lowering the flag. I quickly realized, however, that the acts of raising and lowering the Confederate flag were based less on the words and actions of these two politicians and more on the political climate of the time and their agency within that context. While May was able to raise the flag with very little backlash, Haley was a political puppet forced to take her action by the social and political context in which she operated. As I develop my arguments in this thesis, I will discuss how much agency each actor had in raising or lowering the Confederate flag. I drew conceptual guidance on this from the writings of Jeffrey C.
Alexander. According to Alexander, there is a spectrum between structural compulsion and agency. The structural element to this theory is that people are compelled to act by their location in the social order; however, he also says that people have agency and can make individual choices.\textsuperscript{13} This spectrum and the tensions between the two ends of it informed my analysis of May and Haley in the differences of their actions and time periods.

At the outset of this project, I knew that I wanted the format to be focused on two bookends—one historical and one more current. I chose to focus on 1961 and 2015 as crucial years in the Confederate flag argument in South Carolina because the most physically recognizable actions related to the symbolism of the Confederate flag happened in these two years. My primary research focused on two types of sources from each time period in order to maintain consistency in my analysis. The first category of sources that I used was speeches by May and Haley. I examined speeches because I believed that the individual voices of both of these two political leaders would be the most important clues into the cultural and political contexts of when the flag was raised and lowered. It quickly became clear, however, that while Haley spoke very directly about the symbolism of the Confederate flag and her rhetoric aligned with the actions she took in calling for its removal, May never even spoke candidly about the flag as a symbol of the Confederacy; rather, May’s actions demonstrated his support for the flag while his words mainly conveyed white supremacist ideologies. Also, through reading their speeches, I determined that the things they said heavily relied upon their audiences. The second type of source I used were articles from the local South Carolina newspaper, the \textit{State}. By using

articles from a single news source in my primary research and analysis, I aimed to maintain consistency in the source of information most relevant to these two leaders.

I expected to research the two time periods in chronological order, but I realized that information on Nikki Haley was easier to find since her relevance is very contemporary, so I looked at her voice first. The speeches and articles that I examined came from three important dates in the progression of her role as an activist for the removal of the flag: June 22, 2015, the day that Governor Haley called for the removal of the Confederate Flag from the South Carolina State House grounds; July 9, 2015, the date that a bill was signed in the South Carolina legislature in favor of removing the flag from the grounds; and, finally, July 10, 2015, the date when the flag was removed from the State House grounds. While looking through the news articles about her and her speeches my goal was to pay particular attention to the words and phrases that Haley frequently repeated, so that I might determine the key factors motivating her political and moral decision to furl the flag. Through this analysis, I determined that there were four main recurring themes in her speeches and news articles about her. These themes were the idea of unity versus division, the concept of the passing of time, public versus private use of the Confederate flag, and race.

Once I completed that strand of research I was prepared to look at the speeches and writings of John May, but I quickly found that these types of documents were not easily accessible online or in nearby libraries or archives. I decided, therefore, to travel to Columbia, South Carolina to do a large portion of my research. I spent a few days in Columbia and visited the South Carolina State Library and the Columbia Public Library, the University of South Carolina archives, the State House, and the Confederate Relic Room and Museum. Once I had
gathered my primary research materials on John May, I analyzed the texts to determine the most prominent themes in his writings and speeches as well as articles about him. The crucial texts were writings published by the South Carolina Confederate War Centennial Commission, speeches given by May, and newspaper articles from the local newspaper, the *State*, from 1961 and 1962. I analyzed these works by drawing important quotations from them to highlight the main arguments made by May in favor of Confederate ideals, which consistently reinforced his belief in the Southern Cause for the Civil War. I found that the content and tone of May’s speeches depended greatly on the audience to which he was speaking. In speeches meant for public consumption by Civil War centennial commissions across the country, May emphasized a theme of unity in his plans for the commemoration of the Civil War. In the speeches that he gave to his sympathizers, however, he spoke openly about his very traditional Confederate beliefs.

I chose to use speeches as my primary texts in my research because I wanted to examine the voices of these two political figures, May and Haley, as causes for the placement and later removal of the Confederate flag on the South Carolina State House grounds. The themes that May and Haley emphasized provided me with a better sense of the political climates of their times. Particularly notable was the fact that Haley seemed to speak more universally than did May, addressing the various and conflicting viewpoints involved in the debate over the Confederate flag. May, on the other hand, bluntly shared his singular, racist opinions about the Civil Rights Movement and the causes of the Civil War. This contrast between the two state politicians caused me to ask the question: what differentiating factor influenced what they could and could not say in their public speeches? I realized that the audiences were crucial, and this realization led me to re-focus my project on the impact of media coverage and national public
perception on the actions of the South Carolina politicians.

Through my research on the more contemporary bookend of this project, it also occurred to me that there was one crucial voice in this conversation that I had originally been ignoring: the Charleston Shooter, Dylann Roof. I realized that Roof’s actions and their connection with the Confederate flag and his hateful rhetoric played a key role in the cultural climate of the time and that, in addition to a difference in audiences, Roof’s voice was a key complicating factor in this narrative about the flag in South Carolina. This realization drastically altered my central claim from focusing on the words and actions of just two people to considering other cultural and political factors of their times.

When I started this project, I had made a few assumptions that my research caused me to abandon or qualify. First, I assumed that John May would have spoken directly about his decision to raise the Confederate flag above the State House. In May’s speeches, it was obvious that he staunchly supported the Confederacy, but—in major speeches, at least—he never spoke directly about the Confederate flag as a symbol of the Confederacy. I therefore used other evidence to substantiate this connection, such as the fact that he was cited as the person who privately requested that it be raised. I also then had to make connections between that decision and his racist attitudes, which I accomplished by citing his speeches and newspaper articles about him and about racial controversies in which he was involved. As I began my research, I had also assumed that May and Haley themselves would be the main forces behind the raising and lowering of the flag, respectively, through their words and actions. While I did find that this was the case with May, I realized that the national media and the power of popular voices had a major impact on Governor Haley’s decision to furl the flag.
This thesis is divided into three chapters. It is structured chronologically in the sense that it sequentially examines the history of the Confederate flag prior to the 1960s, John May’s role in raising the flag, and Nikki Haley’s part in lowering it.

The first chapter gives a brief overview of the history of the Confederate flag starting with its first use in the Civil War and continuing through my first bookend in 1961. Since the flag was well established as a controversial symbol by 1961, this chapter details the progression of its usages that led to those connotations. The purpose of this chapter is to situate the Confederate flag in the history of American culture in order to provide the foundations for the remainder of the argument.

The second chapter focuses on the first bookend in my project, South Carolina Representative John Amasa May and the Civil War centennial. I provide detailed reasons for why the absence of any national spotlight on May allowed him to complete an act in a time of heightened racial tensions with virtually no obstacles or repercussions that would eventually cause intense controversy.

The third chapter includes the analysis of the second bookend in this project, Nikki Haley and her role in removing the Confederate flag from the South Carolina State House grounds. The content of this chapter is important to the overall argument because it proves that much of Nikki Haley’s decision to remove the flag was motivated by the intense focus of national attention drawn to her state by a violent shooting that caused people across the country to suddenly question the placement of a symbol that had been flying there for over fifty years.
Chapter I: The History of the Confederate Flag: How did it become so controversial?

During the Civil War there were multiple flags associated with the Confederacy. Some of the most popular were the Bonnie Blue flag, a blue flag with a white star at the center, and the Stars and Bars flag, which resembled the Stars and Stripes of the American flag with three stripes alternating red and white and a blue square with a circle of white stars in it [see Appendix Figure 1 and Figure 2]. The Stars and Bars was the original battle flag of the Confederacy, but at the early Battle of Bull Run it became clear that the similarities between that flag and the flag of the Union would cause too much confusion for soldiers. This is the point when the Confederate battle flag that is engrained in American culture today came into more popular use. This flag incorporates the St. Andrew’s cross, on a red field and, though it was never the official flag of the Confederacy, it has been memorialized as the most important and most representative of the Confederate cause. The flag never gained official status, but by 1863 the St. Andrew’s cross battle flag was so widely used on the battlefield that it was the flag most strongly associated with the Confederate army and it evoked powerful nationalistic pride for the Confederacy. Originally, companies within the army used it more frequently, but the sacrifices that those men made and their association with the flag made it more popular:

‘Soldiers have died with one last look upon its dear cross; and in the hour of victory it has seemed transfigured into something God-like, when the rapturous shouts of our Southern soldiery shook its folds like a storm.’ Having acquired such associations, it seemed clear.

14 Gerald R. Webster and Jonathan I. Leib, Neo-Confederacy (Austin: University of Texas Press 2008), 172.

. . that ‘the baptism of blood and fire has made the battle-flag of General Johnston our national ensign,’ regardless of its delayed official recognition.16

The soldiers were the most passionate supporters of the Confederate battle flag when it first emerged as an important symbol. They looked to the flag as a rallying symbol in battle and it, therefore, did not have the same connotations at that time that have been ascribed to the flag since. The process of changing the meaning of the flag began when the families of the soldiers and other Southerners who supported the Confederacy used the flag in public events and flew it at their homes. Elected officials supported this use of the Confederate flag in a context beyond the battlefield and the flag became more of a political symbol.17 At the end of the Civil War, sectional battles between the North and the South continued and created heated debate about the causes of the war and the Confederate battle flag was used frequently in this dispute.

The Confederate flag has been tied to racism for many reasons, but the reason most often mentioned is that the flag represented the side of the war that fought for the continuation of slavery. James De Bow—editor, economist, and superintendent of the 1850 United States census—spoke about the prevalence and importance of slavery in the South:

---

16 Bonner, 318.

17 Bonner, 330.
Slaveholders, he observed, ‘make up an aggregate, greater in relative proportion than the holders of any other species of property whatever, in any part of the world; and that of no other property can be said, with equal truthfulness, that it is an interest of the whole community.’

---

Ownership of slaves, therefore, was very widespread and common in the South, but regardless of whether or not they owned slaves, whites considered slavery a crucial institution in maintaining the social balance to which they were accustomed.19 Moreover, the vote to secede was higher in counties with the most slaveholders across the South than in counties with fewer slaves. If only low-slaveholding counties voted, the secession votes would have failed.20 Though in more recent history many people deny that slavery was the cause of the Civil War, language from political leaders of the time proves that there was a fairly open understanding that it was very important to the cause.21 In March of 1861, Confederate Vice President Alexander Stephens delivered the “Cornerstone Address,” a speech that laid out the basic differences between the Confederate and the United States Constitutions. The language in the speech was shockingly blunt from the contemporary perspective. He stated, “Our new government is founded upon…the great truth that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery subordination to the superior race is his natural and normal condition.”22 The general Southern population at the time, therefore, was not ignorant to the racist implications of their cause; rather, they had been socialized to perceive the Civil War as a fight for their long-standing heritage. So, the war was known to have started over the issue of slavery, but people tried to convey a message of a battle for upholding the values of Southern heritage. The connection that exists between the Confederate flag and racism today was

19 Coski, 25.


22 Stephens, “Cornerstone Speech.”
not widely perceived during the Civil War, however, it deepened over time as the significance of the flag evolved: “The Confederate flag is no longer simply a flag.” Due to the association of the flag with slavery and racism, it changed from a rallying emblem on the battlefield to a contentious symbol in the political and social spheres in America. These associations started in the Civil War and continued to exist over time, but they rarely caused any real changes in flag usage.

---

The period after the war known as Reconstruction was a crucial time for the establishment of the legacy of the Confederate flag and the pride that Southerners would continue to take in the symbol. This was a time when the flag was cemented in the American consciousness as a symbol of opposition to the North and efforts that Southerners felt were being made to infiltrate their culture. In this time period, “the battle flag was sometimes treated as ‘contraband’ and its display was forbidden.” The ban of the Confederate battle flag forced Southerners to conceal the symbols of their defeated army and created disdain among supporters of the Confederacy. Banning the flag was an attempt by the government in the South during Reconstruction to stifle rebellious Southern culture. There were some people who still flew the flag in defiance to the political situation in America, but it was much less prevalent during this time period. Certain people were so angered that they actually formed groups to combat the progress of African Americans in the South that the federal government imposed. The Carolina Rifle Club of Charleston, South Carolina provided “the only organized defense of the white race against negro aggression.” They were founded in 1869 and used the Confederate flag as the emblem to represent their cause while using violent means to suppress the advancement of the black community. When Reconstruction failed it became obvious that the efforts to restrain Southern culture only created more of a sectional divide and heightened anger towards Northerners. Once federal troops left the South in 1877, the white Southern population revived

________________________________________

24 Webster and Leib, 173.

25 Coski, 49.

xxi
the Confederate battle flag. Increasingly, as Southerners enjoyed their freedom from the constraints of Reconstruction, it became the most visible symbol to memorialize the Confederacy.

26 Webster and Leib, 173.
The period from 1890 through 1915 is historically referred to as the “Confederate memorial period” because Reconstruction was over and veterans of the Civil War were still alive so Southerners used it as an opportunity to shape the memory of the Confederacy in the national narrative. Monuments and memorials were built for Civil War heroes while groups such as the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) and the Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV) formed to try to preserve the legacy of the Confederacy. These groups also established Confederate holidays that included Confederate Memorial Day and Robert E. Lee’s birthday. These holidays were celebrated in Southern towns with parades where the streets were filled with Confederate flags and Confederate flag regalia. Confederate holidays became popular at a time when “Confederate veterans and their sons dominated political life in the South and African Americans were excluded from mainstream life.” Due to this political climate, these celebrations were very public and were welcomed by most white Southerners with an immense amount of pride. Holidays and celebrations of veterans of the Civil War created a type of “civil religion’ that sanctified the Confederacy and deified Confederate heroes.” The Confederacy was also memorialized in movies, the most famous of which was The Birth of a Nation. The premise of D.W. Griffith’s film was that African Americans were monsters and could not be

27 Webster and Leib, 173.

28 Coski, 51-52.

29 Coski, 54.

trusted and that Southern culture and white identity should be revered.\textsuperscript{31} These domestic attempts to elevate the status of the South post-Reconstruction then carried over into the international sphere during World War I. Many Southern troops fighting for the United States carried Confederate flags at their camps and wore them on their uniforms in battle, familiarizing people of other nations with the symbol.\textsuperscript{32} The cultural acceptance of the Confederate flag during the memorial period began to associate the flag with a new narrative:

Confederate flags were used not merely to honor the veterans who fought under them but also as symbolic manifestations of ‘correct’ history. Metaphorical references to flags, latter-day representations of flags, and especially the ceremonial use of actual wartime battle flags symbolized not just the character and accomplishments of Confederate soldiers but the societal ideals for which they fought.\textsuperscript{33}

By this point, it was certain that the Confederate flag was no longer just a battle flag around which troops rallied. Though the meaning of it continued to change over time, it was now permanently ingrained in the American psyche as a symbol with connotations that associated it with the Southern cause during the Civil War.

\textsuperscript{31} Webster and Leib, 173-174.

\textsuperscript{32} Webster and Leib, 174.

\textsuperscript{33} Coski, 62.
During the Confederate memorial period and World War I the Confederate battle flag was used quite frequently to represent Southern pride and honor for veterans, but most of the people who used the flag had close ties to the Confederacy. By the 1920s, the Confederate flag began making its way into popular culture, starting on college campuses. One of the driving forces behind the flag’s popularity at universities, especially in the South, was its use by the Kappa Alpha fraternity, which was founded in 1865 at Washington University when Robert E. Lee was the president of the school. In the 1920s, the brothers of that fraternity throughout the South began planning “Old South” balls where members of Kappa Alpha wore Confederate army uniforms and invited dates that would dress in hoop skirts. These dances were usually ornately decorated with Confederate flags, and the battle flag hung on the outside of the Kappa Alpha fraternity houses on a daily basis. The Confederate battle flag was also infused in college football culture at many universities in the South. When their opponents were from the North, football teams at Southern schools often referred to games as the “Blue versus Gray” game. Confederate flags were used at all games at schools like the University of Virginia and the University of Alabama, but they were present in the greatest quantities when the teams from those schools played Northern teams. The school with the most notorious association to the Confederate battle flag, however, was the University of Mississippi, or “Ole Miss.” The name of
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the university’s sports teams became the Rebels in 1936 after it was chosen in a student contest, and the mascot of Colonel Reb was first used in 1937.\textsuperscript{38} The association of the university with Confederate imagery only increased from that point. The Confederate flag first became an important part of the Ole Miss sports culture in 1948. One of the reasons that this year marked the first use of the flag was because it was the centennial of the founding of Ole Miss and they wanted to use the flag to represent their Southern heritage. During the 1948 season, the Ole Miss band created a half time show in which they walked out onto the field carrying the world’s largest Confederate flag and playing “Dixie.” Students loved the show and it became common for them to bring miniature versions of the flag to wave in the stands at football games.\textsuperscript{39} This was the first of many traditions that became a part of the University of Mississippi that were meant to honor the values of the Old South. The fact that the flag became popular on the campus in 1948 is also interesting, however, because it coincided with the Dixiecrat convention in Alabama that occurred that year.

\textsuperscript{38} David G. Sansing, “A Modern University,” \textit{The University of Mississippi: A Sesquicentennial History} (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1999), 255.

\textsuperscript{39} Sansing, 270.
The presidential election of 1948 was a crucial point in the history of the Democratic Party and the evolution of the symbolism of the Confederate battle flag. Sitting President Harry Truman was running for reelection and he was proposing civil rights legislation to improve conditions for African Americans throughout the country. Many Southern Democrats were angered by this plan, leading to the formation of the National States’ Rights Democratic Party. More commonly known as the Dixiecrats, this radical group of anti-integration Southern Democrats held a convention in Birmingham, Alabama where the Confederate flag was a prominently featured symbol to represent the party at the convention. Many of the flag-waving delegates at the convention were students from the University of Mississippi and Birmingham Southern University. The mere presence of the flag at the convention, whether the candidates wanted to use the flag as a symbol or not, tied the symbol to its racist connotations:

[This] moment announced the marriage between the flag’s emerging pop culture status and its ideological roots. Once again in the 1940s as in the 1860s, the Confederate battle flag was the chosen symbol of people dedicated to defending states’ rights as a means to preserve a social order founded on white supremacy.

---
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Now, a symbol that had become popular among young people on college campuses, in addition to the reverence granted to it by older generations of Southerners, was recognized as the emblem of a political party with very racist incentives. The convention nominated Strom Thurmond as their candidate for president and throughout his campaign Thurmond tried to avoid directly addressing the issue of race because he knew that he needed to be able to appeal to more liberal Democrats.\textsuperscript{43} The voting data, however, made it impossible for Thurmond to argue that his campaign for the presidency did not garner racially motivated results: “Thurmond received 82 percent of the vote in Mississippi, the state with the largest black population, and 72 percent in South Carolina, the state with the second largest African American population.”\textsuperscript{44} The Dixiecrat convention and the use of the Confederate flag as the symbol for the Dixiecrat Party caused sales of Confederate flags and flag regalia to increase exponentially in the United States.\textsuperscript{45} The year 1948 marked the beginning of the period of the most visibility of the Confederate flag in history and set the tone for further association of the flag with racism.


\textsuperscript{44} Donaldson, 185.

\textsuperscript{45} Coski, 105.
The organization most infamously associated with the Confederate flag is the Ku Klux Klan (KKK). The Klan has existed in various forms dating back to the Civil War, however, not all of the different manifestations of the KKK overtime have utilized the Confederate flag as a symbol to represent their cause. The first widely recognized use of the Confederate flag by the KKK was in a *Life* magazine article in 1946. The article described a resurrection of the Klan and showed pictures of the rituals at a Klan meeting. Throughout the photographs, there is a Confederate flag draped across an altar as the Klan members perform the complex process of initiating new members. From that point forward, members of the KKK were often seen using the flag in ceremonies as well as frequently in protest of progress of integration during the Civil Rights Movement. Whether the KKK really was the group that used the flag most often or not, their ideals are the ones most intimately associated with what the Confederate flag represents to many Americans.

While the Confederate flag continued to grow in popularity as a symbol of the South and Southern values in the years following the Civil War, the heated conflicts of the Civil Rights Movement marked the pinnacle of its association with racism and its reemergence as a symbol of defiant Southern values:

---
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Homage to Dixie and the Confederate battle flag regained a significance they had lost over the years. . . . The white South was once again an embattled minority, with the forces of the Supreme Court, the NAACP, northern liberalism, and ‘Yankee ignorance’ arrayed against it.  

---

The disagreements that arose between the Federal Government and Southern local and state officials over civil rights for African Americans in the 1950s and 1960s highlighted the racism of many people in the South and a new type of defiance, not seen since the Civil War. The Supreme Court decision in the case of Brown vs. the Board of Education in 1954 was one of the first major steps toward widespread integration throughout the country and specifically in public schools. Southern segregationists, many of whom were politicians, staunchly opposed the decision, so 77 members of the House of Representatives and 19 United States Senators from Southern states responded by authoring the “Southern Manifesto.” They claimed that the Federal Government was depriving them of their rights as individual states to make decisions regarding their school systems. Former presidential candidate Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina was one of the leaders of the project and his goal was for the manifesto to “unite and encourage those white Southerners who were opposed to desegregation.” People gradually began to use the flag more to express their resistance to the integrationist ideals that they felt Northerners, more specifically the federal government, were imposing on them. For example, at the integration of Little Rock Central High School in 1957, women who belonged to the Mothers’ League of Central High School, an organization that worked tirelessly to prevent integration, were seen waving the red and blue flags as they screamed threats at the nine African

---
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American children who were trying to enter the high school. There were countless other examples of times when the battle flag was used as a symbol of contention and racial hatred, one of which I will explore more later.

The difference between the flag’s usage on this new social and political battlefield and the battlefield of the Civil War, though, was that the legalized institution of slavery was a thing of the past and the racist attitudes of Southern politicians and segregationists had a purely social basis with no logical or practical justifications. By calling that document, which had no real legal jurisdiction, authored by key Southern politicians, the “Southern Manifesto,” the authors symbolically involved that entire region of the country and caused all Southerners to be associated with the opinions expressed in it. Racist attitudes, therefore, began to be considered an inherent, unavoidable part of Southern culture, and these attitudes were represented by the symbol that had developed over the course of almost a century into the most prominent sign of the South.

---

Chapter II: How Mr. Confederacy Raised the Flag While the Nation Looked Elsewhere

With pride I say that there is a constant and growing consciousness of the nobleness, and justice, and chivalry of the Confederate cause. My friends, evil dies, the good lives and the time has now come when we see the so-called failure of the Confederacy as a victory amid defeat.\(^\text{54}\)

- John Amasa May, 1960

In the mid 20\(^{th}\) century, commemoration of the Civil War became a huge part of life for some Americans with the advent of the United States Civil War Centennial Commission (CWCC). In 1957, President Dwight D. Eisenhower commissioned a planning committee in

observance of the upcoming centennial of the Civil War. He called for the formation of a national committee, which was led by Ulysses S. Grant III, a direct descendant of the famous Union general and former president, as well as local committees in states throughout the country [see Appendix Figure 3]. The centennial celebrations would involve battle reenactments, social gatherings in Civil War era attire, parades, and many other festivities. According to Grant, the hope of the centennial was to allow the entire nation to collectively celebrate the memory of the soldiers who died in the war and the important cause for which they sacrificed their lives:

We think there was enough heroism and self-sacrifice on both sides, to commemorate. It shows what people were willing to do in those days for principle, whether you think they were right or not . . . the war served to draw us together rather than tear us apart. The commissions in states in both the North and South set out to honor the accomplishments of the many soldiers from their state who fought in the Civil War.

Despite the unifying intentions of the centennial, the historical context of the commemorative period thwarted the ability of the centennial to create a united national collective memory of the war. As the planning continued for the centennial, heightened racial tensions resulted from the ongoing Civil Rights Movement. Ironically, the argument over race that had prompted South Carolina to secede from the Union in 1860 was again a major issue that divided the country and prevented the nation from coming together in agreement on issues of race. This


divide was manifested very prominently in the centennial in South Carolina. As a part of the centennial commemorations, there were annual national assembly meetings held in various states where the centennial commission delegations came together to discuss the progress and success of their events and commemorations. In conjunction with the South Carolina commission’s remembrance of the first firing of shots in the Civil War at Fort Sumter, the CWCC planned to host the fourth annual meeting for the delegations from other states at the well-known Francis Marion Hotel in Charleston. One of the delegates from New Jersey, Madaline Williams, was an African American woman and due to the segregation laws that were instituted in South Carolina, she was denied the ability to reserve a room at the hotel. As a result of this incursion on Williams’ civil rights, the delegations from New Jersey, New York, California, and Illinois announced that they would boycott the event unless it was held at a venue that would accommodate all members of the centennial commissions. Other prominent African Americans, such as author and educator Dr. Lawrence S. Reddick, also noticed that the undertones of the celebrations “were perpetuating the ‘Confederacy myth’ and setting up harmful emotional barriers [for participants].”

58 Cook, 88.

59 Cook, 90.


President Kennedy sent a personal letter to Grant that stated that the CWCC was a federal body and it had to act in accordance with federal laws, but leaders in both the national and local delegations still declined to interfere with the rules that the hotel chose to enforce, claiming that this was an issue of states’ rights and they were therefore warranted in denying admission to Williams. In the wake of these events, the attention of the national media fell on South Carolina and focused in on this civil rights dispute in connection with the centennial. Newspapers like the Chicago Tribune, the New York Times, and the Washington Post reported on the segregation plaguing the smooth progress of the centennial commission events. The Chicago Tribune called the segregation of the meeting venue “the racial issue that caused South Carolina to secede from the national centennial commission.” Due to the widespread attention that the centennial meetings attracted, much of it quite negative, President John F. Kennedy decided that he needed to intervene. He called for the National and South Carolina Centennial Commissions to decide on a new location for the event or he would change it himself. After President Kennedy’s involvement, the CWCC partially moved the assembly meetings to an integrated naval base nearby—business meetings would be held there—but many of the scheduled events were kept at

---


the Francis Marion Hotel. This compromise was reached by Grant in order to appease the president and abide by his policies.66

Amid all the racial turmoil, the focus of Americans failed to acknowledge the important role that the head of the South Carolina commission played in these events and hold him accountable for his actions. His name was John Amasa May, but his peers also knew him as “Mr. Confederacy.”67 A South Carolina State Representative from Aiken County, May played a crucial role in all centennial events in South Carolina once he was chosen to lead the commission in 1959.68 May was one of the most famous historians of the Confederacy in South Carolina because he had a very large collection of historical relics and he was a vocal supporter of Southern heritage.69 His background as a Confederate enthusiast and “a true son of the South” equipped him to handle the role through judging Miss Confederacy pageants, presenting a Confederate battle flag to the grandson of the most famous Union general, and even donating Civil War memorabilia to the centennial events from his own personal collection.70 As a member of the South Carolina Confederate War Centennial Commission (SCCWCC), May co-authored


several important works such as *South Carolina Fights*, a historical account of battles that took place in South Carolina during the Civil War; *South Carolina Speaks*, a collection of important speeches made by South Carolinians during the centennial; and *South Carolina Secedes*, his most famous and extensive work, which included the story of South Carolina’s path to secession, the South Carolina Declaration of the Causes of Secession, and detailed biographies of all the members of the secession convention.\(^{71}\) May was also a major in World War II and served as a prosecutor on the War Crimes Commission at the Nuremberg Trials following the war.\(^{72}\)

May was a well-respected politician in South Carolina by his peers, his constituents, and the local media. His peers often praised him for his commitment to upholding the legacy of the Confederacy: “Rep. John May, Aiken, paid tribute to Confederate soldiers yesterday in the House and received a standing ovation from his colleagues.”\(^{73}\) In keeping with the political culture of the South in at least the first half of the 20\(^{th}\) century, white males, many of whom were pro-segregation, dominated the course of the legislature for which May served in South Carolina. Senator John Long was a fellow South Carolina politician, whom May praised for his role in helping start the centennial commission. In a speech that Long gave in 1960, he glorified the Old South and compared its opponents to his more contemporary opposition: “The abolitionists of


\(^{72}\) “College Students Learn Politics.”

the pre-war days were not a far cry from the frothing-at-the-mouth integrationists today. They are trying to violate the laws of God and Nature. Not even the Warren Supreme Court can integrate God and Satan, black and white, right and wrong.”

In a later article titled “Sen. Long is Praised,” May was cited as the person who honored Senator Long’s work by presenting him a copy of the Ordinance of Secession, proving his loyalty to this controversial politician.

May’s close relationship with prominent Southern politicians beyond South Carolina also became clear when introduced Mississippi Governor Ross Barnett as a “great man . . . fearless leader . . . beloved governor . . . the Jefferson Davis of our day.” In the speech that followed that introduction, Barnett spoke of the impossibility of equality between blacks and whites. Another controversial South Carolina politician with whom May was close was the famed segregationist Strom Thurmond who was once quoted saying, “I am proud of the job that South Carolina is doing [in regard to segregation] and I urge that we continue in this great tradition no matter how much outside agitation may be brought to bear on our people and our state.” While May never used language that was as blatantly pro-segregation as these men, his association with them and
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respect for their values and leadership prove that his actions during the centennial had racist motivations.

The support of May’s constituency also proves his positive local rapport. By the time he was chosen to serve as the head of the SCCWCC he had served seven terms in the South Carolina House of Representatives, more than any other state legislator in South Carolina’s history. He was frequently described as a moral politician who fiercely defended his principles. Political support for May is a complicated topic, however, because of the voting restrictions in South Carolina during his tenure. Under the harsh Jim Crow laws in place in many Southern states, African Americans were prevented from voting in South Carolina through the use of literacy tests. Many civil rights battles were underway during the start of the centennial celebrations in 1961, but a push for equal voting rights did not gain strength until 1964 and 1965. There were some examples of African American newspapers calling for the removal of the Confederate flag from the State House grounds, but those news sources were mostly in the North and they went unrecognized [see Appendix Figure 4]. The Freedom Summer of 1964 brought
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activists from the North into Southern states to help African Americans fight for voting rights.\textsuperscript{83} Then the march from Selma to Montgomery in 1965 created intense national scrutiny on the voting situation in the South, leading to the intervention of President Lyndon B. Johnson: “Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which can excuse the denial of that right.”\textsuperscript{84} Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. described the success of this march when he said, “In focusing the attention of the nation and the world today in the flagrant denial of the right to vote, we are exposing the very origin, the root cause, of racial segregation in our Southland.”\textsuperscript{85} The Voting Rights Act of 1965, therefore, made it legal for African Americans to vote in the United States, but May’s election occurred before this date and before the media attention necessary to incite change was focused on the issue of voting rights for African Americans.\textsuperscript{86} Black citizens of South Carolina, therefore, were unable to have their opinions heard in a meaningful way that could have changed the course of May’s actions.

Despite the crucial part that he played in the South Carolina Commission that planned the segregated Charleston meeting, May was not recognized in the national media. The stories that were printed in the \textit{Chicago Tribune}, the \textit{New York Times}, and the \textit{Washington Post} about the centennial meeting in South Carolina failed to mention May as a stakeholder in this event. In


fact, a search of the keywords “John May” and “South Carolina” in the archival databases of those three publications between September 1960 and May 1962 did not return any relevant articles. Since information about May’s involvement in the Civil War centennial was not disseminated across different parts of the country, he was not accountable to people in other parts of the nation with views of the Confederacy and the Confederate flag that clashed with his own.

Like Grant, May was not concerned by the segregation of the centennial meetings and he announced that he planned to leave the decision up to the hotel, despite the fact that his job as the head of the commission in charge of the meetings was to create an event that all delegates could attend in the spirit of a unified commemoration of the Civil War. In a speech he made that was published in South Carolina Speaks, a work of the South Carolina Commission, May quoted the same statement that Grant made about the need for the whole country to celebrate a war that he said unified the nation rather than dividing it. Just before he quoted Grant in the speech, however, May discussed the naming of the South Carolina Commission, which was anything but unifying:

We in South Carolina object to the word ‘Civil War’ because we believe that our secession and our fight for our independence was in no way a rebellion against Civil Authority—hence we could call it, ‘The War Between the States,’ ‘The War for Southern Independence,’ or ‘The War of Northern Aggression,’ however, we chose the name ‘Confederate War Centennial Commission.’

87 New York Times Article Archive; Chicago Tribune Archives; Washington Post Archives, ProQuest.

88 “Fort Sumter is Again Target; Shelling This Time is Verbal,” State (Columbia, SC), March 17, 1961, accessed November 13, 2015, Newsbank.

89 May, “South Carolina and the Confederate Centennial,” 17.
Though he sought to endorse a message of unity, the very naming of his commission, which he fully supported, seemed to indicate a sectional divide at the outset of the centennial. There was one member of the South Carolina Centennial Commission, Civil War Historian Daniel Hollis, who later said that he disagreed with the naming, but he chose not to say so at the time of the meeting. Hollis cited the fact that the other people on the commission included members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and that he did not want to get into an argument with them by disagreeing with May’s suggestion for naming the commission, ample evidence of the power of the pro-Confederate majority in South Carolina in those years.  

May’s absence in the eyes of the national media was not the only evidence for his lack of accountability to the entire nation. The speeches that May gave around the time of the centennial included incendiary language that would have offended Northerners, civil rights activists, and African Americans in general. The audiences to which he gave his public speeches were crucial. When speaking to pro-Confederate groups like the United Daughters of the Confederacy, May was more open in expressing his racist ideas about the social situation in America, whereas in speeches for wider consumption, he restrained those feelings and spoke more neutrally about his beliefs. May was heavily biased against Northern views, both of the Civil War and the Civil Rights Movement. Much of his language indicated that his beliefs dated back to the Civil War Era. He strongly believed that the Civil War was not fought over slavery. In order to establish the legitimacy and possibility of this concept, he argued in a speech to the UDC that the slave masters and mistresses treated their slaves very well: “The Mistress of the Southern Plantation who ministered day and night, hot or cold, to the sick slaves . . . [or] the Master who saw that

90 Bursey, “The Day the Flag Went Up.”
they were well fed, well clothed, and well cared for” [see Appendix Figure 5]. Over time, the atrocities of slavery had become so widely known and acknowledged that by the time of this speech it would have been clear that May was extremely biased to the point that he was bordering on delusion. Building on that skewed view, May then suggested that since slavery was not the reason for secession, what really happened was “[a]ll the South asked was to let us go in peace as the Constitution said we had a right to do.” Though many of his contemporaries probably agreed with him, it was much more commonly understood by 1961 that the association of the Southern cause and slavery was undeniable prior to the Civil War.

Another frequently mentioned theme in May’s speeches was his criticism of the Civil Rights Movement and the cultural and political tensions of his time. When he was talking about slavery in the UDC speech, he said, “The people of the South took care of their negroes. The feeling was one of mutual respect of one race for another.” Not only was this a false depiction of slavery, but it also failed to acknowledge the extreme racial tensions in the 1960s at the very moment he was speaking. Indeed, one could even describe his argument as selectively tunnel- visioned, when he proposed a historical view that made relations between blacks and whites seem amicable during slavery at a time when those same relationships were still extremely fractured. The disconnect between his beliefs and reality continued to become clearer as he criticized the Civil Rights Movement. In one argument, he asserted that the Northern attempts to


counter racial oppression in the South were all illegal, whereas secession was a completely legal act on the part of Southerners. For example, “The Underground Railroad was a violation of the law, pure and simple. It was the same thing in the 1850s and 1860s as we in the 1960s now know as The Freedom Riders.” By connecting his image of the Underground Railroad as an illegal system to the Freedom Riders of the Civil Rights Movement, May made his negative view of civil rights very clear. May was a staunch supporter of upholding Southern ideals despite the negative connotations that support entailed: “In the same spirit with which our Confederate heroes dedicated themselves to service of the South, and to the preservation of Southern ideals, let us, as guardians of this noble trust, devote ourselves to the needs of the present America.”

Perhaps such observers who already suspected that Confederate ideals were a mechanism for protecting slavery would come to the conclusion that this statement promoted the perpetuation of racial suppression.

The partially segregated South Carolina national assembly meeting of the centennial commissions, led by May, began on April 11, 1961 with a reenactment of the Battle of Fort Sumter, which had started the Civil War. Three days prior, on April 8, the State reported, “The flag [will be] flown at the request of Aiken Rep. John May, chairman of the Confederate War Centennial Committee. The [Confederate] flag will fly next week in observance of the centennial

---


activities being held in Charleston.” The article that made this announcement was confined to one small section in the local newspaper [see Appendix Figure 6]. May’s act of raising the flag above the State House in 1961, therefore, went relatively unrecognized in comparison to the segregated national assembly meeting in Charleston, despite the fact that the two were happening in conjunction with each other. Without political accountability to the people who would disagree with his actions or social accountability to the entire nation, John May was able to raise the Confederate flag above the South Carolina State House. The article in the State about May’s request to raise the Confederate flag suggested that it was in honor of the centennial. While it did coincide with that event, the racist beliefs that May expressed in his speech to the UDC make it impossible to make a distinction between those opinions and the motivations he had to raise that flag. Since May was excellent at catering to his audience, it is probable that he used the centennial to cover for his decision to raise the Confederate flag in defiance of the Civil Rights Movement in general, as well as the interference of the movement’s goals in the meetings in Charleston manifested in the segregation dispute at the hotel. Though May did play an important role in the political structure of his time, his lack of accountability to the whole nation as well as people within his state made him less susceptible to structural constraints. May, therefore, had a great deal of agency in this case to act in whatever way he wanted in order to express his beliefs and desires.

96 “The ‘Stars and Bars’ Fly Again,” State (Columbia, SC), April 8, 1961, accessed November 13, 2015, Newsbank; Rebecca Watts clarifies this point about the raising of the Confederate flag in Contemporary Southern Identity: Community through Controversy: “At the time, however, ‘atop the state capitol’ did not mean on a flagpole on top of the dome. The ladder to the dome’s flagpole had been declared unsafe five years earlier, so a flagpole was put on top of a lower part of the building, visible only from the front side of the Statehouse, and the U.S. and South Carolina flags were on display there; the Confederate flag was added to that lower flagpole in April 1961. In February 1962, May proposed in a concurrent resolution that all three flags be moved to a flagpole atop the dome,” 90.
About a year later in 1962 the South Carolina Legislature passed a concurrent resolution to have the flag flown on top of the State House. The bill was introduced by May and Representative Julian LeaMond, one of his colleagues from the South Carolina House of Representatives. Though it was a concurrent resolution and therefore did not have the same force of law, it still carried a lot of weight in South Carolina and through its enforcement the Confederate flag could only be removed from the dome of the State House with a two-thirds majority vote from the South Carolina General Assembly. By April 5, 1962, the Confederate flag was legally flying above the South Carolina State House due to a concurrent resolution that did not indicate a time frame for the flag’s placement there, so “it just stayed up.”

This action was so overlooked that many people to this day still think that the Confederate flag was first raised on the State House in 1962, the year that May finally drafted legislation to keep it there. This was obvious through the coverage of the Confederate flag controversy in the summer of 2015 in which many reputable news sources cited 1962 as the first time the Confederate flag waved on the State House. In the public turmoil of a clash over


racist restrictions, the hoisting of one of the most infamous racist symbols in American history was made possible because of the actions of one man. Without the attention of the national media or a sense of accountability to anyone beyond his mostly white voting constituency, May’s act of raising the Confederate flag above the State House proceeded flawlessly. Daniel Hollis, the historian who was on the SCCWCC, suspected that “hoisting the Confederate flag over the State House didn’t generate any controversy at the time. Perhaps those most offended by it were too busy fighting real-life battles to expend any energy on symbolic ones.”

The symbolic battle over the Confederate flag was such a low priority for South Carolinians that the debate about the placement of the flag on the State House did not reemerge again until the mid-1970s. In fact, an article published on the State’s website in June 28, 2015 titled “A Flag Timeline” noted the legal raising of the flag in 1962 and then they only listed the entire period of the “1970s-1980s” as a time when “black lawmakers and others call[ed] for the flag’s removal.” There was a wave of controversy surrounding the use of Confederate flags in schools right after the official integration of schools in South Carolina because the flag was frequently used as a symbol of resistance to desegregation. Those local debates, however, never reached the state government level. The first grassroots organizing against the placement of the Confederate flag on the State House began in 1972, but the issue did not reach the state level until 1977 when the state’s Black Caucus began fighting for the flag to be relocated to the
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Confederate Relic Room.\textsuperscript{105} Within the legislature, a faction of politicians formed in support of the flag and a back-and-forth debate continued with little progress throughout the 1980s and 1990s. In 1987, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Southeast Regional Conferences proposed a resolution against public use of the Confederate flag, however, that did not change the minds of many South Carolina politicians either.\textsuperscript{106} During the 1994 legislative session, the members of the South Carolina General Assembly passed a law that “require[d] legislative approval to remove flags from the capitol, limiting the power of the governor to make unilateral decisions regarding the flag.”\textsuperscript{107} So, in 1996 Governor David Beasley had to appeal to the public in an effort to urge the legislature to remove the flag. As a white, Republican governor, Beasley seemed like an unlikely candidate to take such a strong stance on the Confederate flag issue, but he had the foresight to know that this contentious debate would not go away as long as the flag remained visible on the State House grounds: “Governor David Beasley asked South Carolinians whether they wanted their children to be debating the Confederate flag in ten years.”\textsuperscript{108} Some criticized Beasley saying that his opinions were motivated by commerce, but his input in the debate marked a “turning point” in the Confederate flag conversation in South Carolina.\textsuperscript{109}
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When Governor Beasley ran for office again in 2000, he was defeated despite the fact that he said he would never try to campaign against the flag again in order to appease voters who supported the flag. In that same year, an economic boycott of South Carolina by the NAACP finally prompted the passage of a compromise called the Heritage Act which moved the Confederate flag from the dome of the State House to a new location next to the Confederate Soldiers monument. The NAACP, however, continued its boycott . . . because the compromise relocated the Confederate flag from the capitol dome to the most prominent location on the capitol grounds—a spot that an African American columnist observed was ‘Columbia’s equivalent to New York’s Times Square.’

Rather than alleviating the tensions of the debate with this compromise, South Carolina lawmakers moved the flag to a more visible location, further angering those who fought against the Confederate flag and perpetuating this debate for many years.

---

Chapter III: All Eyes on Nikki Haley

110 Watts, 94.

Furl that banner, softly, slowly!
Treat it gently—it is holy—
For it droops above the dead.
Touch it not—unfold it never,
Let it droop there, furled forever,
For its people’s hopes are dead!

—The Conquered Banner,
Fr. Abram Joseph Ryan, 1865

Governor Beasley, a white Republican, failed to remove the Confederate flag from its place on the State House grounds, but a little over a decade later a young Indian woman became the first female and first minority governor of South Carolina; little did she know at the time that she would take up the same fight that Beasley had lost years before her. “I am the proud daughter of Indian parents who reminded us every day of how blessed we are to live in this country.” These are the words that Governor Nikki Haley used at the beginning of every speech she gave when running for governor of South Carolina. Her parents were immigrants and growing up in South Carolina in the 1970s and 1980s as a minority, Haley faced racial discrimination at many points in her life. The issue of the Confederate flag was raised at a debate when Haley ran for reelection in 2014. At that point, many people worried that the flag was deterring business from South Carolina, but Haley claimed that during her time as governor she had never spoken to a CEO of any company who complained about the position of the flag on the State House. She also
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cited her election as an example of the ability of South Carolina to create a positive image on issues of race.\textsuperscript{115} Haley was criticized for the fact that she cared more about the opinions and needs of CEOs than her own constituents. Later, however, she would change her own opinions on the Confederate flag after a flashpoint event caused her to rethink them.

The social and political context of the summer of 2015 certainly provided an opening for, and perhaps even compelled Governor Haley to furl the flag. On June 17, 2015, tragedy struck South Carolina. White supremacist Dylann Roof sat in prayer with nine parishioners of Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston for an hour before fatally shooting nine members of the historical African American church.\textsuperscript{116} The racially motivated shooting shocked the nation and people around the country grieved. Days after the shooting occurred and the shooter was apprehended, more information came out about Roof and his motivations. A disturbingly racist manifesto had been posted on a website created by Roof called lastrhodesian.com.\textsuperscript{117} In it, Roof spoke of his need to kill African Americans because of the threat they posed to America, especially to white lives. He argued that slavery was not bad and that slaves cared for their masters. He also proposed, “segregation was not a bad thing” and that “how

\begin{footnotesize}


\textsuperscript{117} There is speculation that the name of Roof’s website refers to Rhodesia—the former name of Zimbabwe. White supremacists are known to identify with the civil war that was fought in that country after South African apartheid because the white population in Rhodesia was the minority but they ruled the country. https://warisboring.com/why-white-supremacists-identify-with-rhodesia-480b37f3131f#.7uq2zkau9.
\end{footnotesize}
good a school is considered directly corresponds to how White it is.”\textsuperscript{118} On the same page as the manifesto, in which he stated that he “hate[d] the sight of the American flag,” Roof was pictured posing with a Confederate flag.\textsuperscript{119} The association that Roof made between the hateful mass shooting, racism, and the Confederate flag was therefore undeniable.

Two days after the shooting, a bond hearing was held for Roof and several family members of the victims of the shooting were in attendance. The judge at the hearing offered representatives of each family the opportunity to directly address Roof and all of the people who spoke offered words of forgiveness and hope that hate would win over evil:

‘I forgive you,’ Nadine Collier, the daughter of 70-year-old Ethel Lance, said at the hearing, her voice breaking with emotion. ‘You took something very precious from me. I will never talk to her again. I will never, ever hold her again. But I forgive you. And have mercy on your soul.’\textsuperscript{120}

Though he was present at the hearing through a live video stream, Roof showed no reaction to words like these from the family members of his victims. The reactions that broke out across the country, however, were staggering. People were amazed at the ability of the families to honor the ones they lost and their devotion to their church by offering words of forgiveness to someone


\textsuperscript{119} O’Connor, “Dylann Roof’s Racist Manifesto.”

they recognized as a hateful killer. The words of the families set the tone for the serious nature of the reaction that needed to occur to try to begin to fix the racial hatred in the United States. Roof was charged with thirty-three federal counts, including nine murder charges and hate crime charges.

This terrible tragedy gained national attention that brought the focus of the entire nation to South Carolina. Important public figures joined the thousands of other people who used social media such as Twitter and Facebook to express their grief over the tragedy. On the day after the shooting, Governor Haley issued a tearful statement that asked people across the country to pray for the victims’ families and all the people of South Carolina. Her speech was broadcast on major national news channels like NBC, CBS, Fox News, and CNN. Through this statement and the publicity that it garnered, the Governor marked herself as an important public representative of South Carolina in the eyes of a nation concerned about the consequences of the Charleston shooting. From this point forward, Haley was propelled into the national scope and was, therefore, accountable to people from all across the country rather than just her constituents in her home state.

---


Once the connection was made between racism, the shooting, and the shooter’s support for the Confederate flag, it became clear that the flag that flew on the South Carolina State House grounds would again be brought to contention. People across the country took to social media and began insisting that the Confederate flag issue be addressed. The 2016 Presidential candidates were of particular interest because informed voters were curious to know how the candidates would react to the divisive issue of the flag. Important politicians including Mitt Romney and President Barack Obama directly called for the removal of the flag from the State House grounds. Terms such as “Charleston Shooting” and “Confederate Flag” were frequently used as hashtags and began trending on a variety of social media outlets, drawing the attention of even more Americans who were previously unaware of the shooting and the placement of the Confederate flag on the South Carolina State House grounds. According to a data and opinion analysis on mentions of this issue on Twitter, “About 77 percent of those mentioning the issue favored the flag’s removal, 20 percent expressed neutrality and 3 percent defended its place on the capitol grounds.” Within days, after no immediate political action had been taken, citizens of the United States began implementing political actions to try to have the flag removed: Karen Hunter made an “online petition that demanded the flag’s removal from the State House grounds.


It would be signed by more than 566,000 people.”\textsuperscript{127} The wide-range of anger toward the Confederate flag and the passionate calls for its removal set the stage for a crucial moment for Governor Haley.

With the spotlight on South Carolina, Governor Haley had to determine the best response to the shooting and the growing number of calls to remove the Confederate flag. She acknowledged the responses of the nation to the tragedy and the Confederate flag by continuously making statements like, “the country and the world have watched our resilience over the last few days,” and, “the outpouring of love and support from all corners of people across this state and the country has been amazing.”\textsuperscript{128} As time went on and Haley continued speaking in public about the shooting, her words shifted from the theme of unity in the wake of tragedy to a theme of unity as a means to incite necessary political change to remove the Confederate flag, a symbol that created division. Her call for unity among Americans and the South Carolina legislature indicates the fact that she was not the only force of change in this situation but that she had to rely on the power of the popular message. That message was that a terrible thing had happened and that all good people in the country needed to do what they could to have the flag removed.

The act of removing the flag was not left up to Haley alone. As a result of the Heritage Act of 2000, a two-thirds vote was required in the South Carolina legislature for the flag to be

\textsuperscript{127} Barbaro and Martin, “5 Days that Left a Confederate Flag Wavering, and Likely to Fall.”

removed. As a nationally recognized figure, Haley knew that the blame would fall on her if the flag stayed in its public position on the State House grounds, so she had to strongly urge the legislature to pass the necessary bill to furl the flag. The speeches that she gave called for the legislature to use their common feelings of grief to come together and remove a symbol that divided the people of the nation. In this case, Haley was structurally compelled to fulfill her role as a political figure in South Carolina, but she also exercised her agency in the matter by recognizing that her role in encouraging the removal of the flag was crucial. On June 22, 2015, Haley made an important speech where she called for the flag’s removal for the first time. The speech progressed in a persuasive manner by starting with a discussion of unity in the face of tragedy in order to excite the sympathies of Americans everywhere and within the South Carolina legislature:

We saw the action of forgiveness, we saw the families show the world what true forgiveness and grace looked like. That forgiveness and grace set off another action. An action of compassion, by people all across South Carolina and all across this country. They stopped looking at each other’s differences, they started looking at each other’s similarities, because we are all experiencing the same pain.

A statement of this type was effective in prompting Americans to feel sympathy for the losses that the families of the victims experienced and then to feel inspired by the fact that the governor
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130 “Transcript: Gov. Nikki Haley of South Carolina on Removing the Confederate Flag.”

felt moved by the ability of the nation to come together. Haley then continued using that theme of unity in her direct call for the furling of the flag: “Today, we are here in a moment of unity in our state without ill will, to say that it’s time to move the flag from the Capitol grounds. . . . By removing a symbol that divides us, we can move forward as a state in harmony.”

By emphasizing the concept of unity in the face of tragedy as a means of removing the Confederate flag, Haley strengthened her argument by making it harder for people to argue that the flag should stay.

The context of the emotionally charged reactions to the shooting and the connection of that shooting to the Confederate flag allowed Haley to call for the removal of the Confederate flag with less backlash from the flag’s supporters. Though there were people who openly disagreed with her position, the tragedy made it harder for them to present a legitimate case because it seemed irreverent to the lives that had been lost. People who turned to social media to present their positive views of the flag were immediately targeted: “They were labeled racists or compared to white supremacists and told, in colorful and unmistakable terms, that their views had no place in modern society.”

Haley prioritized the need to address the people whose ancestors had fought in the Civil War and their right to free speech in using the flag:

. . . the people in our state who respect, and in many ways, revere [the flag]. Those South Carolinians view the flag as a symbol of respect, integrity, and duty. They also see it as a memorial, a way to honor ancestors who came to the service of their state during time of conflict. That is not hate, nor is it racism.

---

132 “Transcript: Gov. Nikki Haley of South Carolina on Removing the Confederate Flag.”
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In this instance, Haley was trying to appeal to people in South Carolina and Southerners in general who felt attacked in the national conversation that condemned the location of the Confederate flag on the State House grounds. Her general proposal to remove the flag, however, proved that she could not cater to the desires of the localized minority of people who supported the placement of the flag; rather, she had a duty to appease the nation.

Some radical groups such as the Ku Klux Klan supported Roof’s actions in the shooting. Just days after the tragedy, people in several states across the United States found bags filled with candy and recruiting materials for the Klan. The sheet of paper included in the bag of candy prompted the person who found it to call the KKK hotline. Very soon after the shooting, the message on the hotline said, "We the Loyal White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan would like to say hail victory to Dylann S. Roof who decided to do what the Bible told him. They have spilled our blood too long. It’s time we spilled theirs. An eye for an eye."\(^{135}\) In instances such as this, the small minority of hate-filled flag supporters that was represented by the KKK stripped those who claimed an ancestral connection to the flag of any credibility.

Nikki Haley’s ancestry played a major role in her ability to remove the Confederate flag from the South Carolina State House grounds. Since she was the daughter of immigrants, she did not have the same ties to Confederate heritage that many other Southern politicians, and Southerners in general had. In comparison to the other two focuses of this study—John Amasa May and Dylann Roof—Haley’s roots in the South were not very deep. May was the Commander-in-Chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, an organization that describes itself as...

“champions of the Lost Cause,” from 1964 to 1966. Since Dylann Roof was not a well-known public figure prior to the shooting, there is very little information about his background from credible scholarly sources. There is a blog, however, that cites and includes a picture of historical documents from Ancestry.com proving that Roof was the descendant of a Confederate veteran and slave owner. Though Haley was a very visible national figure, she did not have that same level of accountability to Confederate sympathizers. This lack of ties to pro-Confederate activists was a major factor that made her the right person to call for the removal of the flag.

A comparison of the rhetoric used by May and Roof further proves their common Confederate roots. Through an analysis of the language in Roof’s manifesto, parallels emerge between the rhetoric that Roof used and quotes from public speeches made by John May and many of his segregationist peers [see Appendix Figure 7]. The exact phrases that Roof used were strikingly redolent of those of his white-supremacist predecessors. The connection between the language used in these two moments proves that this type of sensibility, which was so prominent during the Civil War and the Civil Rights Movement, had not disappeared from the South. The difference between these two moments, though, was how the feelings aroused by this language were implemented. While May raised the Confederate flag above the South Carolina State House to represent these beliefs, Roof took much more violent action by shooting and killing people in a church. Though Roof did not foresee this consequence, the same feelings that led to the raising of the flag in 1961 are the ones that motived the action that led to its removal. In calling for the
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removal of the flag, Nikki Haley was not only reacting to the fact that the shooting was in a historically black church, she also reacted to the motivations that prompted this horrible act and the blatant connection of those feelings to the Confederate flag. Though they are inherently connected through their association with the Confederate flag issue in South Carolina, there is no evidence that Roof knew who May was or that he was influenced by the speeches and writings of May. The similarities between the phrases used by these two men are indicative of the pro-Confederate cultural commonalities that are still visible in the South today and have transcended time and cultural change to remain relevant.

Another argument that Governor Haley made in order to justify the removal of the flag to its supporters was that the flag could not be flown on such public grounds as the State House, but individuals had the right to their own private use of it. She argued that the State House, as a public space for all South Carolinians to enjoy, was not an appropriate location for the display of a flag that made many citizens of the state deeply upset because people like Dylann Roof and John May supported it. 138 This argument about the public use of the flag on the State House had been used many times in calls for removal in the past. In earlier debates, many groups who supported the removal of the flag “reasoned that since the Confederate States of America was not a contemporary, ruling authority in the state, its flag should not be flown along with the flags of those entities that do have authority: the United States . . . and the State of South Carolina.” 139


139 Watts, 88.
One of the articles in the *State* pointed to the fact that people coming to mourn the death of Senator Clementa Pinckney at the State House would have to walk by the flag that Pinckney’s shooter used as a symbol of racism. Acting as a promoter of unity, Haley repeatedly mentioned the notion that symbols on the State House grounds were for all South Carolinians and should, therefore, reflect the beliefs of the whole population. As a solution, she felt that this flag would be better suited on display in the Confederate Relic Room, a museum to honor the memory of Confederate soldiers. In this context, the flag would have a more historical connotation.

With the encouragement and pressure from Haley and the national public, the South Carolina legislature finally passed a bill to remove the Confederate flag from the State House grounds that was signed by Governor Haley on July 9, 2015—just 22 days after the shooting in Charleston. When Haley called for the removal of the flag on June 22, she said that she had explained to the South Carolina legislature that she had the power to call them back into session “under extraordinary circumstances” and that she was prepared to exercise that power if the debate about the Confederate flag did not occur in the immediate future. With the force of this threat driving them, South Carolina legislators engaged in a heated debate about the Confederate flag. Due to the grief over the loss of South Carolina Senator Clementa Pinckney, the debate was extremely emotional. Toward the end of the thirteen-hour debate, Representative Jenny Horne
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gave a passionate, tearful speech arguing that although she was a descendant of Jefferson Davis, she thought the flag needed to come down. The impact of the Republican legislator’s speech changed the course of the conversation because she combined her anger with mourning the loss of Pinckney to drive her point home: “

‘I cannot believe that we do not have the heart in this body to do something meaningful such as take a symbol of hate off these grounds on Friday,’ Horne said, shouting through tears. ‘For the widow of Senator Pinckney and his two young daughters, that would be adding insult to injury.’

Though some of the lawmakers were upset with the decision, they were ultimately able to pass a bill. The House of Representatives passed the bill 94-20 after it had passed in the Senate earlier in the week and the bill stated that the flag had to be removed within twenty-four hours of that signing.

When Haley first called for the flag’s removal, the State newspaper noted the bipartisan support that she received. Haley also intentionally emphasized the unity behind the decision to furl the flag on multiple occasions: “The act of bringing down this flag was not a Republican or Democrat thing. It wasn’t a black or white thing. If you look at the debate, you wouldn’t have divided it along party lines or racial lines. People who wanted the flag down were all types of

———


people.”\textsuperscript{147} The fact is that the tragedy of the shooting finally gave the anti-Confederate flag argument enough force that the flag had to come down. In addition to the legislators who voted for the flag to be removed, coaches of South Carolina sports teams who wanted NCAA championships to be played there and members of the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce expressed their support for the flag’s removal.\textsuperscript{148} With these crucial elements in place, people all across the country who wanted the flag to be removed were represented in Governor Haley’s call to action that led to a momentous legislative feat: “For that moment the crowd, including men who as boys had played army in Confederate hats and women who had defended the emblem for years, seemed ready to give up the fight.”\textsuperscript{149} The combination of the factors that led to the call for removal with the support from several key players within the state of South Carolina and across the country set the climate for this difficult political action to occur.

On July 10, 2015, a large crowd of thousands gathered outside the South Carolina State House to watch the furling of the Confederate flag. Governor Nikki Haley watched from the steps of the State House with former governors of South Carolina, Jim Hodges and David Beasley, both of them had fought for the removal of the flag during their time in office.\textsuperscript{150} The crowd cheered and chanted “U.S.A.” as the State Highway Patrol honor guard slowly lowered

\textsuperscript{147} “Transcripts: Interview with South Carolina Governor Nikki Haley.”

\textsuperscript{148} Barbaro and Martin, “5 Days That Left the Confederate Flag Wavering and Likely to Fall.”

\textsuperscript{149} Barbaro and Martin, “5 Days That Left the Confederate Flag Wavering and Likely to Fall.”

and folded the flag.\textsuperscript{151} The flag was then given to Allen Roberson, the director of the Confederate Relic Room, where it will eventually go on display. The day after the Confederate flag was lowered, the NAACP issued a resolution to end the fifteen-year economic boycott of the state of South Carolina. The resolution stated that members of the NAACP were proud of the strength and duration of the boycott because it led to the eventual removal of the flag. They recognized this moment as a victory for the NAACP and African Americans in general, but they also highlighted the importance of this moment in the ongoing fight for equal rights:

> Whereas, while removal of the flag was clearly a victory for the NAACP and a defeat for promoters of hate, the NAACP clearly recognizes that there are still battles to be fought in other states and jurisdictions where emblems of hate and oppression continue to be celebrated; and

> Whereas, removal of the confederate flag is not going to solve most of the severe tangible challenges facing our nation, including discrimination in our criminal justice system, economic system, employment, education, housing, health care, or other barriers to full and equal protection under law and full first-class citizenship, but it does symbolize an end to the reverence of and adherence to values that support racially-based chattel slavery and the hatred which has divided our country for too long.\textsuperscript{152}

Ultimately, the act of furling the Confederate flag from the State House grounds was the culmination of a call for its removal from Americans across the country due to the circumstances of the shooting and the changing hearts of South Carolina politicians and flag supporters. Governor Haley’s actions were in reaction to these factors and, therefore, she cannot be considered the sole actor in this removal; rather, she was a puppet reacting to public opinion,


circumstance, and grief. She does, however, deserve credit for the role she played as a figurehead for South Carolina and for the political process leading to the removal of the Confederate flag.

Many people granted Haley the credit she deserved for her role in this debate—most notably President Obama in his eulogy at the funeral for Reverend Clementa Pinckney. In addressing the issue of the Confederate flag during this famous speech—in which he sang “Amazing Grace”—President Obama stated that Haley’s “eloquence on the subject is worthy of praise.”

A writer for the State, Cindy R. Scoppe, accurately described Haley’s role in the flag controversy in the summer of 2015 saying,

> The person who deserves the most credit is Gov. Nikki Haley. Were hearts changing even before she rounded up that incredible array of political leaders and held that incredible news conference to demand the flag’s removal? Certainly. Certainly in the public, and I suspect among elected officials. But she helped change even more hearts — helped people focus on the pain and the grace of the people of Emanuel, and the pain caused by the flag.

Governor Haley’s compassion, public grief, message of unity, and call for action—in conjunction with the shooting and the reactions of the victims’ families—set the tone for the necessary political and social changes that needed to occur in order to incite the removal of the Confederate flag from the South Carolina State House grounds in 2015.
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Conclusion

Through the contrasting political and social contexts in the time periods that were discussed in this thesis, it is possible to see what elements were necessary for anti-Confederate flag arguments to defeat those who supported the flag as well as the negligence of people who were indifferent. When John Amasa May raised the Confederate battle flag above the South Carolina State House in 1961, the national media did not even recognize him as an important political figure in the South Carolina centennial events. Governor Nikki Haley, on the other hand, was catapulted into the national spotlight and the American people analyzed her actions because her visibility in the wake of the Charleston Shooting made her accountable to the whole nation. The difference in accountability to the American people that May and Haley experienced is one of the main reasons that their agency in the Confederate flag debate was so different. While May was able to raise the Confederate flag because no one who would disagree with him took notice or had the power to change his actions, Haley became a pawn in the debate and had no choice but to furl the flag in order to avoid intense scrutiny from people across the country.

The criticism that Haley would have faced if she had not taken the necessary actions to lower the flag would have centered on the racism involved in the Confederate flag controversy that was tragically highlighted by the racially motivated shooting. Once Dylann Roof’s racist manifesto surfaced in the national media along with photos of him posing with the Confederate flag, Haley had no choice but to call for the flag’s removal or else she would have been politically and morally tainted, regardless of whether or not she supported the symbolism of the flag. May spoke out against the Civil Rights Movement, denied the association between slavery and the Civil War, and supported notoriously racist Southern politicians, yet his lack of
accountability to the nation and the political climate of his time made it possible for him to do something that was racist in light of his opinions without any backlash.

The contrast between what was happening in the two periods is very interesting because while it would seem obvious that the national media and the American public would have made a connection between the racist connotations of the flag and the ongoing Civil Rights Movement and there would have been a national uproar, no such connection was made. In retrospect, the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s is the time period when historians believe the Confederate flag became most obviously tied to racism, but the focus of that time was not on the symbolism of the flag. There were obviously trigger events occurring at the time such as the fact that the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Committee boycotted the Charleston convention, but the Confederate flag was never directly tied to these types of events and the association between racism in the Civil Rights Movement and the Confederate flag was more widely recognized later.

There were still intense racial problems in America in 2015 such as the Black Lives Matter Movement and the trend of police shootings of young black men. Also, however, examples of immense progress and exponential improvement in political participation were much more common in 2015, most notably with the election of Barack Obama as president. Even in this climate though, the direct tie—strong enough to really challenge the placement of the flag—between racial violence and protest did not occur until the shooting. Although the political climate in 2015 was very different from 1961 and the accessibility to national media had vastly improved, this trigger event was still required to prompt the removal of the Confederate flag despite the social movements for black progress of the time.
The relationship between May, the raising of the flag, and the African American community in South Carolina in the 1950s and 1960s is an area that would be interesting to pursue in further research. While the lack of input the black community had in political processes at the time was discussed in this thesis, it would be fascinating to take a closer look at the few reactions that African Americans, especially the NAACP, did publically express against the Confederate flag and May’s actions. The concurrence of the Civil Rights Movement and the raising of the Confederate flag in South Carolina is a crucial element of this story that deserves further inquiry. The black community’s role in the furling of the flag in 2015 would also be interesting to explore. This thesis looked very generally at Americans’ reactions to the association of the Confederate flag and the shooting, but a closer analysis of the reactions of different demographics would enhance the analysis of this intersection of events. The backgrounds of both May and Haley are also worthy of more research in light of this argument. The connection between them is difficult to make except for the fact that they were the two most prominent actors in the raising and lowering of the flag. Otherwise, they were two very different people, so it would be interesting to examine their developments and their values in order to examine their motivations in raising and lowering the flag. In particular, it is notable that Haley was once vocal about keeping the Confederate flag on the State House grounds and that she then changed her mind and this deserves further study.

The Confederate flag itself, as an inherently American symbol, will continue to be an area for further study for as long as there are Americans who support its use as a cultural or political symbol. Since the Confederates—the losers of the Civil War—were welcomed back into the United States along with all of their beliefs and symbols, the Confederacy myth has been
perpetuated over time and periodically reveals itself in dark, violent ways. Though many
Southerners value the memory of the Confederacy as an honorable fight for the values of their
ancestors, the hard truth is that those values held by the Confederate soldiers actually devalued
the lives of other Americans. The rhetoric that demonstrates pro-Confederate sentiments is still
remarkably prominent today, in a time characterized by relative racial progress: “[The flag] so
often serves as the symbol of the darker side of the American oppositional tradition, a reminder
of how close to the surface are beliefs and attitudes that most Americans think are relics of the
past.”

John Coski wrote these words in the early 2000s, well before these dark attitudes
manifested themselves again in the words and actions of Dylann Roof, proving that the symbolic
significance of this flag has transcended the constraints of time.

As an American symbol, the Confederate flag is an emblem of a national collective
identity for all Americans—black or white, Southern or Northern, young or old. Though it
represents different things to people within that collective identity, the stark contrasts between
those opinions do not present themselves in the national consciousness until this type of
occurrence forces the implications of the former uses of the flag into a spotlight. Within the
United States, this acute attention on the symbolism of the flag causes divisions that had been
ignored until the trigger event. As Americans, we interpret symbols differently and allow their
meanings to change over time until they are resurrected and forced into the national
conversation. Within our own collective identity there is a multitude of experiences that inform
opinions about a particular symbol. When we use a symbol, particularly in a public or political
space, we do not take all experiences of that symbol into account; rather, we determine that our

155 Coski, 301.
own individual stances on a symbol, or issue related to a symbol, are right and all others are wrong. This patterned reaction to symbolism is as much a part of the American collective identity as the symbols themselves. To the rest of the world, however, the Confederate flag is a symbol that is associated with all Americans, often with no regard for who supports or opposes its use. Why, then, in violent flashpoints like the Charleston shooting are many Americans incapable of seeing that as long as it is possible for a symbol to have hateful, negative connotations, that is what will be projected to the rest of the world?

The massive effect that a trigger event can have on the American political scene is certainly important when considering the evolution of the Confederate flag issue in America, and it can also be seen in other crucial political and social issues and events. There are many problems that plague American society, but the nature of our population and political system is that these issues are rarely addressed in an impactful way until a tragic event forces them into the public eye. For example, many Americans know that police brutality is a serious issue and work on a daily basis to try to fix this broken system, but it takes the multiple killings of young black men, caught on citizens’ hand-held cell phone cameras, or on video cameras operated by the police themselves (on clothing or squad cars), to make it almost impossible to deny the reality and the social impact and importance of such regular shootings. In a sense, they are 21st-century parallels to the filming and televised national broadcasting during the 1960s of police attacks on peaceful civil rights protesters in places like Selma, Alabama. Another example is that Americans knew that there was a refugee crisis happening in the world, but strong opinions
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against accepting refugees did not emerge in full force until it was discovered that one of the attackers in the Paris bombings in November 2015 had come from Syria to France. There is no simple answer to why this is the way our system works or whether there is anything we can do to change it, but the killing of nine African Americans at Emanuel AME Church in June 2015 can be examined as an example of a time when addressing a political issue, such as the Confederate flag’s placement, before a situation turns violent has the potential to make a difference, rather than waiting until it is too late.

Not only does the examination of the Confederate flag illustrate a circular pattern of violent action, but it also demonstrates that political ideologies that have been a part of the American identity from the origins of the country have a tendency to repeat themselves. In the case of the Confederate flag, the most obvious recurring political theme is the defiance of individuals, particular organizations, or states against the federal government. In the political elections of 2016, disillusionment with the federal government is a very prominent theme, as many of the candidates seem to be disassociating themselves from the “establishment.”

Candidates like Donald Trump appeal to “the angriest and most pessimistic people in America [who] are the people . . . who wonder how white male became an accusation rather than a description.” At the same time, Confederate symbols and memorials—especially the Confederate flag—are experiencing resurgence in popularity after the anti-Confederate flag movement of summer 2015. According to an article from the New York Times by Alan Blinder, “The momentum to force Confederate symbols from official display has often been slowed or
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stopped.” Is it a coincidence that Confederate flags are seeing more support within this anti-establishment political climate? What does this reemergence of the flag in the wake of the Charleston shooting say about the reactivity of American media and political culture? Despite the tragedy of the slaying of nine African American people in the name of an ideology represented by the Confederate flag, Confederate enthusiasts and people who are politically anti-big government are promoting the flag as the symbol that represents them. Due to this type of support, the Confederate flag debate will probably continue for as long as it exists as an American cultural symbol; so, what will be the next tragedy that brings it into the limelight and causes Americans to question its uses and its symbolism?

---
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Figure 1:
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The Bonnie Blue flag

Figure 2:

The Stars and Bars

Figure 3:
Ulysses S. Grant III Receives Confederate Flag at Start of Centennial
State (Columbia, SC), Section B, April 12, 1961, accessed November 13, 2015, Newsbank.
**Figure 5:** John A. May, “Address by Rep. John A. May,” speech, United Daughters of the Confederacy Annual Convention, Charleston, SC, October 12, 1961. Photos taken by author at South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, on November 12, 2015.
ADDRESS BY REP. JOHN A MAY
Delivered before the South Carolina Division,
of the United Daughters of The Confederacy
ANNUAL CONVENTION
Charleston, South Carolina
October 12, 1961

Madam President, Distinguished Guests, and Members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy:

I shall not name the title of this address until after I have concluded.
Should I divulge it now, I might be thrown out of this place before you would let me begin.

There are two women in this story—neither are now, or ever have been, members of the United Daughters of The Confederacy. My words about them, as you will see, are not too complimentary.

One was born in Litchfield, Connecticut, June 14, 1811. She was the daughter of, the sister of, and the wife of Ministers of the Gospel. With all of this religious background and environment, it seems strange that this woman would be so careless with the truth—or, to be kind to her—maybe I should say careless about seeking the truth. Her name was HARRIET BEECHER STOWE, and she wrote the most prejudicial book of abolitionist propaganda that had been published up to that time—"Uncle Tom's Cabin." As for sheer propaganda and half truths, only two books have since equaled it in this respect; Hitler's "Mien Kampf" and Marx's "Das Kapital."

The other woman to whom I shall pay my respects tonight, is Julia Ward Howe. She was born May 27, 1819. After her marriage, she moved to Boston and engaged in newspaper work with her husband. She was an ardent anti-slavery leader. Her best known contribution—written for the purpose of stirring up trouble, was the "BATTLE HYMN OF THE REPUBLIC"—it was written to the tune of "John Brown's Body." John Brown, as you know, was the Patron Saint of the North's "Do-gooders."
He was their hero because he advocated bloodshed and violence, just as Mr. Khrushchev and the Soviet leaders do today. He urged the slaves to kill their masters but was killed himself. He then became a so-called martyr. He attempted to steal United States Government weapons with which he planned to arm the slaves so that they could murder the white people of the South. This man, whom Henry Ward Beecher (Harriet's brother) and Wendell Phillips, two leading (I started to say great) preachers endorsed and praised his plan -- this man of violence whom they so dearly loved and idolized was a most unusual creature. He advocated HATE, VIOLENCE, MURDER and DEATH. Read Marx, Engel, Lenin and Stalin and see if you can distinguish them. For want of a better description, he was a Hitler, Mussolini, Togo, Khrushchev and John Dillinger rolled into one.


"My eyes have seen the Glory of The Coming of the Lord"

He is trampling Out The Vintage Where The Grapes of Wrath are stored."

Listen to that -- - - "Trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored." What does she mean? What Vintage? What grapes of Wrath? Where are they stored?

I presume that she means by Grapes of Wrath -- Hate -- Well, who was supposed to hate who? All the South asked was to let us go in peace as the Constitution said we had right to do . . . And our Representatives were sent to Washington for the peaceful separation of the States -- - - Was that hate, or was that seeking a peaceful solution?

I have often wondered what Julia had in her mind when she wrote that line -- Where the Grapes of Hate are stored -- Certainly it was not the Mistress of the Southern Plantation who ministered day and night, hot or cold, to the sick slaves, nor was it the Master who saw that they were well fed, well clothed and well cared for.
Is it possible that this idea of hate came to her from her idol, John Brown, who certainly had lots of Grapes of Wrath stored up in him.

Let's go on - - - -

"He hath loosed the Faithful lightning of his Terrible Swift Sword"

Now Julia is presuming a lot - - -

Loosening the Faithful lightning of His Terrible Swift Sword. So contrary to the Truth, the Bible, and history.

We of the South have always been taught that God is a God of Love - - Why would he draw his sword?

And if so, Whom would he draw it against? Yes against evil - - you say, but Julia, was it not "your" ancestors, not ours, who chased the poor negro down in the jungles of Africa and sold him at a nice profit to us after you found it unprofitable to your interests? I wonder what would have happened to him had the negro turned out to be an expert tender of Maple Sugar Trees or a skillful Cape Cod Fisherman.

And then with all of her saintliness, she proudly proclaims "His Truth is Marching On."

Now, that is what I like about the whole song, and that is the line that I am going to agree with Julia. Thank God because of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Confederate Centennial Commissions from all over the South, the Truth is now being told. So let's look at the truth;

We have already settled who started this slavery business in the first place.

Now let's discuss who started this secession business. The record, I believe, is the best place for the truth.

Calhoun, Hayne, Jeff Davis, Robert E. Lee, and almost every Southerner from 1850 to the present time have been cussed and blamed for secession. We have
been called Rebels, traitors and practically everything else. Now let’s see where we got the idea.

I am going to quote the following:

"Government is instituted for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness of the people. Therefore, the people alone have an incontestable, inalienable, and indefeasible right to institute government, and to reform, alter, or totally change the same when their protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness require it" and "that the people of this commonwealth have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves as a free, sovereign, and independent state, and do, and forever hereafter shall, exercise and enjoy every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not, or may hereafter be, by them expressly delegated to the United States of America in Congress Assembled."

Was that Calhoun?

Was that South Carolina’s Secession Convention?

No — No — it was not —

Those words, I have just read to you were from the original convention of 1780 of the convention of the State of — — Massachusetts.

In 1793 when war with the European Powers seemed eminent — — Timothy Dwight voiced the sentiments of New England when he said:

"A war with Great Britain, we, at least in New England, will not enter into. Sooner would ninety-nine out of one hundred of our inhabitants separate from the Union than plunge themselves into an abyss of misery."

Then again when the question of the Louisiana Purchase came up, what did the Honorable George Cabot, Senator of Massachusetts, have to say?

He threatened to exercise "Our Unquestioned Right," as he put it, of Secession.
It was Timothy Pickering, Revolutionary War Officer, Washington's Secretary of State, United States Senator from Massachusetts, who said in a letter on December 24, 1803: "I will rather anticipate a New Confederacy exempt from the corrupt and corrupting influence and oppression of the Aristocratic Democrats of the South. There will be," he said, "a separation."

Then he went further and said on January 29, 1804, "I do not believe the practicability of a long continued Union. A Northern Confederacy would unite congenial characters and preserve a fairer prospect of public happiness while the Southern states might be left to manage their own affairs in their own way." - Don't we wish that that man had won his way - - wouldn't it be wonderful if - "the Southern States had been left to manage their own affairs - in their own way" if so - today the United States would have at least one section that would never bow to tyranny whether it be from Russia or anybody else.

Listen to the debate in Congress in 1811 over the admission of Louisiana. The orator said this:

"If this bill passes, it is my deliberate judgment that it is virtually a dissolution of this Union - that it will free the States from their moral obligations and, as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some to definitely prepare for a separation - - - friendly if they can, violently if they must."

These are strong words - - - these are words of secession.

Who was the Orator of this fiery blast:

- John C. Calhoun - - - - NO
- Jefferson Davis - - - - NO
- Bob Toombs - - - - - NO
- Robert Barnwell Rhett - NO

I know it will surprise you. It was the Honorable Josiah Quincy, United States Senator
from Massachusetts. I repeat, Friendly if they can - Violently if they Must.

The first Secession Convention, I am sorry to tell you was not the one Mrs. Faunt and I wrote about in "South Carolina Secedes," the one, as you know that was held in Columbia, South Carolina on December 17, 1860.

The first Secession Convention was in Hartford, Connecticut. The New England States had practically nullified every law passed by Congress during the War of 1812. They definitely refused to send troops to defend this Country from the British attacks.

Their Hartford Convention was attended by duly elected delegates officially chosen by the Legislatures of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut and other New England States. They met December 14, 1814 - - 56 years and two days - before we met in Columbia, South Carolina. They deliberated within closed doors and their proceedings were never published; however it was generally known that its object was to take the New England States out of the Union. If this was not true - then why have these proceedings never been published.

John Quincy Adams was so ashamed of his New England Brethren that he called this "A Treasonable Convention" because as he put it - "It gave aid and comfort to the enemy in a time of war." I do not think I have to point out that when South Carolina and other Southern states seceded this nation was not at war with a foreign power -

THE TRUTH IS MARCHING ON, JULIA.

They called us slavers and preached about cruelty of the Southern Slave Holders --- Yes they yelled to High Heaven of our cruelty to slaves which, with very few exceptions, was definitely not true. But Harriet did not write a book telling us of the awful sordid treatment of how the poor Whites of the North were treated. I wish we could compare the Northern Whites slaving in the Northern Industrial plants with the negro slaves on the southern plantations. The negro slaves were, as I have
said, nursed by the Mistress of the Plantation when they became sick. I wish Harriet had told us — — — WHO — — — if anybody, did anything for the poor whites shackled in the mills of northern industries who labored there from sunrise to sundown in their dirty, grimy, ill-kept factories.

I wish they had told us something about the average northern people and how they lived in their so-called perfect New England. The people of the South took care of their negroes. The feeling was one of mutual respect of one race for another.

Here is how I felt about Aunt Maria, who was my ole Negro Mammy:

She was an institution
That made the South so grand,
A Heavenly contribution
That bore the heavenly brand
That is no substitution
No other could withstand,
The work, the care, the evolution
In the making of a man;
Her care was intuition
Her heart upon its goal,
Never swerving from her mission
Be it hot or be it cold,
Yielding all in full fruition,
For the comfort of her soul.

NO grapes of Wrath there, Julia. And Harriet, if you had taken the time to check the facts you would have found lots of Aunt Marias in the south and a lot more white people who loved them for what they were, not because they could be used for political purposes as they have been for lo these many years.

HARRIET, while you were writing "Uncle Tom's Cabin" concerning things that you knew nothing about - Why didn’t you tell us something about your own folks?
Yet, Julia writes a song to the tune of

John Brown's Body lying a molding in the Grave

But his truth is marching on -

Yes, John Brown's type of truth, I am sorry to say, is Marching on. It is marching on in Russia, Red China, Cuba and far too many other places today where the truth has been suppressed.

When we criticize the decisions of the Supreme Court, we are rebuked and told that we should obey the law of the land whether we like it or not. Let us remind our friends that unpopular decisions of the Supreme Court have met with criticism in the North as well as in the South.

In 1850 when the Court held under the DRED SCOTT decision that slaves were property and had not the right to sue in court, the Supreme Court came in for considerable criticism because the decision was contrary to what the Abolitionists wanted.

And when Congress passed the Fugitive Slave Law which ordered United States Marshalls to help owners of runaway slaves recover them, our law-abiding friends organized what was known as the underground railroad, whose purpose it was to thwart the law by helping runaway slaves to hide and escape to Canada. The underground railroad was a violation of the law, pure and simple. It was the same thing in the 1850s and 1860s as we in the 1960s now know as The Freedom Riders.

No concern for the law, no matter about anything as long as the South is the whipping boy and they can stir up trouble.

Now before I leave Julia and Harriet, I want to point out one more thing. These girls wrote many books, stories, poems and editorials. They made a great deal of speeches, talked and wrote about almost everything under the sun.

Julia wrote as many as 18 books besides editorials and short articles. Harriet wrote as best I can find out, about 48 books plus a lot of other stuff and in all
this writing, speaking and exhorting - - - Not one, no - not one time, did either of
them take the time to sweep under their own doorsteps.

Let's go on -

"Let us die to make men free

While God is Marching On"

Yes, let us die to make men free and don't you forget, Julia, that we of the South have
done just that. Let me tell you this very plainly and very simply. The north has no
monopoly on patriotism; neither has the South, east or west. Heroes from every state
in this Union died to make men free. Our brave men and women of the South had a
great part, if not the greatest, in dying to make men free in the American Revolution.

And let me point out in 1814 while New England was preparing to secede that
the only thing that stopped you was a South Carolinian named Andy Jackson, who at
New Orleans, won a war that was already lost and thereby saved this country from
further foreign aggression. His men died to make men free.

And don't forget that it was the Southern Patriots that died to make men free
at the Alamo.

And don't forget that it was Pierce Butler and the South Carolina Palmetto
regiment who first stormed the gates of Mexico City. They died to make men free, and
Don't forget that in the war itself thousands of Southern boys died to make
men free.

FREEDOM OF OUR OWN FIRESIDES
FREEDOM OF SELF GOVERNMENT
FREEDOM THE CONSTITUTION GAVE US

And don't forget when it was all over - - -

When might became the master of right and the north gave us - not the
Marshall Plan - but the Thaddeus Stevens plan. We still under Hampton in 1876 fought
to keep men free.

And please don’t forget that in 1898, the first time this Nation was challenged in almost a hundred years, our Southern boys went to Cuba and Manila and fought beside the Northern boys to make men free.

I need not recall World War I and World War II and Korea – – – where we Southerners were there fighting to make men free – all over the world – not just Whites and Blacks, but all colors and all races.

So I started out to give you the title. It was “THE BATTLE HYMN OF THE REPUBLIC” but now I hope it will become THE BATTLE HYMN OF TRUTH.

May I sum up with my Creed of a South Carolinian.
Figure 6:

**Figure 7:** Comparison of May and Roof Rhetoric (Chart created by author; sources listed within chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John May et al</th>
<th>Dylann Roof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The Mistress of the Southern Plantation who ministered day and night, hot or cold, to the sick slaves...[or] the Master who saw that they were well fed, well clothed, and well cared for.”</td>
<td>“I have read hundreds of slaves narratives from my state. And almost all of them were positive.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The people of the South took care of their negroes. The feeling was one of mutual respect of one race for another.”</td>
<td>“I wish with a passion that niggers were treated terribly throughout history by Whites, that every White person had an ancestor who owned slaves, that segregation was an evil and oppressive institution...but it is all based in historical lies, exaggerations, and myths.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibid, 7.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Barnett: “Whites and blacks, he said, can never be equal, for no laws can make the two races equal.”</td>
<td>“Even today, blacks are subconsciously viewed by White people [as] lower beings. They are held to a lower standard in general.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>