

ECONOMIC OPPRESSION AND POOR WHITE WORKER  
SOUTHERN IDENTITY DURING THE NEW SOUTH ERA:  
A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF HENRY GRADY'S  
SELECTED SPEECHES FROM  
1886-1889

by

VERNON RAY HARRISON

JASON EDWARD BLACK, COMMITTEE CHAIR  
BETH S. BENNETT  
MEREDITH BAGLEY  
KIMBERLY BISSELL  
JOLENE HUBBS

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy in the College of Communication and  
Information Sciences in the Graduate School of  
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2012

Copyright Vernon Ray Harrison 2012  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

This study situates the constituted rhetorical identity of poor Southern white workers during the New South era. Specifically, this project argues that journalist and politician Henry Grady helped create a mythic image of the poor white Southern worker as both industrious and a victimized hero of the unregulated economic system of American capitalism, while simultaneously constituting a mythic villain of Northern economic and industrial systems.

Theoretically, this study employs mythic criticism to deconstruct three selected speeches given by Henry Grady, from 1886-1889: the “New South” speech, his “Against Centralization” speech, and his “Farmers and the Cities” speech. The outcome of this critical analysis complicates widely held conceptions of whiteness theory in public address and rhetorical studies. This study challenges whiteness constructs in public address and rhetorical studies based on realities of class and wealth distinctions within the American economic system. Specifically, this study engages Material Marxist Dialectic to show that there was a palpable class struggle among, and exploitation of, the poor white class in the South during the Gilded Age.

This study argues that the poor white Southern worker faced difficulties in achieving the American Dream myth. Therefore, Grady offered a counter mythic construction of a hardworking and victimized poor white Southern worker to balance the American Dream myth sold by the economic elite of America. Following from Gilded Age contexts and the mythic structures that Grady promoted, this study posits that class must be taken into account when studying whiteness and that whiteness is not an immutable category of privilege based solely on race.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am pleased to have this opportunity to thank the many colleagues, friends, and faculty members who have helped me with this research project. I am most indebted to Jason Edward Black, the chair of my dissertation, for sharing his knowledge, wisdom, and research expertise regarding rhetorical studies. I would also like to thank all of my committee members: Beth S. Bennett, Kimberly Bissell, Meredith Bagley, and Jolene Hubbs. Without your expertise and guidance, this would have been a fruitless project and I have learned so much from all of you through your input in this dissertation.

This research would not have been possible without the support of my friends and fellow graduate students. We have spent many long nights working together on our projects and encouraging each other not to give up when one of us hit the wall. Thank you for getting me over the wall. Finally, I would like to thank my family. I cannot overstate how important your support and advice has been throughout this process.

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
a. Justification.....	4
b. Rationale for Study.....	8
c. Plan of Study.....	9
CHAPTER TWO: WHITENESS AND COMMUNICATION/RHETORICAL STUDIES, MARXISM, AND MYTHIC METHODOLOGIES.....	12
a. Whiteness.....	12
b. Material Marxism.....	26
c. Mythic Criticism.....	33
CHAPTER THREE: HENRY GRADY AND THE NEW SOUTH AS A CONTEXT.....	39
a. Henry Grady.....	39
b. The New South and Its Economic Issues.....	42
CHAPTER FOUR: THE NEW SOUTH SPEECH AND THE MYTHIC IMAGE OF THE HARD WORKING POOR WHITE SOUTHERNER.....	52
a. Context.....	53
b. The “New South” Speech.....	58
c. Mythic Struggle and the Poor White Southern Worker.....	65
d. Conclusion.....	79

CHAPTER FIVE: AGAINST CENTRALIZATION AND FARMERS AND THE CITIES SPEECHES.....	81
a. Context.....	84
b. The Rise of Populism and the Changing Economic Ideology in Henry Grady’s Speeches.....	86
c. The Southern Worker/Farmer as Victim and the Northern Industrial Villain: “The Against Centralization” speech.....	88
d. The Southern Worker/Farmer as Victim and the Northern Industrial Villain: “Farmers and the Cities” Speech.....	98
e. Conclusion.....	109
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSION.....	112
a. Future Research.....	115
b. Iron Cog Metaphor.....	116
c. Whiteness in Terms of Class and Historical Whiteness.....	119
d. Role of Myth in Social Movements and Its Current Application.....	121
e. Material Dialectical Marxism and Social Movements.....	122
f. Henry Grady.....	122
g. Conclusion.....	123
NOTES.....	125
REFERENCES.....	144
APPENDIX.....	150
a. The “New South” Speech – An Oration Delivered to the New England Society 1886.....	150
b. “Against Centralization” Speech- Delivered as a Commencement Address to the University of Virginia 1889 .....	156
c. “Farmers and the Cities” Speech- Delivered to Supporters of the Farmers Alliance in Elberton, Georgia 1889.....	164

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

Public culture in the United States is comprised of mythically and rhetorically constructed storylines. These master narratives are infused with ideological underpinnings that privilege those who consent to the storylines. Of course, those individuals and groups who do not fit the mold of a prototypal “American” – productive, republican, landed, upwardly mobile, and raced in particular ways – suffer alienation. One such group left out of the conception of what we may deem American capitalist success, especially as inscribed in and through the American Dream, are poor white Southern workers. Not only is this group occluded by class, but it is marginalized in ways that make the individuals comprising it less-than white. This is so because poor white Southern workers do not always reflect and, thus, add back to the invisible power of, whiteness. Rhetorical scholar Raymie McKerrow argues that there is an invisible space that should be accounted for in the study of critical rhetoric.<sup>1</sup> In this study the invisible space is that which is occupied by poor white Southern workers. The discussion of why poor whites of the South – historically and contemporarily – have been marginalized as a group comes later.<sup>2</sup> But first, it is important to understand why poor whites as a whole have been left out of American capitalist discussions. Communication scholar Philip Wander calls the group that is left out of public renderings of U.S. citizenship the “Third Persona.”<sup>3</sup> Wander points out that the first persona is the “I” – the ego of a rhetor placed in a position of power that allows for the addressing of an audience. The second persona is the “you” – the ideal audience – that the rhetor has in mind for achieving her/his goal in a rhetorical moment. On the other hand, the third

persona is the one that is left out of the conversation. It is the attempt of this study to bring into focus a group that has traditionally been left out of major academic discussions in public address and rhetorical studies. That group of people consists of poor white Southern workers.

If there were a group of people who historians, sociologists, anthropologists, and humanities scholars in general have traditionally looked past, it is poor white people.<sup>4</sup> It took until the late twentieth century before poor whites were studied by more than just a niche scholar in a particular field. Historian Wayne Flynt argues “Despite the glossy veneer of political correctness, which has been painted over the rust and corrosion of centuries of racism and classism, the enduring American necessity for a social ‘other’ has chosen working class whites as the focal scapegoat of our time.”<sup>5</sup> This study focuses specifically on poor white Southern workers whites to add to the limited amount of scholarship on the topic within the fields of public address and rhetorical studies in particular.

The turn towards this group of people as a worthy culture to study has only happened in the past few decades. Flynt notes that only “recently have historians begun to appreciate the complex dance of victimization and agency that characterized the lives of poor whites.”<sup>6</sup> There is much more research to be done regarding the working poor white Southern worker. The research that has been published on this particular group of people has involved working class and poor whites within the twentieth century and early twenty first century, yet nothing during the Gilded Age era after Reconstruction.<sup>7</sup>

Economically speaking, poor whites had very little, if any, capital power. They comprised impoverished communities that lived a marginal existence.<sup>8</sup> It was not only economic powerlessness that they faced. Flynt notes, “without exception these people were economically powerless. The statistical definition of poverty changed with time, but they always lived on the

margin, with a bare minimum of land, calories, education, medical care, worldly goods, and security.”<sup>9</sup> In other words, these people had no way of advancing up the social ladder because they lacked nutrition, education, and sanctuary. These are commodities necessary for a group to enjoy economic mobility. Poor whites did not have these opportunities until the fruits of the Progressive Era were realized.<sup>10</sup> Years of struggle and poverty played an important role in defining the South in the face of a nation that is/was renowned for its affluence.<sup>11</sup> This materiality of capital had an impact on the identity of the poor white Southern worker built from within the South as a culture. Yet, through this struggle, there were leaders who tried to account for and fix the identity of the South and its people.

After U.S. Reconstruction in the late nineteenth century, Southern leaders of the time tried to constitute a new identity for what was once the Confederate States of America (CSA), a rebel nation that was proud, but had suffered a crippling defeat and was in search of a new constitutive meaning. Much of this meaning involved redefining as a community what rhetorician Michael Calvin McGee calls the “people.”<sup>12</sup> The biggest problem facing the leaders of the day was how to resurrect a new, more industrialized and modern economy for the South.<sup>13</sup>

After the CSA lost the Civil War, the era of Reconstruction ushered in a painful time for many Southerners. Historian James C. Cobb posits that the post-Reconstruction era generated the perfect storm to allow leaders of the South to try to reconceptualize the region as the “New South.”<sup>14</sup> The “New South” was based upon the idea of “Northernizing” the South’s economy through industrial development while “doing their best to restore and then uphold the most definitively “Southern” ideals of the Old South, especially its racial, political, and class hierarchies.”<sup>15</sup>

Southern editors, politicians, and orators took it upon themselves to be the leaders of this economic solution to the South's many economic problems and social difficulties. One man became the most outwardly visible and internally vibrant leader of this movement: the editor of the *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, Henry Grady. Grady's rise to prominence was implemented through his acceptance by Northern elites who had a stake in Southern development and were looking for a representative with whom to negotiate.<sup>16</sup> In a sense, Grady became the "unofficial" spokesperson for the South during his speech to the New England Society on December 21, 1886.<sup>17</sup> In this speech, Grady played the role of assurer to the North when most Northern investors were hesitant to invest in the South. The hesitation stemmed from the rampant violence left from Reconstruction and the poverty it caused the people of the South.<sup>18</sup> Grady had to follow a balancing act between creating a myth of the Southern worker as industrialized and hardworking, yet he also had to deal with the Northern skullduggery, economic pillaging, and general dehumanizing of the Southern worker. With the popularity of the speech and the fact that he was the first Southerner to speak at the New England Society, Grady became an ambassador and leader for the South.

### *Justification*

This project is justified on the grounds that it seeks to fill a gap in whiteness theory within the field of public address and rhetorical studies. There is a lack of scholarship that takes into account economic and regional constructs of whiteness within the fields of public address and rhetorical studies. Communication scholars such as Thomas Nakayama, Judith Martin, Philip Wander, Ronald Jackson, Robert Krizek, Lisa Bradford, Debian Marty, Raka Shome, K.E. Supriya, Dreama Moon, Jolanta Drzewiecka, Kathleen Wond, Kevin DeLuca, Priya Kapoor, Melissa Steyn, and Wen Shu Lee have all addressed whiteness but failed to take into account the

issue of class and the role it plays in white identity.<sup>19</sup> There are different ways to address this issue, with one theoretical concept being Materialist Marxist Dialectic.

The project adds to the understanding and role of material Marxism within the field of rhetorical criticism in public address and rhetorical studies. The time period and labor movement that are involved have not been addressed by Material Marxist scholars in the fields of public address and rhetorical studies. It adds to the theoretical discussion of how Material Marxism can be used in rhetorical theory and some of the different ways it can address identity and ideological formations of cultures. This study also attends to an often looked over culture in rhetorical studies: the white Southerner. There is much work in other fields, such as history, American studies, sociology, and anthropology but not much on the American white Southerner as an underclass cultural group in public address and rhetorical studies, in particular. Finally, this study will attend to a period of historical and rhetorical significance that has not been addressed by many scholars. This context, the Gilded Age, was the time when the United States was becoming a modern country and the rhetorical situations and exigencies that people faced during that time are also pertinent in today's society, especially when it comes to concepts of wealth and capital.

To work through the Reconstruction and Gilded Age contexts in the service of discovering and unpacking the way the New South function in terms of identities and meanings for the South, I will perform a rhetorical analysis of Grady's major works. In terms of artifacts used for this proposed study, I access the speeches of Grady, between the specific years of 1886-1889. I have chosen these texts because he was one of, if not the most, influential Southern man in the American South during this time. As the editor of the largest newspaper in the South (*Atlanta Journal Constitution*), and was seen as a glowing and respected spokesperson to the

North during this time. His orations were so influential he was able to term a whole time period (The New South; he used this expression and historians have applied the term backwards to him). Moreover, he was lauded as a possible vice-presidential candidate by Northern newspapers. His influence within Atlanta, the South, and the country in general cannot be understated. It is important to note here that Grady was a veritable “capitalist in socialist clothes.” This means that although Grady’s speeches had a strong socialistic overtone, he was a staunch capitalist and was part of the wealthy elite of the South. Grady was the premier voice of this time; therefore I believe that his work is worthy of study within the fields of public address and rhetorical studies.

Specifically, this study will craft a macro argument about how poor white Southern workers in the New South were mythically constituted through the speeches of Grady during this era; again, the focus will be 1886-1889, which was the height of Grady’s popularity. The myths discussed in this study are American based myths. From the outset, I argue that that Grady created a new identity for poor white southern workers based around economic ideals and ideologies of protestant work ethics. He configured a mythic worker who was hard working and able to take part in the American Dream, yet was victimized by the societal structure that had been placed upon the worker by the Northern industrial complex. In the process of fostering this myth, Grady allowed for the identity of the poor, hard working, but victimized, Southerner to take hold in the mythos of Southern lore and Southern identity for years to come. In Grady’s time, that constitution may have created distrust between the South and the North based upon economic structure. And, of course, it might be contended that his constitution of poor white Southern worker identity has problematized sectionalist politics between the North and South to the present day.

This time period in U.S. history is important for many reasons, but two stand out amongst the others. First, this was the time when Southern white identity was being reformed into the more recent incarnation we have seen in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The time period of discussion in this study was after Reconstruction (which did almost nothing for economic advancement for the South), This era was the first time that white Southern workers were able to identify what it meant to be a worker in an economic time that did not involve slavery. Moreover, post-Reconstruction was the time when, economically, the South was compelled by the federal government and social reformers to diverge from its slave-based agrarian model and to institute a free labor model of society. The time period also coincided with the first large economic boom in the United States, resulting directly from the Industrial Revolution and the widespread acceptance of capitalism, with a particular focus on free wage labor.

Free wage labor was different for people in the South because before the Civil War labor and wages were scripted through the “peculiar institution” of slavery and it did not allow for any competition amongst workers. The system held labor costs and pay artificially low. Free wage labor made it possible for poor white Southern workers to demand more pay because the large farms and industry could not rely on forced labor anymore.

Second, the economic disparity that we are facing in our country during the first two decades of the twenty first century is a similar disparity of opulent wealth and poverty that the middle and working class people were experiencing during the Gilded Age. This was the first great boom from capitalism. It mirrors the boom that is happening in the early twenty first century. It seems not much has changed in the last one hundred and twenty years. Having a better understanding of how the middle and working class of a subjugated economic region in

the past will give more insight into the identity(s) constructions of social movements, labor movements, and cultural communities as a whole.

The time period of the New South and the work of Grady are of immense importance and should not be overlooked by public address and rhetorical scholars. His speeches and writings inspired a generation and still hold meaning today. There are many aspects of critical analysis that are available to help make sense of Grady and his discourse in his own time. I am only taking up a limited part, a part that deals with whiteness identities, material Marxist theory as it relates to identity creation, and mythic and ideographic rhetorical lenses. Grady's impact on Southern identity at the beginning of the modern industrial era was the beginning of a New South identity, a new constitution of what it meant to be a white middle and working class member of society. The ideas he constituted and identities he helped craft can still be seen in the present day South in the middle and working classes.

#### *Rationale for the Study*

The reason I have chosen this topic is because of its cultural and historical relevance and importance in Southern cultural identity constitution and, to an extent, national class identity and social movement contexts. The time period of the New South, before the Populist Movement, is very important and has been missed by critical rhetorical scholars and public address scholars within the field of communication studies.<sup>20</sup> It was a time period that brought the United States into a modern economy. It was the first time that Southern workers had a chance to advance; they were simultaneously figuring out just who they were when they could no longer define themselves against a slave-based agrarian economy. It was the first boom era that led to the ability for a better life and movement within the class structure that had been implemented in/by

the U.S. government. It was a time of great change in Southern culture and reflects the values of what happened even up to the present day.

The reason that I choose to write about Grady, specifically, is because he was the prominent leader in the South's largest city (Atlanta) and the editor of the largest newspaper in the South. He was well respected and was seen equally as a leader to the North as the South was trying to repair ties following the Civil War and the Reconstruction era. As I discuss below, Grady's importance to the New South movement cannot be overstated. Yet, his stance on key issues changed and helped develop the beginning of the populist movement by addresses economic inequities and abuse by powerful banks and corporate trust interests.

#### *Plan of the Study*

More specifically, the "selected" texts I analyze are his "New South" speech and two subsequent speeches that followed between the years of 1886-1889. These artifacts are vital to understanding not only the ideological movement of Grady's orations, but also the change in the identity of poor white Southern worker due to the economic conditions of the time period. Scholars have seemed to pass by most of his speeches after the "New South" speech, while only marginally studying the New South speech and what it meant for the South and the country as a whole. The speeches I have selected to study are the "The New South (1886)," "Against Centralization (1889)," and "The Farmer and the Cities (1889)." These speeches make up the era of Grady's most important time as a social leader. The speeches also set the foundations for the beginning of the Populist Movement, which – in the New South – would later be led by another Georgian, Tom Watson.

From a theoretical and methodological perspective, I explore these possibilities through a Materialist Dialectic view of Marxist theory. That is, I believe identities are based on real and

actual economic and material oppressions, and rhetoric is a way that the oppressed are able to create an identity out of the economic and material oppression. Theoretically, I also address issues of whiteness as an identity/cultural study. I critique the concepts of whiteness studies by bringing to bear material dialectical Marxist theory as a point of contention within whiteness studies. I argue that there are gaps in whiteness studies, especially in public address and rhetorical studies, which can be addressed by the implementation of basic Marxist theory in whiteness studies. In other words, class is an issue within whiteness studies that needs to be addressed by public address and rhetorical scholars.

The rest of this study is organized as follows: the second chapter is a literature review of whiteness and whiteness studies in the fields of rhetorical studies. Also, the literature review addresses the Materialist dialectical Marxist theory of economics in communication studies along with a section on identity formation. Finally, the second chapter ends with a discussion about methodology as it pertains to mythic criticism and the role that metaphors play in building a mythic identity.

Next, chapter three contains the context that lays out the rhetorical situation and information on Grady as a rhetor. More specifically, this section discusses the era of the New South and the economic conditions that were put upon the poor and working class whites (including farmers) in the region and how their treatment created the need for the rhetorical moment that brought to bear Grady as a social and cultural leader of the South. The chapter also provides the background of the rhetor and explains why he is worthy of study in this project.

Chapter four analyzes how Grady formed Southern white identity through his “New South” speech by employing economic terms and mythic creations of the Southern worker. Specifically I argue that Grady creates the myth of the hard working Southerner that creates a

mythic identity for the poor white Southern worker. It is based in the role of Puritan work ethic myth.

Chapter five is an analysis of two other speeches that Grady gave subsequent to his “New South” speech, “Against Centralization” and “Farmers and the Cities” speeches. This chapter shows how he helped change the identity of the poor white Southern worker away from a pure capitalist ideal of what a worker should be into a more socialistic view of what the workers should expect from capitalism. This is where Grady builds the mythic structure of North versus South in terms of capitalist identity. More specifically he creates a mythic hero of the poor white Southern worker and villain of the Northern economic and industrial complex. He uses this mythic structure to explain why to the poor white Southern worker why they were not seeing the benefits of the American Dream and he used the myth to give the poor white Southern worker an explanation of how to fix their problems.

The last chapter is the conclusion to the study. In this chapter there is a discussion on the limitations and future research in the fields of public address and rhetorical studies as it relates to whiteness studies, Material dialectical Marxism, and the role that these theories could/should play in social movements. This study does not address social movements but the text that is under analysis was derived in response to a large scale economic social movement that eventually led to Populism and the Progressive era. Also, within this chapter, there is discussion about a new Mythic theory called the Iron Cog myth. It is a mythic theory that seeks to fill gaps left by the American Dream myth that was founded during the Gilded Age and that is theoretically built by Mythologist Richard Hughes. Finally, this chapter contains the implications for the arguments of this study on social movements.

CHAPTER TWO  
WHITENESS AND COMMUNICATION/RHETORICAL STUDIES, MARXISM, AND  
MYTHIC METHODOLOGIES

*Whiteness*

Whiteness assumes an incredibly pivotal place in my study of Grady's instantiations of New South identities. However, whiteness studies in the field of public address and rhetorical studies is a concentration that is surprisingly lacking given the discipline's insistence on studying multiple – often intersecting – identities, subjectivities and standpoints. Whiteness is the study of how hegemonic structures of white power and privilege function in social, political, economic, and cultural contexts.<sup>21</sup> This concept of whiteness is sometimes flawed because it works from the idea that all white people (as individuals) are privileged without taking into account such factors as region or class (or other subject positions). While an automatic privilege might exist for white folks, the difficulty is with the structure itself, not necessarily the people whose subjectivities (race/ethnicity as “white”) just happen to relate to the structures of power and privilege.<sup>22</sup> This is a limited understanding of white identity and what it really means to be white. One of the important components of whiteness to consider is how white people themselves are impacted by whiteness. Much of this has to do with region and class; that is, whiteness works on and for white folks, but it does so in qualitatively and negatively different ways for poorer and more rural whites, especially in the South. Therefore, a work that seeks to understand the connections among region and class within white identity becomes increasingly important when trying to understand sub-cultures of whiteness. This study attends significantly to Grady's

discourse, thus exploring its constitutive dimensions with the aid of whiteness theory might help better sense of the meaning-making of Grady's rhetoric.

The concept of whiteness retains importance when it comes to the ability of scholars to understand constructs of power, subaltern voices, and cultural identity constructions. Justification for the research into whiteness lies at the heart of understanding intercultural communication,

First, whiteness is tied closely to power in a rather upfront manner. Nakayama and Krizek give examples of their respondents defining “white” as the “majority” or the “status.”<sup>23</sup> A second strategy of whiteness involves negative or oppositional definitions of whiteness as opposed to positive definitions. In their study, people responded by saying “white” meant being “not black.”<sup>24</sup> White is defined by what it is “not,” and anyone who is “not white” is created as the “other.” Because the “other” is “different” or “not white,” the “other” is outside the norm, and thus whiteness becomes the center or the “universal space.”<sup>25</sup>

A third strategy “naturalizes white” with a scientific condition. One respondent from the Nakayama and Krizek study said of whiteness that “it just classifies people scientifically and not judgmentally.”<sup>26</sup> Nakayama and Krizek link science with naturalization when they say, “the invocation of science serves to privilege reason, objectivity, and masculinity, concepts that have long been viewed in the Western tradition as stable, and therefore more trustworthy, poles in the dialectic relationships that exist as reason/emotion, objectivity/subjectivity, masculinity/femininity.”<sup>27</sup> Accordingly, they add that “conflating the discourse of whiteness with the label of science serves to mask irrationality and contradictions with a rational image possessing cultural currency.”<sup>28</sup>

The fourth strategy confuses whiteness with nationality, which is a legal status conferred by social institutions. Respondents believe that whiteness meant that they were “American.” This idea of naturalized whiteness as American has been around since the founding of the country. When the country was first formed the only people that could vote were white male landowners.

The fifth strategy is recognized in the discourse of people who refuse to label themselves. Nakayama and Krizek argue that people who said “I do not want to be labeled” also listed that they were proud of their heritage.”<sup>29</sup> They found that “There is an emphasis on the ideology of individualism over subjectivity, the social construction of identity, is quite clear.”<sup>30</sup> Also, by there not being a label, it allows for whiteness to continue to be invisible within the larger social order.

Finally, the sixth strategy of whiteness is linked to European ancestry. One respondent in the Nakayama and Krizek study said that being “white” meant that they were of European lineage.<sup>31</sup> Traditionally Europe has been a source of world-wide power since the beginnings of the Roman Empire, which furthers the centeredness and power constructions of whiteness.

Following this study, intercultural scholar Jackson decided to see if white people could adequately define what it means to be “white” in opposition to Nakayama and Krizek’s study that sought to find the discursive space of “white.”<sup>32</sup> Jackson’s study argues that white people identified whiteness as: (1) incompleteness, (2) uninterrogateable space, (3) metaphor for the universal insider, (4) guilty and fair space, and (5) situationally immutable.<sup>33</sup>

First, incompleteness is the idea that there is something missing. Jackson believes that his respondents, when asked to define whiteness, “necessitated fragmentation and ambiguity.”<sup>34</sup>

Because of this ambiguity it seems as though something is missing from the definition of whiteness that white people cannot quite explain or comprehend.

Second, Jackson asserts that whiteness was an uninterrogatable space. This is because “respondents identified themselves as the center from which all societal norms must come.”<sup>35</sup> Therefore, the norms that whiteness create(s) typically are not questioned.

Third, is the metaphor for the universal insider. Jackson explains the universal insider as “the transportable feature of whiteness which permits Whites to transcend social boundaries and still gain a semblance of acceptance as an insider.”<sup>36</sup> Jackson provides the pop-culture example of the movie *Dangerous Minds*, and a more recent movie would be *Freedom Writers* where a white person enters into a minority community and tries to “fix” them and their problems by getting them to accept white ideals of interaction and society.

Fourth, is guilty and fair space, which, according to Jackson, “seeks to justify white space by paradoxically suggesting that it is privileged space, but that the space is open and shareable, due to the believed existence of social parity.”<sup>37</sup> The idea Jackson is promoting is that the respondents believe that we are all equal and that white people feel some amount of guilt if they try to say that space of whiteness is on supposed to be inhabited by white people.

Fifth, Jackson says that whiteness is situationally immutable. Jackson claims that Whites have the option to try out other customs for “novelty” but can switch back if they feel uncomfortable. He goes on to say that if Whites began to commit themselves to different cultural communities they would be forced to “concern themselves with the counter-space that affects the cultural community...[t]his would not only reorganize white space, but it would also virtually eliminate white privilege, racism, and prejudice as we know it.”<sup>38</sup> If white people were

not allowed to just try on different cultures and identified with other groups, then they could understand the privilege they have and help to unravel the power they control.

As noted by whiteness scholar Ruth Frankenberg, “the explicit study of white culture is imperative in order to fully understand intercultural communication and the role of power and privilege in these encounters.”<sup>39</sup> Concurrently, historian David Roediger posits “to ignore white ethnicity is to redouble its hegemony by naturalizing it.”<sup>40</sup> In other words, such a direction in inquiry is necessary as a means by which we extend our scholarly understandings of constructions of identity, not only of white people, but also of other races and ethnicities. On this point, communication scholar K. E. Supriya also argues that, “to fall short of this is to face the charge of theoretical and historical reductionism and empirical simplification.”<sup>41</sup> Yet, public address and rhetorical studies scholars seem reluctant to begin working towards an understanding of white identity in the contexts of region, economic class, religion, etc. Or, perhaps, our field is in the midst of doing just that.

The broad consensus in such studies is that whiteness can be combined with regionalism and class, an idea I weave throughout this project. I am attempting to define a small interpretation of the identity of Southern whiteness through my work. I believe with the conception that Grady constituted white identity through economic views of oppression and hard work. White Southerners saw their identity not as privileged, mainly because of the economic power dynamics that the regions within the United States had developed. Though they are important, economic theories of class division and cultural regionalism are not the only issues that whiteness scholars in public address and rhetorical studies have not addressed.

The first (and constant) problem that whiteness wrestles with is the notion that whiteness remaining invisible and, thus, stays unchecked. Cinema Scholar Richard Dyer’s study of

whiteness points out that “white” is a framing position. It is a dominant space against which difference is measured. White is the point from which judgments are made, about normality, and abnormality.”<sup>42</sup> This means that whiteness is the norm, defined by the negative.<sup>43</sup> Because whiteness is seen as normal, and everything else different, whiteness is then “invisible.” How does one study what is invisible? This is a worrisome quandary concerning the impact of whiteness on/within cultures. Because whiteness is seen as normative, it would be easy for scholars to disregard whiteness as a colonial influence over society, or some sort of all encompassing power structure that society must recognize. Which, coincidentally, scholars have argued for in most of the work of whiteness studies in the field of public address and rhetorical studies.

The majority of work found in whiteness studies has been argued from the point that whiteness is the norm (invisible) and that it is the work of the scholar to uncover it and to deconstruct its power relations.<sup>44</sup> Because of the belief that whiteness is the norm, and, in effect, discriminates against other cultures because they are not the norm, the literature from scholars has led to a surplus of research that promotes a vision of whiteness as guilt and apology. Frankenberg suggests there has been much work about white people and the lack of awareness about their race, and a sense of “indifference to the unremarkable nature of being white.”<sup>45</sup> Sociologist Wendy Shaw, notes that “research on whiteness has tended to suffer from guilt by discursive association with the bulk of whiteness studies.”<sup>46</sup> There has to be more than guilt and dominance when studying an entire race and culture of people. When it comes to power relations and privilege, it does not matter if whiteness is visible or invisible. The privilege of being white is that it is the norm; it is the standard. Sociologist Steve Garner points out that being white is a privilege whether or not white people want to benefit from it.<sup>47</sup> The white people that do see the

privilege of being white try to deflect the idea that they are privileged by using anti racist rhetoric. According to communication scholar Debian Marty,

Much white antiracist rhetoric takes the form of an apologia. This speech genre enables rhetorician to defend their moral character against accusation and attack as they deflect any recognition of wrongdoing or of the need for accountability. White people use the elements of apologia, in its most basic form, to ward off racist accusations through disclaimers such as, “I’m not racist, but...” or through implying that they could not be racist because they are “color-blind.” These and other more sophisticated apologetic strategies allow white rhetoric to reject responsibility for racism and reassert their good moral standing. Having thus restored their antiracist ethos, the questioned of white racial privilege is made.<sup>48</sup>

By promoting apologia as a defense against privilege, white people are allowed to continue to live in their space of privilege and nothing will change, no power relations will be challenged. Marty argues that this power relation will continue until the white community begins to “care more about their interracial relationships than their anti-racist identity.”<sup>49</sup> I argue that whiteness needs to be looked at as more than just discriminatory power structures against minorities and the Other. Whiteness scholars in public address and rhetorical studies need to analyze the influence of power relations with subcultures of white people, either by class and/or regionality.

Another part of whiteness studies that is contested is the idea of white identity as a whole. Mainly, is there whiteness as a racial group, and if so, what are its norms? Much scholarly writing about whiteness and empirical work concerning white people suggests there is a lack of awareness about race, and indifference to the unremarkable nature of being white.<sup>50</sup> Other scholars have noted that whiteness is a racial category.<sup>51</sup>

If whiteness is a racial category, then the group(s) that is/are being studied must have a set or norms. The idea that whiteness has a set of norms is raised by historian Matthew Jacobson’s reading of the senate debates on U.S. citizenship in 1870.<sup>52</sup> He finds a “capacity of industriousness, Christianity, a high degree of freedom, exercise of independent thought

necessary for democratic government, and complexion.”<sup>53</sup> The argument that whiteness has a set of norms leads to setting the validity of the argument that whiteness is a race and social/communal order of people. Therefore, I agree with other scholars such as Matt Wray and David Roediger that whiteness is a social and historical construction, not an essential and immutable racial category.

Within any racial group, community, or society, there is a multiplicity of identities. As Roediger points out, “Race is constructed across time by people in the same social class,” and it is constructed “differently at the same time by people whose class positions differ.”<sup>54</sup> There is no one monolithic category of white identity. In fact, where and when possible, I prefer to pluralize “identity.” It must be understood that within any group there are those that will not fit into the community and they will be marginalized. As cultural scholar Thi Trinh explains, even within the center there are margins; however, only when the mirror of study is turned upon the center will this be realized.<sup>55</sup> Communication scholar Christina Stage reminds us of a “white rural community that sees itself drifting away from the heart of the center and toward the margins; as they drift toward the margins they turn inward, sticking together as have many historically oppressed minority groups.”<sup>56</sup> This is a smaller example of what I show in a larger scale of Southern identity through this project.

Most of the work in marginalized white communities focuses on racial issues of working class people. These studies have come from the field of sociology and history with little or no influence within the field of public address and rhetorical studies. White people with little or no money have traditionally not been seen as “white” but as something else that is not entirely worthy of being considered “white.” Communication scholars Philip Wander, Judith Martin, and Thomas Nakayama note that “color, race, whiteness, blackness are contested terms. They are

part of the vocabulary of historical struggle going back into the nineteenth century, when poor whites were sometimes called ‘white negroes’.”<sup>57</sup> Ethnographic studies of lower class or blue-collar whites have led to many discoveries within class identity and how whites see other minorities based upon their communal values. Many of sociologist Michele Lamont’s blue-collar interviews state that their values are family – and outward – oriented, and they seek to differentiate themselves from white-collar workers and managerial staff they see as selfish, money obsessed, and poor communicators.<sup>58</sup>

There have been class studies of white identities in a historical context. Roediger combined classical Marxism, psychoanalysis and new labor history to see how working class white identity was developed during the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. He found that the legacy of racism helped define white identity within the working class and can still be seen in today’s society.<sup>59</sup> Roediger points out that “whiteness was a way in which white workers responded to a fear of dependency on wage labor and the necessities of capitalist work discipline”<sup>60</sup> This may have been true for the aristocracy of the South, but many other historians have pointed out that this was not true for all the people in the South, especially the poor whites.<sup>61</sup>

The issues of economic identity can all be led back to the idea of the myth of American exceptionalism and the fear of failure. Roediger notes that use of terms like “white slavery” and “slavery of wages” during the 1830’s and the 1840’s “presents an intriguing variation on the theme of American exceptionalism.”<sup>62</sup> If white people are privileged, then why do they have an entire group called white slaves? There may have been this promotion of American exceptionalism but people did not always and readily believe it at a practical level. Roedinger notes that “it might instead be profitable to view the paranoid style itself as a republican tradition

much enlivened by the horrific example of chattel slavery and fears engendered by the growing failure of the American republic to produce a society of independent farmers and mechanics among whites.”<sup>63</sup> The lack of security and stability made the idea of a prosperous white working class seem like it could be something that would fail. Poor white people, up to this point in history, had been left behind in the prospering new America and they did not buy into an ideology or identity readily because of their treatment in society up to the time period of Reconstruction.

Also in his book, Roediger traces the historical formation of white working identity from the early nineteenth century to the end of the Civil War. He argues that concept of the white worker appeared early in the nineteenth century.<sup>64</sup> Yet some historians believe the idea of the white worker arrived with the settlers who called themselves “hard working whites” as a differential identity to that of polyvocal Native America lifeways.<sup>65</sup>

The early concept of the white working class was difficult to define, as we know it in today’s context. Things were not so clear when it came to white worker identification before the Civil War. Most people believe there were slave owners, slaves, and then white farmers that tended small independent farms. Yet, there is a more complicated structure during this time period. As Roedinger notes,

The many gradations of unfreedom among whites made it difficult to draw fast lines between any idealized free white worker and a pitied or scorned servile Black worker. Indentured servitude, impressment, apprenticeship, convict labor, farm tenancy, wage labor and combinations of wage labor and free farming made for a continuum oppression among whites.<sup>66</sup>

That is, the white worker did not have many chances for economic advances during this time. It was virtually impossible to move up from the poor working class white economic class into the middle or large agrarian farmer class before the Civil War.

During the Antebellum period, the idea of the white worker was splintered and concomitantly varied from community to community. What is known is that many whites, not just the indentured, “were called servants and the same term was used, with adjectives like perpetual and negro to describe slaves.”<sup>67</sup> The point is a white working class had not formed, mainly because there was no need for it at the time. Whites were seen as something on the same working level as the slave; they just had more rights, but their economic condition was seen as pretty much the same. This was mainly because in the early to mid nineteenth century, attempts to “connect a consciousness of whiteness with a consciousness of status as worker failed.”<sup>68</sup>

The problems that poor whites in the South faced gave way to important changes that were lying ahead. As the nineteenth century progressed various forms of laws and economic working systems proved to the poor white Southern worker that they were seen as nothing more than a white slave because of the unfair labor practices that kept them in constant debt and minuscule wages by the white upper class.<sup>69</sup> The struggle and inequality that poor white faced would eventually lead to a collective identity that would be formed during the New South era.

Studies about more current time periods have raised interesting questions about whiteness and class. The division of middle and working class whites and poor whites has been debated with interesting points of view on the subject. Sociologist John Hartigan Jr. addresses the division in his book *Odd Tribes: Toward a Cultural Analysis of White People*. Hartigan’s book is a “sustained argument for the need to simultaneously critique notions about what counts as race while also analyzing the behaviors and beliefs of whites in the United States.”<sup>70</sup> He argues that the words that we use to describe the differences in economic classes of white people, such as “white trash,” are reminders that there are important dimensions to whiteness and that whites are not uniformly privileged and powerful.<sup>71</sup> He argues that “critical assessments of representation of

poor whites need to account for the way these depictions participate in and derive from the social process that shape white middle- and working – class identities.”<sup>72</sup> That is exactly what the current project purports to do. By looking into economic foundations of identity through the speeches of Grady, I add to the understanding of white class dynamics and cultural identity of white people from that specific time period.

Sociologist Matt Wray’s work in whiteness studies takes a more pronounced turn in the study of poor whites, specifically looking at the concept of “white trash.” In his book *Not Quite White: White Trash and the Boundaries of Whiteness* he points out that being able to understand the “story of white trash and other terms of abuse can help us better understand social difference and inequality and how they are produced.”<sup>73</sup> He also argues that conceiving of whiteness primarily in terms of racial domination unnecessarily limits the scope of analysis of whiteness and white identities.<sup>74</sup> Like Hartigan above, Wray points out that too many scholars have addressed whiteness as power. He posits that it could be something different when he says, “Racial analysis in the form of whiteness studies has failed to bring the term white trash into focus. Scholars of whiteness have become extraordinarily sure – footed and nimble when the word that follows white is supremacy, power privilege, or pride, but they tend to stumble badly when it is followed by trash.”<sup>75</sup> Historically, Wray points out, much like Roediger does, that beginning in the 1830’s and 1840’s, abolitionists put forth the notion that the poor whites of the South were victims of the agrarian slave economy. They were pushed to the margins with no means of economic viability or social advancement, and they suffered the ravages of poverty and want.<sup>76</sup> Again, the lack of economic racial/cultural understanding is paramount and this study builds on the works of these two scholars.

Historically, the poor have been looked over in respect to scholarly work within American academia. The problem with whiteness research from the late 1980's-2006, according to Wray, is that it overlooks the bottom of the bottom of white classes,

Until quite recently, when stories of poor rural white people have been told by social scientists, they have been told mostly as stories about class. These studies have been inadequate in part because the lens of class analysis has always had trouble focusing on the lowest status groups. Like Marx's ill-defined *lumpenproletariat*, the "poor white trash" in these class based accounts seems to be only a residual category, a theoretical after-thought. As these that opted out of or were left behind in the wake of capitalist modernization, poor whites appear more like a caste than a class, and as such are thought to have no social worth and only regressive political tendencies.<sup>77</sup>

These groups of poor white Southern workers are the people that led to the uprising and organization of alliances and unions during the New South era. They were the ones that were barely scrapping by working the mills, toiling as tenants, and the ones that could not find any work. This study describes the how this group of Southern whites identified themselves through communication.

Wray and sociologist Annalee Newitz's reader on poor whites, *White Trash: Race and Class in America*, concludes that "white trash is not just a classist slur –it's also a racial epithet that marks out certain whites as a breed apart, a dysgenic race unto themselves."<sup>78</sup> This means that poor whites are not even seen as white, and therefore cannot accept or wield power and privilege because they do not belong with the normal sect of "white people."

There were many stereotypes of poor white people. As noted above, poor whites were seen as incestuous and sexually promiscuous, violent, alcoholic, lazy, and stupid.<sup>79</sup> These stereotypes have existed for almost two hundred years, even up to the current day. It is troubling because when one combines the stereotypes with the power of the racist/classist slur of "white trash," it is easy to understand how a group could be left out of society.

The lack of scholars addressing the poorest of the poor within white society is troubling, but it could be explained by the fact that these people have no voice because they are seen as something other than white. Wray and Newitz note, “white trash as whiteness under multiculturalism reminds us that far too often, admission into the multicultural order depends upon one’s ability to claim social victimization.”<sup>80</sup> This project argues that working poor whites are identified as victims in the speeches of Grady. This study argues that poor whites claimed victimage, but now the question becomes will scholars or society see them as multicultural under pure economic forms, regional identity, and/or race?

Wray and Newitz agree with Roediger on the aspect of economic instability and its ability to redefine concepts of white identity. The only difference between the two works is that there is about one-hundred and sixty years between the time periods they are researching. Wray and Newitz point out “As the economy and unemployment figures in the U.S. worsen, more whites are losing jobs to downsizing and corporate restructuring, or taking pay cuts. While it used to be that whites gained job security at the expense of other racial groups, whiteness in itself no longer seems a sure path to good income.”<sup>81</sup> So now, just as during the time period of the antebellum era and the Gilded Age, racial color and identity does not necessarily guarantee privilege and power, which then adds to the disambiguation of whiteness within economic constructions of class and cultural meaning. The idea of unfettered privilege of whiteness begins to seem weaker and weaker when issues of economics are brought into the fold of scholarly thought.

Finally, the last work to be discussed, within poor whiteness studies, is by anthropologist Kirby Moss. He argues that whiteness, when seen as a class issue, is not as cut and dry in regards to power and privilege dynamics of whiteness. He notes “poor whites are the silences we speak

least of in political and academic debates about poverty, illiteracy, and many other common social ills.”<sup>82</sup> There is one main reason for this. The mythic structure and identity of white people and power do not allow for poverty. Moss notes “narratives and prevailing images of poor whites are conveniently missing from the middle-class ideological portrait of itself because to acknowledge poverty and banality within its own ranks erodes the eminent, constructed image of whiteness.”<sup>83</sup> This mythic construction of “whiteness” that not only white people, but scholars as well, have perpetrated has looked past whites who are poor and have little, if no representation in society. This is a problem, as stated before, in whiteness studies in the field of rhetorical studies and public address.

Within the field of public address and rhetorical studies, there has been a varied approach to understanding whiteness. Most of the studies have been qualitative and dealt with personal interpretation or ethnographic studies. Two of the most influential studies were conducted by communication scholars Nakayama and Krizek and intercultural researcher Ronald Jackson. In their groundbreaking work, Nakayama and Krizek uncovered six strategies of the discourse of whiteness.<sup>84</sup>

### *Material Marxism*

Marxism has long been a contentious, yet undeniably valuable theory for understanding social, economic, and cultural constructions. Marxism has been an arduous concept when studying the past eras in American history. The biggest question asked by historians is why did the United States not end up a socialist country after the Populist revolution, where all other Western democracies did?<sup>85</sup> I believe the answer lies in the founding scholars of economic thought. Noted rhetorical scholar James Arnt Aune points out that the leading scholars and promoters of capitalism had an advanced understanding of the rules of communication and the

role it played in society, while the founders and supporters of Marxism did not address the role of communication and its importance.<sup>86</sup> The lack of promotion of rhetoric and communication by economic and social theorists Karl Marx and Frederich Engels was their fatal flaw. Yet, there were leaders who were trained in the art of rhetoric that took it upon themselves to promote more socialistic ideals just as capitalism was taking off in America and turning into the system we have today. One of those leaders was Grady. As noted previously, Grady did not live to see the Populist Movement in full bloom, but he did sow the seeds for it in the South. In this section I discuss, in short order, the original theory of Marxism and then move to material Marxist theory in public address and rhetorical studies. Throughout this study I discuss how Marxist criticism might potentially lend itself to the study of Southern identities through the speeches of Grady.

Marxism is derived from the work of Marx and Engels. Marxism is based on the perspective of materialism, which contends that real, physical objects or conditions give rise to culture and our experiences.<sup>87</sup> Regarding social systems and culture, Marxism has a long tradition of thought on the subjects of social systems and culture. Communication scholar Borchers notes,

Marx made this distinction by defining two key concepts: the base and the super structure. The base refers to the actual practices and products of capitalism, including land, buildings, and money. These material objects lead to a super structure, which includes the social, political and religious institutions of a culture as well as the social consciousness of its people.<sup>88</sup>

From this basic idea of society, Marxist theorists are able to build their theory of class identities and struggle based around the concepts of production, goods, ownership, and labor. For early Marxists, the biggest issue was the struggle between the capitalist and the proletariat.<sup>89</sup> Marx and Engels explained, “owing to the extensive use of Machinery and to division of labor, the work of the proletarians has lost all individual character, and, consequently, all charm for the workman.

He becomes an appendage of the machine, and it is only the most simple, most monotonous, and most easily acquired knack, that is required of him.”<sup>90</sup> All humanity is stripped of the worker. The worker loses her/his positionality both as a worker and within society because he is no longer a represented of his trade and knowledge. Marx and Engels continue in their explanation, “not only are they slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois state, they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the overlooker, and above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself.”<sup>91</sup> The real oppression of manufacturing, machines, and owners were of great distress to Marx and Engels, leading them to define their theories of Communism and Socialism that we have today.

However, this project is not concerned with their ideals of Communism and Socialism. Rather, I am interested in how Marxists promoted the ideals of class distinctions based on the economic disparities that had arrived out of the industrial revolution. Based on my early readings, I contend that Grady addresses these same issues with the Southerners during his time as editor of the *Atlanta Journal Constitution* and developed a Southern positionality based around constructions of class and economic privilege.

Marxist theory goes to great lengths to explain the plight of the proletariat worker. Marx and Engels explained the difficulty of the proletariat in more detail that nearly mirrors Grady’s explanation of the exploited Southerner. Marx and Engels make their point when they write, “no sooner has the laborer received his wages in cash, for the moment escaping exploitation by the manufacturer, that he is set upon by the other portions of the bourgeois, the landlord, the shopkeeper, the pawnbroker, etc.”<sup>92</sup> In this sense, the superstructure of society completely encompasses the worker and does not let the oppression subside and is thorough systematic oppression of the worker. Grady ideology reflects these concepts of Marxism (purely

coincidental) and addresses this in many of his speeches to the poor workers and farmers that he approaches in his travels and orations.

Marxism has a long and varied history in the fields of public address and rhetorical theory. Marxism is a theoretical approach to communication that critical scholars of communication often base their observations through.<sup>93</sup> Traditionally, Marxism has been seen as an economic or social theory, yet in the last few decades, as critical studies has developed, public address and rhetorical scholars have been able to address issues of oppression and ideological identities through Marxist theory.

The materialist view is most closely aligned with traditional Marxism.<sup>94</sup> The materialist view sees society as something real and tangible and communication is used to describe what is going on around the individuals. Communication scholar Dana Cloud notes, “this dialectical model suggests that people must be understood as historically located and socially constituted. This notion is the starting point of materialist language theory’s emphasis on the subject as a historically situated product of discourse and relations.”<sup>95</sup> In other words, Cloud argues that the discourse is located in reality, something that is tangible and has an objective affect on the individuals in the society. She makes the point that the situation is not something that is rhetorically constructed; it is an actual event that society and people experience and use rhetoric to describe what is going on around them.

There is a second, broader view of materialism. Cloud points out that the second definition “consists in the idea that the mode of production, or the way in which goods are made and distributed in society, determines the social relations and forms of consciousness of any given epoch.”<sup>96</sup> This view holds that all social relations are through the use and promotion of goods, services, and capital. It is the view that holds true to the original Marxist theory. Borchers

notes that the materialistic view of rhetoric “focuses on how rhetoric conceals or reveals political or economic forces. This view, which never loses sight of what is tangible or material, seeks to reconcile rhetoric with the reality that people regularly witness and experience.”<sup>97</sup> This materialism focuses less on social order and more on how goods, services, and capital create the social order.

Cloud calls the second Marxist approach “idealist.”<sup>98</sup> In this view, rhetoric is seen as a material force that determines the ideas that people have about their world and culture. This view relies heavily on cultural hegemony. Cultural hegemony is the idea that oppression happens through other means than just economic conditions. Cultural artifacts such as music, art, clothing, movies and other forms of art also promote one controlling idea that keeps people under control of the hegemonic group. The area of cultural studies that we have today came from this view of Marxism.

Cloud calls the third Marxist approach the relativist approach. In this view, rhetoric creates reality. Cloud explained from that approach, “The critic is not in a credible position to adjudicate the truth or falsity of discourse, or to speculate about whose interests are served by a particular set of texts.”<sup>99</sup> Power and oppression do not exist because they cannot be understood because power, under this theory, is always fluid and changing based upon individual discursive reality.<sup>100</sup> This causes a competition of rhetorically constituted realities to fight it out for meaning, not giving privilege to any constructed reality over the other.<sup>101</sup> I find this view a bit troubling and agree with Cloud when she avers that “We cannot talk about unmasking repressive, dominating power without some understanding of reality and oppression.”<sup>102</sup> So if this version of Marxism has a fluid reality based in rhetorical constructs, how does one understand oppression and dominance if it is all relative to the language and person that hears it?

Does there not have to be some sort of grounded reality? I think there does, and this study draws support from the materialist view of Marxism.

At this point, a better understanding of material Marxism is needed, especially concerning the concept of rhetoric and the materialist Marxist dialectic. Marxist dialectics is the theory of social change as the social change emerges from the differentiations that may cause a rift in capitalist society.<sup>103</sup> This is due to the unequal distribution of wealth in American society. Many government officials have argued that capitalism has won and there is no need for socialism anymore.<sup>104</sup> The economic differences and unequal spread of wealth in society is exactly what was happening during the New South era when Grady gave his speeches that are under review in this study.

It is practically impossible for a lasting system of social stability to arise when there are large groups fighting one another for goods. Cloud notes that permanent social stability is impossible in a system divided by class and thus prone to conflict among groups with contradictory material interests.<sup>105</sup> This split in class systems is where Materialist dialectics comes into play. Materialist dialectics is a mode of understanding that shows how the conflict between classes has propelled history forward.<sup>106</sup> Cloud suggests “Materialist dialectic is also a way of understanding how people, through communication and other bodily action, take advantage of the historical opportunities afforded by contradiction and contention.”<sup>107</sup> In other words, Materialist dialectic is a way to understand how inconsistent societal ideas or ideologies are worked through by those who have competing economic interest, for example, the idea of America being the land of “milk and honey” and those who do not believe that America is as prosperous as it is said to be. To the poor people of America, it does not seem like a place for progress and wealth, and therefore, have an inconsistent idea of what American economics is and

should be, thus allowing for the use of Materialist dialectics to study how the people worked out their differences and create social change. This is pointed out by Marx because he believes that materialist dialectics is the understanding of something in its entirety; tension between two opposites that yields the chance of the beginning of something new.<sup>108109</sup> The issue of American prosperity and economic reality is the issue that Henry Grady was trying to address in his speeches. Society is telling people about the wonders of capitalism and the wealth it was creating, yet more and more poor white Southern workers were not getting any of the wealth and were being held down by the reality of the system, which was labor exploitation for the benefit of the capitalist owners of the society.

This bifurcation between ideas and reality of the American economic experience is another way to understand Material dialectics. The difference between what people hold in their heads as ideas and their real lived experience causes a rift in the people's expectations and reality and that leads to the possibility of change.<sup>110</sup>

The most important thing to remember about materialist dialectics is that it is supplied in reality and only tries to understand relations of capital between classes. Cloud argues:

Materialist dialectics is a theory of how people and all their ideas and activities get things done in the world, not merely a theory of how the world is. It is grounded in materiality and seeks to understand how concrete relations of economic distribution and labor are real and exploitative; how ordinary people and their bosses have divergent real interests, consciousness of which may generate struggle against immediate harms and, in some instances, against the class society as a whole system.<sup>111</sup>

In other words, it is interested in the social movement aspect of social change based upon a definition of social change that is wrapped in economic realities, both by cause and by ending effect.

Materialistic dialectics can also be used as a way to understand history of a certain group. It has been maintained that "materialist dialectics describe the ways in which history unfolds, not

as a series of great ideas or scientific reforms, but rather as a product of contending classes, possessing divergent structural interests.”<sup>112</sup> Materialist dialectics only focuses on the class differences and struggles that take place over a given time period. In this study that given time period where the class struggle is focused is between 1886-1889.

Materialist dialectical Marxist theory will advance the theoretical views of whiteness by adding a materialistic economic view to whiteness theory. It will allow for a theoretical explanation of how real economic inequalities define a sub-culture in the larger white culture. I believe, as do other scholars, that there are real, concrete differences between whiteness and power relations that are borne in economic and class based systems. Whiteness, in public address and rhetorical studies, does not address the issue of class as positionality alone, the way Marx does. Even though I do believe there is a benefit to being white, I do not believe it is such a large benefit that all white people can be seen as part of the hegemonic control of society. Therefore, whiteness scholars need to look at class as a position of identity. The use of the word “Southerner” during the era of the New South shows that they were poor, powerless, and held down by economic realities and were not part of any hegemonic power group, in the larger sense of identification and power structure within the larger United States. I also believe that this same line of thought is still relevant and can be used to understand current economic systems of identification and in today’s society.

### *Mythic Criticism*

Another theoretical and methodological component that intersects with this project on Grady’s rhetoric is mythic criticism. Myths represent an integral part of a community’s existence. Norman Austin wrote that they “articulate our experience of ourselves in our social and natural environment,” making the chaotic and complex dynamic of human life

understandable.<sup>113</sup> Communication scholars Leroy Dorsey and Rachel Harlow note “Mythic stories are revered origins, gallant behaviors, and life threatening encounters dramatically retold, which can range from factual to the fictive, and fuel a nation’s imagination with wonder about itself.”<sup>114</sup> Essentially, these stories become the touchstones for human behavior within a community and the criteria for meaning in that community’s existence.<sup>115</sup> These stories help build the identity of communities and I show how Grady used stories of abused workers to create a new Southern white identity for the working people of the South. All the myths that are discussed in this study are American based myths.

Myths can do more than just build identity, they can also cause a change in established identities. For mythologist Joseph Campbell, such narratives worked to “carry the human spirit forward,” providing people with the spiritual aid necessary to meet their imagined destiny.<sup>116</sup> This can allow for the advancement of entire groups of people. Dorsey and Harlow note that “simply put, myths constitute a powerful epistemological rhetoric that offers compelling explanations for the community’s development of fundamental concepts such as identity, morality, religion, and law.”<sup>117</sup> These concepts are in Grady’s speeches and I demonstrate how they interact to help create the New South.

The concept of myth has no “one” definition. Religious studies scholar William Doty notes that “myth is regarded variously across a wide spectrum of opinions spanning several centuries.”<sup>118</sup> Pinning down one description or idea of what myth represents is virtually impossible. Yet, there are some general ideas about myth that are widely accepted. For example, “myths serve as stand-ins for serious truths of western civilization” and “myths are seldom fantasy constructions; more frequently they are the backbones of practical ways of living realistically.”<sup>119</sup> In other words, myth offers a foundational way of understanding cultures and

their identities. It also explains to the culture how to live in certain situations that may challenge and change the cultural structure. Myths build what a culture would deem “appropriate behavior and models of selfhood,” as well as examples of social and political ways of existing.<sup>120</sup>

A myth captures its audience’s attention and influences it’s thinking with three basic elements: the universe, the protagonist, and the narrative. According to historian Richard Slotkin, the universe depicts the backdrop in which the story unfolds, revealing a world-scene that provides the motivation for the characters’ actions.<sup>121</sup> The protagonist, or hero, becomes the archetype with whom the audience can identify. His or her struggles in the universe define the type of behavior necessary for survival in both the universe and in the real world that it represents.<sup>122</sup> Finally, the narrative describes the relationship between the protagonist and the universe, establishing the “laws of cause and effect, of natural process, and of morality” within which the protagonist acts.<sup>123</sup> Representing more than the story itself, the narrative reveals the moral of the tale, the goal for which the audience must strive.

There are quite a few debates about the scope and practice of mythic criticism. Communication scholar Anthony DeSantis explains that while there is some debate as to how restrictive the framework should be, “there are three broad categories that myths intertwine: 1) they are understood in narrative form; 2) are found in all cultures; 3) and they supply answers to the culture’s most fundamental question.<sup>124</sup> Mythic criticism has been a long included method in rhetorical criticism.<sup>125</sup> Janice Hocker Rushing and Tom Frenz explain the historical presence of mythical criticism in communication studies and organize a small theoretical frame:

Myths are more properly conceived as changing over time, co-varying with the development of human consciousness. They add the cultural expression of a myth responds to historical and political contingencies, and may appropriate archetypal imagery, consciously or unconsciously, for rhetorical means. From the perspective of rhetorical study, myths borrow prevalent cultural material from the past and adapt that material to fit the contingent needs.<sup>126</sup>

One reason to take a mythic lens of critique to the economic renderings of the poor white Southern worker has been promoted by religious scholar Richard Hughes when he noted “In the late nineteenth century, capitalism became shrouded in myth and linked to other mythical dimensions of American culture.”<sup>127</sup> This myth will be further explored in this study as I show how Grady came to deal with the myth of capitalism as it was being built during the Industrial Revolution.

Hughes also issues the argument that God was an important symbol after the Civil War. Specifically, he notes “in the beginning – especially in the years immediately after the American Civil War – American capitalism found its justification in the myth of the Chosen Nation and had struck a covenant relationship with its God.”<sup>128</sup> This may be true for the North, but the South still did not see what was happening as being a “covenant relationship with God” because they were not the “Chosen Nation” and saw what was happening as oppression by Northern industrialists. Because of this mythic construction of the “Chosen Nation,” the South had to create its own myths to understand what was happening to their culture at the time. Rhetorical scholar Robert Rowland contends “The function of myth is to transcend ordinary life and provide meaningful grounding for that which cannot be supported rationally.”<sup>129</sup> Rowland posits that myths are designed to deal with problems of human existence which seem insoluble.”<sup>130</sup> Rationally, the poor white Southern worker and intellectual were at a loss to explain why the golden promises of capitalism and the American Dream had not been realized by a man who was a hard worker. Hughes explains that a hard worker should enjoy the limitless fruits of capitalism when he said, “because they fit, nature had decreed that other would survive in the context of capitalist competition, and because they were ‘weak and listless’ ...nature had decreed that others would simply die away.”<sup>131</sup>

It should be noted that three of the eight tenants of the “American Dream” myth are discussed in this study. Three of the eight that DeSantis categorize are 1) Wealth: the promise that one can procure money, property, and the good life that accompanies such acquisitions; 2) Puritan Work Ethic: The promise that one is able to find meaningful work; and 3) Consumption and leisure: the promise that one can secure products and services that aid a lifestyle marked by relaxation and self-indulgence.<sup>132</sup>

Specifically, myths are stories or descriptions that also involve a hero, villain, and problem that is used to move the story/myth along. Rowland says, “The villains in a myth generally will possess great power, precisely because a great hero requires a great adversary.”<sup>133</sup> Rowland also argues that a problem is central to the tenant of a myth when he says, “Identification of the problem is one crucial part of the problem-solving process. Moreover, myths that identify a societal problem almost always point to the potential solution to that problem.”<sup>134</sup> This project shows that Grady’s villain to the Southern worker is the Northern industrial complex, especially the banks that kept credit from reaching the Southern farmer. He acknowledged the problem and promoted a solution to get rid of the lien system that had crippled the industriousness of the Southern worker/farmer.

Metaphors can also play a role in helping develop mythic identity. Communication scholar Sonja Foss says that “a metaphor joins two terms normally regarded as belonging to different classes of experience.”<sup>135</sup> Metaphors contain a tenor and a vehicle, with the tenor being the topic of the subject being explained and the vehicle is the lens through which the topic is viewed.<sup>136</sup> Communication scholar Michael Osborn points out that metaphors are “popular in rhetorical discourse...grounded in prominent features of experience, in objects, actions, or conditions which are inescapably salient in human consciousness”<sup>137</sup> This means that metaphors

are used in popular communication and are understood by cultures because the metaphor is built by their shared culture consciousness. Osborn also notes “the subject of the metaphor is associated with a prominent feature of experience, which has already become associated with basic human motivation.”<sup>138</sup> What this means is that metaphors can be used to build and change based upon the usage of the metaphor by the rhetor. Grady used metaphors in his speech to build and describe the mythic poor white Southern worker. He used metaphors that are easily understandable and relatable to his audience. He used metaphors that are understood in the economic condition of oppression because the audience to which he is talking to had felt it and it had become a “prominent feature of experience” for them.

To do a metaphor analysis, Foss points out that one should list all the metaphors out and group them together based a particular subject.<sup>139</sup> From there, the critic should group the metaphors based on either their tenor and vehicle and see if there are any repetitions of meaning that describe the particular subject.<sup>140</sup> This analysis will allow for a better understanding of the worldview of the rhetor. It can shed light into any of the subjects that are under review and help the critic better explain what is going on in the text. Metaphors can be used to build a mythic identity and Grady uses metaphors to vividly describe both the heroic poor white Southern worker and the villainous Northern economic and industrial complex

In this study I use mythic criticism as a rhetorical/critical lens of analysis. Specifically, I apply mythic criticism to the speeches of Grady and I demonstrate how he creates a mythic poor white Southern worker and the mythic Northern industrial baron. I also explore how the farmer and worker are constituted as the victims of the economic system of capitalism during the Gilded Age and are seen as the heroes and how the Northern industrial barons of industry and finance are seen as the oppressors and are the villain because of their abuses of the system of capitalism.

## CHAPTER 3

### HENRY GRADY AND THE NEW SOUTH AS A CONTEXT

#### *Henry Grady*

Henry Grady was born in Athens, Georgia, on 24 April 1850.<sup>141</sup> As a child, Grady had an elitist education. He was “learning to read at a private school taught by the daughter of the President of the University of Georgia.”<sup>142</sup> Grady’s education was interrupted by the Civil War, yet in January 1866, Grady was admitted to the sophomore class of the reopened University of Georgia.<sup>143</sup> While on campus, Grady joined one of two literary or debating societies on campus, the Phi Kappa society, after he discovered that every student had to choose between the Phi Kappa and Demosthenian debating societies.<sup>144</sup> He noted many years afterward that the debate organization provided the “most valuable training” of his college career.<sup>145</sup>

From these early experiences, it is apparent that Grady soon became an accomplished practitioner of oratory. As graduation drew near for Grady he was given one of the university’s top honors by being named Phi Kappa’s commencement orator. For this occasion he delivered a speech called “Castles in the Air” in which he “painted a vision for the future of the South.”<sup>146</sup> Communication scholar Ferald Bryan notes that “the manuscript of this particular speech has not survived but, as the graduation ceremonies came to an end, it was evident that Grady’s speech had been a hit and that he was well on his way to becoming a local and national advocate for his native region.”<sup>147</sup> It was an early indicator of the ideas that he had for his region as it was experiencing a monumental change in identity.

After graduation Grady left the University of Georgia to enter a master's program at the University of Virginia, based upon his proclivity that Virginia is where he needed to be if he was to become a young and successful politician.<sup>148</sup> He did this because he believed that all great Southern leaders had a connection with the state of Virginia. Grady registered for graduate courses in modern languages, history, literature, and rhetoric in the fall of 1868.<sup>149</sup> The major "consuming ambition of Grady from the day he arrived on the Virginia campus was to be the final orator of the Washington Literary Society."<sup>150</sup>

The final orator of the Washington Literary Society was a very prestigious award given to a graduate of the University of Virginia. According to Bryan, "the final orator would be the Society's principal speaker during Spring Commencement, and Grady and his fellow members coveted this position."<sup>151</sup> He spent most of his free time outside of his graduate classes practicing and preparing to be the final orator. Grady barely lost the election, yet this shocked him and he withdrew from the University of Virginia and moved back home to spend the summer in deep evaluation his life.<sup>152</sup> During that time, Grady discovered the works of American writers that influenced him to the point that he decided to become a journalist. This need for a career move occurred because he believed that his career in politics was over with the loss of the final orator position at the University of Virginia.<sup>153</sup>

The next stage in Grady's life is the most important step that led him to becoming one of the voices of the New South movement. That is, Grady next began his career as a writer covering local assignments for the *Atlanta Constitution*.<sup>154</sup> Bryan notes "from those contacts he was later offered his first regular newspaper position as the associate editor of the Rome, Georgia *Courier*."<sup>155</sup> As a member of the *Courier*, Grady's editorials became overwhelmingly political in nature. He started by attacking the Governor of Georgia by questioning the lavish spending of

government social events.<sup>156</sup> Grady soon became tired of the political pressures placed upon him at the *Courier*.<sup>157</sup> He decided to buy another competing paper. Through buying up other smaller newspapers and covering more sensational stories, such as the Ku Klux Klan's activities, Grady built a prominent news circulation in North Georgia.<sup>158</sup>

Grady's editorial prowess and keen business sense received the attention of publishers in Georgia's biggest market: Atlanta. According to Bryan, "on October 21, 1872, Grady became the co-owner of the Atlanta *Herald*...after selling all his interest in the *Commercial* to his formal boss at the *Courier*."<sup>159</sup> Eight months after arriving in Atlanta, one of Grady's primary competitors, the *Sun*, suspended its publication.<sup>160</sup> Grady's paper soon lost the circulation war with the *Constitution*, which was the only other regional paper that served the Atlanta area. Grady was without work for six months until a new owner of the *Constitution* decided to seek Grady out and make him a part of the editorial staff.<sup>161</sup>

Around this time, Grady's personal life was not going well. He was short on cash, his stock in the *Constitution* was not liquid, his wife had a miscarriage, and he was not well physically. He had large debts from his previous business deals with his smaller newspapers.<sup>162</sup> Yet, Grady was able to parlay his struggles into a penchant for hard work and he became one of the most successful political influences in the city of Atlanta, the state of Georgia, and after his New South speech, the United States.

Grady began building his political connections while he has the editor of the *Constitution*. Historian Harold Davis notes that Grady spent much time winning political influence as he did performing his newspaper duties.<sup>163</sup> He became the indispensable member of a successful political organization called the Atlanta Ring.<sup>164</sup> The Atlanta Ring was an organization of

powerful political leaders during the time and its members would get together to set policy for the city behind closed doors.

This was the beginning of Grady's influence and foray into the political arena. Bryan notes "as a well known editor of the *Constitution*, Grady was invited to give lectures and speeches to various groups around the city."<sup>165</sup> After a few years of working as a political editor and giving speeches, Grady moved onto a topic that was "closer to his heart."<sup>166</sup> That topic was the South and how it was being portrayed to the country at large during the time he was alive. Bryan points out that "on February 13, 1881, for example, Grady lashed out at Northern fiction writers for creating in the popular mind two false stereotypes of Southerners."<sup>167</sup> This was a very important development in Grady's writings, as this was the beginning of his attempt to recreate a mythic Southerner that fit his view of what being a Southern worker meant.

From that inception of fighting for what he believed to be the Southern ideal, Grady delved deeper into the political arena in hopes of influencing the practices of his state. Bryan says "from 1881-1886, Grady and his editorial staff of the *Constitution* worked diligently in local city charity projects as well as state politics."<sup>168</sup> Grady's influence in Atlanta helped elect Confederate General John B. Gordon as Governor of Georgia in 1886, and from that time on, important Northern investors who traveled to Atlanta for business began to recognize the influence that Grady had as a journalist, orator, and politician.<sup>169</sup> His reputation catapulted him into the vanguard of the New South Movement.

### *The New South and Its Economic Issues*

The rise, and need, of the New South was in direct relation to the end of the Civil War and Reconstruction. The main problem that was faced in the South was establishing a new economy to replace the agrarian slave-based economy that was in place before the Civil War and

the failed economic and social policies of Reconstruction. This emptiness of an economic system is what led to the rhetorical situation that called for Grady to step forward as a voice of the New South. This was his political life's most resonant and motivating exigence.

But the main problem that faced the South and its working class poor whites, was the system that sprung up directly after the Civil War. The poor whites assumed many aspects of a caste system and were increasingly seen as an identifiable population within the society of Southern whites as a whole.<sup>170</sup> Their status in society became more unyielding and their alienation from the general public became more pronounced. The amount of poor whites increased along with the debilitating consequences of their poverty.<sup>171</sup>

The inability for the poor Southern white worker to move from the caste it was in was troubling and involved many generative reasons. Some of these reasons were: "inadequate transportation, one-crop agriculture, poor farming techniques, absence of credit and banking facilities, illiteracy, and poor health. The South had not developed an adequate transportation system, and farmers could not get to towns where more options might be available for shopping credit, and schooling, or where they could market their crops more profitably."<sup>172</sup> This was a direct result of the Civil War destroying most of the South's infrastructure, the failure of Reconstruction to build anything, and the political leaders implementing regressive policies that hurt the lower class.

One of the biggest issues that kept the Southern white worker poor was the fact that they had an economy that was brought to bear based upon one-crop agriculture. The one crop agriculture that dominated the South was the crop of cotton. it stripped the land of its nutrients, which would make it harder and harder each year to produce a large crop, thus making the farmers work harder for a minimal crop. Another issue with a one-crop system when large scale

competition comes into play. Competition from abroad combined with the Southerner's obsession to grow cotton drove the price per bale lower and lower.<sup>173</sup>

Poor health also played a large role in the enduring poverty of the poor Southern white worker. A diet that lacked fresh fruits and vegetables left farmers in the region malnourished. This malnourishment meant that the farmer had to work even harder while they were sick to produce what they could off the land. Nutritional ailments, malaria, hookworm, and lack of medical and dental care took an enormous toll on the energy and output of the farmers.<sup>174</sup> Again, this can also be linked to the repercussions of the Civil War and failure of Reconstruction to provide any meaningful rebuilding of Southern society.

The South did not have as much industry or capital as the North, especially following the Civil War. What the South did have was fertile land that supported the agrarian empire that was there before the Civil War and an abundance of commodities such as iron, cotton, and wood. Grady knew that there needed to be an influx of Northern capital so that the poor Southern white worker could begin to move into a more modern economy. The problem was that the Northern industrialists and creditors saw the South as a way to make astronomical amounts of money by keeping the Southern worker/farmer in constant states of indebtedness and serfdom. Historian Wayne Flynt suggests, "between 1865 and 1900, they [poor whites] gradually entered the economic system as industrial wage earning or tenant farmers. This assimilation did not bring prosperity, but at least the wage and tenant system provided a place for poor whites within the prevailing economic institutions."<sup>175</sup> Although the economic conditions of poor whites did not improve during the years of the Redeemer rule, they were absorbed into the economic system, thus allowing for their eventual rise into the political system.<sup>176</sup>

Many writers of the time did not entirely understand what they were seeing when they took it upon themselves to preach the promising times that lay ahead for the New South.<sup>177</sup> Historian C. Vann Woodward notes that the census reports that appeared for 1860-1880 showed that the number of Southern farms had increased, while the size of the average farm had decreased.<sup>178</sup> This led him to speculate that small farming means, in short, meant pigs fed with homemade corn...yarn spun, stockings knit, butter made and sold (instead of bought); eggs, chickens...products of natural animal growth, and grass at nothing a ton.<sup>179</sup> Woodward explained, "Later elaborations pictured this yeomanry 'breaking up the plantation system,' or 'wiping out the last vestige of the planting aristocracy,' and vindicating the Civil War as the bringer of 'economic democracy' to the South."<sup>180</sup> This could not have been farther from the truth. What was being overlooked in the expansion of these farms was the fact that the government was actually counting sharecropping as farms.<sup>181</sup>

What sprung up to take the place of a slave-based economic system was the tenant system of farming, based upon lien credit. According to Woodward, "the lien system was one of the strangest contractual relationships in the history of finance," but "the farmer had to have credit or he would starve."<sup>182</sup> He continues that the interface and interaction of the lien system went like this:

The seeker of credit usually pledged an unplanted crop to pay for a loan in unstipulated amount at a rate on interest to be determined by the creditor. Credit was advanced in the form of supplies – pork, plowpoints, calico, hay – to the extent the merchant considered safely covered by the probably crop. The interest rate was greatly augmented by the price charged on the goods... under this arrangement it was not surprising when, at the end of the season, the farmer was told he had not "paid out." His contract then bound him to renew the lien on his next crop under the same merchant.<sup>183</sup>

This cycle of indebtedness kept the Southern farmer in a stage of constant poverty. Yet, it was not the merchant's fault that this kept happening. The merchant was a middle man who had to

request his money in the form of credit from banks in the North and they were the ones that traditionally set the abhorrent interest rates.<sup>184</sup> The main reasons for tenant farming were a lack of credit in a region with few banks, poor transportation, and fear of labor shortages following the abolition of Slavery.

The amount of poverty that induced landless tenant farming only increased during the New South era. Flynt notes “When the Bureau of Census for the first time investigated the number of landless Southern farmers in 1880, it discovered that tenants operated 36.2 percent of all Southern farms. By 1920 the figure had risen to 49.2 percent.”<sup>185</sup> The poor Southern white working class, whether it was an industrialist or the yeoman farmer, was stuck in a caste system that was unrelenting. The extent of white poverty increased in the late nineteenth century, the numbers augmented by thousands of former farmers whose condition was steadily worsening. Flynt argues, “although some antebellum small farmers had become prosperous landowners or merchants, thousands more were descending into the rank of the tenant farmers, textile mill workers, or miners.”<sup>186</sup> It is clear from Flynt’s examples that poverty was an increasing problem in the South and was not improving.

The grinding poverty of the tenant system had taken its toll on many of the farmers, both land owning and tenant. The tenant system forced many off the land in the years after Reconstruction. Recruiters for the new industrial order that was being amassed in the South promised the tenant farmer a better life in the mill towns, mining camps, and lumberyards. The recruiters were very successful and tens of thousands of poor whites left the struggle of the land for the factory’s spindles, blackness of the mines, and danger of the lumberyard.<sup>187</sup> These new industries drew workers from local farms who were eager for a different occupation that promised a better life.<sup>188</sup>

Things were not better for the Southern industrial worker. Grady noted in his Elberton, Georgia speech (1889) that the youth of the rural South was moving to the cities to try and seek a better life, yet they were not finding it: “It saddens me to see a bright young fellow come to my office from village or country, and I shudder when I think for what a feverish and speculative and uncertain life he has bartered his rural birthright, and surrendered the deliberation and tranquility of his life on the farm.”<sup>189</sup> Many of the workers were underpaid and the owners of necessities were Northern barons of industry that set the prices of goods in a monopolistic fashion that squeezed almost all the money from the Southern worker in the city.<sup>190</sup>

The new industrial base was small in its differentiation of services. The base consisted mostly of lumber, furniture making, tobacco, coal mining, and iron and steel production.<sup>191</sup> The economic industrial system that was implemented exploited the South through its abundance of raw materials, seemingly endless pool of poverty-stricken cheap labor, and absence of labor unions or laws that protected the workers.<sup>192</sup> Conditions within these factories and mines made many who left the farm second guess why they left the farm in the first place. Conditions in the Mill villages, for example, were just a little better than on the tenant farms but the conditions were still wretched.<sup>193</sup>

The textile mill village was similar to the Antebellum plantation that had only died out a few decades before. As Flynt notes, “it was isolated from the adjacent community, produced a single staple commodity, utilized a largely unskilled labor force, and created its own self-contained institutions.”<sup>194</sup> Life for poor whites was not much better than the blacks that had been in slavery just fifteen years earlier. There was no guarantee against unemployment, disability, or old age, and the occasional paternalism of an individual mill owner did not soften the impact of the industry on the poor.<sup>195</sup> The problem for the industrial owners was that because people who

were separated by vast land and farms had come together, they began to recognize their class powerlessness and develop a class-consciousness after they settled into the mill towns. The consciousness started a social movement, the beginning of which Flynt describes: “thousands of Southern Workers were discovering for themselves that industry was a Frankenstein, beckoning them from a hard, monotonous life on the land with beguiling promises, then providing only more poverty amidst the choking lint of the textile mill or unrelenting gloom of the coal mine.”<sup>196</sup> Alternative political parties arose to challenge the established elitist powerful political parties and farm and labor movement began to organize and become stronger in the political environment of the New South.

Soon after the Civil War, the Democratic Party was able to intimidate its way back into power in the South. It did so by running a campaign of white racial unity. It allowed for the aristocracy to exercise disproportionate influence because the people, the poor Southern white workers, were electing wealthy whites that implemented laws and policies that took complete advantage of their economic conditions. Poor whites began to recognize this and independent parties challenged the Democratic hegemony between 1870-1900.<sup>197</sup> They were called by many names – readjusters, the People’s Anti-Bourbon party, the Greenback-Labor Party, Jeffersonian Democrats, Populist, and the Farmers Alliance.<sup>198</sup> Yet whatever their name, the most important part was the fact that they challenged conservative Democrats at every turn. The labor and farmers movement was setting into motion to challenge for political and social power.

The labor movement began to grow in the South later than the labor movements in the rest of the country. This was due in part to the lack of economic advancement that losing the Civil War and Reconstruction brought to the region. Flynt postulates that “when the Knights of Labor began to decline nationally in 1886, it turned its organizational effort to the South. By the

end of that year, there were some 45,700 members of the Knights in the Southern States. Southern locals embraced farmers, textile operatives, sugar cane workers, timber workers, and urban craftsmen.”<sup>199</sup> White working class members of Southern society were all coming together to try and better their lives and their working conditions by joining the various labor unions and movements that were going on during that time.

Industrial workers were not the only ones that came together to fight for a better life. Farmers from all over the South were developing their own interests, and by the late 1880s they had become one of the largest and most influential voting blocs in the South. The largest of these groups was the Farmers Alliance. Flynt notes that “Texas farmers formed the Farmers’ Alliance as an educational and social organization. It spread rapidly throughout the South until it numbered three million white and one-and-a-quarter million black members by 1890.”<sup>200</sup> The group entered politics in the late 1880s seeking to work within the Democratic Party, but soon they realized it was a futile attempt and they began to back whichever candidate supported their causes.

Southern farmers came to the conclusion that public policy and corporations favored everyone on America except for them.<sup>201</sup> The alliance did not rely solely on farmers to fill the ranks of their alliance. As Ayers writes, “the Alliance opened membership to anyone of either gender over sixteen years of age who believed in a supreme being and who was a farmer, farm laborer, a county school teacher, a country physician, or a minister of the gospel.”<sup>202</sup> This allowed for the entire rural community to come together to fight for a unified cause, and that was better representation in the legal systems of the United States during the Gilded Age.

The Farmers Alliance developed demands against the corruption of the political system of the day. The Alliance’s leaders promoted the unlimited coinage of gold and silver and wanted

better economic controls over the price for their goods to stave off the declining values in their crops. Ayers notes that there were “also calls for the state’s recognition of union and cooperative stores, the establishment of a national bureau of labor statistics, a better mechanics lien law, statutes requiring workers be paid on time and with cash instead of scrip, the abolition of convict leasing, and a national conference of all labor organizations.”<sup>203</sup> Their demands gave a unified voice to farmers all over the South and farmers rushed into the Alliance in numbers that surprised everyone.<sup>204</sup> The farmers finally had the organization to fight back and try and raise themselves out of poverty, but it was easier said than done because the Northern industrial and economic system that Grady fought to bring down worked well with the regressive laws of the South.

For all of the reasons stated above in the context of the 1880s, Grady had a monumental task in front of him. The South needed more investments from the North; its business leaders needed an alternative to tenant farming, and the South needed industry as the catalyst to bring about the change. The problem for Grady was that the Southern workers were becoming conscious of their own political power and they were organizing and fighting back, threatening to through out of power Grady’s conservative Democratic Party. He had to develop a message that would embrace the changing times and spur an more progressive era for his party and give voice to the Southern worker against the atrocities brought in by an abusive Northern industrial and economic system. Although Grady’s messages to the poor white worker were an economic socialist’s message, he was a capitalist who had benefited from and had become part of the elite wealthy of the South and Atlanta, specifically.

Because of this stark and dichotomizing reality that Grady faced as an orator, he had to balance the need to convince the Northern investors that the South was ready to work and

produce in an industrious economy and simultaneously support the workers that were being taken advantage of by the Northern industrial elites. He was seeing with his own eyes the exploitation of the farmer and worker by the same people the South was counting on for capital. Grady responded by creating a myth of the Southern worker/farmer as industrious and hardworking, yet one that is victimized by forces that he or she could not control. Grady's use of stories and myth and his ideas of the Southerner are all bound up in the overall identities of whiteness, and those identities are harbored in real economic subjugation of the Southern worker.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### THE NEW SOUTH SPEECH AND THE MYTHIC IMAGE OF THE HARD WORKING POOR WHITE SOUTHERNER

From the outset, Grady constituted a mythic poor white Southern worker that was hard working and just as good, if not better, at production than his/her Northern counterparts. Grady did so by creating his mythic character in the midst of overcoming great obstacles through hard work and industriousness and with the goal of building his/her society back. Grady's poor white Southern worker first found light in his "New South" speech. This chapter attends to this mythic constitution. It begins with a summary of the arguments that Grady made in his "New South" speech and continues into an explanation of the context that lead up to the "New South" speech. First, I will set up the context of the "New South" speech. Then the chapter presents a rhetorical analysis of the "New South" speech and finishes with a conclusion section about the chapter.

Grady built upon many sub-arguments of his main theme of the hard working poor white Southerner. The analysis of the "New South" speech is as follows: Grady first showed that the poor white Southern worker was the same as the Northern worker through his use of the mythic explanation of the convergence of the Puritan and Cavalier into the current American. This combination can be also explained through symbolic action theorist Kenneth Burke's theory of consubstantiality.<sup>205</sup> By using the metaphor of Puritan and Cavalier, Grady brought the Northern and Southern societies together. Grady continued to build the mythic poor white Southern worker by showing how the workers were founded with the honorable Confederate soldier in mind. The story of the Soldier is used to underscore the immense obstacles the poor white

Southern worker had to overcome. Primarily the biggest obstacle for the poor white Southern worker was economic. Yet, through hard work, the South was able to rebuild. Grady had to overcome the widely held theory that Southerners were lazy and he refuted these ideas when he talked about the work of the poor white Southern woman and the difference between theoretical economic expansion and the real economic expansion the South had built through the diversification of its crops and the lowering of its interest rates. Grady promoted the South as a place that was pro-business and ready for a modern economy. He argued that the South was a place that was hampered and held back by the slave based economy. Grady finished his mythic ideal of the poor white Southern worker by connecting the myth of the American Dream to the role of Northern investment in the South. All in all, he glorified the South and the work ethic of its people, all while extolling the benefits of capitalism in reaching the American Dream.

### *Context*

The rhetorical moment that was the “New South” speech (1886) was brought to bear because of the failing race relations in the South and the failure of northern capitalism to bring prosperity to the South. Capitalism had long been involved in American mythos and the U.S. nation’s identity before the Civil War. American capitalism found its justification in the myth of the Chosen Nation and had struck a covenant relationship with its God.<sup>206</sup> This meant that God had ordained capitalism to bless the people of America with prosperity if they worked hard. This may have been true for the North, but the South still did not see what was happening as being a “covenant relationship with God” because it was not the “Chosen Nation” and saw what was happening as oppression by Northern industrialists. If the nation was chosen to benefit then all in the nation should benefit.

The problem was that only a select few were benefiting and those people were the barons of economics and industry from the North. According to historian Edward Ayers, Northern barons of economics and industry built their fortunes on the hard work of others, mainly Southerners.<sup>207</sup> Because of this mythic constitution of the “Chosen Nation,” the South had to create its own myth to understand what was happening to its culture at the time. The function of myth is to transcend ordinary life and provide meaningful grounding for that which cannot be supported rationally, if one were to accept the “Chosen Nation” myth.<sup>208</sup> Rationally, the poor white Southern worker was at a loss to explain why a man who was a hard worker had not realized the golden promises of capitalism and the American Dream. It was a new time for the South economically and the poor white Southern worker was buying into everything capitalism was selling.

Economically, the South was expanding thanks, in great part, to Northern investments in railroads, factories, and mills. Each year more and more people were drawn into the factories and mills, yet there was a need for more investment and a worry that the investors might pull out all together.<sup>209</sup> Cities and towns were springing up where there were previously none before thanks to the railroads.<sup>210</sup> Other tenets that defined the era were the fact that farmers were able to advance their crop production and that Democrats came back into power. Because of railroad transportation and regional production of exceptional goods, farmers were able to “get fertilizer from the mid-west that was better and make growing seasons longer and focus more of their time away from their own fertilizer to tending their crops, thus increasing their yield. Democrats promised that under their direction political bloodshed would cease, race relations would calm, and the economy would improve.”<sup>211</sup> This was not a time of timid political and economic change for the region. It was a “continual redefinition...of unintended and unanticipated consequences,

of unresolved tensions.”<sup>212</sup> It was a time where the South moved from failed policies and a war that set the region back decades in terms of societal advancement.

After the election of 1884, the Republican Party lost control of the U.S. Congress for the first time since the Civil War.<sup>213</sup> They were convinced that they needed to carry some of the Southern states if they were to get back into power. To do this they had to have the Negro<sup>214</sup> vote. What they did was revive an idea that brought agitation from the South, which was federal supervision of national elections in the South.<sup>215</sup> The bill was called a “force bill” by the Southerners and did not sit well with the South because it harkened back to painful memories of federal occupation during the era of Reconstruction. It was called a “force bill” because it would force the Southern states to make sure that all Negro men had the right to vote, which – despite the 14th and 15th Amendments – was not the fact due to various enactments of Jim Crow laws and widespread intimidation by powerful whites in the South.<sup>216</sup> Most people believed that an enactment of the “force bill” would make life as violent and uneasy in the South as it was right after the Civil War.<sup>217</sup>

Since Reconstruction, the Southern Democrats had been in control and usually without any opposition. The promotion of a “force bill” discussion tended to make Northern investors uneasy about conditions in the South and threatened to reverse the economic investments that had already been made in the South.<sup>218</sup> The investors thought that violent race relations would negatively impact their investments or products because of the many effects of violent race subjugation. This would have deleterious effects to all the progress that had been made in the Southern economy and would set the South back even further in its bid to become a modernized economy supporting citizens in the region.<sup>219</sup> This fear of the “force bill” and what it meant for Southern advancement was the reason Henry Grady was selected to give his speech to the New

England Society. Grady was to play the role of assurer to the North when most Northern investors were hesitant to invest in the South. He became known as a homegrown appeaser to those who still clung to traditional Old South norms and values, yet wanted a better economic situation for the South.

One of Grady's closest friends at the time was John H. Inman, an important investor from New York who had invested millions of dollars into the Southern economy.<sup>220</sup> "As director of the Richmond & Danville Railroad Company, Inman had access and was associated with influential bankers who were members of the New England Society."<sup>221</sup> According to Historian Raymond Nixon, Grady was "able to convince his friends that much may be accomplished by having a progressive young Southerner bringing a reassuring message to the North."<sup>222</sup> The society's annual dinner in December, 1886, offered the perfect place for such a speech "because it was always well attended by business and financial leaders and the meeting was widely reported in the press."<sup>223</sup> Never in the eighty-one year history of the organization had a Southerner been invited to address its members.<sup>224</sup> Grady's presence was a historic turning point in North-South relations and his participation spoke volumes about his ethos and importance to Northern investors, as represented by the New England Society.

Grady was the logical man to champion the message of the New South considering he had not fought in the war and had no Confederate background to arouse Northern suspicions. Moreover, "he was known as a journalist, not a politician, and this fact would help establish him as an unbiased spokesperson."<sup>225</sup>

The telegram inviting Grady to appear in New York awaited him when he returned home on the night of November 6, after delivering an address of welcome to the National Prison Reform Convention in Atlanta. The subject of the "New South" was nothing new to Grady, but

he gave much thought and preparation during the weeks prior to the banquet.<sup>226</sup> He had familiarity with the New England Society, and it has been noted that Grady “read the published proceedings of the New England Society and knew that many famous speakers, including one of his idols, Daniel Webster had addressed the organization.”<sup>227</sup> Grady accepted the offer and saw this as a chance to bring change and prosperity to the South.

Grady was accompanied to New York by his friend Marion J. Verdery, who reported to the *Atlanta-Journal Constitution* that Grady was “crowded with attentions.”<sup>228</sup> In the two days preceding the New England Society banquet, Grady was honored by a reception by the Press Club and dinner at the Union League Club. Asked by a report for the Boston newspaper, *The Sun*, what he intended to say in his speech, Grady replied “The Lord only knows? I have thought of a thousand things to say, five hundred of which if I say they will murder me when I get back home, and the other five hundred of which will get me murdered at the banquet.”<sup>229</sup> This was important because Grady was treading a fine line between his immediate Northern audience and how he was going to sell the South and his audience back home in the South, which were worried about how he would portray them to the rest of the country.

The dinner was held in the banquet hall of the famous Delmonico’s Café. All 360 seats had been sold long in advance, and several hundred people had been unable to obtain tickets. Since the dinner celebrated the 266<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock, the first speaker responded to the toast “Forefathers Day” in which he gave a dignified address that pictured the typical American yet to come, a combination of all the good aspects of the European immigrants.<sup>230</sup>

The next toast was to the President of the United States, Grover Cleveland, and in his absence was addressed by General William Tecumseh Sherman. “Sherman was saluted when he

rose to respond to the toast. He talked mostly of the Civil War and shared stories of marching through Georgia.”<sup>231</sup> Grady was a native Georgian and a resident of the city of Atlanta, which Sherman burned to the ground. This is an interesting choice of speaker to have before Grady. This could be to remind Grady what he represents in the South and how powerful and the North is. It seemed like petty gesture to the first Southern speaker that the New England Society had ever hosted.

Next, the president of the society introduced the final speaker of the night: “We have with us tonight a man who has come from that country which General Sherman has just been telling us about – all the way from Georgia. Let us make him feel how glad we are to see him and how kind and affectionate is the feeling entertained by us towards the land from which he has come.” As Grady rose, the audience stood and gave generous applause to the man that was to speak on the New South.<sup>232</sup>

### *The New South Speech*

An analysis of Grady’s speech reveals and punctuates the ways he crafts his mythic character. Grady began his speech by using a metaphor to compare two different prototypical founders of the country: one from the north and one from south. He called the Northerner the Puritan and the Southerner the Cavalier. Both, he would say, played an important role in creating an economic identity for the inhabitants of the South. Grady began by noting “The fact that the Cavalier as well as the Puritan was on the continent in its early days, and that he was ‘up and able to be about.’”<sup>233</sup> The notion that they were “up and able to be about” is important because it showed that both groups of people were willing to work hard to develop the country that they had found. This work ethic would, at the time Grady was alive, build one of the wealthiest nations in the world. It allowed Southerners, some of whom would have the opportunity to read

Grady's speech the next day, to get the idea that their forefathers were hard working and that they should continue in that lineage of work ethic. It allowed for a mythic constitution of a poor white Southern worker that was willing to work because it was in their blood and part of their culture all along. It allowed for his immediate audience to see that both the North and the South were from similar positions when it came to industriousness and it helped to wipe away the questions of why the North was so much better off than the South.

Grady took his explanation of the Cavalier a step further as he described the bountiful success the Cavalier was gaining from his hard work. Grady pointed out that "the Cavalier was courting everything in sight, and that the Almighty had vouchsafed great increase to the Cavalier colonies, the huts in the wilderness being as full as the nests in the woods."<sup>234</sup> The Cavalier was working hard to tame, build, and create a new country for his people. Because of his work ethic, Grady made it seem that God blessed the Cavalier.<sup>235</sup> The Cavaliers' work ethic, combined with divine intervention, led to a prosperous society that was just as bountiful as the "nests in the woods." The allusion of the nests in the woods is important in understanding the bountifulness of prosperity the Cavalier was achieving. When America was discovered, it was virtually untouched, at least by westerners, and was heralded for the amount of natural resources it could provide. The nests refer to the large amount of almost endless natural commodities that the Anglo/Europeans had discovered. And so with the strong work ethic that the Cavalier/Southerner had, he was able to create a great society that was as impressive as the natural landscape of America itself.

Concentration on the Cavalier and the Puritan is important because it allowed for the audience to see the Southerner as someone who is not different from himself, thus, making the North more likely to invest capital into the South. The concentration on the Cavalier and Puritan

served to reunite the North and the South after the fractions caused by the Civil War and Reconstruction and it set a foundation for the mythic constitution of the Southerner that Grady develops throughout his New South Speech.

Grady continued his evolution of the Cavalier and Puritan to the point that they become one – the first American. He did so when he said, “But both Puritan and Cavalier were lost in the storm of the first Revolution, and the American Citizen, supplanting both and stronger than either, took possession of the republic bought by their common blood fashioned to wisdom, and charged himself with teaching men government and establishing the voice of the people as the voice of God.”<sup>236</sup> Every positive aspect of the separate Puritan and Cavalier came together to create something that was stronger than each, as different entities. “The American Citizen” allowed for a metaphorical unification of Puritan and Cavalier, North and South, into what all members of America share as a unified identity of the American. Communication scholar Michael Osborn points out that metaphors are “popular in rhetorical discourse...grounded in prominent features of experience, in objects, actions, or conditions which are inescapably salient in human consciousness”<sup>237</sup> This means that metaphors are used in popular communication and are understood by cultures because the metaphor is built by their shared culture consciousness. The shared consciousness of what it meant to be an American was an attempt by Grady to unite his two audiences. Strategically, this may have allowed for the Northern people in the audience to take a more favorable view of Southerners because they should see the Southerner as a type of kindred spirit in the form of mythic Americanism. Therefore, economically speaking, the people of the South should be seen as hard working and prosperous as the North.

Another aspect of the metaphor linkage between the Puritan and Cavalier can be seen through the theoretical use of consubstantiality. Burke uses the concept of identification and

consubstantiality interchangeable. Burke argues that the basic motive of rhetoric is that people communicate in an attempt to eliminate division between one another.<sup>238</sup> This elimination is to create some sort of shared identity between the rhetor and the audience, which is the shared substance that creates consubstantiality.<sup>239</sup> When two groups are share more ideas and are more consubstantial to one another then they are more likely to be persuaded by one another.<sup>240</sup> Grady used the metaphorically analysis of Puritan (Northerner) and Cavalier (Southerner) to try and unite the identities of him as the rhetor that was a Southerner and his audience that was made up of Northerners. This rhetorical act allowed for the two sides to share a common theme of becoming the American and would thus allow for a greater chance that Grady would be able to persuade his audience.

Constructing a historical ideal and trying to unify his audience with the people he was speaking on behalf of, was marginally effective and Grady needed more. Communication scholars Leroy Dorsey and Rachel Harlow note “Mythic stories are revered origins, gallant behaviors, and life threatening encounters dramatically retold, which can rang from factual to the fictive, and fuel a nation’s imagination with wonder about itself.”<sup>241</sup> This is the beginning of mythic story and it began the revered origins of the poor white Southern worker twenty years after the end of the Civil War. Grady started to build the identity of the southerner, for his audience, in the form of a mythic narrative. He did so when he said “Let me picture to you the footsore Confederate soldier, as buttoning up in his faded gray jacket the parole which was to bear testimony to his children of his fidelity and fault, he turned his face southward from Appomattox in April, 1865.”<sup>242</sup> The Confederate soldier was a representation of the South that fought during the Civil War. The jacket represented both the South’s honor and error. It allowed for an appeasement of Grady’s immediate Northern audience by placating their victory over the

South, yet at the same time painting the Southerner as someone who was honorable and trustworthy and that is willing to do what they believe was right in the face of what they now believed was wrong. The jacket represented was the Southerners' loyalty to a cause, a cause that Grady argued during the time of 1886, was being an American and sharing in the economic success that the industrial revolution and the Gilded Age had come to offer.

Although the Southern Confederate soldier may have had honor in the new task, it was imperative that Grady show how downtrodden the Southerner was at the end of the war so as to be able to create a vivid ideal of the poor white Southern worker and the obstacles he had to overcome. As mythologist Norman Austin notes, myths “articulate our experience of ourselves in our social and natural environment,” making the chaotic and complex dynamic of human life understandable.<sup>243</sup> Grady articulates the experience to try and make his audience understand the hard and complex life the poor white Southern worker had to endure after the Civil War. Grady described the Southerner as follows: “Think of him as ragged, half-starved, heavy hearted, enfeebled by want and wounds, having fought to exhaustion, he surrenders his gun, wrings the hands of his comrades in silence, and lifting his tear stained and pallid face for the last time to the graves that dot, old Virginia hills, pull his gray cap over his brow and begins the slow and painful journey.”<sup>244</sup> Southern Confederate soldiers, as representations of the South as a whole, were in utter desperation from the sweeping devastation of the war. Their goods, such as clothes, were worn out; most of the people were starving and facing mal-nourishment because the farms had been destroyed and/or because the men could not tend the farms for fighting in the war. Their spirit was broken because the cause they had given so much to was defeated, and they were wounded both physically and mentally from four years of war. Grady painted the South as a battered and beaten group of people who had given everything and then had to rebuild from a

land that was left in waste. When Grady mentioned the “slow and painful journey” it is not only a literal description of the journey that the soldiers had to make as they returned, but it was a metaphor for the rebuilding of the South. All of this was the natural state that the poor white Southerner was in. Reconstruction was a long and painful era for the country as a whole and the South had yet to reach its full acclimation of where it should have been if a war had never took place. That was a possible reason for Grady agreeing to give the speech in the first place: to bring back badly-needed Northern investment in the South so that the “slow and painful journey” could finally come to an end.

Grady then brought together a direct comparison of the two sides so as to show the North how bad the South actually had it when the war was over, and to show all that the South had to overcome as a society. He pointed this out by arguing:

What does he find – let me ask you who went to your homes eager to find, in the welcome you had justly earned, full payment for four years sacrifice – what does he find when, having followed the battle-stained cross against overwhelming odds, dreading death not half so much as surrender, he reaches the home he left so prosperous and beautiful? He finds his house in ruins, his farm devastated, his slaves free, his stock killed, his barns empty, his trade destroyed, his money worthless, his social system, feudal in its magnificence, swept away; his people without law or legal status; his comrades slain and the burdens of others heavy on his shoulders. Crushed by defeat, his very traditions are gone.<sup>245</sup>

This is an example of the mythic constitution that Dorsey and Harlow mentioned about how myth is “constructed by life threatening encounters that are dramatically retold.”<sup>246</sup> This is a story of the difference in status between the members of the North and South right after the Civil War. Grady acknowledged that Northern soldiers had received everything they were promised. They got the money for the work that they had done. However, everything the Southern soldier and the Southerner in general had known was gone. Their way of life was completely destroyed. The way they made money, a slave based agriculture, was completely gone. The money that the

soldiers and Southerners had earned during the time of the war was worthless because their country had lost. Most of the people were still considered enemies of the state until they went through extensive reevaluation by government officials and swore their allegiance to the Union. The wealthier plantation owners and politicians were never given complete citizen status for many decades after the war. Their entire way of living, their society, their culture, and their prosperity were gone and the struggle they faced to rebuild it was monumental. Yet, it was very important for Grady to lay out the struggle, in vivid detail, that the South faced because he was going to use it as a way of building identity of the poor white Southern worker for the Northern capitalists and barons that were in the audience that night. It was also important, mythically, because the struggle built the “universe” that the poor white Southern worker lived in. It is the place where the protagonist of this myth lives. He had one example of hardship left to make and that was of the economic struggle the average Southerner faced and the issue of what to do with a newly free group of people after the war.

Grady described the economic and freedman problems as something that was intertwined into the daily life of Southern society.<sup>247</sup> He pointed out that “Crushed by defeat, [the Southerner’s] very traditions are gone. Without money, credit, employment, material, or training; and beside all this, confronted with the gravest problem that ever met human intelligence – establishing of a status for the vast body of his liberated slaves.”<sup>248</sup> Economically, the Southerner had nothing. Yet, as Grady noted before, the Northerners returned to everything they were promised. In the South there were no banks to lend money, and the employers only had one staple crop that they knew they could grow but they had to deal with the problem of their lack of money because now they had to partake in the wage labor system instead of slavery. Economics were not the only issue facing the South with what should be done with the newly free slaves.

Southerners also had to completely reestablish a cultural working order to take into account this new group of freemen that were given the same rights as the people that owned them just months prior. The race relations that had sprung up over the last twenty years in the South was one major reason that Grady came to address the New England Society.

*Mythic Struggle and Hard Working Poor White Southern Worker*

So, Southerners had no money and a weak economic system that led to rampant poverty, plus they had to deal with what to do with a large newly free population that the North itself didn't have any real answer for. This all came together to represent the struggle of the poor white Southern worker – a struggle that seemed so insurmountable that one would think it was a miracle that they had advanced to the point that they did over the twenty-year period that led to this rhetorical moment. In the end, Grady took the struggle and gave an answer to Northerners in the form of the Mythic poor white Southern worker. It is important to note here that mythologist Joseph Campbell argues that such narratives worked to “carry the human spirit forward,” providing people with the spiritual aid necessary to meet their imagined destiny.<sup>249</sup> This destiny was to have the poor white Southern worker reemerge from all of the troubled times and be able to achieve a higher standard of living, through the American Dream.

Grady began to create the mythic identity of the poor white Southern worker, after taking careful precautions in building up the Southerners trails and troubles. As noted in Chapter Two, a myth captures its audience's attention and influences its thinking with three basic elements: the universe, the protagonist, and the narrative. According to historian Richard Slotkin, the universe depicts the backdrop in which the story unfolds, revealing a world-scene that provides the motivation for the characters' actions.<sup>250</sup> Grady has started to build the universe by describing in detail the struggles the Southerner went through after the Civil War. Grady's next step was to

describe the protagonist, or hero, becomes the archetype with whom the audience can identify. In Grady's speech, the protagonist was the poor white Southern worker. The struggles in the universe define the type of behavior necessary for survival in both the universe and in the real world that it represents.<sup>251</sup> Therefore, Grady showed that the protagonist poor white Southern worker had to struggle with limited supplies to rebuild the South, but they got through it because they were hard workers. Grady drove this point home with a narrative about the hard work ethic that the Southerners possessed.

Mythically, the hard working hero of the South was not someone that would let issues of Reconstruction get his/her way. Grady made this point when he stated, "What does he do – this hero in gray with a heart of gold? Does he sit down in sullenness and despair? Not for a day. Surely God, who had stripped him of his prosperity, inspired him in his adversity. As ruin was never before so overwhelming, never was restoration swifter."<sup>252</sup> Grady moved away from the problems of the South and the issues that the Southerner faced into the mythic constitution of the poor white Southern worker that was hard working and industrious, a worker that restores their country that was destroyed by their bad decisions. It was a quick rebuilding of the South and the communities that lied within by a noble hard working individual that had overcome nearly biblical and supernatural destruction of their lives.

The first mythic creation that Grady raised was the myth of the industrious worker. He needed to create and devise and communicate the myth to a Northern audience so that it would feel secure in investing corporate and private capital in the South. Because of the popular press of the time, Southerners were seen during the Civil War as being lazy (because they had slaves) and extravagant with their money.<sup>253</sup> Grady addressed the situation of how the southern man and woman, as individuals, should be seen as industrious. He did so with his statement,

As the soldier stepped from the trenches into the furrow; horses that had charged federal guns marched before the plow, and fields that ran red with human blood in April were green with the harvest in June; women reared in luxury cut up their dresses and made breeches for their husbands, and, with a patience and heroism that fit women always as a garment, gave their hands to work. There was little bitterness in all this. Cheerfulness and frankness prevailed. Bill Arp struck the key-note when he said: "Well, I killed as many of them as they did if me, and now I'm going to work."<sup>254</sup>

Grady painted the identity of the Southern man as industrious to the bankers and businessmen in attendance and he adeptly accomplished his goal. He brought to life the startling violence of the war and envisions a myth of industriousness by using the statement "the fields that ran red with human blood in April were green with harvest in June." The idea of "fields running red with blood" creates a monumental problem to the Southern farmer that is returning to his fields. The sharp turnaround time of three months from war to farming prosperity was an attempt to get the audience to see the soldier that came from that war, twenty years previous, as an industrious man that will work hard for his crop and his livelihood. This turnaround time was almost superhuman, part of a work ethic that could overcome the seemingly impossible and make a better life for the worker. This is an example of how the poor white Southern worker dealt with the problems in his/her universe. This myth of hard working allowed the investors to feel safe in their investment of capital to the South because the workers were not lazy and were almost superhuman in their drive to produce and live a better life.

Grady continued his mythic narrative impulse when he brought the Southern woman into the speech and showed how she dealt with her universe and, as Campbell would note, carry the human spirit of the poor white Southern worker forward.<sup>255</sup> Grady moved to create the ideal of poor white Southern workers when he drove home the point of sacrifice and hard work when he spoke of "women that had been reared in luxury cutting up their dresses to make breeches for their husband." Women of the South were supposed to be genteel and not work or have to

sacrifice. Obviously, with their homeland in ruin they had no other choice but to begin to work so that their families and communities would survive. This sacrifice showed that even the women that were “reared in luxury” and therefore used to a life of no work, could change now that the demands had caused them to work for a living. This mythic creation of a hard working woman in the South is the biggest dispeller of the stereotype that Southern people were lazy.

The connection to making clothes is also important in this speech because one of the largest industrial developments in the South was the explosion of textile mills and the mill towns that came along with this industry. The mills produced clothes and were filled mostly by women and children. Here, in this particular speech, was an allusion to the work of clothes making that most had come to expect as women’s work in the new industries of the New South.

Grady gave many examples of Southern industriousness and what it could create, with its own limited resources. He began by describing the largest Southern city, Atlanta, noting “That from the ashes he left us in 1864 we have raised a brave and beautiful city; that somehow or other we have caught the sunshine in the bricks and mortar of our homes, and have builded therein not one ignoble prejudice or memory.”<sup>256</sup> This statement served two purposes. First, it was to show again the ability of the poor white Southern worker and the Southern people as a whole, as magnanimous in their ability to work and produce from ruin. As noted earlier, it is the protagonist and his relationship with his universe. It is also an example of “gallant behaviors” that build the mythic identity of the South.<sup>257</sup> Not only did they rebuild their flagship city, but they rebuilt their homes and communities the best they could. Second, it was to show the Northern audience that the South held no ill will towards the people who beat them and left their society in ruins. They had “Caught the sunshine” in their buildings, which is a representation of the luck, good will and feelings that the society needed in order to rebuild what they had lost.

Grady promoted a society that is on the upswing in their restoration and strength as an economic system. Yet, he was able to go beyond metaphors to describe the resurgence in the South. He used narratives of struggles to show mythically constituted gallant behaviors and showed the interaction of the protagonists with the universe that they had been living in that caused them so much trouble.

Grady brought together accomplishments not only for white Southerners but what black and white Southerners had been able to do in the last twenty years since Emancipation. What Grady described next is what Slotkin calls “the relationship between the protagonist and the universe,” establishing the “laws of cause and effect, of natural process, and of morality” within which the protagonist acts.<sup>258</sup> Here we see Grady fomenting a process of morality after the Civil War for the mythic poor white Southern worker. Grady did this when he said, “We have planted the schoolhouse on the hilltop and made it free to white and black. We have sowed towns and cities in the place of theory, and put business above politics. We have challenged your spinners in Massachusetts and your iron-makers in Pennsylvania.”<sup>259</sup> Grady wove multiple mythic identity structures through this section of discourse. Overall, he showed that morally, the poor white Southern worker had made things of value, such as education, available to all people in the South. More specifically, he promoted the idea that education is valued and Southern society, so much so, that it is made available to all children in the South. This was the one thing that African Americans were not discriminated on, as far as a chance for an education goes. The imagery of the schoolhouse being on the hilltop was important because being on top represented dominance or something that was vital and sacred for the people in the community.

The next sentence in Grady’s discourse went beyond creating a hard working identity of poor Southern white people; it showed practical societal norms as they related to business and

how the universe of the South worked in business contexts. It also created a mythic ideal of applied work over abstract work. For example, when Grady said, “we sowed town and cities in the place of theory” he was alluding to the ability of the poor white Southern worker to actually build something instead of just thinking about it. It showed that the worker was capable of creating large works and it showed that they could have benefited from their practices of labor. It differentiated the jobs of people who do not perform labor, such as doctors and lawyers, and made it seem as if Southern society is full of hardworking laborers and not as advanced in the white color professions. This was exactly what the northern business interests in the audience wanted to hear. They needed large amounts of unskilled labor and raw material commodities and Grady painted a mythic picture of a South with both in spades. He helped constitute a mythic protagonist who was able to create and build from a situation that was never ideal, yet it could be improved on if the audience in attendance invested in the South and its mythic workforce of industrious hard working people.

Next, Grady described the role of business as it related to Southern society. He was fond quipping, “put business above politics.” This was telling in the sense that politics is supposed to represent government and government represents the will of the people. If business is put before politics, then it could also be conceived that it will be put above the will of the people to create very business friendly laws and regulations. This is exactly what happened, and as will be discussed later, it played a part in a large-scale social movement in the South. One of the parts of a myth, as noted above, is that the “universe” is relational to what the protagonist goes through.<sup>260</sup> The South that is business friendly and can work against the will of the people sets up for different kind of universe for the poor Southern white worker. Up to this point, the “universe” had only caused problems based on lack of development and it gave a backdrop for the

protagonist to be defined based on overcoming these problems through hard work. Now, the “universe” was presenting a whole new set of problems for the poor white Southern worker, but it could benefit the Northern capitalist in the room. So, it can be seen that Grady sold the investors on the idea that the South, as a whole, was culturally in favor of business over politics, valued education for all members of their society, and was full of labor ready individuals and abundant material commodities that would make the business interest in the audience very wealthy.

One problem the South was still facing was the wide spread stereotype that the people who lived there were lazy.<sup>261</sup> Grady took that stereotype on and tried to replace it with his view of the South when he said, “We have challenged your spinners in Massachusetts and your iron-makers in Pennsylvania.” Massachusetts and other parts of New England were renowned for their textile mills. One of, if not the most important economic investment structure that small towns needed in the South, was that of the mill town.<sup>262</sup> Grady was trying to convince the barons of textile industry to bring more mills into the South because they were able to produce just as much product as the famed mill workers of Massachusetts and New England. Another important staple commodity that the South had plenty of was Iron ore.<sup>263</sup> The establishment of the City of Birmingham (Alabama), the largest boomtown of the New South era, was a direct result of the iron rich land that surrounded the city. Grady pointed out that the commodities and industrial interests that the North had been famous for could also be replicated in the South. The challenging of the output of the Northern worker was a direct response to the stereotype that Southerners were lazy and it was his attempt to create a mythic poor white Southern worker that was able to keep up and produce with anyone in the world. Combine that with cheap labor and favorable business policies that placed business before the worker, you have a South that looked

like a cornucopia for the barons of Industry and a fertile ground to produce and procure more wealth for those that would invest. However, there was one more aspect of Southern industrialism that Grady was going to address in his attempt to promote the South.

To this point, Grady had painted the Southerner as a person that has no privilege and has had to work in unbelievable conditions to gain any sort of economic prosperity. Historically, this pointed out that there were a section of white people that were not privileged. This goes against the scholarly arguments presented by critical film scholar Richard Dyer and communication studies scholars Thomas Nakayama and Robert Krizek, in which both have argued that whiteness is an all powerful point of privilege.<sup>264265</sup> The points that Grady made back up other scholars, such as Anthropologist Kirby Moss, in his argument that poor white people have no privilege over any other race because they do not have the economic means to get ahead.<sup>266</sup>

Grady compiled one last argument in his selling of the South and mythic constitution of the poor white Southern worker. It was the pay off of hard work and reaping the fruits of their labor that were actually not being seen by any of the poor white Southern workers. They were seeing some benefits, such as lower interest rates, but what they really needed to control their destiny was money and they were missing that. Grady challenged three of the eight tenants of the American Dream myth that DeSantis categorize are 1) Wealth: the promise that one can procure money, property, and the good life that accompanies such acquisitions; 2) Puritan Work Ethic: The promise that one is able to find meaningful work; and 3) Consumption and leisure: the promise that one can secure products and services that aid a lifestyle marked by relaxation and self-indulgence.<sup>267</sup> Grady told the audience “We have learned that the \$400,000,000 annually received from our cotton crop will make use rich when the supplies that make it are home-raised. We have reduced the commercial rate of interest from 24 to 6 per cent.”<sup>268</sup> The poor white

Southern worker was producing a vast amount of cotton with an incredible return for the time period. Yet, there was an issue. The South and the white workers that farm the cotton are not seeing any of the benefits because what they need to raise the cotton was not coming from the South.<sup>269</sup> The poor white Southern worker was not able to procure the capital and tools it needed to work into the American Dream myth. The tools were being made in the North and the fertilizer was coming from the West. The credit that was needed to buy the seeds and to rent the land was coming from Northern Banks and the interest was killing any profit that the worker was trying to make. These poor white Southern workers were at a disadvantage when it came to making money by producing their own goods. They had no white privilege, in regards to overall white privilege, when taken into account how much better other workers from across the country had it. Therefore the lack of privilege that Grady argued about refutes commonly held beliefs that all whiteness is privileged and even goes to back up the points promoted by Flynt earlier in the chapter.<sup>270</sup> Grady showed that the poor white Southern worker could produce a large quantity of a good, yet they needed help in bringing some of the money back into the South so that it could be more self supportive society. The issue of the South's money being taken from them by the North, either through economic or legal ways, will be brought up by Grady in his subsequent speeches.

Grady pointed out that the South had seen a staggering reduction in its commercial interest charges. This is important because it adds to the myth of the poor white Southern worker as someone that can pay back their debts. Grady and the audience he is speaking to that night both know that the South needs and influx of Northern capital to allow for lending so that growth can happen in the South. Therefore, with Grady pointing out the South's reduction in interest rates, it showed that the lenders did not have to take such a large risk lending to the people of the

South. This is because when a lender was taking a greater risk of lending, the interest rate was higher, at 24 percent as Grady noted. As the lender knew it was more and more likely they will get their money back, they were able to lower the interest rate for the person(s) they were lending to. If the Northern economic barons felt safer about lending they were more likely to lend and lend more money to the South, thus helping the South grow economically and this can only work if they believed the poor white Southern worker will pay them back. Consequently, that is why it was important that Grady mentioned the reduction in commercial interests so that he could paint the mythic white working Southerner as someone that will pay their debts in full.

To be able to pay debts, a person must not spend all of his/her money on things that he/she does not need. This perception of the white Southerner doing this by living in a lavish house was still a real issue because some still believed in the afore mentioned stereotype that the South had slaves because they were lazy and wanted more money to live a more opulent lifestyle.<sup>271</sup> Grady had to confront this issue and he did when he said, “We have established thrift in city and country. We have fallen in love with work.”<sup>272</sup> Small time farmers and tenant farmers had, for a long time, been seen as thrifty. But people in the cities had not. Grady helped create a unified myth of the South by saying thrift had been brought in to the communities of both the city and the Country. Also, he then reassured the audience of the New England Society that the South, as a whole, had fallen in love with work. He said this because his mythic constitution that he alluded to earlier could have been construed by the audience to have multiple meanings of the South and their work ethic. But this statement leaves nothing to doubt. All members of the South had fallen in love with work and would produce returns to those that invested in them. It is assumed here that all work was meaningful to the poor white Southern worker. If so, then it is

easy to see that Grady supported one of the eight tenants that Desantis pointed out, the ability to find meaningful work.

Through all of this Grady still had to address the issue of racial problems that the investors had been nervous about in the first place. This is also why this study is focused on poor white Southern worker identity. His Northern audience was white, his Southern audience was white, and the workers that were going to fill the industry needs were white. Although there are no rhetorical elements to whiteness, the agreed upon theory of whiteness in communication studies is that whiteness is a space of invisibility and that all white people are privileged just because they are white. In the sense of racial problems it is not invisible because the racial problems arising from freed African Americans was based upon the fact that they were definitely not white, therefore, the concept of race and whiteness being invisible was a moot point. The second issue of all white people having an advantage does not work here either. Mainly because the poor white Southern worker had equal economic disadvantages because the rich white people were exploiting the poor white Southern workers labor, much like the rich white Southern farm owner had done to the slaves before the Civil War.

Grady only mentions African Americans at the end of the speech, patronizes them and does not give much in the way of any societal construction of African Americans in the South. He painted them as a helpless childlike victim that is now better and has all the rights and equalities that white people had. All of Grady's speeches address issues only white Southerners were facing and African Americans are only addressed when they have to be, otherwise, they seem to be an invisible part of Southern Society.

Up to the point of the New South speech, both African American and poor white Southern workers were invisible people. No one spoke on their behalf and that is why there was

such a large scale movement underway throughout the country and in the South. The only reason they were mentioned as the mythic worker in Grady's speech was because of sheer numbers, the only group that could meet the demand of the industrial revolution in the Gilded Age was the members of the poor white Southern worker group.

Grady connects the problems that the South had faced economically, before the Civil War, with the problem of slavery. By doing so he was able to show a South that was a victim to the system, along with the slave:

The shackles that had held her [the South] in narrow limitations fell forever when the shackles of the negro slave were broken. Under the old regime the negroes were slaves to the South; the South was a slave to the system...thus was gathered in the hands of a splendid and chivalric oligarchy the substance that should have been diffused among the people, as the rich blood, under certain artificial conditions, is gathered at the heart, filling that with affluent rapture but leaving the body chill and colorless.<sup>273</sup>

By making the comparison that shackles limited the South, just as the "Negro," Grady constituted a South that was held captive by its wealthy oligarchy. It was a South that had no say in what was going on, which is historically accurate.<sup>274</sup> This was also the first time that Grady addresses the issues of the abuses of an elite group that owns most of the money and property in a region, or country when the South was the Confederate States of America. Grady promoted a socialistic view of the spread of wealth when he said, "thus was gathered in the hands of a splendid and chivalric oligarchy the substance that should have been diffused among the people." Slavery punctuated the condition of abundant wealth that was seated with a few at the top of the social system, and in later speeches, this concept would be the main theme in Grady's speeches.

Grady used metaphors to make his argument that a concentration of wealth was a poor decision for Southern Society. He accused the hoarding of wealth as being bad for the South when he said, "as rich blood, under certain artificial conditions, is gathered at the hear, filling

that with affluent rapture but leaving the body chill and colorless.” Mythically, this gets to the tenant that DeSantis says is part of the American Dream myth of consumption and leisure.<sup>275</sup> The people of the South are not getting the money they need to consume or live a life of leisure. Therefore, Grady pointed out the holes in the American Dream myth and offers one of his own in replacement. In his speech, the heart represents the beating life blood of the economic system of the South, the oligarchy, while the rest of the body is the entire Southern society. The blood represents capital and wealth and by it being placed in one area of the body, the rest slowly died away, as did the South under the slavery based agrarian economic system. It is also still important to remember that the African Americans of the South were just points of reference for the South in Grady’s speeches. Mythically, the real victims were the poor whites that did not receive any of the wealth from the economic system and remained “chill and colorless.” This is a myth of a Southern that is dead and has no life, other than just scraping by in the current economic system. The South was saved when the slave was freed. There is nothing else about the importance of the end of slavery other than it helped out the poor white working class of the South.

Grady finished his speech by addressing one important point in the reputation of the South, and by promoting the idea of Southern investment. First, Grady told his audience to look past initial impressions of the South when he said, “A social system compact and closely knitted, less splendid on the surface, but stronger at the core – a hundred farms for every plantation, fifty homes for every palace – and a diversified industry that meets the complex need of this complex age.”<sup>276</sup> Grady acknowledges that the South, with its rampant poverty and racial prejudice and violence, does not look as appealing as it should when he said “less splendid on the surface.” Yet, he brokered a different set of views by arguing that the society is stable and “stronger at the

core.” This is to give reassurance to the audience on their investments in the South and to show that the South has been able to move on from its problems by breaking up plantation home and allowing for the advancement of industry during their boom time era of the Gilded Age.

Second, Grady finished by promoting a South that was ready to achieve everything the American Dream promised. He noted that “the New South is enamored in her new work...she is thrilling with the consciousness of growing power and prosperity.”<sup>277</sup> The New South being “enamored in her new work” showed a South that was ready to move past the agrarian slave based economic model that ran the system for so long. They were ready to get past the hard years of Reconstruction and join in the new work of building a stronger and better America through the advancements of the Industrial Revolution, a Revolution that had, until this point, escaped the South and led to its economic and cultural stagnation behind the rest of the country. The new industry, infusion of capital, and booming wage labor jobs for the white working class, according to Grady, would bring about the “power and prosperity” the South so desperately needed.

It was a fitting end to one of the greatest speeches in American public address and he sold the South and its people as the harbingers of a new area of advancement in capitalism because of the untouched resources the South had to offer. He vividly created the poor white Southern worker as someone that did not rest in defeat and fill their time with sorrow. He created a Southern worker that was industrious and one, and because of things out of their control, allowed for the ills of slavery to persist even though it hurt them too. He mythically constituted a worker that was ready to work and produce for the audience at hand, if only they would take a chance and invest in the worker that was sure to bring them a profitable return. This is all built from DeSantis’s argument that the American Dream myth was procured on a Puritan work ethic of being able to find meaningful work.<sup>278</sup> The issue was that the poor white Southern worker could

not find meaningful work and the only way the people of the South could find meaningful work would be from the influx of capital and industry from the North. So to accomplish this goal, Grady promoted a hardworking poor white Southern worker that was industrious and valued work above all else.

### *Conclusion*

The day following the “New South” speech newspapers from all over the North extolled praise upon Grady and his address. Many were calling it not only best of the night but the best speech given all year. R. Miller, editor of the *Times* said: “It was eloquent. It swept the whole range of emotion, of sentiment, and of patriotism...in all its fourscore years the society of Plymouth Rock worshippers never heard a speech that was better worth its while to hear and think about.”<sup>279</sup> The *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* of New York, one of Grady’s primary audiences, also gave a flattering review of the speech.<sup>280</sup>

Grady was treated as a victorious dignitary upon his return to Atlanta. It has been noted, that “when Grady returned to Atlanta on Christmas Eve, he was met at the railroad station by a reception committee, a brass band, and ‘at least a thousand people,’ who escorted him to the Kimball House. Here the leading figures of Atlanta and Georgia passed through the parlors, partook of champagne punch, and shook the hand of their rising national hero.”<sup>281</sup> Grady made an impressive impact on the rest of the country. Most of the newspapers were singing his praises, and the South that he created was a South that was different. It was a region of the country that everyone could be proud of. It was a South that rejected common themes of laziness and backwardness. The Southern dignitaries came out and had such a celebration because Grady, through his New South speech, made Southerners proud to be from the South.

Grady used his platform to help create a new mythic identity for the poor white Southern worker, and the South as an economic machine. Grady successfully showed that there was no difference between the North and the South in respects to lineage and valor, as they both came together to create the first “American.” He demonstrated that even after the South had been destroyed by four years of war and an ineffective reconstruction program, the poor white Southern worker was a laborer who was industrious and could overcome any obstacle that was set in front of him/her because of his/her hard working ethic. He displayed that the South, as an economic source of capital and industry, was ready to be built and used and could provide a great return on investment for whomever would take the chance. He promoted the raw materials and the business friendly laws that allow for business to be conducted with limited interruption from workers. He exhibited a South that was remorseful for its bondage of African Americans and a South that was no longer at conflict based upon racial issues of the day.

Grady effectively marketed the South as a “New South.” He made it a South in which traditional issues and problems would no longer be afoot; a South that was ready to join the rest of the country in its prosperity; a South that could gain resources so that the white working class had a chance at participating in the American Dream. Grady’s New South was peaceful, full of abundance in labor and commodities, and business friendly almost to a fault. This was the South that the investors needed to see and it is the South that Grady sold them on; it was a pro-capitalist South.

The pro-capitalist South that was a unified and stronger South looked beyond agrarianism for its livelihood and the ability of this industry to meet the needs of the complex era of Grady. However, what Grady did not know at the time was that in many respects his approach to improvement would make matters worse for most Southerners rather than help the poor white

Southern worker reap the benefits of what capitalism promised.<sup>282</sup> There was a movement underway that would be the most sweeping political movement the United States had seen since the Civil War. The large political movement came from the farmers of the South. Farmers were facing a depression of their goods, more and more Southerners were poor, and Populism was on the rise. Farmers had realized, for the first time since the American Revolution, how large and important their voting bloc was and the impact they could have on Southern society. The farmers and workers were tired of being used as cheap labor and not getting the representation they deserved from their political leaders. Grady had to address these situations if he was to stay a relevant leader and politician in Atlanta, the State of Georgia, the South, and the Nation.

From the outset, Grady constituted a mythic poor white Southern worker who was hard working and just as good, if not better, at production than his/her Northern counterparts. Grady did so by devising his mythic character in the midst of overcoming great obstacles through hard work and industriousness and with the goal of building his/her society back. Grady's poor white Southern worker first found light in his "New South" speech. This chapter attended to this mythic constitution. It began with a summary of the arguments that Grady made in his "New South" speech and continued into an explanation of the context that led up to the "New South" speech.

Grady built upon many sub-arguments of his main theme of the hard working poor white Southerner. The analysis of the "New South" speech is as follows: Grady first showed that the poor white Southern worker was the same as the Northern worker through his use of the mythic explanation of the convergence of the Puritan and Cavalier into the current American. Again, this combination can be also explained by Burke's consubstantiality. By using the metaphor of Puritan and Cavalier, Grady brought together the regional cultures of the North and the South.

Grady constituted the mythic poor white Southern worker by showing how the workers were founded from the metaphor of the honorable Confederate soldier. The story of the Soldier was used to underscore the immense obstacles the poor white Southern worker had to overcome. Primarily the biggest obstacle for the poor white Southern worker was a disastrous economic condition. Yet, through hard work, the South was able to rebuild.

Economic challenges were not the only thing that Grady addressed in his speech. Grady had to overcome the widely held stereotype that Southerners were lazy. He refuted these ideas when he talked about the work of the poor white Southern woman and the work of the Confederate Soldier upon his return from the Civil War. Grady also showed a difference between theoretical economic expansion and the real economic expansion the South had built through the diversification of its crops and the lowering of its interest rates. Grady promoted the South as a place that was pro-business and ready for a modern economy. He argued that the South was a place that was hampered and held back by the slave-based economy. Grady finished his mythic ideal of the poor white Southern worker by connecting the myth of the American Dream to the role of Northern investment in the South. All in all, he glorified the South and the work ethic of its people, all while extolling the benefits of capitalism in reaching the American Dream.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### AGAINST CENTRALIZATION AND FARMERS AND THE CITIES SPEECHES

Although Henry Grady was welcomed home and celebrated as a hero, stark and dichotomizing problems between the wealthy and the working class lay ahead for the South during the late 1880s. Grady's "New South" speech reassured the Northern capitalists and they invested heavily in the South with both capital as credit, and by building mills and industry. The Northern Capitalists took advantage of a poor uneducated workforce and abused them through various harsh working conditions and little pay for their work. The abuse of the poor white Southern worker created political problems for Grady.

This chapter takes the stance that Grady mythically constituted the Northern banks and industrialists as villains and promoted the poor white Southern worker as an innocent victim of the system. Theoretically, for this chapter, my argument lays in the hero and villain myth theory promoted by rhetorical studies scholar Robert Rowland and how Grady used concepts of Materialist Marxist Dialectic to create a movement based purely on economic exploitation of poor white Southern workers.

Heroes and villains go hand in hand in mythic criticism. Rowland contends that in a myth there are heroes and villains and "the villains in a myth generally will possess great power, precisely because a great hero requires a great adversary."<sup>283</sup> Grady created both a powerful villain in the Northern economic and industrial complex and its control of the government and a powerful hero in the poor white Southern worker that all revolved around the issue of exploitation. Rowland also argues that a problem is central to the use of a myth when he says, "identification of the problem is one crucial part of the problem-solving process. Moreover, myths that identify a societal problem almost always point to the potential solution to that

problem.<sup>284</sup> Grady pointed to the issues with the government and he told the poor white Southern worker how to overcome these problems.

The divide between classes was also an important issue. In the speeches “Against Centralization” and “Farmers and the Cities” there were strong uses of capital and materialism as the main separation between the North banks and industry and the poor white Southern worker. I argue that Grady used myth and Materialist Marxist Dialectics in his speeches to show the divide between the Northern banks and industry and the poor white Southern worker. Grady did this by using examples of real material and capitalistic differences and relates stories of good versus evil to construct the poor white Southern worker. This chapter follows with a brief explanation of the arguments and sub-arguments that Grady made to help build his idea of the mythic poor white Southern worker and the Materialist Marxist Dialectic economic deterrents that led to this mythic constitution. Next, this chapter presents a context section that explains what was happening at the time of the two speeches followed by a description of the rise of populism and why Grady changed his stance towards the poor white Southern worker. The chapter continues with an analysis of the “Against Centralization” speech and the “Farmers and the Cities” speech. The chapter ends with a conclusion section that restates the main issues and problems Grady had to address in the two speeches as he helped constitute the mythic poor white Southern worker based on real economic materialism.

### *Context*

In the “Against Centralization” speech, Grady argued that the Northern banks and industrialists were villains who were taking advantage of the innocent hero, the poor white Southern worker. His arguments were based in Materialist Marxist Dialectic and he used

examples of price fixing and commodity manipulation as the examples. At the end of the speech he gave the poor white Southern hero hope and talked about their role as the “toppling masses.”

In the “Farmers and the Cities” speech, Grady continued to create the myth of the poor white Southern worker and he argued that there was a lack of recognition of the American Dream myth by the poor white Southern workers. Specifically, he posited that the southern farmers’ work was divine and the troubles he/she faced at the hands of the Northern banks and industrialists were evil. He argued in more detail that the government played a role in the victimization of the poor white Southern worker, mainly because it was controlled by the Northern banks and industrialists. He used this relationship to talk about the role of freedom and money and the effect that price gouging of essential commodities strips freedoms from the poor white Southern worker. Grady finished his speech by addressing the right that the farmer had to organize against the government and listed socialistic solutions on how to fix the problems that were harming the poor white Southern worker.

Grady was not only part of the political elite Atlanta, but he was part of the political elite of the South, the Democratic Party. The problems of unionization and class-consciousness presented issues that could cause Grady’s party to be swept out of office come Election Day. The Democratic Party had come to power and stayed in power after Reconstruction by pitting poor and working class white southerners against black southerners. This effectively allowed for the Democratic Party to run the governments of the South because the white majority backed them. The problem that was occurring was the fact that now the lower working class whites had become self-aware of their economic plight and started organizing and voting on economic principles instead of race.

The main issue that sparked this newly awakened body politic was the disparity of wealth and the subjugation that was being put upon the workers of the South by Northern Industrialists. Grady memorialized the hard working aspects of the working class whites in his “New South” speech, yet the abuses that the Northern industrialists were plaguing the South with was becoming unbearable and the people were beginning to strike back at the economic systems that held them in the state of oppression. The two groups of people who were being exploited were the workers in the mills and the farmers.

The poor white Southern worker and the farmer performed two different tasks, yet the Northern banks and industrial systems equally exploited both of them. Grady had to address both audiences and their grievances and try to appease poor white Southern workers so as to not lose their support to the rival Republican Party. Grady addressed both groups as individual sects, but their exploitation carries the same mythic constitution. Grady promoted a mythic poor white Southern worker and farmer as victimized and oppressed by the economic system that he had a hand in bringing into the South; it was the worker and farmer who were innocent and the real lifeblood of what it meant to be an American. The hard working poor white Southern worker was an American that was being destroyed by the current system and overall culture of life that the industrial revolution and unchecked Gilded Age capitalism had wrought into their current society.

#### *The Rise of Populism and the Changing Economic Ideology in Henry Grady’s Speeches*

The economic investment and current conditions the North imposed upon the South as rules of investment and return had decimated the poor white worker and farmer. Grady began to hear from his readers, mainly farmers, when they would write to him as representatives of the Farmers Alliance. The Farmers Alliance was the largest voting bloc in the state, and Grady

needed to understand what was happening that would cause this political shift. Ultimately, he had to change his tone if he was going to stay popular with his constituents. The Farmers Alliance, and various other unions at the time, provided a message and unified voice for the other workers in the South who were being taken advantage of by the economic systems of the North.

The Farmers Alliance was an expansive movement that was comprised of about three million members in the South and West, and it grew from the same ideological underpinnings of the Knights of Labor and Nationalism.<sup>285</sup> Throughout the early 1880s organizers of the Knights of Labor were busy organizing union locals throughout the South that consisted of members that were black and white, men and women.<sup>286</sup> The message they sought to extoll was formed from the Declaration of Independence, the Bible, and that of artisanal pride. The group openly opposed “the concentrations of power and monopolies that dominated a large part of the American economy.”<sup>287</sup> During the years between 1886-1889, when the Alliance was sweeping across the South, farmers saw the guild as a way to make their lives better by such things as cooperative stores and community local enterprises that would allow them to deal with the crop lien system that was keeping them in constant poverty.<sup>288</sup>

The other unions, such as the Knights of Labor and the United Mill Worker Union, sought to help the people that they represented in the South. They began to fall into the same political factions with the other unions as the Populist Movement began to grow and develop in the South. The Populist Movement was spurred by those that felt they were not getting their equal share of the wealth that America was producing. The power of these unions was evident when the Farmers Alliance, who would let in anyone that was not a business man or merchant, reserved the state capital to hold their secret meetings. They marched out of their meeting and went directly to the Georgia Governor’s mansion where he met the Alliance outside and

announced to the media and all whom were in attendance that he was supporting the Alliance.<sup>289</sup> Their political voting bloc was that influential and caused enough shockwaves of change that the leaders of Georgia, and the South, had to start taking them seriously.

They were the poor white working class of the South. Grady had to address this audience, and in doing so he gave them a voice and mythic constitution of their representation to society. He did this by creating the villain and the hero of the oppressed poor white Southern worker that needed to fight back against the Northern economic industrial complex. If he failed to do this, he would surely lose his leadership position in Atlanta, the state of Georgia, and the South. His readership might also diminish and he might take a hit at the *Atlanta Journal Constitution*. All of the work he had put in selling the New South and building alliances with the North would be for naught. However, Grady faced this problem head on and was able to build unity between himself and his audience by constructing the working class white Southerner as a victim of the repressive Northern economic system. He gave the White working class of the South an enemy that was the North and their barons of industry.

*The Southern Worker/Farmer as Victim and the Northern Industrial Villain: The "Against Centralization" Speech*

Grady's tone about capitalism changed by the time he delivered his "Against Centralization" speech. The wealth, power, and control of capital from Northern banks took its toll on poor white Southern workers. Grady found this very problematic, especially when his constituents begin to turn against his newspaper and political party. Grady, through his speeches, created the myth of the worker as a hero and victim within the economic system against the villain of the Northern economic and industrial complex. He based his argument in real material divides that promote a Materialist Marxist Dialectical explanation for the separation of the classes between the poor white Southern worker and the Northern economic and industrial

complex. Grady went to great lengths to explain how the Northern banks and industry were villains:

But the abuse of this amazing power of consolidated wealth is its bittersweet result and its pressing danger. When the agent of a dozen men, who have captured and control an article of prime necessity, meets the representatives of a million farmers from whom they have forced \$3,000,000 the year before, with no moral right than is behind the highwayman who halts the traveler at his pistol's point, and insolently gives them the measure of this year's rapacity, and tells them – men who live in the sweat of their brows, and stand between God and Nature – that they must submit to the infamy because they are helpless, then the first fruits of the system are gathered and have turned to ashes on the lips.<sup>290</sup>

Religious scholar Richard Hughes notes, “In the late nineteenth century, capitalism became shrouded in myth and linked to other mythical dimensions of American culture.”<sup>291</sup>

Hughes also forwards the argument that God was an important symbol after the Civil War.

Specifically, He notes “in the beginning – especially in the years immediately after the American Civil War – American capitalism found its justification in the myth of the Chosen Nation and had struck a covenant relationship with its God.”<sup>292</sup> Here, Grady built his mythically oppressed hero and villain around structures of God and Christian religion. This allowed for Grady to use morality to build the hero and villain in his examples.

In this section of speech, Grady accomplished two goals through an analogy and created a mythic villain and an innocent hero. First, Grady used the metaphor of highway robbery to construct a mythic villain out of the barons of industry that would take over a necessity, and plunder large amounts of money from farmers through the illegal and immoral act of robbery. He compared the agent of an elite few men and that agent's interaction with the farmers unions as one that has no moral right. It was an interaction that was not based in something that is honest or in something that would help the people or workers of the South.

Second, these farmers were good because they “stand” between the two pure objects of God and Nature. This levied the idea that farmers were good because they were in line with

objects representing purity. Only the most villainous group would rob someone who is pure and carrying out God's work with nature. Also, they "live in the sweat of their brow" meaning that they were manual, hard working people. Hard work is associated with an honest day's work, and the barons were robbing men that are doing pure, righteous, and honest work. Grady saw more than just metaphorical examples of good and evil in constructs of Southern worker identity; he saw an inherent flaw with the system of capitalism. No longer can people be trusted to do the "right" thing. The American Dream myth, which is based on hard work allowing one to prosper, is also directly related to the reality that everyone in the economic system will play fair. In this situation (as with capitalism as a whole) the barons of industry were the ones that were not working through a moral lens of right and wrong. Capitalism, as a chosen Godly form, had disappeared and what had been put in its place went against God and what he would have commanded. This is different take on what Hughes argued in his work.<sup>293</sup>

The last sentence is where Grady used myth to explain parts of life that groups could not rationally understand or comprehend. Rhetorician Robert Rowland contends "the Function of myth is to transcend ordinary life and provide meaningful grounding for that which cannot be supported rationally. Rowland posits that myths are designed to deal with problems of human existence which seem insoluble."<sup>294</sup> What this means is that the orator has to use some sort of myth as an example to explain to the audience what is going on around them. Grady tried to bridge the gap between reality and comprehension when he said, "the first fruits of the system are gathered and have turned to ashes on their lips" is in reference to the promise of capitalism. Part of the American myth is based in capitalism. Many Americans, especially those who were hard-working, expect to partake in the promise of capitalism and the ability to live a good life through their hard work. Grady made the reference that this was not happening. The "first fruits"

or the first generation of wealth that was being created thanks to industry was turning to ash. The sweetness of wealth was not touching the lips of the poor white Southern worker. However, the taste of ash was what the poor white Southern worker was left to savor. The myth of the villainous Northern industry was a way that Grady tried to rationalize how individuals that were hard working had not yet been able to partake in the benefits that they had been promised through capitalism.

Another interesting point that Grady brought up in the previous excerpt, is the matter of repeated abuse. Grady gave another example of abuse suffered by poor white Southern workers when he said, “when the agent of a dozen men, who have captured and control an article of prime necessity, meets the representatives of a million farmers from whom they have forced \$3,000,000 the year before.”<sup>295</sup> Grady built his argument that the reprehensible acts of monopolistic control of capitalistic necessities was something that was not a one time deal. It allowed the audience to see this as a recurring problem, something that was not a mistake, and sanctions a belief that the people that are abusing the system will continue that way, thus making the poor white Southern worker a legitimate, long-term victim of capitalism.

Grady continued to bemoan the problems of economic centralization that capitalism allowed. Here materialist Marxist dialectic comes into play because of the real world examples he used by dichotomizing the aspects of freedom and sovereignty of an unregulated market and a government that does not do the bidding of the people it represents. This description shows the reality of the poor white Southern worker when he said,

When a dozen men get together in the morning and fix the price of a dozen articles of common use — with no standard but their arbitrary will, and no limit but their greed or daring — and then notify the sovereign people of this free Republic how much, in the mercy of their masters, they shall pay for the necessaries of life — then the point of intolerable shame has been reached.<sup>296</sup>

These dozen men had a large influence on economic life of the nation and its citizens. There where no limits to their power, except their own will. They had complete control. Since they had complete control, then logically it follows that the people had no freedom or sovereignty in the matter of capitalist material goods. This causes the mythic poor white worker to be seen as someone who is powerless against a few men with complete control. It is also an example of the real world centralization that was going on at the time that lead to the large separation of the economic classes by a material good being controlled by the wealthy to extract more money from the poor. They were “in the mercy of their masters, they shall pay for the necessaries of life.” They were slaves to the system and have no way of getting out because what was being held from them at an abhorrent rate of purchase were the necessities that one cannot get by without. It is again, out of their control, creating even more helplessness and victimization.

Grady finished the section by trying to bestow shame upon those who have abused the system and arguing that the point in time he is talking about had already begun. He stated so when he said, “We see the feudal tendency, swept away by Mr. Jefferson, revived by the conditions of our time, aided by the government with its grant of enormous powers and its amazing class legislation.”<sup>297</sup> Feudal governments are a repressive form of power and economic distribution that had died out long ago in Europe and just twenty years prior in the South. To accuse the era that they were living in as a replacement for feudal tendency speaks volumes to the repressive nature of the economic system that poor working class white Southerners were being subjected to. It is a material economic separation between what had been promised by capitalism (and how the wealthy were living at the time) and what the poor class of Southerners were seeing in their real lived experiences.

The government was part of the reason that the economic system allowed for the Northern capitalists to abuse their power and create an unfair system of material wealth.<sup>298</sup> Grady explained how this power is abused when he said,

It has set up a creature without soul or conscience or limit of human life to establish an oligarchy, unrelieved by human charity and unsteadied by human responsibility. The syndicate, the trust, the corporation, — these are the eldest sons of the Republic for whom the feudal right of primogeniture is revived, and who inherit its estate to the impoverishment of their brothers.<sup>299</sup>

Grady used the metaphor of a creature to describe the current economic system. It was something that was not even close to being human, it had not soul or conscience. The economic system was evil and did not understand the concept of good. It did not care about the value of human life, the work that people do, or what humanity meant to a community. It had created oligarchy that could not be reasoned with in the traditional sense of the human condition and what it meant to have a conscience of right and wrong. The syndicate, the trust, the corporation, was by all accounts from Grady an evil non-human entity that allowed for the suffering of the masses so long as a few prospered.

In the next sentence, Grady pointed out that the people of the North are the ones benefiting from this system. “The feudal right of primogeniture” guarantees that the wealth of the family of oligarchs will go to the eldest son. The eldest son, in this case, was New England and the people of the North. They were the first colonies and the most successful in industry. They reaped the rewards of the feudal right of primogeniture and not the other child, the South. This section of his speech made the point that the privilege of whiteness was not being seen by the poor white Southern worker. This analysis of Grady’s speech backs up what sociologist John Hartigan argues, poor white people have no privilege or power in society if they have no

money.<sup>300</sup> One group (the North) got all the money, power and privilege, while the other group (the South) got nothing.

Starvation and the ability to eat become a big part of the vilification of the Northern economic and industrial system and victimization of the poor white Southern worker hero. Many Southerners had a hard time getting enough to eat since the Civil War, and the Depression of the 1870s did not help matters any. It was a problem that those in attendance could relate. Grady made the point: “They are known of all men, and, my countrymen, no argument can follow them, and no plea excuse them, when they fall in the men who, toiling, yet suffer, - who hunger at their work, - and who cannot find food for their wives with which to feed the infants that hang famishing at their breasts.”<sup>301</sup> These were farmers who produced food for a living, yet the economic system of wealth and capitalism was so distraught with inequities that the people that produce the food had a hard time affording it and being able to provide for their own families. Also, how powerful can a group of white people be if they have no food to eat? This flies in the face of the arguments by Richard Dyer and Thomas Nakayama and Robert Krizek that white people are privileged based upon race. Privilege would not allow for one to starve and struggle throughout life. Therefore, through a rhetorical analysis of Henry Grady’s speech, it can be seen that poor white Southern workers were no more privileged than anyone else because they too struggled with the basic necessities of life.

The ability to eat is one of the most basic necessities that people have. When a group willingly takes that right away for their own gain, a very powerful and evil mythic villain is created in the minds of those that are suffering. This inability to eat, when industry has guaranteed the production of enough food for all people, proliferates the logic of the promise of

the American myth because even the most prosperous and free countries on earth feed their hard working members of society.

The simplicity of food was not the only commodity under control of the Northern economic industry. There were others such as wheat, flour, and cotton that affected not only the Southerner but also poor people all over the world. Grady continued to construct his vision of the Northern villain and helpless poor white Southern working victim when he provided examples of fixed-priced commodities and the effect on workers:

Economists have held that wheat, grown everywhere, could not be cornered by capitol. And yet one man in Chicago tied the wheat crop to his handkerchief, and held it until a sewing woman in my city, working for ninety cents a week, had to pay him twenty cents tax on the sack of flour she bore home in her famished hands...[t]hree men held the cotton crop until the English spindles were stopped and the lights went out in 3,000,000 English homes. Last summer a man cornered pork until he had levied a tax of \$3 a barrel on every consumer, and pocketed a profit of millions.<sup>302</sup>

The owner had been given an even more impressive, almost superhuman power, by flying in the face of human logic from the economists that set the rules of industry, finance, and economy. Monopolies should not arise and competition should have been the order of the day. Yet, monopolies controlled all of a necessity and took a large percentage of the money a woman had from her week of work and make her pay that large percentage for something that should not, according to the rules of economics and production, cost her that much. By doing this, the owner was making even more money while the worker was kept in poverty and victimized by greed.

Grady continued to show that not only does food get taken from workers but also electricity. If the barons were not pleased with the amount of money they made, they would take away the luxuries of contemporary society and move the worker back years in technological advancement. If the workers could not work, then they could not afford to pay their bills. Therefore, their electricity got cut off just because the barons of industry wanted to make more

money at the expense of the working class poor. This English example was used to show how the economic conditions of capitalism were being abused all over the world. It also showed that the system was not only flawed in America, but in other parts of the world. This is important because if the system was as flawed and unregulated, who is to say that the barons would not work together to affect the prices on a worldwide stage? This was important for poor white Southern workers because most of their product was either used overseas or it was in direct competition with cotton grown in other parts of the world.

Grady began to offer hope in this myth of the hard working and victimized worker. As noted before, Rowland argues that a problem is central to the tenant of a myth when he says, “Identification of the problem is one crucial part of the problem-solving process. Moreover, myths that identify a societal problem almost always point to the potential solution to that problem.”<sup>303</sup> Grady started by unveiling the major, descriptive disparity between the rich and the poor; then he finished by giving those that are victims of this disparity hope by creating a solution to the problem they were facing:

The fact that a man ten years from poverty has an income of \$20,000,000 – and his associates nearly as much – from the control and arbitrary pricing of an article of universal use, falls strangely on the ears of those who hear it, as they sit empty handed, while children cry for bread.... Millions are made on the turn of a trade, and the toppling mass grows and grows, while in its shadow starvation and despair stalk among the people, and swarm with increasing legions against the citadels of human life.<sup>304</sup>

It must first be remembered that the time period is the late nineteenth century, and the budget is twenty million dollars. Even though this is a lot of money in today’s terms, this budget allocation was astronomical during this time period. The disparity that was brought to bear between the men who fix prices and hold such wealth while the worker that did not have enough money to even feed his children was a stark representation between what is good and what is villainous. Only the worst kind of people would arbitrarily set prices on needed goods just to

make more money while others starve. Because of this, Grady gave the hope that the workers would eventually overcome this repudiation of basic necessities. Millions of workers saw and heard what was happening. Men were creating enormous amounts of wealth on a single trade, yet the majority of people were sitting in the middle of abject poverty, even though they are working the jobs that helped produce this large amount of wealth for the select few that were at the top of the capitalist system.

Grady's allusion to the "toppling mass" is what gave the poor white Southern worker hope. It was a solution that the hero could beat the villain. After years of neglect, subjugation, and economic exploitation, the poor white Southern worker that had been left in poverty would be able to fix the problem. The "toppling mass" was a group of all the lower and working class people that had been used to make the millions and millions for the Northern economic and industry barons. The group, Grady argued, would get larger and larger and their plight more serious, until they were large enough to create real political and economic change and right the unscrupulous practices into a system that was based upon a moral rectitude of righteous humanity. The group of poor white Southern workers would topple the system in place and allow for a more equal distribution of wealth, therefore alleviating the pain felt by the poor white Southern workers.

The call for the toppling mass was in direct response of the exploitation of the workers because the poor white Southern worker had no power or privilege. They were being taken advantage of by the economic system and Henry Grady gave them a mythic structure of their identity based in what Materialist Marxist Dialectic because he described to the poor white Southern worker what they did not have in terms of economics and wealth. The idea of the toppling masses goes to the heart of what Hartigan is arguing when he points out that the words

we use to describe economic classes explain power relations within society.<sup>305</sup> Because poor white Southern workers are the toppling mass, it shows that they were the ones that must rise up and gain power. They did not have any power and therefore, they were lacking privilege in the sense that whiteness gave a person some sort of privileged status.

*“Farmers and the Cities” Speech*

The speech in Elberton, Georgia (1889) described in more detail the inequalities faced by the Southern farmer. The farmer was being abused by the lien system, traded his/her crop in volatile markets, and was at the whim of the local merchant when it came to receiving credit. Because of this, the farmer was kept in almost a constant state of indebtedness and could not make a viable living for him or his family. Eventually, the farmers organized together in a farmers union called the Farmers Alliance. This speech was in response to the Farmers Alliance that had gained considerable political strength in Georgia politics. In his previous speech, Grady created the mythic victim of the South and evil North economic and industrial system. In this speech, he continued the mythical allusions and expanded into a recall of the power structure and economic inequalities capitalism brought to the farmers of the South. He also called into question the role of the government and how it is part of the villain but that it could be saved as a chance of hope for the poor white Southern worker.

The Farmers Alliance had grown so large that Grady knew he had to approach its leaders and members to retain their votes for his party and their allegiance for the readership of his newspaper. Grady began his speech by talking about the farmers in attendance, why they are there, and what the farmers wanted out of society:

It is a meeting of men who feel that in spite of themselves their affairs are going wrong; of free and equal citizens who feel that they carry unequal burdens; of toilers who feel that they reap not the just fruits of their toil; of men who feel that their labor enriches

others while it leaves them poor, and that the sweat of their bodies, shed freely under God's command, goes to clothe the idle and the avaricious in purple and fine linen.<sup>306</sup>

There was a listing of grievances wrapped around the mythical notion of capitalism. Grady made the farmer feel good by saying “in spite of themselves their affairs are going wrong.” It created a farmer that does everything right and works hard, but they were being treated wrong by the system of capitalism. The idea that they were “free and equal” citizens allowed for the farmer to have the chance to be equal in wealth status, as long as he had a fair chance and equal market to trade in. Yet, they did not get to “reap the fruits of their toil.” It was as if the farmer was working for nothing. They did not get what had been promised to them from their hard work. It was an attempt to explain what seems insoluble to the farmers; that they could not get to the American Dream just by a hard work ethic. This description was showing the poor white Southern worker that their plights were a direct result of the material and economic differences brought upon them by capitalism. The difference in wealth status was what made Grady’s speeches have elements of Material Marxist Dialectic. This is because he gave speeches that showed the real class differences between the poor white Southern worker and the Northern economist and industrial baron were rooted in actual material wealth distribution that were unequal and were causing such plight and exploitation of the bottom class.

Again, the worker was working hard but not receiving the reward that the myth of capitalism had promised. The Northern economic industry was reaping the benefits of the poor white Southern worker. Their working was divine and pure but their profit goes to those that are lazy, un-God like, and wealthy. The farmer worked hard, as God commanded, while those that do not follow the wishes of God, those that sit idle, were enriched and given the wealth of those that were working based on divine doctrine. The fact that the Northern industrial baron of wealth

was idle made them deny the words of God, thus making them evil and their work attached to wrong doing. On the other hand, the farmer was blessed and was doing the right thing by God.

The use of “purple and fine linen” as descriptive metaphor is important. It created a class-consciousness of what the poor white Southern worker was not. The poor white Southern worker did not have these things, which represent wealth and royalty. Purple is the traditional color of royalty and power in Europe and linen was a fine material that only the wealthy had the resources to possess. So here are these workers, whose work was divine, and their work was gaining them nothing but poverty while those who already have riches and power were gaining even more at the expense of the Southern farmer and white working class of the region. It is the beginning of the class distinction in his speech that creates the overall mood of his oration.

Grady used metaphors to create his mythic constructions. As communication scholar Charles Osborne notes, metaphors can be used to explain the reality that myth creates or helps to explain.<sup>307</sup> The “fruit of their toils” was all the farmer and poor white Southern worker wanted. Grady continues and he expressly called out what the farmers are entitled to under the constructs of their labor:

This is a meeting of protest, of resistance. Here the farmer meets to demand, and organize that he may enforce his demand, that he shall stand equal with every other class of citizens; that laws discriminating against him shall be repealed; that the methods oppressing him shall be modified or abolished; and that he shall be guaranteed that neither government nor society shall abridge, by statute or custom, his just and honest proportion of the wealth he created, but that he shall be permitted to garner in his barns, and enjoy by his hearthstone, the full and fair fruits of his labor.<sup>308</sup>

Grady accomplished two mythic constructions with that prose. First, he formed a poor white Southern worker that stands up and fights for what their best interests. This is the identification issue that Rowland argues that a great villain needs a great hero. The poor white Southern worker had been an afterthought in most sociopolitical endeavors in the South and now they are

constituted as a group that can stand up and fight back, which is something they had never been able to do. Most poor Southern working class whites disagreed with the Civil War and did not see it as their fight because they did not own slaves.<sup>309</sup> Yet, they were pulled in and suffered not only the consequences of a brutal war, but they also suffered from the economic depression of the Reconstruction Era and its policies that affected white working class individuals in a negative way.

Second, Grady directly identified the structural and governmental injustices to which the farmer had succumbed. There was a direct call for class representation and a better distribution of wealth based on those who labor, not to those that are representative of the capitalistic Northern economic industry. Yet, this was not a call just for wealth in the hands of the poor; Grady insists this was for a greater prosperity for all: “It is no trifling cause that brings the farmers into such determined and widespread organization as this...it is a deep and abiding conviction that, in political and commercial economy of the day, he is put at a disadvantage that keeps him poor while other classes grow rich, and that bars his way to prosperity and independence.”<sup>310</sup> There was a mythic structure of Socialism in his speech. He created a world in which the Southern white worker should be given a more equal share of the prosperity of the Nation. It was a stark difference and a complete change away from his “New South” speech and aids in the overall constitution of the mythic poor white Southern worker. This call for additional prosperity to the white Southern worker was because the worker was not privileged based upon economic or racial means. The identification, as Rowland notes, will give an answer to the problem.<sup>311</sup> Here the identification was wrapped up in class system in which the poor white Southern worker was in the lowest class and had to fight back for capital. The solution that

Grady offers, that is also found in the myth, was that of a socialistic uprising against the villains of the North economic and industrial system.

Grady continued developing a villain against the white Southern working class hero. He did so by not just demonize the Northern industrial economy; he went into greater detail and explained the mortgage and lien system that was victimizing the farmer:

Think of it — Iowa strips from her farmers \$14,000,000 of interest every year, and sends it to New York and Boston to be reloaned on farms in other states, and to support and establish the dominion of the money lenders over the people. Georgia gathers from the languishing field \$2,000,000 of interest every year, and sends it away forever. Could her farmers but keep it at home, one year's interest would build factories to supply at cost every yard of bagging and every pound of guano the farmers need, establish her exchanges and their warehouses, and have left more than a million dollars for the improvement of their farmers and their homes. And year after year this drain not only continues, but deepens. What will be the end?<sup>312</sup>

Here, Grady gave another example how the Northern economic barons were holding back and subjugating the poor white Southern worker. Grady explained the loss of capital from the lien system and what it could mean to the farmers, perhaps a more self-fulfilled life where they do not have to rely on anyone else. A place where they could have used their own money to reinvest in their economies, and by that, making the whole life better for the people that live in the South. Grady pointed out that the economy has the potential to improve; however, it did not because [the South] lost money to the economic interests to the North. It was a vicious cycle that kept taking from the laborers that were producing and it kept reaping benefits to those at the top.

Another important aspect of what Grady was trying to explain is the concept of the dominance that money had over people. Their chief concern with day to day living comes from the economic model of capitalism. This economic model was not providing the laborers and farmers with the wealth they had been promised for their hard work. Grady mentioned that when he said, “and to support and establish dominion of the money lenders over the people.”

Establishing dominion over the people was a powerful example of the economic realities that the poor white Southern worker had been dealing with for some time. Take the established dominion and combine the reality of it only getting worse if nothing was done to curb the influence of the Northern economic barons of industry, and you have the universe that Grady was creating. This dominion took power and privilege away from the poor white Southern worker. Because a group had dominion over them, they did not have the power to stand up and stop the abuse, thus the mythic creations of Grady's speech. It also challenges the concepts of freedom that Americans had built their self-identity on. If the barons are in control then the working classes are the ones that have no power or say in what goes on in society. Grady constructs the Northern industrial and economic baron as a group of people that are so villainous that they would take away the very fabric which makes America unique, the freedom of the people.

It was not only the lien system (predatory credit lending by Northern banks to Southern farmers) that was causing the problems the farmer was facing but also the broader economic conditions of unregulated capitalism. In his speech Grady addressed this problem with macroeconomic examples:

Few men comprehend the growth of private capital in this country, and the encroachment it has made on the rest of the people. A man in Chicago that had a private fortune secured control of all the wheat in the country, and advanced the price until flour went up \$3 a barrel. When he collected \$4,000,000 of this forced tribute from the people, he opened his corner and released the wheat, and the world, forgetting the famishing children from whose hungry lips he had stolen the crust, praised him as the king of finance and trade. Let us analyze this deal. The farmer who raised the wheat got not one cent of the added profit; the mills that ground it not one cent. Every dollar went to swell the toppling fortunes of him who never sowed it to the ground, nor fed it to the thundering wheels, but who knew it only as the chance instrument of his infamous scheme.<sup>313</sup>

The people that were actually doing the work (laborers) were not making any profit, while there were laborers in a monopolistic holding patterns, making a very few wealthy at the detriment of those who needed products the most. It is a perpetual villainization myth construct from his

previous “Against Centralization” speech. He goes a step further by moving past interest paid to the economic barons of the North to show how price gauging in this capitalist system works, created wealth for the owner, passes no wealth to the worker, and had little humanity in terms of helping those that needed to survive with the most basic of needs, such as with food.

This description of the wheat being held for profit hits at a larger theme in the villiniazation process. The fact that villain kept people from eating but was called “king of finance and trade” is important because it was a critique on the social order and overall destructive culture that unregulated capitalism had created during the time period. It wiped away any notions of what was right and wrong, for the accumulation of wealth capital is all that was important. Grady criticized this and was trying to show that this was how the North did business (especially with his reference to Chicago) and that the South was different because its people would not corner the market on a necessity for life and hold against people for more money while people perished from hunger.

Before Grady offered a resolution against the ills that he sees sprouting up in the economic condition of the South, he called out those involved in the capitalistic run on poor white Southern workers by continuing to explain their immense influence over goods, and he continued to build the mythic structure of the evil Northern capitalist industrial economic system:

In the power and irresponsibility of this sudden and enormous wealth is bred an insolence that knows no bounds. "The public be damned!" was the sentiment of the plutocrats, speaking through the voice of Vanderbilt's millions. In cornering the product and levying the tribute — in locking up abundant supply until the wheels of industry stop — in oppressing through trusts, and domineering in the strength of corporate power, the plutocrats do what no political party would dare attempt and what no government on this earth would enforce. The Czar of Russia would not dare hold up a product until the mill wheels were idle, or lay an unusual tax on bread and meat to replenish his coffers, and yet these things our plutocrats, flagrant and irresponsible, do day after day until public indignation is indignant and shame is lost in wonder.<sup>314</sup>

Grady constituted the Northern industrial baron, or plutocrat, as someone that would do anything in their power to stop economic means and advancement just to gain more money. He compared what was happening in America to what would not even happen in a country that is not free and ruled by a king, Russia. Again, there was a dichotomization between what capitalism has brought to the people of America and how their freedoms are being stripped away and countries with little freedom have more of a conscience than a free country that was trapped in the claws of unregulated capitalism. The plutocrats and corporate power of industry were the ones that had caused the “indignation” of the farmer and the workers, of not just only the South but to all the farmers and workers of the entire country. Yet, they were not the only ones involved.

In his attempt to explain in detail the inequalities that the farmer was facing, Grady called out the groups that were gaining wealth while the farmer was losing money: “Its nucleus was the passion that survived the war, and around this it has gathered the protected manufacturer, the pensioned soldier, the licensed monopolist, the privileged corporation, the unchallenged trust — all whom power can daunt or money can buy — and with these in close and constant phalanx it holds the government against the people.”<sup>315316</sup> All of these people, in some way or another, had benefited from the plight of the farmer. Grady acknowledged that it is not just the economic system that was contributing to this. He also pointed out that the government allowed this to happen and that they must be held accountable, as he did in the “Against Centralization Speech.” Therefore, he began to offer solutions as to what can be done to correct the inequities that were facing the lower class of poor white Southern workers.

There were certain wrongs that were dealt to the people that must be rectified changes. Grady puts what had been happening to the poor white Southern worker in a historical

perspective of the founding fathers: “Why, our fathers declared war against England, their mother country, from whose womb they came, because she levied two cents a pound on our tea, and yet, without a murmur, we submit to ten times this tax placed on the bread of our mouths, and levied by a private citizen for no reason save his greed, and no right save his might.”<sup>317</sup>

Grady began to call for a change by showing the farmers what large scale calls for change had done before when government mandated inequities of wealth are put upon people. He showed that historically, the people of the country had fought for much less in the way of taking the wealth of the working class individuals for the oligarchy. The events that sparked the American Revolution were nothing compared to what the poor white Southern worker was going through. All of Grady’s speeches had been written to highlight the plight of the worker and the abuses by the oligarchical economic system that capitalism had put into place.

Yet it is not as if the farmers had not been complaining, it was why they created the Farmers Alliance in the first place, but Grady made their case: “And when an outraged people turn to government for help, what do they find? Their government in the hands of a party that is in sympathy with their oppressors...and whose confessed leaders declared that trusts are largely private concerns with which the government had naught to do.”<sup>318</sup> It was the farmers not only against the economic industry of corporations and trusts, but also the government that had been bought and influenced by the wealth of the capitalist system. It was a large system of corruption that would take a large group of political motivated actors to fix; and it came in the form of the Farmers Alliance and unions of textile and mill workers in the South.

Grady offered a socialist call to the end of the abuses by the capitalist system and the Northern barons of capitalism, economics and industry. Grady offered one last vivid example of

what would happen if there were no change in the economic structure that was against the lower classes:

It declares that a strong government is better than a free government, and that national authority, backed by national armies and treasury, is a better guarantee of peace and prosperity than liberty and enlightenment diffused among the people. To defend this policy, that cannot be maintained by argument or sustained by the love or confidence of the people, it rallies under its flag the mercenaries of the Republic, the syndicate, the trust, the monopolist, and the plutocrat, and strengthening them by grant and protection, rejoices as they grow richer and the people grow poorer...that the protective tariff shall be deepened, thus building one class against another, and that the party of trusts and monopoly shall be kept in power, the autonomy of the Republic lost, the government centralized, the oligarchs established, and justice to the people postponed.<sup>319</sup>

This was a message that is a stark difference from the “New South” speech that he delivered just over three years previous. Most of the people in the audience and the ones he went to sell the South too are the monopolists, syndicate, trust, plutocrat, and politician that he mentions in his speech as the ones that were destroying the republic and taking away the justice for the people. Again, Grady assailed the loss of freedom that the poor white Southern workers had lost under the influence of unregulated capitalism and he continued to make the case stronger and stronger against the Northern capitalist industrial economic system as a group of people that would take away freedom of the people for their own gain in wealth.

This is the first time that Grady attacked the government and accused the government for its ability to victimize the poor white Southern worker. He accused the government of taking away the power of the people and supplanting it with a government army that was beholden to corporate interests. He made his point when he said, “it rallies under its flag the mercenaries of the Republic, the syndicate, the trust, the monopolist, and the plutocrat, and strengthening them by grant and protection, rejoices as they grow richer and the people grow poorer.” The centralized government control, then, was allowing for the abuse of the poor white Southern

worker because it is what is strengthening the Northern capitalist industrial economic system that was already keeping the Southern white worker in a constant state of poverty.

Grady continued to talk about the inequities and class warfare that was being waged upon the people of the South. He had pointed out that the villains in his mythic creation were the members of the Northern capitalist industrial economic system (also known as the plutocracy) and a centralized form of government that was nothing more than mercenaries for the plutocracy. What is important is that Grady linked the concept of justice with economic inequality. He did so when he said, “thus building one class against another, and that the party of trusts and monopoly shall be kept in power, the autonomy of the Republic lost, the government centralized, the oligarchs established, and justice to the people postponed.” This implies that the economic repression that poor white Southern workers was more than just morally wrong, it was criminal. If things stayed the same there would be no justice for those that were oppressed. The systems’ abuses of its people should be stopped, legally, by decentralizing government and taking away the arms power it gave the Northern capitalist industrial economic system.<sup>320</sup>

Grady does offer a solution to the class differences and capitalistic problems that have arisen since the Civil War. The solutions were based in tax policy and decentralization of corporate power:

The government can protect its citizens. It is of the people, and it shall not perish from the face of the earth. It can top off these colossal fortunes and, by an income tax, retard their growth. It can set a limit to personal and corporate wealth. It can take trusts and syndicates by the throat. It can shatter monopoly; it can equalize the burden of taxation; it can distribute its privileges impartially; it can clothe with credit its land now discredited at its banks; it can lift the burdens from the farmer's shoulders, give him equal strength to bear them—it can trust the people in whose name this Republic was founded; in whose courage it was defended; in whose wisdom it has been administered, and whose stricken love and confidence it cannot survive.<sup>321</sup>

Not all hope was lost on the government. Grady initially promoted them as an enemy to the poor white Southern worker, but he did argue that the government can be saved and protect its citizens. The policies that Grady promotes would help the farmer and those in the white working classes. They were not policies of capitalism, but are more socialistic in their structure; it was a call for greater distribution of wealth. He made his point when he said the people, through the government “can set a limit to persona and corporate wealth...equalize the burden of taxation.” Grady’s tone had changed from that of economic investor through capitalistic principals to protector of the South by socialistic economic policies that were meant to make sure that laborers were not taken advantage of any more. Grady understands that the people of the South had been left out and abused by the system and had at that point completely pulled away from the mythic structure of poor white Southern worker and his capitalist view points that he originally laid out in the “New South” speech.

### *Conclusion*

Grady entered into the American political arena at the opportune time to promote his idea of a New South. He fit the bill, went and sold his idea, but later, he changed his economic outlook on the South based upon the class inequities that capitalism had created in America during the late nineteenth century.

Grady promoted unfettered capitalism in his “New South” speech. He assured the investors that race relations were good and that the South was safe to invest in. He promoted the South as an untapped resource of labor and goods that could be used to create immense wealth because of the natural resources and ready workforce that was available to those with the capital to invest. This turned out to be a problem in the years to come for Grady.

Soon, because of the financial lien system and market trusts and monopolies, the poor white Southern worker and farmer became victims of unregulated markets and were left desolate and poor, even though they were working hard. Grady took this opportunity to side with the populist movement that was building momentum at the time and used his “Against Centralization” speech to create a mythic structure of the poor white Southern worker/farmer and the Northern industry baron. He did this to help explain to the audience why they were not achieving what they had been promised through the American Dream myth and why all their hard work still left them in a constant state of poverty. It was simple way to explain a complex problem to those that were not only in the audience but to those that would read transcripts of the speech at a later time.

Later, Grady continued his explanation of what has going on in the Southern economy when he gave his “Farmers and the City” speech. Here, Grady made his turn away from a staunch capitalist to a socialist based upon labor rights. He continued to mythically demonize the economic powers of the North, but he also did more. He went into great detail to explain how the farmer was being victimized by the Northern capitalist industrial economic system and went to great lengths to call out all of the entities that had a hand in delivering the economic subjugation to the farmer. He also attacked the centralization of government power away from the people and into the hands of the plutocracy. He used this platform to promote governmental policies that would correct the egregious distribution of wealth and allow for those who work hard to actually be able to buy into the American Dream myth.

At the time of his death, Grady was not the staunch free market capitalist that most believed. He had abandoned his ideological ideals of economic prosperity from Northern investment and called for a greater, socialist, distribution of wealth for those that were the

laborers and producers in the economy. He called for more government regulation and taxation as an oversight to how much money a person could earn. He laid out in detail the real division of wealth between classes and his work helped lead into the Populist Movement that happened after he died.

This chapter took the stance that Grady mythically constituted the Northern banks and industrialists as villains and promoted the poor white Southern worker as an innocent victim of the system. He also blamed the government for its implications in the economic system that was abusing the poor white Southern worker. Grady constituted both a powerful villain in the Northern economic industrial complex for its abuses of the financial system and for its control of the government. Grady constituted a powerful hero in the poor white Southern worker that all revolved around the issue of exploitation from the Northern economic industrial complex. Grady pointed to the issues with the government and he told the poor white Southern worker how to overcome these problems and how to use the government to fight back against the Northern economic industrial complex.

The divide between classes was also an important issue. In the speeches “Against Centralization” and “Farmers and the Cities” there was a strong uses of capital and materialism as the main separation between the North banks and industry and the poor white Southern worker. Grady used myth and Materialist Marxist Dialectics in his speeches to show the divide between the Northern economic industrial complex and the poor white Southern worker. He did so by discussing the power in the plutocracy when a few people are allowed to centralize and monopolize goods in the capitalist society. Grady did this when he used examples of real material and capitalistic differences and relates stories of good versus evil to construct the poor white Southern worker.

## CHAPTER 6

### DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSION

In this study I have argued that Grady constituted a mythic poor white Southern worker who is hard working and just as good, if not better, at production than his/her Northern counterparts. Grady was able to help imagine mythic poor white Southern workers by discussing a people who had to overcome great obstacles, but through hard work and industriousness, built their society back. Grady constituted this mythic poor white Southern worker throughout the “New South” speech. (This myth is based in American mythic dynamics.)

Grady crafted many sub-arguments to underscore his main theme of the hard working poor white Southerner. The analysis of the “New South” speech showed that Grady first argued that the poor white Southern worker is the same as the Northern worker through his use of the mythic explanation of the convergence through his use of consubstantiality of the Puritan and Cavalier into the term “American.” It was an idealized American founded in the memory of Abraham Lincoln that brought both the best of the Northern and Southern identities together. Grady continued to promote the mythic poor white Southern worker by showing how the workers were founded in the honorable Confederate soldier. The Confederate soldier is a symbolic representation of all the poor white Southern workers and their shared ideals that harken back to a glorified ancestor that fought in the Civil War. The story of the Soldier is used to show the immense obstacles the poor white Southern worker had to overcome. Primarily the biggest obstacle for the poor white Southern worker was economic. Yet, through hard work, the South was able to rebuild. Grady had to overcome the widely held theory that Southerners were

lazy, and he refuted these ideas when he talked about the work of the poor white Southern woman. Grady also addressed the difference between theoretical economic expansion and the real economic expansion the South had built through the expansion of their crops and the lowering of their interest rates. Grady promoted the South as a place that is pro-business that had been hampered and held back by the slave based economy. Grady finished his mythic ideal of the poor white Southern worker by connecting the myth of the American Dream to the role of Northern investment in the South. All in all, he glorified the South and the work ethic of its people, all while extoling the benefits of capitalism in reaching the American Dream.

This study also argued that Grady mythically fashioned the Northern banks and industry as villains and promotes the poor white Southern worker as an innocent victim of the system. Theoretically, my argument is based in the hero and villain myth theory promoted by rhetorical scholar Robert Rowland. Rowland contends that in a myth there are heroes and villains and “The villains in a myth generally will possess great power, precisely because a great hero requires a great adversary.”<sup>322</sup> Grady created both a powerful villain in the Northern economic and industrial complex and its control of the government and a powerful hero in the poor white Southern worker. Rowland also argues that a problem is central to the tenant of a myth when he says, “Identification of the problem is one crucial part of the problem-solving process. Moreover, myths that identify a societal problem almost always point to the potential solution to that problem.”<sup>323</sup> Grady pointed to the issues and problems the poor white Southern worker was facing with the government, and he told the poor white Southern worker how to overcome these problems by his revisioning of the poor white Southern worker in his mythic oration to his Southern audience.

In the “Against Centralization” speech, Grady argued that the Northern banks and industry were villains, taking advantage of the innocent hero, the poor white Southern worker. His arguments are based in Materialist Marxist Dialectic, and he used examples of price fixing and commodity manipulation as the examples. At the end of the speech he gave poor white Southern heroes hope and talked about their role as the “toppling masses.”

In the “Farmers and the Cities” speech, Grady continued to create the myth of the poor white Southern worker, and he argued that there was a lack of recognition of the American Dream myth by the poor white Southern workers. Specifically, he posited that the work of southern farmers was divine and the troubles they faced at the hands of the Northern banks and industry were evil. He argued in more detail that the government played a role in the victimization of the poor white Southern worker, mainly because it was controlled by the Northern banks and industry. He used this relationship to talk about the role of freedom and money and the effect that price gouging of essential commodities strips freedoms from the poor white Southern worker. Grady finished his speech by addressing the right that the farmer had to organize against the government and listed socialistic solutions on how to fix the problems that were harming the poor white Southern worker. These findings are important to future research in rhetorical studies and public address.

This chapter follows with a discussion of future research. Next, there is a promoted argument about a new metaphoric construction called the Iron Cog and the role of understanding whiteness in terms of class and historical whiteness. The implications of this study are discussed based upon social movements, myths in social movements, and the role of myth in economic based social movements.

### *Future Research*

This study opens up our field to many different future research possibilities. First, this project returns scholarly inquiry to the concept of whiteness in public address and rhetorical studies. Because the study of whiteness has fallen out of vogue in the last decade, such a study brings a fresh perspective and asks for scholars to look at the communication impact of whiteness not so much as privilege, but as an economic condition of poor whites. Also, this study encourages a historical look at constitutions of whiteness, which is something that has not been taken up by scholars within our field. Also, for all the reasons listed above, the implications should have the same impact in cultural studies in the fields of rhetorical studies and public address. By better understanding where those with perceived power are culturally and economically based, scholars will be better able to understand power dynamics between cultures and the hegemonic control through the use of communication.

Second, class, as a communication issue, can also be developed better in our field. All too often, outside of Marxist communication scholars, our field likes to take into account the subaltern voice when completing works in critical rhetorical scholarship. Class is often left out of the discussion. Hopefully, this work will push more scholars into taking the class and economic conditions of the subaltern groups being studied into account. Such accounts promise a better understanding of context and meaning from the groups being investigated and examined and it gives a greater knowledge to subaltern voices in public address and rhetorical studies.

Third, this study might encourage scholars to go back and reassess the Gilded Age. The New South era is only a sliver of the entire Gilded Age, and it played an important role not only in developing the South as a current industrial system, but also in shaping the U.S. polis. Many important movements such as the Populist Movement and the Progressive Era arose during this

time frame. What has been undertaken in this study is just a beginning to investigations of this era and focuses on a small percentage of the people and how they came to terms with whom they were by defining themselves in terms of economic exploitation.

Fourth, and in staying in the Gilded Age era, is the importance of the social movements that arose from the time period. There is much work on labor movements, but scholars in the field of rhetorical studies and public address need to address the Populist Movement of the 1890s and the Farmers and Greenback Movements that built the Populist and Progressive Movements out of which most labor studies originate. Though a wealth of social movement studies has been done, the scholarly community needs to go back and address this time period.

### *Iron Cog Metaphor*

The one shortcoming that I have found using American myth as a critical lens is that existing theory formulated about myth and the American Dream seems to lack description for what was going on during the Gilded Age. Three of the eight features that DeSantis categorizes are 1) Wealth: the promise that one can procure money, property, and the good life that accompanies such acquisitions; 2) Puritan Work Ethic: The promise that one is able to find meaningful work; and 3) Consumption and Leisure: the promise that one can secure products and services that aid a lifestyle marked by relaxation and self-indulgence.<sup>324</sup> Yet, those three categories fail to provide an explanation of what was happening to the poor white Southern workers, especially when using Grady's "New South" speech as an example.

To fill in this gap mythic theory from this era, I would like to propose a new metaphor to describe American myth. The new metaphor is called the Iron Cog metaphor. What this metaphor entails is the representation of the poor white Southern worker. Whereas a Puritan Work Ethic presumes that one can find meaningful work, it does not help describe the concept of

hard work. By using Grady's "New South" speech as a template, one can see that Grady promoted a worker that was industrious and valued hard work above anything else, even political representation, to the point of obvious exploitation. The exploitation is representative of the Cog. A cog is a numerous replicatable piece of machinery that can be stuck into the larger machine when it breaks down to keep the larger machine going. Cogs are cheap and easily replaceable and are used until they break down. This image is how the majority of poor and working class people were treated during the Gilded Age.

Iron is the other part of this metaphoric construct. Grady built the poor white Southern worker up to be this strong, almost super human worker in terms of what poor white Southern workers could accomplish when they used their full potential. Iron is representative of strength and the industrial boom of the Gilded Age. The largest city to come from the Gilded Age boom was Birmingham, Alabama, and that city was predicated on the production and refinement of iron ore. That the term of Iron Cog metaphor capably describes how the poor white Southern worker was depicted by Grady.

The most important aspect of the Iron Cog metaphor is the feature of class and economic systems. Based on the idea of Material Marxist Dialectic in the sense that class distinctions exist and are built on real world material differences, this mythic construct assumes that differences may be described by the use of communication. As noted in chapter two, Material Marxist dialectics is the theory of social change as the social change emerges from the differentiations that may cause a rift in a capitalist society.<sup>325</sup> The rift is due to the unequal distribution of wealth in American society. The Material part of the theory is based in the fact that the difference between classes is founded in an unequal distribution of capital and material goods between the classes. The material difference in classes is needed to understand the Iron Cog metaphor,

because the members of the Iron Cog are the people in the poor working class. If there is no abuse of labor because of a class divide based on material wealth, then there is no need for the Iron Cog metaphor. Simply put, the Iron Cog metaphor is formed from the labor abuse of the poor and lower classes so as to take economic advantage of the labor they produce.

The implications for the use of the Iron Cog metaphor are multifold. First, it is a better description of what was happening to the working class of the South during the late 1880's and the Gilded Age than what has been used by previous metaphor research. It gives a more centralized theme to the time period than that of "Puritan work ethic." Certainly, people seemed to want fulfilling jobs, but they were not getting them, which explains the rise in unions and alliances at the time. There would have been no need for such wide-scale social uprising in the South if the workers were able to achieve their part of the American Dream.

The Iron Cog metaphor is based in economic disparity and abuse by the powerful wealthy elite. To understand the role of the Iron Cog and the abused worker, we must understand that there are class relationships centered in economic abuse of the lower class. Therefore, this metaphor does not just apply to poor white Southern workers. This metaphor can apply to all workers, no matter what race or region from which they come. It also does not have to be grounded in the time period of the Gilded Age. The economic abuse between classes, in a top down sense, is and has been happening since the time period of the present study.

In conclusion, the Iron Cog Metaphor allows public address and rhetorical studies scholars to understand more fully the plight of the working class members of society during the Gilded Age time period. Iron Cog Metaphor also helps in understanding economic oppression and abuse of workers based upon their labor output. Iron Cog Metaphor can be used by labor scholars, myth scholars, and historical scholars that seek a better understanding to how people

addressed the shortcomings of the American Dream myth, based in the reality of the economic society in which they were living.

*Whiteness in Terms of Class and Historical Whiteness*

As noted in chapter two, whiteness scholars in public address and rhetorical studies have not addressed the problematic issue of class and race when it comes to the theory of white privilege. I hope that this study, through the case study of Henry Grady's speeches, has shown that there is a definite need to reexamine the theory of whiteness and privilege and take into account, as scholars from other fields have, the issue of power, race, and class in society. Scholars such as anthropologist Kirby Moss make the argument that whiteness is not a privilege when people have no wealth.<sup>326</sup> Another scholar who promotes this idea is sociologist John Hartigan.<sup>327</sup>

The fact that there are multiple scholars from different fields who have the same view on the subject of wealth and white privilege should be enough to start a serious debate in our field of public address and rhetorical studies on the role of class and privilege when it comes to not only whiteness, but all races. It does not make sense that in a society based upon wealth, that Americans still see power and differences based upon race with no accountability for the influence that wealth has in our society. It is a glaring hole in whiteness studies in our field and it is something that we as scholars must include in our discussions of whiteness as we move forward in our scholarly concentration.

Another issue that I hope this study helps to address is the problem with understanding historical whiteness. All of the whiteness pieces that are in public address and rhetorical studies are based in a present sense of whiteness. We have nothing that actually seeks to construct white identity based upon historical issues that white people faced. It is the equivalent of knowing

where we are at but not knowing where we came from. Again, I hope the case study of the poor white Southern workers has made enough of an argument to show that, historically, not all white people were privileged. Having a better understanding of how subgroups of whiteness and white identity developed can give the scholarly community a better understanding of whiteness and subgroups of whiteness in today's society. Such understanding is especially valuable since the issues of wealth inequality are still prevalent today one hundred and twenty years later.

The issues that Grady raised in his speeches in both the mythic constitution of the poor white Southern worker as industrious in the "New South" speech and the hero and villain mythic constitution in his "Against Centralization" and "Farmers and the Cities" speeches are wrapped in the sense that the poor white Southern worker was not privileged just because of their race. In the "New South" speech, Grady shows that the poor white Southern worker was not privileged because of all the obstacles that he/she had to overcome. They had to completely rebuild their society. The North, on the other hand, was largely unaffected by the Civil War, in terms of physical destruction, which allowed for the North to prosper economically in the twenty years after the war. In the speeches "Against Centralization" and "Farmers and the Cities," Grady used explicit stories and arguments that described the plight of the poor white Southern worker in terms of exploitation by the Northern economic and industrial barons. Their lack ability to actually fend for themselves and have the products, credits, and material goods it took to succeed and make a successful farm is a telling point when it comes to privilege based on the issue of race. Grady points out, in more than one example, that poor white Southern workers were starving. Where is the privilege based on whiteness in that sense?

My argument is that we need to follow in the footsteps of anthropologists and sociologists and look at whiteness from a different view. As a field we must see how those with

no economic power rhetorically construct whiteness, both historically, and in the present.

Whiteness and class raises the question of how do they address their identity in the form of subaltern communication tactics? Do they use different tactics than what a traditional subaltern group would use? Do poor whites differentiate their race from economics or is it all a part of a larger identification model? These are important questions that need to be answered and I hope that future research will move in that direction.

### *Role of Myth in Social Movements and its Current Application*

This study did not discuss the role of social movements, yet the case study was based upon a social movement that was taking place. Therefore, I feel as though the role of myth in social movements is a place for future research. Myths are important aspects of social movements. They can be used to explain why the movement is happening in the first place. Social Movement scholars Charles Stewart, Craig Allen Smith, and Robert Denton Jr. argue that “events do not simply exist; they are interpreted by those who experience them...public perceptions and impressions are influenced by significant myths and symbols that are emotional, intense, and cultural in nature.”<sup>328</sup> Myths are valuable in helping frame the situation. As my study has noted, Grady helped define the poor white Southern worker as a victim of the Northern industrial and economic system. He did so by using cultural examples of hard work, the American Dream, and the role the yeoman farmer played in American identity. Grady used myth to interpret what was happening to the poor white Southern worker and he tried to give him/her an explanation to what was going on and how to fix their issues by using myth.

Myths have been shown to promote culturally held norms such as patriarchal power structures and oppress groups that have traditionally been oppressed, and they have been shown to help those that have been oppressed and fight against patriarchal power structures.<sup>329</sup> Myths

can also be used to not only frame situations, but they can be used to build identities in order to fight the power structures that are set in society, be them governmental, economic, or cultural. Grady used myth to challenge the power and economic structure in the country at the time and allow the poor white Southern worker a chance to rebel against the power structures.

One area for future research is in the role that myths play in economic based social movements. Questions that could be raised are what different myths were used by labor unions? Do they stay the same throughout time? Are the myths different for each union or labor division? Is there a united myth based primarily on economic conditions? Does the myth change based on regional/cultural differences? Is there a mythic identity created by the leaders of the labor movements? If so, how do they differ between one another and what can they add to mythic and social movement theory?

#### *Material Dialectical Marxism and Its Role in Social Movements*

Material dialectical Marxism can play an important role in understanding future social movements. This is the first time in American history since the 1930's that there has been a large scale social movement based around the economic system of this country. Obviously, this is not something that has happened that often, but with the wealth gap in America showing no signs of changing, it is probable that in the next few decades that there will be more and more social movements based around economics. Material dialectical Marxism can play an important role in understanding the public address and rhetorical constructions of these social movements.

#### *Henry Grady*

Henry Grady is an often overlooked figure in public address and rhetorical studies. He played a very important role in Southern society and American culture during his brief lifetime and was instrumental in the New South era in building better business relations between the

North and the South. More scholars should look into the speeches of Grady. Not only that, but scholars should look into the editorials that he wrote as the editor of the *Atlanta Journal Constitution*. There is a cornucopia of public address and rhetorical discourse to be studied by

Scholars that are interested in social movements should study Grady's use of rhetoric.

The New South era and the South's movement into a new economic system is something that has not been studied by scholars in public address and rhetorical studies that focus on social movements. Grady's works can show how a subjugated group appealed for the help of the hegemonic elite in order to rise up and challenge the hegemonic elite. Also, his use of socialism and terms of economics could be something that scholars take into account when studying social movements that are primarily framed in economic terms.

### *Conclusion*

Since its inception, America has promoted an ideal that it is a country of wealth and success. It is a mythic narrative taught and disseminated to everyone in the country, called the American Dream. Behind this myth lies the reality of rigid economic abuse and exploitation by plutocrats and economic and industrial elites of the country. The abuse and exploitation of America's poor have been going on since the beginning for those who did not get a chance at the American Dream. In this study I sought to shed light on a very small section of the larger community that has been, and continues to be, abused by the economic and industrial system of the U.S. nation. This group is the poor Southern white worker during the Gilded Age. Although this is a historical based study, the problems remain the same for poor Southern white workers to this very day. Existing theories on race and power in our fields of study have ignored the importance of class and economic power. To leave the discussion of class out of a discussion of power is detrimental to those who do not have the economic means to give themselves a voice.

Are we, public address and rhetorical studies scholars, not doing a disservice to our research by ignoring the important tenants of power? Are we not doing a disservice to the people to whom we are supposedly giving a voice to if we exclude them based upon their race? My answers to both questions should be apparent, and I hope that the work here begins a scholarly conversation not only about the importance of economics in white privilege but also the importance of economics and wealth in all power privilege. In a world where power is based upon wealth and money, it is the highest folly to ignore the importance of economic distributions of wealth and power relations regarding cultural identities.

---

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Raymie E. McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis," *Communication Monographs* 56 no. 2 (June 1989), 94.

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that "poor whites," "working class whites" and "farmers" are used herein interchangeably because the vast majority of the literature on this topic does the same. Also, by understanding the time period of the late nineteenth century, one notes that there is no middle class yet. This period witnessed the beginning of a movement (Populism, which later became Progressivism) to establish one. The working class was as politically destitute as people with no employment; given this shared oppression there is little socially discernable difference among groups of "poor whites."

<sup>3</sup> Philip Wander, "The Ideological Turn in Modern Criticism," *Central States Speech Journal* 35 no.4 (Winter 1984), 200.

<sup>4</sup> Some sociologists see a difference between poor whites in their classification of poor. John Hartigan argues that there are two types of poor southerners: Generational and Patrician. Generational poor are the people who have been born into families with no money. Patrician poor are the people who lost their money and have a better chance of getting it back because of their name and societal influence they had when they had money. This study does not see a difference in types of poor because the Materialist Marxist economic theory used for analysis does not differentiate between these two types of poor. See John Hartigan Jr., *Odd Tribes: Toward a Cultural Analysis of White People* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005), 1.

<sup>5</sup> Wayne Flynt, *Dixie's Forgotten People: The South's Poor Whites* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2004) xvii.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, xxi.

<sup>7</sup> Most of the work deals with the twentieth century and poor whites in the South. This study will only look at the era of the late 1880's and how poor whites were defined based upon economic materialist interests. David Roediger wrote a book called the wages of whiteness, which discusses such a topic, yet it ends at the end of the Reconstruction era of 1877.

<sup>8</sup> Flynt, *Dixie's Forgotten People*, 1.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>10</sup> The Progressive Era was borne out of the failed political movement of the populism. It lasted from 1900-1918. The progressive era did not see its policies it fought for enacted until the New Deal after the beginning of the Great Depression. It was the first time that poor whites had laws

---

to protect them as workers and the capital invested in the South to give them a good wage and lift them out of poverty into the American middle class. For more on this topic see Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York: Random House, 1965).

<sup>11</sup> Flynt, *Dixie's Forgotten People*, 3.

<sup>12</sup> Michael Calvin Mcgee, "In Search of 'The People:': A Rhetorical Alternative." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61 no. 3 (August 1975).

<sup>13</sup> C. Vann Woodward, *Origins of the New South: 1877-1913* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951).

<sup>14</sup> James C. Cobb, *Redefining Southern Culture: Mind and Identity in the Modern South* (Athens, Ga: University of Georgia Press, 1999), 67.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 68.

<sup>16</sup> Ferald J. Bryan, *Henry Grady or Tom Watson? The Rhetorical Struggle for the New South: 1880-1890* (Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 1994).

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>18</sup> Woodward, *Origins of the New South*.

<sup>19</sup> Thomas Nakayama, Judith Martin, and Philip Wander, "Whiteness and Beyond: Sociohistorical Foundations of Whiteness and Contemporary Challenges." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, ed. by Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin (London: Sage publications, 1999), 13-26; Judith N. Martin, Robert L Krizek, Thomas Nakayama, and Lisa Bradford, "What do White People Want to be Called? A Study of Self-Labels for White Americans." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, ed. by Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin (London: Sage publications, 1999), 27-50; Debain Marty, "White Antiracist Rhetoric as Apologia: Wendell Berry's *The Hidden Wound*." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, ed. by Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin (London: Sage publications, 1999), 51-68. Raka Shome, "Whiteness and the Politics of Location: Postcolonial Reflections." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, ed. by Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin (London: Sage publications, 1999), 107-128; K. E. Supriya, "White Difference: Cultural Constructions of White Identity." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, ed. Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin (London: Sage Publications, 1999), 129-148; Dreama Moon, "White Enculturation and Bourgeois Ideology: The Discursive Production of 'Good (White) Girls.'" In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, ed. Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin (London: Sage Publications, 1999), 177-197; Jolanta Drzewiecka and Kathleen Wong, "The Dynamic Construction of White Ethnicity in the Context of Transnational Cultural Formations." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, ed. Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin (London: Sage Publications, 1999), 198-216; Kevin Deluca, "In the Shadow of Whiteness: The Consequences of Constructions of Nature in Environmental Politics." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, ed. Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin

---

(London: Sage Publications, 1999), 217-248; Priya Kapoor, "Provincializing Whiteness: Deconstructing Discourse(s) on Internations Progress." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, ed. Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin (London: Sage Publications, 1999), 249-263; Melissa Steyn, "White Identity in Context: A Personal Narrative." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, ed. Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin (London: Sage Publications, 1999), 264-278; Wen Shu Lee, "One Whiteness Veils Three Uglinesses: From Border-Crossing to a Womanist Interrofation of Gendered Colorism." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, ed. Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin (London: Sage Publications, 1999), 279-298.

<sup>20</sup> The Populist Movement was a movement that occurred between 1890-1896 and was burgeoned from the large scale labor and farmers alliances that had swept the country in the previous decade. The Populist Movement fought against government corruption, large banks and trusts, giant corporations, and the influence of wealth in the political system. Politically, the movement was led by Democrats who created their own caucus in Congress and sought to nominate their own candidates for President within the Democratic Party. They were successful and the end of the Populist Movement occurred when their Presidential ticket lost the national election to the Republican Party in 1896. For more information on the Populist Movement see Michael Kazin, *The Populist Persuasion: An American History* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), 11-57.

<sup>21</sup> Thomas Nakayama and Robert Krizek, "Whiteness as a Strategic Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81 no. 3 (August 1995): 303.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 298.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 299.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 300.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 299-300.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 300.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 301.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 302

<sup>32</sup> Ronald Jackson, "White Spaces, White Privilege: Mapping Discursive Inquiry into the Self," *Quarterly Journal of Communication* 85 no. 1 (January 1999).

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 45.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 46.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 48.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 50.

<sup>39</sup> Ruth Frankenberg, *White Women, Race matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 26.

<sup>40</sup> David Roediger, *Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (New York: Verso, 1993), 6.

<sup>41</sup> K. E. Supriya, "White Difference: Cultural Constructions of White Identity," 135.

<sup>42</sup> Richard Dyer, *White* (London: Routledge, 1997), 34.

<sup>43</sup> Kenneth Burke, "A Dramatisitc View of the Origins of Language," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 38 (October 1952).

<sup>44</sup> Nakayama and Krizek, *Whiteness as Strategic*, 300.

<sup>45</sup> Frankenberg, *White Women, Race Matters*, 24.

<sup>46</sup> Wendy Shaw, "Decolonising Geographies of Whiteness," *Antipode* 38 (December 2006): 854.

<sup>47</sup> Steve Garner, *Whiteness: An Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2007).

<sup>48</sup> Debian Marty, "White Antiracist Rhetoric as Apologia: Wendell Berry's the Hidden Wound," 52.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 66.

<sup>50</sup> Frankenberg, *White Women, Race Matters*, 56

<sup>51</sup> For more on whiteness being its own racial category see the books of David Roedinger, *Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (New York: Verso, 1993); Wayne Flynt, *Dixie's Forgotten People: The South's Poor Whites* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2004); Matt Wray, *Not Quite white: White Trash and the Boundaries of Whiteness* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006); Kirby Moss's *The Color of Class: Poor*

---

*Whites and the Paradox of Privilege* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003); Matt Wray and Annalee Newitz's *White Trash: Race and Class in America* (New York: London, 1997); , John Hartigan *Odd Tribes: Towards a Cultural Analysis of White People* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005); Lewis Killian, *White Southerners* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985).

<sup>52</sup> Matthew Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 68.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 73-74).

<sup>54</sup> Roediger, *Wages of Whiteness*, 7.

<sup>55</sup> Thi Trinh, *When the Moon Waxes Red: Representation, Gender, and Cultural Politics* (New York; Routledge, 1991), 21.

<sup>56</sup> Christina Stage, "We Celebrate 100 Years: An 'Indigenous' Analysis of the Metaphors that Shape the Cultural Identity of Small Town, U.S.A." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, ed. Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin (London: Sage, 1999), 82.

<sup>57</sup> Phillip Wander, Judith Martin, and Thomas Nakayama, "Whiteness and beyond: Sociohistorical Foundations of Whiteness and Contemporary Challenges," 21.

<sup>58</sup> Michele Lamont, *The Dignity of Working Men* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 48.

<sup>59</sup> David Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness*, 177.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>61</sup> For more on poor whites and their view of working conditions see Wayne Flynt, *Dixie's Forgotten People: The South's Poor Whites* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2004) .

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 66.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 67.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 19-20.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 21

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 30.

<sup>70</sup> John Hartigan, *Odd Tribes*, 1.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., 2.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>73</sup> Matt Wray, *White Trash and the Boundaries of Whiteness* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 1-2.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 5.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., 18.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>78</sup> Matt Wray and Annalee Newitz, *White Trash: Race and Class in America* (New York: London, 1997), 1-2.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., 2.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., 5.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., 7.

<sup>82</sup> Kirby Moss, *The Color of Class: Poor Whites and the Paradox of Privilege* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 3.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>84</sup> Thomas Nakayama and Robert Krizek, "Whiteness as a Strategic Rhetoric," 291.

<sup>85</sup> Robert Wiebe, *The Search for order: 1877-1920*, (New York: Hill and Wang Publishing, 1967).

<sup>86</sup> James Arnt Aune, *Rhetoric and Marxism*, (San Francisco: Westveiw Press, 1994), 16.

<sup>87</sup> Lee Artz, "On the Material and the Dialectic: Toward a Class Analysis of Communication." In *Marxism and Communication Studies: The Point is to Change It*, ed. By Lee Artz, Steve Macek, and Dana L. Cloud (New York: Peter Lang,

---

<sup>88</sup> Borchers, *Rhetorical Theory: An Introduction* (New York: Thomson Wadsworth Publishing), 178.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 178.

<sup>90</sup> Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (Arlington Heights, IL.: Harlan Davidson, 1955), 16.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>93</sup> Borchers, *Rhetorical Theory*, 177.

<sup>94</sup> Dana Cloud, "The Materiality of Discourse as Oxymoron: A Challenge to Critical Rhetoric," *Western Journal of Communication* 58 no. 3 (September 1994), 142.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 144.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>97</sup> Borchers, *Rhetorical Theory*, 178.

<sup>98</sup> Cloud, *The Materiality of Discourse*, 143. According to Cloud, French theorist Michel Foucault summarizes this view when he argued that power shifts in discourses and not in economic relations. This view relies heavily on Italian philosopher Antonio Gramsci and his view of cultural hegemony.

<sup>99</sup> Cloud, *The Materiality of Discourse*, 153.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 154.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 155.

<sup>103</sup> Dana L. Cloud, "Change Happens: Materialist Dialectics and Communication Studies." In *Marxism and Communication Studies: The Point is to Change It*, ed. Lee Artz, Steve Macek, and Dana L. Cloud, (New York: Peter Lang), 54.

<sup>104</sup> For more on this, see Dana Cloud's discussion about government officials in her chapter in the book *Marxism and Communication Studies: The Point is to Change It*, 54.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, 55.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*

---

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., 57.

<sup>109</sup> German philosopher Friedrich Hegel also believes this and Marx based part of his writing off of Hegel's views.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 58.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 59.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., 57.

<sup>113</sup> Norman Austin, *Meaning and Being in Myth* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990), 5.

<sup>114</sup> Leroy G. Dorsey and Rachel M. Harlow, "'We Want to be Americans Pure and Simple': Theodore Roosevelt and the Myth of Americanism," In *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism*, ed. Carl R. Burghardt (State College Pennsylvania: Strata Publishing, 2005), 291.

<sup>115</sup> Mircea Eliade, *Myth and Reality*, trans. W. R. Trask (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), 2.

<sup>116</sup> Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, 1973), 11.

<sup>117</sup> Dorsey and Harlow, *We Want to be American*," 291.

<sup>118</sup> William Doty, *Myth: A Handbook*, (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2004), 1.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 2-3.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>121</sup> Richard Slotkin, *Regeneration through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier 1600-1860* (Middleton, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1973), 8.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., 8.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., 8-9.

<sup>124</sup> Anthony DeSantis, "Selling the American Dream Myth to Black Southerners: The Chicago Defender and the Great Migration of 1915-1919," *Western Journal of Communication* 62 no. 3 (September 1998), 478.

<sup>125</sup> Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "An Exercise in the Rhetoric of Mythical America." In *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism*, ed. Carl Burghardt (State College, Pa.: Strata, Publishing, 1995), 198.

---

<sup>126</sup> Janis Hocker Rushing and Thomas S. Frenz, "The Frankenstein Myth in Contemporary Cinema," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 6 no. 1 (January 1989), 2.

<sup>127</sup> Richard Hughes, *Myths Americans Live By* (Urbana, IL.: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 134.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 127.

<sup>129</sup> Robert Rowland, "On Mythic Criticism," *Communication Studies* 41 (March 1990), 103.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, 104.

<sup>131</sup> Hughes, *Myths Americans Live By*, 134.

<sup>132</sup> DeSantis, *Selling the American Dream*, 280.

<sup>133</sup> Robert Rowland, "On a Limited Approach to Mythic Criticism – Rowland's Rejoinder," *Communication Studies* 41 no. 2 (March 1990), 155.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, 153.

<sup>135</sup> Sonja K. Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism* (Long Grove, Ill.: Waveland Press, 2009), 267.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>137</sup> Michael Osborn, "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-Dark Family," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 53 (April 1967), 115.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*, 116.

<sup>139</sup> Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 273.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>141</sup> Bryan, *Henry Grady*, 32.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>145</sup> Raymond B. Nixon, *Henry W. Grady: Spokesman for the New South* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1943), 42.

---

<sup>146</sup> Harold E. Davis, *Henry Grady's New South: Atlanta, a Brave and Beautiful City* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1990), 30.

<sup>147</sup> Bryan, *Henry Grady*, 33.

<sup>148</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>150</sup> Nixon, *Henry W. Grady*, 56.

<sup>151</sup> Bryan, *Henry Grady*, 33.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

<sup>156</sup> Nixon, *Henry W. Grady*, 56.

<sup>157</sup> Bryan, *Henry Grady*, 35.

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*, 40.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, 41.

<sup>161</sup> Nixon, *Henry W. Grady*, 56.

<sup>162</sup> Davis, *Henry Grady's New South*, 1.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, 1.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>165</sup> Bryan, *Henry Grady*, 41.

<sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

<sup>167</sup> *Ibid.*, 43.

<sup>168</sup> *Ibid.*

---

<sup>169</sup> Davis, *Henry Grady's New South*, 3.

<sup>170</sup> Flynt, *Dixie's Forgotten People*, 33.

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>172</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, 37.

<sup>176</sup> "Redeemer rule" or the "Redeemers" is another name for the conservative Democratic Party that sprung to prominence in the South during the era of reconstruction. For more on the Redeemers, see Edward L. Ayers, *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction* (London: Oxford University Press, 2007), 8-9.

<sup>177</sup> Robert Wiebe, *The Search for Order: 1877-1920* (New York: Macmillian, 1967), 3.

<sup>178</sup> Woodward, *Origins of the New South*, 157.

<sup>179</sup> *Ibid.*, 175.

<sup>180</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>182</sup> *Ibid.*, 180

<sup>183</sup> *Ibid.*, 180-181.

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>185</sup> Flynt, *Dixie's Forgotten People*, 44.

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, 37-38.

<sup>187</sup> *Ibid.*, 46.

<sup>188</sup> Attracting textile mills became a secular crusade to save the South's poor whites. An evangelist in North Carolina in the late nineteenth century reportedly proclaimed: "Next to God, what this town needs is a cotton mill." For more on the cities reliance of attracting mills to keep their economies afloat, see Wayne Flynt, *Dixie's Forgotten People*, Chapter 2 and Edward Ayers, *Promise of the New South*, Chapter 5.

- 
- <sup>189</sup> Bryan, *Henry Grady*, 47.
- <sup>190</sup> *Ibid.*, 49.
- <sup>191</sup> Ayers, *Promise of the New South*, 16.
- <sup>192</sup> Flynt, *Dixie's Forgotten People*, 47.
- <sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*, 49.
- <sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>195</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>196</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.
- <sup>197</sup> Eric Foner, *A Short History of Reconstruction* (New York: Harper, 1990).
- <sup>198</sup> Flynt, *Dixie's Forgotten People*, 37.
- <sup>199</sup> *Ibid.*, 49.
- <sup>200</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.
- <sup>201</sup> Ayers, *Promise of the New South*, 214.
- <sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*, 217.
- <sup>203</sup> *Ibid.*, 218.
- <sup>204</sup> *Ibid.*, 219.
- <sup>205</sup> Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950), 7.
- <sup>206</sup> Hughes, *Myths Americans*, 56.
- <sup>207</sup> Ayers, *The Promise of the New South*, 104.
- <sup>208</sup> Rowland, "On a Limited Approach," 167.
- <sup>209</sup> Davis, *Henry Grady's New South*, 113.
- <sup>210</sup> Ayers, *Promise of the New South*, 4.
- <sup>211</sup> Rowland, "On a Limited Approach," 8.

---

<sup>212</sup> Ibid., viii.

<sup>213</sup> Nixon, *Henry W. Grady*, 237.

<sup>214</sup> I use the term “Negro” throughout the rest of the study because it was the accepted term for African Americans during the time period between 1886-1889.

<sup>215</sup> Ibid., 238.

<sup>216</sup> Davis, *Henry Grady’s New South*, 116.

<sup>217</sup> Ibid., 159,

<sup>218</sup> Nixon, *Henry W. Grady*, 237.

<sup>219</sup> For more on economic expansion of the South during the New South era, see Ayers, *Promise of the New South*, 3-34.

<sup>220</sup> For more on Grady and Inman’s friendship see Nixon and Ayers.

<sup>221</sup> The Richmond and Danville Railroad system was a precursor to the current Southern Railroad system that we have today, See Nixon, 238.

<sup>222</sup> Nixon, *Henry W. Grady*, 238

<sup>223</sup> Although the speech mainly garnered lavish praise, some newspapers came out against it. Louisville’s *Courier Journal* and Charleston’s *News and Courier* came out against the speech, see Nixon, 250. Yet, the speech won wide praise for both its technique and effectiveness, See Nixon, 248-253. The speech was so well accepted by some influential news editors that they began to push Grady as a vice-presidential running mate for Grover Cleveland in 1888, See Nixon, 254.

<sup>224</sup> Bryan, *Henry Grady*, 45.

<sup>225</sup> Davis, *Henry Grady’s New South*, 175.

<sup>226</sup> Nixon, *Henry W. Grady*, 240.

<sup>227</sup> Ibid.

<sup>228</sup> Ibid.

<sup>229</sup> Davis, *Henry Grady’s New South*, 176.

<sup>230</sup> Ibid., 177.

---

<sup>231</sup> Nixon, *Henry W. Grady*, 244.

<sup>232</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>233</sup> Joel Chandler Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady Including his Writings and Speeches. A Memorial Volume* (New York: Cassell Publishing, 1980), 84.

<sup>234</sup> *Ibid.*, 85.

<sup>235</sup> For more about the myth of the chosen nation, a nation blessed by God, during the colonial period, see Richard T. Hughes, *Myths Americans Live By*, (Chicago; University of Illinois Press, 2003), 19-45.

<sup>236</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*, 85.

<sup>237</sup> Michael Osborn, "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-Dark Family," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 53 no. 2 (April 1967), 115.

<sup>238</sup> Sonja K. Foss, Karen A. Foss, and Robert Trap, *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric* (Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, 1985), 158.

<sup>239</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>240</sup> *Ibid.*, 159.

<sup>241</sup> Leroy G. Dorsey and Rachel M. Harlow, "'We Want to be Americans Pure and Simple': Theodore Roosevelt and the Myth of Americanism," In *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism*, ed. Carl R. Burghardt (State College Pennsylvania: Strata Publishing, 2005), 291.

<sup>242</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*, 86.

<sup>243</sup> Norman Austin, *Meaning and Being in Myth* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990), 5.

<sup>244</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*. 86.

<sup>245</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

<sup>246</sup> Dorsey and Harlow, *We Want to be Americans Pure and Simple*, 291.

<sup>247</sup> The term Freedman is used to describe the free African Americans after the Civil War. The United States government still did not have a plan on how to integrate all the newly free slaves into American Society. This caused a particular problem in the South. For more on the Freedman see Eric Foner, *A Short History of Reconstruction*, 110.

<sup>248</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry Grady*, 86-87.

---

<sup>249</sup> Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, 1973), 11.

<sup>250</sup> Richard Slotkin, *Regeneration through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier 1600-1860* (Middleton, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1973), 8.

<sup>251</sup> Ibid.

<sup>252</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*, 87.

<sup>253</sup> David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 214.

<sup>254</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*, 87.

<sup>255</sup> Campbell, *A Hero with a Thousand Faces*, 11

<sup>256</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*, 87.

<sup>257</sup> Dorsey and Harlow, *We Want to be Americans Pure and Simple*, 291.

<sup>258</sup> Slotkin, *Regeneration through Violence*, 8.

<sup>259</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry Grady*, 88.

<sup>260</sup> Slotkin, *Regeneration through Violence*, 8.

<sup>261</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 214.

<sup>262</sup> For more on textile mills and their importance, development, working conditions and negative effects on society in the New South, see Ayers, *The Promise of the new South*, 111-117.

<sup>263</sup> For more on the growth and importance of iron ore in the New South and its use in creating the biggest New South boomtown of Birmingham, Alabama, see Ayers, *The Promise of the New South*, 55.

<sup>264</sup> Dyer, *White*, 34.

<sup>265</sup> Nakayama and Krizek, *Whiteness as Strategic*, 300.

<sup>266</sup> Moss, *The Color of Class*, 3.

<sup>267</sup> Desantis, *Selling the American Dream*, 280.

<sup>268</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*, 89.

---

<sup>269</sup> There were black farmers, but by most historians accounts, blacks had moved out of farming because it reminded them too much of slavery and the local courts would not hold up the contracts they signed with local land owners, forcing them to move to cities to take other jobs. This left poor whites to farm the land as tenant farmers and they were the vast majority of people that produced the cotton during this time period. For more on this see Eric Foner, *A Short History of Reconstruction* (London: Harper Perennial, 1990), 55-82.

<sup>270</sup> Flynt, *Dixie's Forgotten People*, 47.

<sup>271</sup> Bright, *Race and Reunion*, 43.

<sup>272</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*, 88.

<sup>273</sup> *Ibid.*, 90.

<sup>274</sup> For more on the poor whites in the South and the lead up to the Civil War, See Foner, *A Short History of Reconstruction*, 1-16.

<sup>275</sup> DeSantis, *Selling the American Dream*, 280.

<sup>276</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*, 91.

<sup>277</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>278</sup> DeSantis, *Selling the American Dream*, 280.

<sup>279</sup> Nixon, *Henry W. Grady*, 247.

<sup>280</sup> *Ibid.*, 248.

<sup>281</sup> *Ibid.*, 249

<sup>282</sup> Richard K. Scher, *Politics in the New South: Republicanism, Race and Leadership in the Twentieth Century*, (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 1997), 6.

<sup>283</sup> Robert Rowland, "On a Limited Approach to Mythic Criticism – Rowland's Rejoinder," 155.

<sup>284</sup> *Ibid.*, 153.

<sup>285</sup> Wiebe, *The Search for Order*, 71.

<sup>286</sup> Ayers, *Promise of the New South*, 216.

<sup>287</sup> *Ibid.*, 124

<sup>288</sup> *Ibid.*, 221.

---

<sup>289</sup> Davis, *Henry Grady's New South*, 124.

<sup>290</sup> H.C. Hudgins, 228.

<sup>291</sup> Richard Hughes, *Myths Americans Live By*, 134.

<sup>292</sup> *Ibid.*, 127.

<sup>293</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>294</sup> Rowland, "On a limited Approach to Mythic Criticism," 158.

<sup>295</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*, 146.

<sup>296</sup> *Ibid.*, 147.

<sup>297</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>298</sup> Since the people give the government its authority it could be reasoned, if government was not corrupt, that the people give the authority of economic oppression to the industrialists. Grady points out in his speech, *The South and her Problems*, that the South is at a disadvantage because the majority of the people that vote live in the North and it is the North that is reaping the benefits of the industrial boom at the time. Therefore, the South has no say in what is going on because their leaders do not have the votes in Congress to change any of the federal laws that would help them. And the Southern workers would not see any of those beneficial laws until Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, enacted over forty years later.

<sup>299</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*, 147.

<sup>300</sup> Hartigan Jr., *Odd Tribes*, 1.

<sup>301</sup> *Ibid* 147-148.

<sup>302</sup> *Ibid.*, 148.

<sup>303</sup> *Ibid.*, 153.

<sup>304</sup> *Ibid.*, 149.

<sup>305</sup> Hartigan Jr., *Odd Tribes*, 2.

<sup>306</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*, 113.

<sup>307</sup> Osborn, "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric," 115.

---

<sup>308</sup> Ibid., 110.

<sup>309</sup> Foner, *A Short History of Reconstruction*.

<sup>310</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*, 111.

<sup>311</sup> Rowland, "On a limited Approach to Mythic Criticism, 149.

<sup>312</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady*, 114.

<sup>313</sup> Ibid., 117.

<sup>314</sup> Ibid., 118.

<sup>315</sup> Ibid., 115. Earlier in his speech, Grady explains how the farmer has lost money while others gained: "he has dug from the soil of Georgia more than \$1,000,000,000 worth of product. From this mighty resource great cities have been builded and countless fortunes amassed, but amid all the splendor he has remained the hewer of wood and the drawer of water. He had made the cities \$60,000,000 richer than they were when the war began, and he finds himself, in the sweat of whose brow this miracle was wrought, \$50,000,000 poorer than he then was."

<sup>316</sup> Ibid., 119.

<sup>317</sup> Ibid., 117.

<sup>318</sup> Ibid., 118.

<sup>319</sup> Ibid., 118-119.

<sup>320</sup> History shows that Grady was right in his accusation of the government being a militarized arm of corporations and trusts. Just four years after he died the Pullman Strike began in 1893. It was the first time that the United States armed forces were ordered by a sitting president to fire on U.S. citizens. The force of the U.S. army subsequently broke the strike and lead to continued abuses to the labor movement by the government until the 1930's. For more on this see Robert Wiebe's *The Search for Order: 1877-1920*.

<sup>321</sup> Harris, *Life of Henry Grady*, 121.

<sup>322</sup> Robert Rowland, "On a Limited Approach to Mythic Criticism – Rowland's Rejoinder," 155.

<sup>323</sup> Ibid., 153.

<sup>324</sup> DeSantis, *Selling the American Dream*, 280.

<sup>325</sup> Dana L. Cloud, "Change Happens: Materialist Dialectics and Communication Studies," 54.

---

<sup>326</sup> Kirby Moss, *The Color of Class: Poor Whites and the Paradox of Privilege*, 3.

<sup>327</sup> Hartigan Jr., *Odd Tribes*, 1.

<sup>328</sup> Charles J. Stewart, Craig Allen Smith, Robert E. Denton, Jr., *Persuasion and Social Movements* (Long Grove, Ill.: Waveland Press, 2007), 323.

<sup>329</sup> *Ibid.*

## REFERENCES

- Artz, Lee. "On the Material and the Dialectic: Toward a Class Analysis of Communication." In *Marxism and Communication Studies: The Point is to Change It*. Edited by Lee Artz, Steve Macek, and Dana L. Cloud. New York: Peter Lang, 2002.
- Aune, James Arnt. *Rhetoric and Marxism*. San Francisco: Westview Press, 1994.
- Austin, Norman. *Meaning and Being in Myth*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990.
- Ayers, Edward L. *Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction*. London: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Blight, David W. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Borchers, Timothy. *Rhetorical Theory: An Introduction*. New York: Thompson/Wadsworth, 2006.
- Bowers, John W., Donovan J. Ochs, Richard J. Jensen, and David P. Schultz. *The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control*. Long Grove, Ill.: Waveland Press, Inc., 2010.
- Bryan, Ferald J. *Henry Grady or Tom Watson? The Rhetorical Struggle for the New South: 1880-1890*. Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 1994.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950.
- . "A Dramatic View of the Origins of Language." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 38, no. 3 (October 1952): 251-264.
- Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1973.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "An Exercise in the Rhetoric of Mythical America." In *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism*. Edited by Carl Burghardt. State College, Pa.: Strata, Publishing, 1995.
- Cloud, Dana L. "The Materiality of Discourse as Oxymoron: A Challenge to Critical Rhetoric." *Western Journal of Communication* 58, no. 3 (August 1994): 141-163.

- 
- . "Change Happens: Materialist Dialectics and Communication Studies." In *Marxism and Communication Studies: The Point is to Change It*. Edited by Lee Artz, Steve Macek, and Dana L. Cloud. New York: Peter Lang, 2002.
- Cobb, James C. *Redefining Southern Culture: Mind and Identity in the Modern South*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1999.
- . *Away Down South: A History of Southern Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Davis, Harold E. *Henry Grady's New South: Atlanta, a Brave and Beautiful City*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1990.
- DeLuca, Kevin. "In the Shadow of Whiteness: The Consequences of Constructions of Nature in Environmental Politics." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*. Edited by Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin, 217-248. London: Sage, 1999.
- DeSantis, Anthony. "Selling the American Dream Myth to Black Southerners: The Chicago Defender and the Great Migration of 1915-1919." *Western Journal of Communication* 62, no. 4 (September 1998), 474-511.
- Dorsey, Leroy G. and Rachel M. Harlow. "'We Want to be Americans Pure and Simple': Theodore Roosevelt and the Myth of Americanism." In *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism*, edited by Carl R. Burghardt, 285-306. State College Pennsylvania: Strata Publishing, 2005.
- Doty, William G. *Myth: A Handbook*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2004.
- Drzewiecka, Jolanta A. and Kathleen Wong. "The Dynamic Construction of White Ethnicity in the Context of Transnational Cultural Formations." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, edited by Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin, 198-217. London: Sage, 1999.
- Dyer, Richard. *White*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Myth and Reality*. Translated by W. R. Trask. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Flynt, Wayne. *Dixie's Forgotten People: The South's Poor Whites*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2004.
- Foner, Eric. *A Short History of Reconstruction*. New York: Harper, 1990.
- Foss, Sonja K. *Rhetorical Criticism*. Long Grove, Ill.: Waveland Press, 2009.
- Foss, Sonja K., Karen A. Foss, and Robert Trap. *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, 1985.

- 
- Frankenberg, Ruth. *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.
- Gallagher, Gary W. *Causes Won, Lost, & Forgotten: How Hollywood and Popular Art Shape What We Know About the Civil War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Garner, Steve. *Whiteness: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Gerster, Patrick and Nicholas Cords. *Myth and Southern History: The New South*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989.
- Gilmore, Glenda Elizabeth. *Gender and Jim Crow: Women and the Politics of White Supremacy in North Carolina, 1896-1920*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Harris, Joel Chandler. *Life of Henry W. Grady Including his Writings and Speeches. A Memorial Volume*. New York: Cassell Publishing, 1980.
- Hartigan, John Jr. *Odd Tribes: Toward a Cultural Analysis of White People*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Hughes, Richard. *Myths Americans Live By*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003.
- Jackson, Ronald. "White Spaces, White Privilege: Mapping Discursive Inquiry into the Self." *Quarterly Journal of Communication* 85, no. 1 (January 1999): 38-54.
- Jacobson, Matthew. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Kapoor, Priya. "Provincializing Whiteness: Deconstructing Discours(s) on International Progress." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, edited by Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin, 248-263. London: Sage, 1999.
- Kazin, Michael. *The Populist Persuasion: An American History*. Ithaca, Ny.: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Killian, Lewis M. *White Southerners*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985.
- Kirby, Jack Temple. *Media-Made Dixie: The South in the American Imagination*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986.
- Lamont, Michele, *The Dignity of Working Men*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Lee, Wen Shu. "One Whiteness Veils Three Uglinesses: From Border-Crossing to a Womanist Interrogation of Gendered Colorism." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, edited by Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin, 107-128. London: Sage, 1999.

- 
- Lemann, Nicholas. *Redemption: The Last Battle of the Civil War*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux Press, 2006.
- Martin, Judith N., Robert L. Krizek, Thomas K. Nakayama, and Lisa Bradford. "What do White People Want to be Called? A Study of Self-Labels for White Americans." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, edited by Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin, 27-50. London: Sage, 1999.
- Marty, Debian. "White Antiracist Rhetoric as Apologia: Wendell Berry's the Hidden Wound." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, Edited by Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin, 51-68. London: Sage, 1999.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. *The Communist Manifesto*. Arlington Heights, IL.: Harlan Davidson, 1955.
- McGee, Michael Calvin. "In Search of 'The People:' A Rhetorical Alternative." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61, no. 3 (August 1975): 235-239.
- McKerrow, Raymie E. "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis." *Communication Monographs* 56, no. 2 (June 1989): 91-111.
- McKinney, Karyn D. *Being White: Stories of Race and Racism*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Moon, Dreama. "White Enculturation and Bourgeois Ideology: the Discursive Production of 'Good (White) Girls,'" In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, edited by Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin, 177-197. London: Sage, 1999.
- Moss, Kirby. *The Color of Class: Poor Whites and the Paradox of Privilege*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- Nakayama, Thomas and Robert Krizek, "Whiteness as a Strategic Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81, no. 3 (August 1995): 291-309.
- Nixon, Raymond B. *Henry Grady: Spokesman for the New South*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1943.
- Osborn, Michael. "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-Dark Family." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 53, no. 2 (April 1967): 115-126.
- Projansky, Sarah, and Kent A. Ono. "Strategic Whiteness as Cinematic Racial Politics." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, edited by Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin, 148-176. London: Sage, 1999.
- Roediger, David. *Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. New York: Verso, 1993.

- 
- Rowland, Robert. "On Mythic Criticism." *Communication Studies* 41, no. 2 (March 1990): 101-116.
- . "On a Limited Approach to Mythic Criticism – Rowland's Rejoinder." *Communication Studies* 41, no. 2 (March 1990): 150-160.
- Rushing, Janice Hocker and Thomas S. Frenz. "The Frankenstein Myth in Contemporary Cinema." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 6, no. 1 (March 1989): 61-80.
- Scher, Richard K. *Politics in the New South: Republicanism, Race and Leadership in the Twentieth Century*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 1997.
- Shaw, Wendy. "Decolonising Geographies of Whiteness." *Antipode* 38, no. 4 (December 2006): 840-859.
- Shome, Raka. "Whiteness and the Politics of Location: Post Colonial Reflections." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, edited by Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin, 107-128. London: Sage, 1999.
- Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier 1600-1860*. Middleton, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1973.
- Stage, Christina. "We Celebrate 100 Years: An 'Indigenous' Analysis of the Metaphors that Shape the Cultural Identity of Small Town, U.S.A." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, edited by Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin, 69-86. London: Sage, 1999.
- Stewart, Charles J. Craig Allen Smith, Robert E. Denton, Jr. *Persuasion and Social Movements*. Long Grove, Ill.: Waveland Press, 2007.
- Steyn, Melissa. "White Identity in Context: A Personal Narrative." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, edited by Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin, 107-128. London: Sage, 1999.
- Supriya, K. E. "White Difference: Cultural Constructions of White Identity." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, edited by Thomas Nakayama and Judith Martin, 129-148. London: Sage Publications, 1999.
- Trinh, Thi. *When the Moon Waxes Red: Representation, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. New York; Routledge, 1991.
- Wander, Philip, "The Ideological Turn in Modern Criticism." *Central States Speech Journal* 34, no. 1 (Spring 1983): 1-18.
- Wander, Phillip, Judith Martin, and Thomas Nakayama. "Whiteness and Beyond: Sociohistorical Foundations of Whiteness and Contemporary Challenges." In *Whiteness: The*

---

*Communication of Social Identity*, edited by Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith Martin, 13-26. London: Sage, 1999.

Wiebe, Robert. *The Search for Order: 1877-1920*. New York: Hill and Wang Publishing, 1967.

Woodward, C. Vann. *Origins of the New South: 1877-1913*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951.

Wray, Matt. *White Trash and the Boundaries of Whiteness*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.

Wray, Matt and Annalee Newitz. *White Trash: Race and Class in America*. New York: London, 1997.

---

## APPENDIX

### **The “New South” Speech** – An Oration Delivered to the New England Society, 1886

There was a South of slavery and secession — that South is dead. There is a South of union and freedom — that South, thank God, is living, breathing, growing every hour." These words, delivered from the immortal lips of Benjamin H. Hill, at Tammany Hall, in 1866, true then and truer now, I shall make my text tonight.

Mr. President and gentlemen: Let me express to you my appreciation of the kindness by which I am permitted to address you. I make this abrupt acknowledgment advisedly, for I feel that if, when I raise my provincial voice in this ancient and august presence, it could find courage for no more than the opening sentence, it would be well if in that sentence I had met in a rough sense my obligation as a guest, and had perished, so to speak, with courtesy on my lips and grace in my heart. Permitted, through your kindness, to catch my second wind, let me say that I appreciate the significance of being the first Southerner to speak at this board, which bears the substance, if it surpasses the semblance, of original New England hospitality, and honors the sentiment that in turn honors you, but in which my personality is lost, and the compliment to my people made plain.

I bespeak the utmost stretch of your courtesy tonight. I am not troubled about those from whom I come. You remember the man whose wife sent him to a neighbor with a pitcher of milk, and who, tripping on the top step, fell with such casual interruptions as the landings afforded into the basement, and, while picking himself up, had the pleasure of hearing his wife call out, "John, did you break the pitcher?"

"No, I didn't," said John, "but I'll be dinged if I don't."

So, while those who call me from behind may inspire me with energy, if not with courage, I ask an indulgent hearing from you. I beg that you will bring your full faith in American fairness and frankness to judgment upon what I shall say. There was an old preacher once who told some boys of the Bible lesson he was going to read in the morning. The boys, finding the place, glued together the connecting pages. The next morning he read on the bottom of one page, "When Noah was one hundred and twenty years old he took unto himself a wife, who was" — then turning the page — "140 cubits long, 40 cubits wide, built of gopher wood, and covered with pitch inside and out." He was naturally puzzled at this. He read it again, verified it, and then said: "My friends, this is the first time I ever met this in the Bible, but I accept this as an evidence of the assertion that we are fearfully and wonderfully made." If I could get you to hold such faith tonight, I could precede cheerfully to the task I otherwise approach with a sense of consecration.

Pardon me one word, Mr. President, spoken for the sole purpose of getting into the volumes that go out annually freighted with the rich eloquence of your speakers — the fact that the Cavalier as well as the Puritan was on the continent in its early days, and that he was "up and able to be about." I have read your books carefully, and I find no mention of this fact, which seems to me an important one for preserving a sort of historical equilibrium, if for nothing else.

---

Let me remind you that the Virginia Cavalier first challenged France on the continent — that Cavalier John Smith gave New England its very name, and was so pleased with the job that he has been handing his own name around ever since; and that while Myles Standish was cutting off men's ears for courting a girl without her parents' consent, and forbade men to kiss their wives on Sunday, the Cavalier was courting everything in sight, and that the Almighty had vouchsafed great increase to the Cavalier colonies, the huts in the wilderness being as full as the nests in the woods.

But having incorporated the Cavalier as a fact in your charming little books, I shall let him work out his own salvation, as he has always done, with engaging gallantry, and we will hold no controversy as to his merits. Why should we? Neither Puritan nor Cavalier long survived as such. The virtues and good traditions of both happily still live for the inspiration of their sons and the saving of the old fashion. But both Puritan and Cavalier were lost in the storm of the first Revolution, and the American citizen, supplanting both and stronger than either, took possession of the Republic bought by their common blood and fashioned to wisdom, and charged himself with teaching men government and establishing the voice of the people as the voice of God.

My friends, Dr. Talmage has told you that the typical American has yet to come. Let me tell you that he has already come. Great types, like valuable plants, are slow to flower and fruit. But from the union of these colonists, Puritans and Cavaliers, from the straightening of their purposes and the crossing of their blood, slow perfecting through a century, came he who stands as the first typical American, the first who comprehended within himself all the strength and gentleness, all the majesty and grace, of this Republic — Abraham Lincoln, He was the sum of Puritan and Cavalier, for in his ardent nature were fused the virtues of both, and in the depths of his great soul the faults of both were lost. He was greater than Puritan, greater than Cavalier, in that he was American, and that in his honest form were first gathered the vast and thrilling forces of his ideal government, charging it with such tremendous meaning and elevating it above human suffering, that martyrdom, though infamously aimed, came as a fitting crown to a life consecrated from the cradle to human liberty. Let us, each cherishing the traditions and honoring his fathers, build with reverent hands to the type of this simple but sublime life, in which all types are honored, and in our common glory as Americans there will be plenty and to spare for your forefathers and for mine.

Dr. Talmage has drawn for you, with a master's hand, the picture of your returning armies. He has told you how, in the pomp and circumstance of war, they came back to you, marching with proud and victorious tread, reading their glory in a nation's eyes I Will you bear with me while I tell you of another army that sought its home at the close of the late war? — An army that marched home in defeat and not in victory, in pathos and not in splendor, but in glory that equaled yours, and to hearts as loving as ever welcomed heroes home! Let me picture to you the footsore Confederate soldier, as, buttoning up in his faded gray jacket the parole which was to bear testimony to his children of his fidelity and faith, he turned his face southward from Appomattox in April, 1865. Think of him as, ragged, half-starved, heavy-hearted, enfeebled by want and wounds, having fought to exhaustion, he surrenders his gun, wrings the hands of his comrades in silence, and lifting his tear-stained and pallid face for the last time to the graves that dot old Virginia hills, pulls his gray cap over his brow and begins the slow and painful journey. What does he find — let me ask you who went to your homes eager to find, in the welcome you had justly earned, full payment for four years' sacrifice — what does he find when, having followed the battle-stained cross against overwhelming odds, dreading death not half so much as surrender, he reaches the home he left so prosperous and beautiful? He finds his house in ruins,

---

his farm devastated, his slaves free, his stock killed, his barns empty, his trade destroyed, his money worthless, his social system, feudal in its magnificence, swept away, his people without law or legal status, his comrades slain, and the burdens of others heavy on his shoulders. Crushed by defeat, his very traditions are gone; without money, credit, employment, material, or training; and besides all this, confronted with the gravest problem that ever met human intelligence — the establishment of a status for the vast body of his liberated slaves.

What does he do — this hero in gray with a heart of gold? Does he sit down in sullenness and despair? Not for a day. Surely God, who had striped him of his prosperity, inspired him in his adversity. As ruin was never before so overwhelming, never was restoration swifter. The soldier stepped from the trenches into the furrow; horses that had charged federal guns marched before the plow, and fields that ran red with human blood in April were green with the harvest in June; women reared in luxury cut up their dresses and made breeches for their husbands, and, with a patience and heroism that fit women always as a garment, gave their hands to work. There was little bitterness in all this. Cheerfulness and frankness prevailed. Bill Arp struck the keynote when he said, "Well, I killed as many of them as they did of me, and now I'm going to work." So did the soldier returning home after defeat and roasting some corn on the roadside who made the remark to his comrades, "You may leave the South if you want to, but I'm going to Sandersville, kiss my wife, and raise a crop, and if the Yankees fool with me any more, I'll whip 'em again." I want to say to General Sherman, who is considered an able man in our parts, though some people think he is a kind of careless man about fire, that from the ashes he left us in 1864 we have raised a brave and beautiful city; that somehow or other we have caught the sunshine in the bricks and mortar of our homes, and have builder therein not one ignoble prejudice or memory.

But what is the sum of our work? We have found out that in the summing up the free Negro counts more than he did as a slave. We have planted the schoolhouse on the hilltop and made it free to white and black. We have sown towns and cities in the place of theories, and put business above politics. We have challenged your spinners in Massachusetts and your iron-makers in Pennsylvania. We have learned that the \$400,000,000 annually received from our cotton crop will make us rich when the supplies that make it are home-raised. We have reduced the commercial rate of interest from 24 to 6 percent, and are floating 4 per cent bonds. We have learned that one Northern immigrant is worth fifty foreigners, and have smoothed the path to Southward, wiped out the place where Mason and Dixon's line used to be, and hung out the latchstring to you and yours. We have reached the point that marks perfect harmony in every household, when the husband confesses that the pies which his wife cooks are as good as those his mother used to bake; and we admit that the sun shines as brightly and the moon as softly as it did before the war. We have established thrift in city and country. We have fallen in love with work. We have restored comfort to homes from which culture and elegance never departed. We have let economy take root and spread among us as rank as the crab-grass which sprung from Sherman's cavalry camps, until we are ready to lay odds on the Georgia Yankee as he manufactures relics of the battle-field in a one-story shanty and squeezes pure olive oil out of his cotton seed, against any down-easter that ever swapped wooden nutmegs for flannel sausage in the valleys of Vermont. Above all, we know that we have achieved in these "piping times of peace" a fuller independence for the South than that which our fathers sought to win in the forum by their eloquence or compel in the field by their swords.

It is a rare privilege, sir, to have had part, however humble, in this work. Never was nobler duty confided to human hands than the up building and uplifting of the prostrate and

---

bleeding South — misguided, perhaps, but beautiful in her suffering, and honest, brave, and generous always. In the record of her social, industrial, and political illustration we await with confidence the verdict of the world. But what of the Negro? Have we solved the problem he presents or progressed in honor and equity toward solution? Let the record speak to the point. No section shows a more prosperous laboring population than the Negroes of the South, none in fuller sympathy with the employing and land-owning class. He shares our school fund, has the fullest protection of our laws, and the friendship of our people. Self-interest, as well as honor, demands that he should have this. Our future, our very existence, depend upon our working out this problem in full and exact justice. We understand that when Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, your victory was assured, for he then committed you to the cause of human liberty, against which the arms of man cannot prevail — while those of our statesmen who trusted to make slavery the corner stone of the Confederacy doomed us to defeat as far as they could, committing us to a cause that reason could not defend or the sword maintain in sight of advancing civilization.

Had Mr. Toombs said, which he did not say, that he would call the roll of his slaves at the foot of Bunker Hill," he would have been foolish, for he might have known that whenever slavery became entangled in war it must perish, and that the chattel in human flesh ended forever in New England when your fathers — not to be blamed for parting with what didn't pay — sold their slaves to our fathers — not to be praised for knowing a paying thing when they saw it. The relations of the Southern people with the Negro are close and cordial. We remember with what fidelity for four years he guarded our defenseless women and children, whose husbands and fathers were fighting against his freedom. To his eternal credit be it said that whenever he struck a blow for his own liberty, he fought in open battle, and when at last he raised his black and humble hands that the shackles might be struck off, those hands were innocent of wrong against his helpless charges, and worthy to be taken in loving grasp by every man who honors loyalty and devotion. Ruffians have maltreated him, rascals have misled him, philanthropists established a bank for him, but the South, with the North, protests against injustice to this simple and sincere people. To liberty and enfranchisement is as far as law can carry the Negro. The rest must be left to conscience and common sense. It must be left to those among whom his lot is cast, with whom he is indissolubly connected, and whose prosperity depends upon their possessing his intelligent sympathy and confidence. Faith has been kept with him, in spite of calumnious assertions to the contrary by those who assume to speak for us or by frank opponents. Faith will be kept with him in the future, if the South holds her reason and integrity.

But have we kept faith with you? In the fullest sense, yes. When Lee surrendered — I don't say when Johnston surrendered, because I understand he still alludes to the time when he met General Sherman last as the time when he determined to abandon any further prosecution of the struggle — when Lee surrendered, I say, and Johnston quit, the South became, and has since been, loyal to this Union. We fought hard enough to know that we were whipped, and in perfect frankness accept as final the arbitrament of the sword to which we had appealed. The South found her jewel in the toad's head of defeat. The shackles that had held her in narrow limitations fell forever when the shackles of the Negro slave were broken. Under the old regime the Negroes were slaves to the South; the South was a slave to the system. The old plantation, with its simple police regulations and feudal habit, was the only type possible under slavery. Thus was gathered in the hands of a splendid and chivalric oligarchy the substance that should have been diffused among the people, as the rich blood, under certain artificial conditions, is gathered at the heart, filling that with affluent rapture, but leaving the body chill and colorless. The old South rested

---

everything on slavery and agriculture, unconscious that these could neither give nor maintain healthy growth. The new South presents a perfect democracy, the oligarchs leading in the popular movement; a social system compact and closely knitted, less splendid on the surface, but stronger at the core; a hundred farms for every plantation, fifty homes for every palace; and a diversified industry that meets the complex needs of this complex age.

The new South is enamored of her new work. Her soul is stirred with the breath of a new life. The light of a grander day is falling fair on her face. She is thrilling with the consciousness of growing power and prosperity. As she stands upright, full statured and equal among the people of the earth, breathing the keen air and looking out upon the expanded horizon, she understands that her emancipation came because, through the inscrutable wisdom of God, her honest purpose was crossed and her brave armies were beaten.

This is said in no spirit of timeserving or apology. The South has nothing for which to apologize. She believes that the late struggle between the States was war and not rebellion, revolution and not conspiracy, and that her convictions were as honest as yours. I should be unjust to the dauntless spirit of the South and to my own convictions if I did not make this plain in this presence. The South has nothing to take back. In my native town of Athens is a monument that crowns its central hill — a plain, white shaft. Deep cut into its shining side is a name dear to me above the names of men — that of a brave and simple man who died in brave and simple faith. Not for all the glories of New England, from Plymouth Rock all the way, would I exchange the heritage he left me in his soldier's death. To the foot of that shaft I shall send my children's children to reverence him who ennobled their name with his heroic blood. But, sir, speaking from the shadow of that memory which I honor as I do nothing else on earth, I say that the cause in which he suffered and for which he gave his life was adjudged by a higher and fuller wisdom than his or mine, and I am glad that the omniscient God held the balance of battle in His Almighty hand, and that human slavery was swept forever from American soil — that the American Union was saved from the wreck of war.

This message, Mr. President, comes to you from consecrated ground. Every foot of soil about the city in which I live is sacred as a battleground of the Republic. Every hill that invests it is hallowed to you by the blood of your brothers who died for your victory, and doubly hallowed to us by the blood of those who died hopeless, but undaunted, in defeat — sacred soil to all of us, rich with memories that make us purer and stronger and better, silent but staunch witnesses in its red desolation of the matchless valor of American hearts and the deathless glory of American arms, speaking an eloquent witness in its white peace and prosperity to the indissoluble union of American States and the imperishable brotherhood of the American people.

Now, what answer has New England to this message? Will she permit the prejudice of war to remain in the hearts of the conquerors, when it has died in the hearts of the conquered? Will she transmit this prejudice to the next generation, that in their hearts, which never felt the generous ardor of conflict, it may perpetuate itself? Will she withhold, save in strained courtesy, the hand which straight from his soldier's heart Grant offered to Lee at Appomattox? Will she make the vision of a restored and happy people, which gathered above the couch of your dying captain, filling his heart with grace, touching his lips with praise, and glorifying his path to the grave — will she make this vision, on which the last sigh of his expiring soul breathed a benediction, a cheat and delusion? If she does, the South, never abject in asking for comradeship, must accept with dignity its refusal; but if she does not refuse to accept in frankness and sincerity this message of good will and friendship, then will the prophecy of Webster, delivered in this very society forty years ago amid tremendous applause, be verified in its fullest sense, when he

---

said: "Standing hand to hand and clasping hands, we should remain united as we have been for sixty years, citizens of the same country, members of the same government, united, all united now and united forever." There have been difficulties, contentions, and controversies, but I tell you that in my judgment,

Those opposed eyes,  
Which like the meteors of a troubled heaven,  
All of one nature, of one substance bred,  
Did lately meet in th' intestine shock,  
Shall now, in mutual well-beseeming ranks,  
March all one way.

---

**The “Against Centralization” Speech-** Delivered as a Commencement Address to the  
University of Virginia, 1889

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: In thanking you for this cordial — this Virginia — welcome, let me say that it satisfies my heart to be with you to-day. This is my alma mater. Kind, in the tolerant patience with which she winnowed the chaff of idle days and idler nights that she might find for me the grain of knowledge and of truth, and in the charity with which she sealed in sorrow rather than in anger my brief but stormy career within these walls. Kinder yet, that her old heart has turned lovingly after the lapse of twenty years to her scapegrace son in a distant State, and, recalling him with this honorable commission, has summoned him to her old place at her knees. Here at her feet, with the glory of her presence breaking all about me, let me testify that the years have but deepened my reverence and my love, and my heart has owned the magical tenderness of the emotions first kindled amid these sacred scenes. That which was unworthy has faded — that which was good has abided. Faded the memory of the tempestuous dike and the riotous thump; dimmed the memory of that society, now happily extinct, but then famous as "The Nippers from Peru"; forgotten even the glad exultation of those days when the neighboring mountaineer in the pride of his breezy heights brought down the bandaged bear to give battle to the urban dog. Forgotten all those follies, and, let us hope, forgiven. But, enduring in heart and in brain, the exhaustless splendor of those golden days — the deep and pure inspiration of these academic shades, the kindly admonition and wisdom of the masters, the generous ardor of our mimic contests, and that loving comradeship that laughed at separation and has lived beyond the grave. Enduring and hallowed, blessed is God, the strange and wild ambitions that startled my boyish heart as amid these dim corridors, oh! My mother, the stirring of unseen wings in thy mighty past caught my careless ear, and the dazzling ideals of thy future were revealed to my wondering sight.

Gentlemen of the literary societies, I have not studied oration for you today. A life busy beyond its capacities has given scanty time for preparation, but from a loving heart I shall speak to you this morning in comradely sympathy of that which concerns us nearly.

Will you allow me to say that the anxiety that always possesses me when I address my young countrymen is to day quickened to the point of consecration? For the first time in man's responsibility I speak in Virginia to Virginia. Beyond its ancient glories that made it matchless among States, its later martyrdom has made it the Mecca of my people. It was on these hills that our fathers gave new and deeper meaning to heroism, and advanced the world in honor! It is in these valleys that our dead lie sleeping. Out there is Appomattox, where on every ragged gray cap the Lord God Almighty laid the sword of His imperishable knighthood. Beyond is Petersburg, where he whose name I bear, and who was prince to me among men, dropped his stainless sword and yielded up his stainless life. Dear to me, sir, are the people among whom my father died — sacred to me, sir, and the soil that drank his precious blood. From a heart stirred by these emotions and sobered by these memories, let me speak to you to-day, my countrymen, and God give me wisdom to speak aright and the words wherewithal to challenge and hold your attention.

We are standing in the daybreak of the second century of this Republic. The fixed stars are fading from the sky, and we grope in uncertain light. Strange shapes have come with the night. Established ways are lost — new roads perplex, and widening fields stretch beyond the

---

sight. The unrest of dawn impels us to and fro — but Doubt stalks amid the confusion, and even on the beaten paths the shifting crowds are halted, and from the shadows the sentries cry, "Who comes there?" In the obscurity of the morning tremendous forces are at work. Nothing is steadfast or approved. The miracles of the present believe the simple truths of the past. The Church is besieged from without and betrayed from within. Behind the courts smolders the rioter's torch and looms the gibbet of the anarchists. Government is the contention of partisans and the prey of spoilsmen. Trade is restless in the grasp of monopoly, and commerce shackled with limitation. The cities are swollen and the fields are stripped. Splendor streams from the castle, and squalor crouches in the home. The universal brotherhood is dissolving, and the people are huddling into classes. The hiss of the Nihilist disturbs the covert, and the roar of the mob murmurs along the highway. Amid it all beats the great American heart undismayed, and standing fast by the challenge of his conscience, the citizen of the Republic, tranquil and resolute, notes the drifting of the spectral currents, and calmly awaits the full disclosures of the day.

Who shall be the heralds of this coming day? Who shall thread the way of honor and safety through these besetting problems? Who shall rally the people to the defense of their liberties and stir them until they shall cry aloud to be led against the enemies of the Republic? You, my countrymen, you! The university is the training camp of the future, the scholar the champion of the coming years. Napoleon overran Europe with drum tap and bivouac — the next Napoleon shall form his battalions at the tap of the schoolhouse bell, and his captains shall come with cap and gown. Waterloo was won at Oxford — Sedan at Berlin. So Germany plants her colleges in the shadow of the French forts, and the professor smiles amid his students as he notes the sentinel stalking against the sky. The farmer has learned that brains mix better with his soil than the waste of sea birds, and the professor walks by his side as he spreads the showers in the verdure of his fields, and locks the sunshine in the glory of his harvest. A button is pressed by a child's finger, and the work of a million men is done. The hand is nothing — the brain everything. Physical prowess has had its day, and the age of reason has come. The lion-hearted Richard challenging Saladin to single combat is absurd, for even Gog and Magog shall wage the Armageddon from their closets and look not upon the blood that runs to the bridle bit. Science is everything! She butchers a hog in Chicago, draws Boston within five hours of New York, renews the famished soil, routs her viewless bondsmen from the electric center of the earth, and then turns to watch the new Icarus as, mounting in his flight to the sun, he darkens the burnished ceiling of the sky with the shadow of his wing.

Learning is supreme, and you are its prophets. Here the Olympic games of the Republic, and you it's chosen athletes. It is yours, then, to grapple with these problems, to confront and master these dangers. Yours to decide whether the tremendous forces of this Republic shall be kept in balance, or whether, unbalanced, they shall bring chaos; whether 60,000,000 men are capable of self-government, or whether, liberty shall be lost to them who would give their lives to maintain it. Your responsibility is appalling. You stand in the pass behind which the world's liberties are guarded. This government carries the hopes of the human race. Blot out the beacon that lights the portals of this Republic, and the world is adrift again. But save the Republic; establish the light of its beacon over the troubled waters, and one by one the nations of the earth shall drop anchor and be at rest in the harbor of universal liberty. Let one who loves his Republic as he loves his life, and whose heart is thrilled with the majesty of its mission, speak to you now of the dangers that threaten its peace and prosperity, and the means by which they may be honorably averted.

---

The unmistakable danger that threatens free government in America is the increasing tendency to concentrate in the Federal government powers and privileges that should be left with the States, and to create powers that neither the State nor Federal government should have. Let it be understood at once that in discussing this question I seek to revive no dead issue. We know precisely what was put to the issue of the sword, and what was settled thereby. The right of a State to leave this Union was denied, and the denial made good forever. But the sovereignty of the States in the Union was never involved, and the Republic that survived the storm was, in the words of the Supreme Court, "an indissoluble Union of indestructible States." Let us stand on this decree and turn our faces to the future!

It is not strange that there should be a tendency to centralization in our government. This disposition was the legacy of the war. Steam and electricity have emphasized it by bringing the people closer together. The splendor of a central government dazzles the unthinking; its opulence tempts the poor and the avaricious; its strength assures the rich and the timid; its patronage incites the spoils men and its powers inflame the partisan.

And so we have paternalism run mad. The merchant asks the government to control the arteries of trade, the manufacturer asks that his product be protected, the rich ask for an army, and the unfortunate for help — this man for schools and that for subsidy. The partisan proclaims, amid the clamor, that the source of largess must be the seat of power, and demands that the ballot boxes of the States be hedged by Federal bayonets. The centrifugal force of our system is weakened, centripetal force is increased, and the revolving spheres are veering inward from their orbits. There are strong men who rejoice in this unbalancing, and deliberately contend that the center is the true repository of power and source of privilege — men who, were they charged with the solar system, would shred the planets into the sun, and, exulting in the sudden splendor, little reck that they had kindled the conflagration that presages universal nights! Thus the States are dwarfed and the Nation magnified — and to govern a people who can best govern them, the central authority is made stronger and more splendid!

Concurrent with this political drift is another movement, less formal perhaps, but not less dangerous — the consolidation of capital. I hesitate to discuss this phase of the subject, for of all men I despise most cordially the demagogue who panders to the prejudice of the poor by abuse of the rich. But no man can note the encroachment in this country of what may be called "the money power" on the rights of the individual, without feeling that the time is approaching when the issue between plutocracy and the people will be forced to trial. The world has not seen, nor has the mind of man conceived, of such miraculous wealth gathering, as are everyday tales to us. Aladdin's lamp is dimmed, and Monte Cristo becomes commonplace when compared to our magicians of finance and trade. The seeds of a luxury that even now surpasses that of Rome or Corinth, and has only yet put forth its first flowers, are sown in this simple Republic. What shall the full fruitage be? I do not denounce the newly rich. For most part their money came under forms of law. The irresponsibilities of sudden wealth are in many cases steadied by that resolute good sense which seems to be an American heritage, and underrun by careless prodigality or by constant charity. Our great wealth has brought us profit and splendor. But the status itself is a menace. A home that costs \$3,000,000 and a breakfast that costs \$5000 are disquieting facts to the millions who live in a hut and dine on a crust. The fact that a man ten years from poverty has an income of 120,000,000 — and his two associates nearly as much — from the control and arbitrary pricing of an article of universal use, falls strangely on the ears of those who hear it, as they sit empty handed, while children cry for bread. The tendency deepens the dangers suggested by the status. What is to be the end of this swift piling up of wealth? Twenty years ago but few

---

cities had their millionaires. To-day almost every town has its dozen. Twenty men can be named who can each buy a sovereign State at its tax-book value. The youngest nation, America, is vastly the richest, and in twenty years, in spite of war, has nearly trebled her wealth. Millions are made on the turn of a trade, and the toppling mass grows and grows, while in its shadow starvation and despair stalk among the people, and swarm with increasing legions against the citadels of human life.

But the abuse of this amazing power of consolidated wealth is its bitterest result and its pressing danger. When the agent of a dozen men, who have captured and control an article of prime necessity, meets the representatives of a million farmers from whom they have forced \$3,000,000 the year before, with no more moral right than is behind the highwayman who halts the traveler at his pistol's point, and insolently gives them the measure of this year's rapacity, and tells them — men who live in the sweat of their brows, and stand between God and Nature — that they must submit to the infamy because they are helpless, then the first fruits of this system are gathered and have turned to ashes on the lips. When a dozen men get together in the morning and fix the price of a dozen articles of common use — with no standard but their arbitrary will, and no limit but their greed or daring — and then notify the sovereign people of this free Republic how much, in the mercy of their masters, they shall pay for the necessaries of life — then the point of intolerable shame has been reached.

We have read of the robber barons of the Rhine who from their castles sent a shot across the bow of every passing craft, and descending as hawks from the crags, tore and robbed and plundered the voyagers until their greed was glutted or the strength of their victims spent. Shall this shame of Europe against which the world revolted; shall it be repeated in this free country? And yet, when a syndicate or a trust can arbitrarily add 25 per cent to the cost of a single article of common use, and safely gather forced tribute from the people, until from its surplus it could buy every castle on the Rhine, or requite every baron's debauchery from its kitchen account — where is the difference — save that the castle is changed to a broker's office, and the picturesque river to the teeming streets and the broad fields of this government" of the people, by the people, and for the people"? I do not overstate the case. Economists have held that wheat, grown everywhere, could never be cornered by capital. And yet one man in Chicago tied the wheat crop in his handkerchief, and held it until a sewing- woman in my city, working for ninety cents a week, had to pay him twenty cents tax on the sack of flour she bore home in her famished hands. Three men held the cotton crop until the English spindles were stopped and the lights went out in 3,000,000 English homes. Last summer one man-cornered pork until he had levied a tax of \$3 per barrel on every consumer, and pocketed a profit of millions. The Czar of Russia would not have dared to do these things. And yet they are no secrets in this free government of ours! They are known of all men, and, my countrymen, no argument can follow them, and no plea excuse them, when they fall on the men who, toiling, yet suffer, — who hunger at their work, — and who cannot find food for their wives with which to feed the infants that hang famishing at their breasts. Mr. Jefferson foresaw this danger, and he sought to avert it. When Virginia ceded the vast Northwest to the government, — before the Constitution was written, — Mr. Jefferson in the second clause of the articles of cession prohibited forever the right of primogeniture. Virginia then nobly said, and Georgia in the cession of her territory repeated, " In granting this domain to the government and dedicating it to freedom, we prescribe that there shall be no classes in the family, — no child set up at the expense of the others, no feudal estates established, — but what a man hath shall be divided equally among his children."

---

We see this feudal tendency, swept away by Mr. Jefferson, revived by the conditions of our time, aided by the government with its grant of enormous powers and its amazing class legislation. It has given the corporation more power than Mr. Jefferson stripped from the individual, and has set up a creature without soul or conscience or limit of human life to establish an oligarchy, unrelieved by human charity and unsteadied by human responsibility. The syndicate, the trust, the corporation, — these are the eldest sons of the Republic for whom the feudal right of primogeniture is revived, and who inherit its estate to the impoverishment of their brothers. Let it be noted that the alliance between those who would centralize the government and the consolidated money power is not only close, but also essential. The one is the necessity of the other. Establish the money power and there is universal clamor for strong government. The weak will demand it for protection against the people restless under oppression — the patriotic for protection against the plutocracy that scourges and robs — the corrupt hoping to buy of one central body distant from local influences what they could not buy from the legislatures of the States sitting at their homes — the oligarchs will demand it — as the privileged few have always demanded it — for the protection of their privileges and the perpetuity of their bounty. Thus, hand in hand, will walk — as they have always walked — the federalist and the capitalist, the centralist and the monopolist — the strong government protecting the money power, and the money power the political standing array of the government. Hand in hand, compact and organized, one creating the necessity, the other meeting it; consolidated wealth and centralizing government; stripping the many of their rights and aggrandizing the few; distrusting the people, but in touch with the plutocrats; striking down local self-government and dwarfing the citizens — and at last confronting the people in the market, in the courts, at the ballot box — everywhere — with the infamous challenge, "What are you going to do about it?" And so the government protects and the barons oppress, and the people suffer and grow strong. And when the battle for liberty is joined — the centralist and the plutocrat, entrenched behind the deepening powers of the government, and the countless ramparts of money bags, oppose to the vague but earnest onset of the people the power of the trained phalanx and the conscienceless strength of the mercenary.

Against this tendency who shall protest? Those who believe that a central government means a strong government, and a strong government means repression — those who believe that this vast Republic, with its diverse interest and its local needs, can better be governed by liberty and enlightenment diffused among the people than by powers and privileges congested at the center — those who believe that the States should do nothing that the people can do themselves and the government nothing that the States and the people can do — those who believe that the wealth of the central government is a crime rather than a virtue, and that every dollar not needed for its economical administration should be left with the people of the State — those who believe that the hearthstone of the home is the true altar of liberty and the enlightened conscience of the citizen the best guarantee of government! Those of you who note the farmer sending his sons to the city that they may escape the unequal burdens under which he has labored, thus diminishing the rural population whose leisure, integrity, and deliberation have corrected the passion and impulse and corruption of the cities — who note that while the rich are growing richer, and the poor poorer, we are lessening that great middle class that, ever since it met the returning crusaders in England with the demand that the hut of the humble should be as sacred as the castle of the great, has been the bulwark and glory of every English-speaking community — who know that this Republic, which we shall live to see with 160,000,000 people, stretching from ocean to ocean, and almost from the arctic to the torrid zone, cannot be

---

governed by any laws that a central despotism could devise or controlled by any armies it could marshal, — you who know these things protest with all the earnestness of your souls against the policy and the methods that make them possible.

What is the remedy? To exalt the hearth, stone, to strengthen the home, to build up the individual, to magnify and defend the principle of local self-government. Not in deprecation of the Federal government, but to its glory; not to weaken the Republic, but to strengthen it; not to check the rich blood that flows to its heart, but to send it full and wholesome from healthy members rather than from withered and diseased extremities.

The man who kindles the fire on the hearthstone of an honest and righteous home burns the best incense to liberty. He does not love mankind less who loves his neighbor most. George Eliot has said: — "A human life should be well rooted in some spot of a native land where it may get the love of tender kinship for the face of the earth, for the sounds and accents that haunt it, a spot where the definiteness of early memories may be inwrought with affection, and spread, not by sentimental effort and reflection, but as a sweet habit of the blest."

The germ of the best patriotism is in the love that a man has for the home he inhabits, for the soil he tills, for the trees that give him shade, and the hills that stand in his pathway. I teach my son to love Georgia, to love the soil that he stands on, — the body of my old mother, the mountains that are her springing breasts, the broad acres that hold her substance, the dimpling valleys in which her beauty rests, the forests that sing her songs of lullaby and of praise, and the brooks that run with her rippling laughter. The love of home — deep rooted and abiding — that blurs the eyes of the dying soldier with the vision of an old homestead amid green fields and clustering trees, that follows the busy man through the clamoring world, persistent though put aside, and at last draws his tired feet from the highway and leads him through shady lanes and well-remembered paths until, amid the scenes of his boyhood, he gathers up the broken threads of his life and owns the soil his conqueror, — this, this lodged in the heart of the citizen is the saving principle of our government. We note the barracks of our standing army with its rolling drum and its fluttering flag as points of strength and protection. But the citizen standing in the doorway of his home — contented on his threshold — his family gathered about his hearthstone — while the evening of a well-spent day closes in scenes and sounds that are dearest, — he shall save the Republic when the drum tap is futile and the barracks are exhausted.

This love shall not be pent up or provincial. The home should be consecrated to humanity, and from its roof-tree should fly the flag of the Republic. Every simple fruit gathered there — every sacrifice endured, and every victory won should bring better joy and inspiration in the knowledge that it will deepen the glory of our Republic and widen the harvest of humanity. Be not like the peasant of France who hates the Paris he cannot comprehend, but emulate the example of your fathers in the South, who, holding to the sovereignty of the States, yet gave to the Republic its chief glory of statesmanship, and under Jackson at New Orleans, and Taylor and Scott in Mexico, saved it twice from the storm of war. Inherit without fear or shame the principle of local self-government by which your fathers stood! For though entangled with an institution foreign to this soil, which, thank God, not planted by their hands, is now swept away, and with a theory bravely defended, but now happily adjusted, — that principle holds the imperishable truth that shall yet save this Republic. The integrity of the State, its rights and its powers, — these, maintained with firmness, but in loyalty, — these shall yet, by lodging the option of local affairs in each locality, meet the needs of this vast and complex government, and check the headlong rush to that despotism that reason could not defend, nor the armies of the Czar maintain, among a free and enlightened people. This issue is squarely made ! It is

---

centralized government and the money power on the one hand, against the integrity of the States and rights of the people on the other. At all hazard, stand with the people and the threatened States. The choice may not be easily made. Wise men may hesitate and patriotic men divide. The culture, the strength, the mightiness, of the rich and strong government, — these will tempt and dazzle. But be not misled. Beneath this splendor is the canker of disturbed and oppressed people. It was from the golden age of Augustus that the Roman Empire staggered to its fall. The integrity of the States and the rights of the people! Stand there — there is safety — there is the broad and enduring brotherhood — there, less of glory, but more of honor! Put patriotism above partisanship, and wherever the principle that protects the States against the centralists, and the people against the plutocrats, may lead, follow without fear or faltering, for there the way of duty and of wisdom lies!

Exalt the citizen. As the State is the unit of government, he is the unit of the State. Teach him that his home is his castle, and his sovereignty rests beneath his hat. Make him self-respecting, self-reliant, and responsible. Let him lean on the State for nothing that his own arm can do, and on the government for nothing that his State can do. Let him cultivate independence to the point of sacrifice, and learn that humble things with unbattered liberty are better than splendors bought with its price. Let him neither surrender his individuality to government, nor merge it with the mob. Let him stand upright and fearless — a freeman born of freemen, sturdy in his own strength, dowering his family in the sweat of his brow, loving to his State, loyal to his Republic, earnest in his allegiance wherever it rests, but building his altar in the midst of his household gods and shrining in his own heart the uttermost temple of its liberty.

Go out, determined to magnify the community in which your lot is cast. Cultivate its small economies. Stand by its young industries. Commercial dependence is a chain that galls every day. A factory built at home, a book published, a shoe or a book made, — these are steps in that diffusion of thought and interest that is needed. Teach your neighbors to withdraw from the vassalage of distant capitalists, and pay, under any sacrifice, the mortgage on the home or the land. By simple and prudent lives stay within your own resources, and establish the freedom of your community. Make every village and crossroads as far as may be sovereign to its own wants. Learn that thriving countryside's with room for limbs, conscience, and liberty are better than great cities with congested wealth and population. Preserve the straight and simple homogeneity of our people. Welcome emigrants, but see that they come as friends and neighbors, to mingle their blood with ours, to build their houses in our fields, and to plant their Christian faith on our hills, and honoring our Constitution and reverencing our God, to confirm the simple beliefs in which we have been reared, and which we should transmit unsullied to our children. Stand by these old fashioned beliefs. Science hath revealed no better faith than that you learned at your mother's knee — nor has knowledge made a wiser and a better book than the worn old Bible that, thumbed by hands long since still, and blurred with the tears of eyes long since closed, held the simple annals of your family and the heart and conscience of your homes.

Honor and emulate the virtues and the faith of your forefathers — who, learned, were never wise above knowledge of God and His gospel — who, great, were never exalted above a humble trust in God and His mercy!

Let me sum up what I have sought to say in this hurried address. Your Republic, on the glory of which depends all that men hold dear, is menaced with great dangers. Against these dangers defend her, as you would defend the most precious concerns of your own life. Against the dangers of centralizing all political powers, put the approved and imperishable principle of local self-government. Between the rich and the poor now drifting into separate camps, build up

---

the great middle class that, neither drunk with wealth, nor embittered by poverty, shall lift up the suffering and control the strong. To the jangling of races and creeds that threaten the courts of men and the temples of God, oppose the home and the citizen — a homogeneous and honest people and the simple faith that sustained your fathers and mothers in their stainless lives and led them serene and smiling into the valley of the shadow.

Let it be understood in my parting words to you that I am no pessimist as to this Republic. I always bet on sunshine in America. I know that my country has reached the point of perilous greatness, and that strange forces not to be measured or comprehended are hurrying her to heights that dazzle and blind all mortal eyes — but I know that beyond the uttermost glory is enthroned the Lord God Almighty, and that when the hour of her trial has come, He will lift up His everlasting gates and bend down above her in mercy and in love. For with her He has surely lodged the ark of His covenant with the sons of men. Emerson wisely said, "Our whole history looks like the last effort by Divine Providence in behalf of the human race." And the Republic will endure. Centralism will be checked, and liberty saved — plutocracy overthrown and equality restored. The struggle for human rights never goes backward among English-speaking peoples. Our brothers across the sea have fought from despotism to liberty, and in the wisdom of local self-government have planted colonies around the world. This very day Mr. Gladstone, the wisest man that has lived since your Jefferson died, — with the light of another world beating in his face until he seems to have caught the wisdom of the Infinite and towers half human and half divine from his eminence, — this man, turning away from the traditions of his life, begs his countrymen to strip the crown of its last usurped authority, and lodge it with the people, where it belongs. The trend of the times is with us. The world moves steadily from gloom to brightness. And bending down humbly as Elisha did, and praying that my eyes shall be made to see, I catch the vision of this Republic, its mighty forces in balance, and its unspeakable glory falling on all its children, chief among the federation of English-speaking people, plenty streaming from its borders and light from its mountain tops, working out its mission under God's approving eye, until the dark continents are opened and the highways of earth established and the shadows lifted, and the jargon of the nations stilled and the perplexities of Babel straightened — and under one language, one liberty, and one God, all the nations of the world hearkening to the American drum beat and girding up their loins, shall march amid the breaking of the millennial dawn into the paths of righteousness and of peace!

---

**The “Farmers and the Cities” Speech-** Delivered to Supporters of the Farmers Alliance in

Elberton, Georgia, 1889

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: For the first time in my life I address an audience in the open air. And as I stand here in this beautiful morning, so shot through and through with sunshine that the very air is as molten gold to the touch; under these trees in whose trunks the rains and suns of years are compacted, and on whose leaves God has laid His whispering music; here in His majestic temple, with the brightness of His smile breaking all about us; standing above the soil instinct with the touch of His life-giving hand, and full of His promise and His miracle; and looking up to the clouds through which His thunders roll, and His lightning's cut their way, and beyond that to the dazzling glory of the sun, and yet beyond to the unspeakable splendor of the universe, flashing and paling until the separate stars are but as mist in the skies, even to the uplifted jasper gates through which His everlasting glory streams — my mind falls back abashed, and I realize how paltry is human speech, and how idle are the thoughts of men!

Another thought oppresses me. In front of me sit several thousand people. Over there, in smelling distance, where we can almost hear the lisp of the mop as it caresses the barbecued lamb or the pottering of the skewered pig as he leisurely turns from fat to crackling, is being prepared a dinner that I verily believe covers more provisions than were issued to all the soldiers of Lee's army, God bless them, in their last campaign. And I shudder when I think that I, a single, unarmed, defenseless man, am all that stands between this crowd and that dinner. Here then, awed by God's majesty, and menaced by man's appetite, I am tempted to leave this platform and yield to the boyish impulses that always stir in my heart amid such scenes, and revert to the days of boyhood when about the hills of Athens I chased the pacing coon, or twisted the unwary rabbit, or shot my ramrod at all manner of birds and beasts — and at night went home to look up into a pair of gentle eyes and take on my tired face the benediction of a mother's kiss and feel on my weary head a pair of loving hands, now wrinkled and trembling, but, blessed be God, fairer to me yet than the hands of mortal women, and stronger yet to lead me than the hands of mortal man, as they laid a mother's blessing there, while bending at her knees I made my best confession of faith and worshiped at the truest altar I have yet found in this world. I had rather go out and lay down on the ground and hug the grass to my breast and mind me of the time when I builded boyish ambitions on the wooded hills of Athens, than do aught else to-day. But I recall the story of Uncle Remus, who, when his favorite hero, Brer Rabbit, was sorely pressed by that arch villain, Brer Fox, said:

"An' Brer Rabbit den he climb'd a tree." "But," said the little boy, "Uncle Remus, a rabbit can't climb a tree."

"Doan you min' dat, honey. Brer Fox pressed dis rabbit so hard he des bleegeed to dim' a tree."

I am pressed so hard today by your commands that I am just "bleegeed" to make a speech, and so I proceed. I heartily invoke God's guidance in what I say, that I shall utter no word to soil this temple of His, and no sentiment not approved in His wisdom; and as for you, when the time comes — as it will come — when you prefer barbecued shote to raw orator, and feel that you can be happier at that table than in this forum, just say the word and I will be with you heart and soul!

---

I am tempted to yield to the gayety of this scene, to the flaunting banners of the trees, the down pouring sunshine, the garnered plenty over there, this smiling and hospitable crowd, and throwing serious affairs aside, to speak to you today as the bird sings — without care and without thought. I should be false to myself and to you, if I did, for there are serious problems that beset our State and our country that no man, facing, as I do this morning, a great and intelligent audience, can in honor or in courage disregard. I shall attempt to make no brilliant speech, but to counsel with you in plain and simple words, beseeching your attention and your sympathy as to the dangers of the present hour, and our duties and our responsibilities.

At Saturday noon in any part of this country you may note the farmer going from his field, eating his dinner thoughtfully, and then saddling his plow horse, or starting afoot and making his way to a neighboring church or schoolhouse. There he finds from every farm, through every footpath, his neighbors gathering to meet him. What is the object of this meeting? It is not social, it is not frolic, and it is not a picnic — the earnest, thoughtful faces, the serious debate and council, the closed doors and the secret session, forbid this assumption. It is a meeting of men who feel that in spite of themselves their affairs are going wrong; of free and equal citizens who feel that they carry unequal burdens; of toilers who feel that they reap not the just fruits of their toil; of men who feel that their labor enriches others while it leaves them poor, and that the sweat of their bodies, shed freely under God's command, goes to clothe the idle and the avaricious in purple and fine linen. This is a meeting of protest, of resistance. Here the farmer meets to demand, and organize that he may enforce his demand, that he shall stand equal with every other class of citizens; that laws discriminating against him shall be repealed; that the methods oppressing him shall be modified or abolished; and that he shall be guaranteed that neither government nor society shall abridge, by statute or custom, his just and honest proportion of the wealth he created, but that he shall be permitted to garner in his barns, and enjoy by his hearthstone, the full and fair fruits of his labor. If this movement were confined to Elbert, if this disturbing feeling of discontent were shut in the limits of your county lines, it would still demand the attention of the thoughtful and patriotic. But, as it is in Elbert, so it is in every county in Georgia — as in Georgia, so it is in every State in the South — as in the South, so in every agricultural State in the Union, In every rural neighborhood, from Ohio to Texas, from Michigan to Georgia, the farmers, riding thoughtful through field and meadow, seek ten thousand schoolhouses or churches — the muster grounds of this new army — and there, recounting their wrongs and renewing their pledges, send up from neighborhoods to county, from county to State, and State to Republic, the measure of their strength and the unyielding quality of their determination. The agricultural army of the Republic is in motion. The rallying drumbeat has rolled over field and meadow, and from where the wheat locks the sunshine in its bearded sheaf, and the clover carpets the earth, and the cotton whitens beneath the stars, and the tobacco catches the quick aroma of the rains, — everywhere that patient man stands above the soil, or bends about the furrow, the farmers are ready in squads and companies and battalions and legions to be led against what they hold to be an oppression that honest men would not deserve, and that brave men would not endure. Let us not fail to comprehend the magnitude and the meaning of this movement. It is no trifling cause that brings the farmers into such determined and widespread organization as this. It is not the skillful arts of the demagogue that has brought nearly two million farmers into this perfect and pledge-bound society, but it is a deep and abiding conviction that, in political and commercial economy of the day, he is put at a disadvantage that keeps him poor while other classes grow rich, and that bars his way to prosperity and independence. General Toombs once said that the farmer, considered the most conservative type of citizenship,

---

is really the most revolutionary; that the farmers of France, flocking to the towns and cities from the unequal burdens of their farms, brought about the French Revolution, and that about once in every century the French peasant raided the towns. Three times the farmers of England have captured and held London. It was the farmers of Mecklenburg that made the first American declaration, and Putman left his plow standing in the furrow as he hurried to lead the embattled farmers who fought at Concord and Lexington. I realize it is impossible that revolution should be the outcome of our industrial troubles. The farmer of today does not consider that remedy for his wrongs. I quote history to show that the farmer, segregated and deliberate, does not move on slight provocation, but organizes only under deep conviction, and that when once organized and convinced, he is terribly in earnest, and is not going to rest until his wrongs are righted.

Now, here we are confronted with the most thorough and widespread agricultural movement of this or any other day. It is the duty alike of farmers and those who stand in other ranks, to get together and consult as to what is the real status and what is the patriotic duty. Not in sullenness, but in frankness. Not as opponents, but as friends — not as enemies, but as brothers begotten of a common mother, banded in common allegiance, and marching to a common destiny. It will not do to say that this organization will pass away, for if the discontent on which it is based survives it, it had better have lived and forced its wrongs to final issue. There is no room for divided hearts in this State, or in this Republic. If we shall restore Georgia to her former greatness and prosperity — if we shall solve the problems that beset the South in honor and safety — if we shall save this Republic from the dangers that threaten it — it will require the earnest and united effort of every patriotic citizen, be he farmer, or merchant, or lawyer, or manufacturer. Let us consider, then, the situation, and decide what is the duty that lies before us. In discussing this matter briefly, I beg the ladies to give me their attention. I have always believed that there are few affairs of life in which woman should not have a part. Not obtrusive part — for that is unwomanly. The work falling best to the hand of woman is such work as is done by the dews of night, that ride not on the boasting wind, and shine not in the garish sun, but that come when the wind is stilled and the sun is gone, and night has wrapped the earth in its sacred hush, and fall from the distillery of the stars upon the parched and waiting flowers, as a benediction from God.

Let no one doubt the power of this work, though it lacks pomp and circumstance. Is Bismarck the mightiest power of this earth, which is attended by martial strains when he walks abroad, and in whose path thrones are scattered as trophies? Why, the little housewife alone in her chimney corner, musing in her happiness, with no trophy in her path save her husband's loving heart, and no music on her ear save the chirping of the cricket beneath her hearthstone, is his superior. For, while he holds the purse strings of Germany, she holds the heartstrings of men. She who rocks the cradle rules the world. Give me, then, your attention, note the conflict that is gathering about us, and take your place with seeming modesty in the ranks of those who fight for right. It is not an abstract political theory that is involved in the contest of which I speak. It is the integrity and independence of your home that is at stake. The battle is not pitched in a distant State. Your home is the battlefield, and by your hearthstones you shall fight for your household gods. With your husband's arms so wound around you that you can feel his anxious heart beating against your cheek, with your sons, sturdy and loving, holding your old hands in theirs, here on the threshold of your house, under the trees that sheltered your babyhood, with the graves of your dead in that plain enclosure yonder — here men and women, heart to heart, with not a man dismayed, not a woman idle — while the multiplied wolves of debt and mortgage, and trust and

---

monopoly, swarm from every thicket; here we must fight the ultimate battle for the independence of our people and the happiness of our homes.

Now let us look at the facts: First, the notable movement of the population in America is from the country to the cities. In 1840 — a generation ago, only one twelfth of the American people lived in cities of more than 8000 people. In 1850, one-eighth; in 1860, one-sixth; in 1870, one-fifth; in 1880, one fourth. In the past half-century the population of cities has increased more than four times as rapidly as that of the country. Mind you, when I say that the city population has increased in one generation from 8 per cent to 25 per cent in population, I mean the population of cities of more than 8000 people. There is not such a city in this congressional district. It is the village and town population, as well as that of the farms that goes to swell so enormously the population of the great cities. Thus we see diminishing with amazing rapidity that rural population that is the strength and the safety of the people — slow to anger and thus a safeguard, but terrible in its wrath, and thus a tremendous corrective power. No greater calamity could befall any country than the sacrifice of its town and village and country life. I rejoice in Atlanta's growth, and yet I wonder whether it is worth what it cost when I know that her population has been drawn largely from rural Georgia, and that back of her grandeur are thousands of deserted farms and dismantled homes. As much as I love her — and she is all to me that home can be to any man — if I had the disposal of 100,000 immigrants at her gates tomorrow, 5000 should enter there, 75,000 should be located in the shops and factories in Georgia towns and villages, and 20,000 sent to her farms. It saddens me to see a bright young fellow come to my office from village or country, and I shudder when I think for what a feverish and speculative and uncertain life he has bartered his rural birthright, and surrendered the deliberation and tranquility of his life on the farm. It is just that deliberate life that this country needs, for the fever of the cities is already affecting its system. Character, like corn, is dug from the soil. A contented rural population is not only the measure of our strength, and an assurance of its peace when there should be peace, and a resource of courage when peace would be cowardice but it is the nursery of the great leaders who have made this country what it is. Washington was born and lived in the country. Jefferson was a farmer. Henry Clay rode his horse to the mill in the slashes. Webster dreamed amid the solitude of Marshfield. Lincoln was a rail-splitter. Our own Hill walked between the handles of the plow. Brown peddled barefoot the product of his patch. Stephens found immortality under the trees of his country home. Toombs and Cobb and Calhoun were country gentlemen, and afar from the cities' maddening strife established that greatness that is the heritage of their people. The cities produce very few leaders. Almost every man in our history formed his character in the leisure and deliberation of village or country life, and drew his strength from the drugs of the earth even as a child draws his from his mother's breast. In the diminution of this rural population, virtuous and competent, patriotic and honest, living beneath its own roof-tree, building its altars by its own hearthstone and shringing in its own heart its liberty and its conscience, there is abiding cause for regret. In the corresponding growth of our cities — already center spots of danger, with their idle classes, their sharp rich and poor, their corrupt politics, their consorted thieves, and their clubs and societies of anarchy and socialism — I see a pressing and impending danger. Let it be noted that the professions are crowded, that middlemen are multiplied beyond reason, that the factories can in six months supply the demand of twelve, that machinery is constantly taking the place of men, that labor in every department bids against itself until it is mercilessly in the hands of the employer, that the newcomers are largely recruits of the idle and dangerous classes, and we can appreciate something of the danger that comes with this increasing movement to strip the

---

villages and the farms and send an increasing volume into the already overcrowded cities. This is but one phase of that tendency to centralization and congestion which is threatening the liberties of this people and the life of this Republic.

Now, let us go one step further. What is the most notable financial movement in America? It is the mortgaging of the farmlands of the country — the bringing of the farmer into bondage to the moneylender. In Illinois the farms are mortgaged for \$200,000,000, in Iowa for \$140,000,000, in Kansas for \$160,000,000, and so on through the Northwest. In Georgia about \$20,000,000 of foreign capital holds in mortgage perhaps one-fourth of Georgia's farms, and the work are but started. Every town has its loan agent — a dozen companies are quartered in Atlanta, and the work goes briskly on. A mortgage is the bulldog of obligations — a very mud turtle for holding on. It is the heaviest thing of its weight in the world. I had one once and sometimes I used to feel, as it rested on my roof, deadening the rain that fell there, and absorbing the sunshine, that it would crush through the shingles and the rafters and overwhelm me with its dull and persistent weight, and when at last I paid it off, I went out to look at the shingles to see if it had not flopped back there of its own accord. Think of it — Iowa strips from her farmers \$14,000,000 of interest every year, and sends it to New York and Boston to be reloaded on farms in other states, and to support and establish the dominion of the money lenders over the people. Georgia gathers from the languishing field \$2,000,000 of interest every year, and sends it away forever. Could her farmers but keep it at home, one year's interest would build factories to supply at cost every yard of bagging and every pound of guano the farmers need, establish her exchanges and their warehouses, and have left more than a million dollars for the improvement of their farmers and their homes. And year after year this drain not only continues, but also deepens. What will be the end? Ireland has found it. Her peasants in their mud cabins, sending every of their earnings to deepen the purple luxury of London, where their landlords live, realize how poor is that country whose farms are owned in mortgage or fee simple by those who live beyond its borders. If every Irish landlord lived on his estate, bought of his tenants the product of their farms, and invested his rents in Irish industries, this Irish question that is the shame of the world would be settled without legislation or strife. Georgia can never go to Ireland's degradation, but every Georgia farm put under mortgage to a foreign capitalist is a step in that direction, and every dollar sent out as interest leaves the State that much poorer. I do not blame the farmers. It is a miracle that out of their poverty they have done so well. I simply deplore the result, and ask you to note in the millions of acres that annually pass under mortgage to the moneylenders of the East, and in the thousands of independent country homes annually surrendered as hostages to their hands, another evidence of that centralization that is drinking up the lifeblood of this broad Republic.

Let us go one step further. All protest as to our industrial condition is met with the statement that America is startling the world with its growth and progress. Is this growth symmetrical — is this progress shared by every class? Let the tax books of Georgia answer. This year, for the first time since 1860, our taxable wealth is equal to that with which, excluding our slaves, we entered the Civil War — \$368,000,000. There is cause for rejoicing in this wonderful growth from the ashes and desolation of twenty years ago, but the tax books show that while the towns and cities are 160,000,000 richer than they were in 1860, the farmers are \$50,000,000 poorer.

Who produced this wealth? In 1865, when our towns and cities were paralyzed, when not a mine nor quarry was open, hardly a mill or a factory running; when we had neither money nor credit, it was the farmers' cotton that started the mills of industry and of trade. Since that desolate

---

year, when, urging his horse down the furrow, plowing through fields on which he had staggered amid the storm of battle, he began the rehabilitation of Georgia with no friend near him save nature that smiled at his kindly touch, and God sent him the message of cheer through the rustling leaves, he has dug from the soil of Georgia more than \$1,000,000,000 worth of product. From this mighty resource great cities have been builded and countless fortunes amassed, but amid the entire splendor he has remained the hewer of wood and the drawer of water. He had made the cities \$60,000,000 richer than they were when the war began, and he finds himself, in the sweat of whose brow this miracle was wrought, \$50,000,000 poorer than he then was. Perhaps not a farmer in this audience knew this fact — but I doubt if there is one in the audience who has not felt in his daily life the disadvantage that in twenty short years has brought about this stupendous difference. Let the figures speak for themselves. The farmer — the first figure to stumble amid the desolate dawn of our new life and to salute the coming day — hurrying to market with the harvest of his hasty planting that Georgia might once more enter the lists of the living States and but the wherewithal to still her wants and clothe her nakedness — always apparently the master of the situation, has he not been really its slave, when he finds himself at the end of twenty hard and faithful years \$110,000,000 out of balance?

Now, let us review the situation for a moment. I have shown you, first, that the notable drift of population is to the loss of village and country, and the undue and dangerous growth of the city; second, that the notable movement of finance is that which is bringing villages and country under mortgage to the city; and third, that they who handle the products for sale profit more thereby than those who create them — the difference in one State in twenty years reaching the enormous sum of \$110,000,000. Are these healthy tendencies? Do they not demand the earnest and thoughtful consideration of every patriotic citizen? The problem of the day is to check these three currents that are already pouring against the bulwarks of our peace and prosperity. To anchor the farmer to his land and the villager to his home; to enable him to till the land under equal conditions and to hold that home in independence; to save with his hands the just proportion of his labor, that he may sow in content and reap in justice, — this is what we need. The danger of the day is centralization, its salvation diffusion. Cut that word deep in your heart. This Republic differs from Russia only because the powers centralized there in one man are here diffused among the people. Western Ohio is happy and tranquil, while Chicago is feverish and dangerous, because the people diffused in the towns and the villages of the one are centralized and packed in the tenements of the other; but of all centralization that menaces our peace and threatens our liberties, is the consolidation of capital — and of all the diffusion that is needed in this Republic, congesting at so many points, is the leveling of our colossal fortunes and the diffusion of our gathered wealth amid the great middle classes of this people. As this question under runs the three tendencies we have been discussing, let us consider it a moment.

Few men comprehend the growth of private in this country, and the encroachments they have made on the rest of the people. Take one instance: A man in Chicago that had a private fortune secured control of all the wheat in the country, and advanced the price until flour went up \$3 a barrel. When he collected \$4,000,000 of this forced tribute from the people, he opened his corner and released the wheat, and the world, forgetting the famishing children from whose hungry lips he had stolen the crust, praised him as the king of finance and trade. Let us analyze this deal. The farmer who raised the wheat got not one cent of the added profit; the mills that ground it not one cent. Every dollar went to swell the toppling fortunes of him who never sowed it to the ground, nor fed it to the thundering wheels, but who knew it only as the chance instrument of his infamous scheme. Why, our fathers declared war against England, their mother

---

country, from whose womb they came, because she levied two cents a pound on our tea, and yet, without a murmur, we submit to ten times this tax placed on the bread of our mouths, and levied by a private citizen for no reason save his greed, and no right save his might. Were a man to enter an humble home in England, bind the father helpless, stamp out the fire on the hearthstone, empty the scanty larder, and leave the family for three weeks cold and hungry and helpless, he would be dealt with by the law; and yet four men in New York cornered the world's cotton crop and held it until the English spindles were stopped and 14,000,000 operatives sent idle and emptied to their homes, to divide their last crust with their children, and then sit down and suffer until the greed of the speculators was filled. The sugar refineries combined their plants at a cost of \$14,000,000, and so raised the price of sugar that they made the first year \$9,500,000 profit, and since then have advanced it rapidly until we sweeten our coffee absolutely in their caprice. When the bagging mills were threatened with a reduced tariff, they made a trust and openly boasted that they intended to make one season's profits pay the entire cost of their mills — and these precious villains, whom thus far the lightning's have failed to blast, having carried out their infamous boast, organized for a deeper steal this season. And so it goes. There is not a thing we eat or drink, that may not be thus seized and controlled and made an instrument for the shameless plundering of the people. It is a shame — this people patient and cheerful under the rise or fall of prices that come with the failure of God's season's charge as its compensation — or under the advance at the farm which enriches the farmer, or under that competitive demand which bespeaks brisk prosperity — this people made the prey and the sport of plunderers who levy tribute through a system that mocks at God's recurring rains, knows not the farmer, and locks competition in the grasp of monopoly. And the millions, thus wrung from the people, loaned back to them at usury, laying the blight of the mortgage on their homes, and the obligation of debt on their manhood. Talk about the timidity of capital. That is a forgotten phrase. In the power and irresponsibility of this sudden and enormous wealth is bred an insolence that knows no bounds. "The public be damned!" was the sentiment of the plutocrats, speaking through the voice of Vanderbilt's millions. In cornering the product and levying the tribute — in locking up abundant supply until the wheels of industry stop — in oppressing through trusts, and domineering in the strength of corporate power, the plutocrats do what no political party would dare attempt and what no government on this earth would enforce. The Czar of Russia would not dare hold up a product until the mill wheels were idle, or lay an unusual tax on bread and meat to replenish his coffers, and yet these things our plutocrats, flagrant and irresponsible, do day after day until public indignation is indignant and shame is lost in wonder.

And when an outraged people turn to government for help, what do they find? Their government in the hands of a party that is in sympathy with their oppressors, that was returned to power with votes purchased with their money, and whose confessed leaders declared that trusts are largely private concerns with which the government had naught to do. Not only is the dominant party the apologist of the plutocrats and the beneficiary of their crimes, but also it is based on that principle of centralization through which they came into life and on which alone they can exist. It holds that sovereignty should be taken from the states and lodged with the nation — that political powers and privileges should be wrested from the people and guarded at the Capitol. It distrusts the people, and even now demands that its bayonets shall hedge about your ballot boxes. It declares that a strong government is better than a free government, and that national authority, backed by national armies and treasury, is a better guarantee of peace and prosperity than liberty and enlightenment diffused among the people. To defend this policy, that cannot be maintained by argument or sustained by the love or confidence of the people, it rallies

---

under its flag the mercenaries of the Republic, the syndicate, the trust, the monopolist, and the plutocrat, and strengthening them by grant and protection, rejoices as they grow richer and the people grow poorer. Confident in the debauching power of money and the unscrupulous audacity of their creatures, they catch the spirit of Vanderbilt's defiance and call aloud from their ramparts, "The people be damned!" I charge that this party has bought its way for twenty years. Its nucleus was the passion that survived the war, and around this it has gathered the protected manufacturer, the pensioned soldier, the licensed monopolist, the privileged corporation, the unchallenged trust — all whom power can daunt or money can buy — and with these in close and constant phalanx it holds the government against the people. Not a man in all its ranks that is not influenced by prejudice or bought by privilege.

What a spectacle, my countrymen! This free Republic in the hands of a party that withdraws sovereignty from the people that its own authority may be made supreme, that fans the smoldering embers of war, and loosing among the people the dogs of privilege and monopoly to hunt, and harrow and rend, that its lines may be made stronger and its ramparts fortified. And now, it is committed to a crime that is without precedent or parallel in the history of any people, and this crime it is obliged by its own necessity as well as by its pledge to commit as soon as it gets the full reins of power. This crime is hidden in the bill known as the Service Pension Bill, which pensions every man who enlisted for sixty days for the Union army. Let us examine this pension lists. Twelve years ago it footed 146,000,000. Last year it was \$81,000,000. This year it has already run over \$100,000,000. Of this amount Georgia pays about \$3,500,000 a year. Think of it! The money that her people have paid, through indirect taxation into the treasury, is given, let us say, to Iowa, for that State just equals Georgia in population. Every year \$3,500,000 wrung from her pockets and sent into Iowa as pensions for her soldiers. Since 1865, out of her poverty, Georgia has paid \$51,000,000 as pensions to Northern soldiers, — one sixth of the value of her whole property. And now it is proposed to enlarge the pension list until it includes every man who enlisted for sixty days. They will not fail. The last Congress passed a pension bill that Commissioner Black — himself a gallant Union general — studied deliberately, and then told the President that if he signed it, it would raise the pension list to \$200,000,000, and had it not been for the love of the people that ran in the veins of Grover Cleveland and the courage of Democracy which flamed in his heart, that bill would have been law to-day. A worse bill will be offered. There is a surplus of \$120,000,000 in the treasury. While that remains it endangers the protective tariff, behind which the trained captains of the Republican Party muster their men. But let the pension list be lifted to \$200,000,000 a year. Then the surplus is gone and a deficiency created, and the protective tariff must be not only perpetuated but also deepened, and the vigilance of the spies and collectors increased to meet the demands of the government. And back of it all will be mustered the army of a million and a half pensioners, draveing their booty from the Republican party and giving it in turn their purchased allegiance and support.

My countrymen, a thousand times I have thought of that historic scene beneath the apple tree at Appomattox, of Lee's 8000 ragged, half-starved immortals, going home to begin anew amid the ashes of their homes, and the graves of their dead, the weary struggle for existence, and Grant's 68,000 splendid soldiers, well fed and equipped, going home to riot amid the plenty of a grateful and prosperous people, and I have thought how hard it was that out of our poverty we should be taxed to pay their pension, and to divide with this rich people the crust we scraped up from the ashes of our homes. And I have thought when their maimed and helpless soldiers were sheltered in superb homes, and lapped in luxury, while our poor cripples limped along the highway or hid their shame in huts, or broke bitter bread in the county poorhouse, how hard it

---

was that, of all the millions we send them annually, we can save not one dollar to go to our old heroes, who deserve so much and get so little. And yet we made no complaint. We were willing that every Union soldier made helpless by the war should have his pension and his home, and thank God, without setting our crippled soldiers on the curbstone of distant Babylons to beg, as blind Belisarius did, from the passing stranger. We have provided them a home in which they can rest in honorable peace until God has called them hence to a home not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. We have not complained that our earnings have gone to pension Union soldiers — the maimed soldiers of the Union armies. But the scheme to rob the people that every man who enlisted for sixty days, or his widow, shall be supported at public expense is an outrage that must not be submitted to. It is not patriotism — it is politics. It is not honesty — it is plunder. The South has played a patient and a waiting game for twenty years, fearing to protest against what she knew to be wrong in the fear that she would be misunderstood. I fear that she has gained little by this course save the contempt of her enemies. The time has come when she should stand upright among the States of this Republic and declare her mind and stand by her convictions. She must not stand silent while this crowning outrage is perpetrated. It means that the Republican party will loot the treasury to recruit its ranks — that \$70,000,000 a year shall be taken from the South to enrich the North, thus building up one section against another — that the protective tariff shall be deepened, thus building one class against another, and that the party of trusts and monopoly shall be kept in power, the autonomy of the Republic lost, the government centralized, the oligarchs established, and justice to the people postponed. But this party will not prevail, even though its pension bill should pass, and its pretorial God be established in every Northern State. It was Louis XVI who peddled the taxing privileges to his friends, and when the people protested surrounded himself with an army of Swiss mercenaries. His minister, Neckar, said to him: "Sire, I beseech you send away these Swiss and trust your own people;" but the king, confident in his strength and phalanx, buckled it close about him and plundered the people until his head paid the penalty of his crime. So this party, bartering privileges and setting up classes, may feel secure as it closes the ranks of its mercenaries, but some day the great American heart will burst with righteous wrath, and the voice of the people, which is the voice of God, will challenge the traitors, and the great masses will rise in their might, and, breaking down the defenses of the oligarchs, will hurl them from power and restore this Republic to the old moorings from which it had been swept by the storm.

The government can protect its citizens. It is of the people, and it shall not perish from the face of the earth. It can top off these colossal fortunes and, by an income tax, retard their growth. It can set a limit to personal and corporate wealth. It can take trusts and syndicates by the throat. It can shatter monopoly; it can equalize the burden of taxation; it can distribute its privileges impartially; it can clothe with credit its land now discredited at its banks; it can lift the burdens from the farmer's shoulders, give him equal strength to bear them — it can trust the people in whose name this Republic was founded; in whose courage it was defended; in whose wisdom it has been administered, and whose stricken love and confidence it cannot survive.

But the government, no matter what it does, does not do all that is needed, nor the most; that is conceded, for all true reform must begin with the people at their homes. A few Sundays ago I stood on a hill in Washington. My heart thrilled as I looked on the towering marble of my country's Capitol, and a mist gathered in my eyes as, standing there, I thought of its tremendous significance and the powers there assembled, and the responsibilities there centered — its President, its congress, its courts, its gathered treasure, its army, its navy, and its 60,000,000 of citizens. It seemed to me the best and mightiest sight that the sun could find in its wheeling

---

course — this majestic home of a Republic that has taught the world its best lessons of liberty — and I felt that if wisdom and justice and honor abided therein, the world would stand indebted to this temple on which my eyes rested, and in which the ark of my covenant was lodged for its final uplifting and regeneration.

A few days later I visited a country home. A modest, quiet house sheltered by great trees and set in a circle of field and meadow, gracious with the promise of harvest; barns and cribs well filled and the old smokehouse odorous with treasure; the fragrance of pink and hollyhock mingling with the aroma of garden and orchard, and resonant with the hum of bees and poultry's busy clucking; inside the house, thrift, comfort, and that cleanliness that is next to godliness, — the restful beds, the open fireplace, the books and papers, and the old clock that had held its steadfast pace amid the frolic of weddings, that has welcomed in steady measure the newborn babes of the family, and kept company with the watchers of the sick bed, and had ticked the solemn requiem of the dead; and the well-worn Bible that, thumbed by fingers long since stilled, and blurred with tears of eyes long since closed, held the simple annals of the family, and the heart and conscience of the home. Outside stood the master, strong and wholesome and upright; wearing no man's collar; with no mortgage on his roof, and no lien on his ripening harvest; pitching his crops in his own wisdom, and selling them in his own time in his chosen market; master of his lands and master of himself. Near by stood his aged father, happy in the heart and home of his son. And as they started to the house the old man's hands rested on the young man's shoulder, touching it with the knighthood of the fourth commandment, and laying there the unspeakable blessing of an honored and grateful father. As they drew near the door, the old mother appeared; the sunset falling on her face, softening its wrinkles and its tenderness, lighting up her patient eyes, and the rich music of her heart trembling on her lips, as in simple phrase she welcomed her husband and son to their home. Beyond was the good wife, true of touch and tender, happy amid her household cares, clean of heart and conscience, the helpmate and the buckler of her husband. And the children, strong and sturdy, trooping down the lane with the lowing herd, or weary of simple sport, seeking, as truant birds do, the quiet of the old home nest. And I saw the night descend on that home, falling gently as from the wings of the unseen dove. And the stars swarmed in the bending skies, the trees thrilled with the cricket's cry, the restless bird called from the neighboring wood, and the father, a simple man of God, gathering the family about him, read from the Bible the old, old story of love and faith, and then went down in prayer, the baby hidden amid the folds of its mother's dress, and closed the record of that simple day by calling down the benediction of God on the family and the home!

And as I gazed the memory of the great Capitol faded from my brain. Forgotten its treasure and its splendor. And I said, "Surely here — here in the homes of the people is lodged the ark of the covenant of my country. Here is its majesty and its strength. Here the beginning of its power and the end of its responsibility." The homes of the people; let us keep them pure and independent, and all will be well with the Republic. Here is the lesson our foes may learn — here is work the humblest and weakest hands may do. Let us in simple thrift and economy make our homes independent. Let us in frugal industry make them self-sustaining. In sacrifice and denial let us keep them free from debt and obligation. Let us make them homes of refinement in which we shall teach our daughters that modesty and patience and gentleness are the charms of woman. Let us make them temples of liberty, and teach our sons that an honest conscience is every man's first political law; that his sovereignty rests beneath his hat, and that no splendor can rob him and no force justify the surrender of the simplest right of a free and independent citizen. And above all let us honor God in our avocations — anchor them close in His love. Build His altars above

---

our hearthstones, uphold them in the set and simple faith of our fathers, and crown them with the Bible — that book of books in which all the ways of life are made straight and the mystery of death is made plain. The home is the source of our national life. Back of the national Capitol and above it stands the home. Back of the President and above him stands the citizen. What the home is, this and nothing else will the Capitol be. What the citizen wills, this and nothing else will the President be.

Now, my friends, I am no farmer. I have not sought to teach you the details of your work, for I know little of them. I have not commended your splendid local advantages, for that I shall do elsewhere. I have not discussed the differences between the farmer and other classes, for I believe in essential things there is no difference between them, and that minor differences should be sacrificed to the greater interest that depends on a united people. I seek not to divide our people, but to unite them. I should despise myself if I pandered to the prejudice of either class to win the applause of the other.

But I have noted these great movements that destroy the equilibrium and threaten the prosperity of my country, and standing above passion and prejudice or demagoguery I invoke every true citizen, fighting from his hearthstone outward, with the prattle of his children on his ear, and the hand of his wife and mother closely clasped, to determine here to make his home sustaining and independent, and to pledge eternal hostility to the forces that threaten our liberties and the party that stands behind it.

When I think of the tremendous force of the currents against which we must fight, of the great political party in that fight, of the countless host of mercenaries that fight under its flag, of the enormous powers of government privilege and monopoly that back them up, I confess my heart sinks within me, and I grow faint. But I remember that the servant of Elisha looked abroad from Samaria and beheld the hosts that encompassed the city, and said in agonized fear: "Alas, master, what shall we do?" and the answer of Elisha was the answer of every brave man and faithful heart in all ages: "Fear not, for they that be with us are more than they that be with them," and this faith opened the eyes of the servant of the man of God, and he looked up again, and lo, the air was filled with chariots of fire, and the mountains were filled with horsemen, and they compassed the city about as a mighty and unconquerable host. Let us fight in such faith, and fear not. The air all about us is filled with chariots of unseen allies, and the mountains are thronged with unseen knights that shall fight with us. Fear not, for they that are with us are more than they that are with them. Buckle on your armor, gird about your loins, stand upright and dauntless while I summon you to the presence of the immortal dead. Your fathers and mine yet live, though they speak not, and will consecrate this air with their wheeling chariots, and above them and beyond them to the Lord God Almighty, King of the Hosts in whose unhindered splendor we stand this morning. Look up to them, be of good cheer, and faint not, for they shall fight with us when we strike for liberty and truth, and all the world, though it be banded against us, shall not prevail against them.