Georgia State University
Digital Archive @ GSU

History Dissertations | Department of History

4-24-2007

Reconfiguring Memories of Honor: William Raoul's Manipulation of Masculinities in the New South, 1872-1918

Steve Ray Blankenship

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/history_diss

Recommended Citation
Blankenship, Steve Ray, "Reconfiguring Memories of Honor: William Raoul's Manipulation of Masculinities in the New South, 1872-1918" (2007). *History Dissertations.* Paper 3.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of History at Digital Archive @ GSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in History Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Archive @ GSU. For more information, please contact digitalarchive@gsu.edu.

RECONFIGURING MEMORIES OF HONOR: WILLIAM RAOUL'S MANIPULATION OF MASCULINITIES IN THE NEW SOUTH, 1872-1918

by

STEVEN R. BLANKENSHIP

Under the Direction of Jared Poley

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines how honor was fashioned in the New South by examining the masculine roles performed by William Greene Raoul, Jr. Raoul wrote his autobiography in the mid-1930s and in it he reflected on his life on the New South's frontier at the turn of the century as change came to the region in all aspects of life: politically, economically, socially, sexually, and racially. Raoul was an elite son of the New South whose memoirs, "The Proletarian Aristocrat," reveals a man of multiple masculinities, each with particular ways of retrieving his past(s). The paradox of his title suggests the parallel organization of Raoul's recollections. The "aristocrat" framed the events of a lifetime through a lens of honor, sustained by southern gentlemen who restrained masculine impulses on the one hand and avoided dependency on the other. Raoul the "proletarian" cast honor through an ideological retrospective whereby traumatic memories of disappointment and failure were re-fashioned through a distinctly politicized view constructed rather than recalled. Raoul's business failures led him to re-conceptualize masculine honor as a quality possessed more by the emerging working class than the rising commercial class. Memory operates in this project as more than mere methodology as assumptions about access to the past through memory are subordinated to an examination of the *meaning* of the memories rehearsed by Raoul. Raoul wrote his autobiography at a bittersweet moment in his

life. While his personal fortune had been nearly wiped out by the stock market crash of October 1929, he clearly looked back on his career in the New South as a committed radical with delight as the Great Depression called into question the legitimacy of the capitalist system that he had long held responsible for his own professional failures in a variety of endeavors, from the cotton-mill industry to box-car building and from saw manufacturing to a practicing accountant. Raoul converted to Socialism in part to join what he regarded as society's most progressive and virile force. It is these two voices, the proletarian and the aristocrat, that are under examination here.

INDEX WORDS: Atlanta, New South, Gender, Class, Race, Honor, Masculinities, Socialism, Labor, Cotton Mill, History of the Self, Plantation, Unions, Greenwich Village, Central of Georgia Railroad, Memory Construction, Business, Sharecroppers, Lynching, Prostitution, Contraception, Textual Analysis, Failure, Epistemology, Autobiography, Narrative, Modernity

RECONFIGURING MEMORIES OF HONOR: WILLIAM RAOUL'S MANIPULATION OF MASCULINITIES IN THE NEW SOUTH, 1872-1918

by

STEVEN R. BLANKENSHIP

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2007

Copyright by
Steven R. Blankenship
2007

RECONFIGURING MEMORIES OF HONOR: WILLIAM RAOUL'S MANIPULATION OF MASCULINITIES IN THE NEW SOUTH, 1872-1918

By

STEVEN R. BLANKENSHIP

Major Professor: Jared Poley
Committee: Glenn Eskew
Alecia Long

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
May 2007

Dedicated to the memory of my Mother

Joan Blankenship

and the encouragement of my Father

Ray Blankenship

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not be possible without the generous advice, guidance, and suggestions given by the following people: at Georgia State University – Prof. Glenn Eskew and Prof. Alecia Long for their careful reading and constructive suggestions, Prof. Joe Perry, Prof. John Matthews (retired), Prof. Steve Rapp, Prof. Charles Steffen, and Prof. Clifford Kuhn. At Emory University – the Special Collections staff at the Woodruff Library, especially Kathy Shoemaker and Naomi L. Nelson; at Georgia Highlands College a special thanks to Larry Stephens, Susan Vines and Bill Vinson. John Russell of the University of Oregon Libraries and Lyndele von Schill of the University of Virginia have shortened this task by locating hard to find information. Thanks also to Jennifer Dickey, Curator of Oak Hill and the Martha Berry Museum, for information on Berry College and its founder. I would also like to thank the staff of the Lily Library at Indiana University and the Georgia Archives for their research assistance. Thanks go to Prof. Robert C. McMath, Jr. at the Georgia Institute of Technology for providing this author a copy of "The Proletarian Aristocrat." I am in the debt of Warren Clark of Clark Associates in Huntsville, Alabama for a copy of the *Diaries of Sarah Lois Wadley, 1856-1920.* I should thank the Southern Historical Collection at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for photographs and archival materials. For City Directories, I'd like to thank the Roswell, Georgia Historical Society, the East Point, Georgia Historical Society, the Cleveland Public Library, the Butte-Silver Bow Public Library and the Chattanooga Public Library. For assistance other than academic, I owe Paul McHale and Jon Strudthoff a debt of thanks. I will always appreciate the patience and support of my wife Helene who encouraged me to pursue this path.

My greatest debts of gratitude go to my original and current advisors. Prof. Krystyn Moon was present at the origins of this dissertation and skillfully guided its progress until her professional life took her to new opportunities. Generously offering to assume the duties of advisor was Prof. Jared Poley, without whom this project could not have been completed. Prof. Poley brought critical reading, a sympathetic ear, attention to detail, much needed organizational skills, and a perfect temperament for the challenges and pressure of completing a dissertation. For this, I will always be grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments…… v

Introduction: Masculine Façades…… 1

Chapter 1: *Fin-de-siècle* Atlanta……. 33

Chapter 2: Lost Honor: Requiem for a Failed Businessman……. 65

Chapter 3: Intimate Honor: Practicing Sex and Gender…… 115

Chapter 4: Honor Denied: Reconstructing Race and Class…… 154

Chapter 5: Alternative Honor: Socialism and a New World…….. 177

Conclusion…… 218

Bibliography……. 230

INTRODUCTION

MASCULINE FAÇADES

For William Greene Raoul, Jr., masculinities were not exclusive. The presence of one did not indicate the absence of another. While in Birmingham, Alabama in 1910, Raoul rejoiced after receiving his first union card that confirmed his new working-class manhood. An upper-class Atlantan, Raoul's conversion to Socialism may have changed his political affiliation but not his taste for haute cuisine as he would happily change into more appropriate attire for dinner with Birmingham's elite. In Butte, Montana, in 1911, Raoul would sweep streets by day and swap gossip with the city's Socialist mayor by night. Filling in for an absent headliner at a Socialist party rally in Cleveland in 1912, Raoul presumably confused his audience by declaring his financial independence due to the railroad bonds on his person while simultaneously attacking the injustices of capitalism. As a dedicated Socialist, Raoul admired hoboes as society's most progressive element while he refused to fraternize with fellow African-American radicals. The reason behind this myriad display of masculine behaviors lay in Raoul's elusive search for honor in a society which judged masculine success by criteria he invariably failed. Although alarmingly candid, Raoul's memoir is not a transparent document finally revealing of an essential self. Its opaqueness invites interpretation of what it meant to be an American man at the turn of the twentieth century. And for a man of the South, like Raoul, issues of masculinity were inextricably intertwined with ideals of honor.

This dissertation proposes "to restore honor" to the New South by examining how honor is rendered through the memories of William Raoul. Raoul was an elite son of the New South whose memoir, "The Proletarian Aristocrat," reveals a man of multiple masculinities, each with

particular ways of reconfiguring the past(s).[1] The paradox of his title suggests the parallel organization of Raoul's recollections. The "aristocrat" framed the events of a lifetime through a lens of honor, sustained by southern gentlemen who restrained masculine impulses on the one hand and avoided dependency on the other.[2] Raoul the "proletarian" cast honor through an ideological retrospective whereby traumatic memories of disappointment and failure were re-fashioned through a distinctly politicized view constructed rather than recalled.[3]

Raoul's depictions of his past(s) suggest another paradox that makes his memoir important for cultural historians interested in memory, autobiography, and self. Separate selves are evident throughout his memoirs in the varying tones taken, changing verb tenses, specific masculine performances for diverse audiences, and alternative points of view.[4] Yet Raoul's

---

[1] William Raoul, "The Proletarian Aristocrat," Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. This nearly five-hundred page manuscript lies at the center of this project. Raoul's autobiography affects a tone both breezy and confident. Written in the early-to-mid 1930s, his memories/confessions are revealing, especially on his metamorphosis from conservative prude to modern libertine. This dissertation examines the first forty-six years in its author's life from 1872 until his abandonment of the South in 1916 and the establishment of a new life in New York in 1918.

[2] Kenneth S. Greenberg, *Honor and Slavery* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 25, argued that "the man of honor . . . had the power to prevent his being unmasked." Certainly Raoul's continued anxiety about his dependence upon his father's wealth and influence lurked just beneath the surface of his superficial confidence; that he was frequently "unmasked" may account for his alienation from his family and community and his creation of other selves with alternative notions of honor.

[3] An interdisciplinary consensus on the "constructed" nature of memories has emerged. W. Fitzhugh Brundage, ed., *Where These Memories Grow: History, Memory, and Southern Identity* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000), argued that memory is "an act of interpretation," and that "objectivity" is less important than understanding the need for "a social history of remembering in the South," 3. Historians Natalie Zemon Davis and Randolph Starn, "Introduction: Memory and Counter-Memory," *Representations* 26 (Spring 1989): 4, argued that memory is "an instrument of reconfiguration and not a reclamation or retrieval." In *History as an Art of Memory* (Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 1993), Patrick Hutton contrasts Maurice Halbwach's thesis that memories are "highly unreliable as a guide to what actually happened because "we continually reinvent the past in our living memories," with Sigmund Freud's view that "memories are preserved whole within the unconscious of the individual psyche," 7. For a summary of how and why memories remain under renovation, see David Thelen's, "Memory and American History," in the *Journal of American History* vol. 75, no. 4 (March 1989): 1117-1129. For further work on memory construction, see Nicola King, *Memory, Narrative, Identity: Remembering the Self* (Edinburgh University Press, 2000), 4; David C. Rubin, ed., *Remembering our Past: Studies in Autobiographical Memory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 4; and Craig R. Barclay's "Autobiographical Remembering: Narrative Constraints on Objectified Selves," 95, in Rubin.

[4] The "self," too, is an interdisciplinary project. Historian Jerrold Seigel pointed out the "inescapably dual" nature of the self as "it is at once an object in the world and an independent subject who posits the world's existence," from "Problematizing the Self," in Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt, eds., *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 287. Seigel also noted the "heterogeneous" self as opposed to a single entity, 299. Literary critics have weighed in on the "self." Nicola King

alliance of selves formed, through selective patterns of memory, a front powerful enough to defend the honor of its constituent members—Raoul's alternative aristocratic and radical selves. As a work of cultural history, therefore, this dissertation will examine alternative patterns of memories: how Raoul reconstituted honor as an old man reflecting on his varied selves before and after his mid-life conversion to Socialism. We will consider those factors that give shape and meaning to memories: narrative, identity, ritual, and gender expectations. Another important element of this work is the analysis of how, amidst the fluctuating masculinities adopted by Raoul, his capacity to speak with more than one voice calls into question the reliance upon memory to confirm historical "facts," while simultaneously opening avenues of investigation into the intricacies of the memoir as a source.[5] We will argue that Raoul's memories are more important than the events he reconstructed along dual tracks decades after they happened.

---

disputed the use of the definite article "the past" and argued instead it should be the indefinite "a past" to correspond to distinct selves, 33. Similarly, Paul John Eakin declared himself "reluctant to speak of 'the self,' for the definite article suggests something too fixed and unified to represent the complexity of self-experience," in *How Our Lives Become Stories: Making Selves* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), x. Psychologists have also taken part in this discourse. Harold Rosen described "each one of us [as] a unique assemblage in a constant dynamic state," in *Speaking from Memory: A Guide to Autobiographical Acts and Practices* (Staffordshire, England: Trentham Books Limited, 1988), 132. James Olney, *Metaphors of Self: The Meaning of Autobiography* (Princeton University Press, 1972), 24, linked selves to memories and argued that "selfhood is not continuous; for it brings up one self here and another self there."

[5] Pierre Nora wrote, "history has entered its epistemological age," in *Of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*, translated by Arthur Goldhammer (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), xxiii. Louis A. Renza asserted "the autobiographical act spontaneously generates epistemological ambivalence," in "A Theory of Autobiography," from James Olney's *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980). Instead of asking, "how reliable is the memoir?" perhaps it would be better to query, "what can the memoir reveal?" The epistemological foundation of memory (and one of its primary manifestations, the memoir) is under fire. Natalie Zemon Davis suggest the formidable impediments to memory: "sheer forgetfulness, suggestibility, censorship, hindsight, conflicting recollections," 4. Hutton follows Michel Foucault by arguing "the categories within which we apprehend the past" were devised by language that is malleable to changing discursive worlds, 5-6. David Thelen suggest memories are made anew by their conflation with other recollections, 1121; while James Olney argued "to indenture it to its own first perception of how things are would be to deny memory's evident plasticity and its capacity for adaptation," in *Memory and Narrative: The Weave of Life-Writing* (The University of Chicago Press, 1998), 371. How important is it whether memoirs report an elusive, objective truth? Bruce M. Ross distrust "subjective belief" in "fabricated memories" and argued that it was "a necessary task . . . to evaluate multiple versions of past happenings for truth," in *Remembering the Personal Past: Description of Autobiographical Memory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), viii. Thelen dismissed this approach by asserting, "the social dimensions of memory are more important than the need to verify accuracy," 1122-23.

The extensive collection of Raoul family artifacts—autobiographies, memoirs, family histories, diaries, children's journals, photographs, account books, ledgers, and letters—reveals a family self-consciously aware of their place amidst the change attendant to Atlanta and the South. These sources provide a glimpse in the turn-of-the-century New South where institutional flux belied ostensible continuity. William Raoul's memory illuminates how honor was manifested by gendered behavior as more than one masculine role was adapted to meet myriad challenges with regard to race, class, sexuality, politics, and business. Raoul is often self-conscious of both his honor and his avant-garde position at the edge of a society advancing uneasily into the twentieth century, an era characterized by increased improvisation and less certainty. For Raoul, modernity destabilized traditional notions of honor while also providing its alternatives. This study will argue that the memory of honor was improvisational and often dependent upon interpretations of masculinity as notions of manliness were rattled by creeping change.

This study will examine the dialectic created between an emerging and improvisational modernity and its effects on "traditional" notions of southern masculinities. Raoul describes his rite of passage into first, his sexual life and, second, into the accompanying gender confusion caused by an absence of a consensus over what constituted proper masculine behavior. It is no coincidence that Raoul recalls (and thus links) on page one of "The Proletarian Aristocrat" two distinct transitions, one meant to be private but ruinously made known to all; the other public but subversive of traditional southern ritual.[6] For example, Raoul courts consummation (and

[6] Culture is, of course, rendered tangible through ritual. For Raoul to participate in a ritual usually reserved for girls sent confusing messages for both his peers and himself. For Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), rituals represent "plastic dramas [where] men attain their faith as they portray it," 114. That the inverse is true for Raoul will be clear as his story continues. Arnold van Gennep's foundational text, *The Rite of Passage* (The University of Chicago Press, 1960), 67, is helpful with regard to Raoul as he describes the "rites of separation from the asexual world . . . followed by rites of incorporation into the world

expulsion from the Lawrenceville School) in the first instance, while in the second, he enjoys a coming-out party—an event usually reserved to coming-of-age southern girls. The performance (and subversion) of gender expectations are best observed during those ubiquitous rites of passage whereby adolescents make the transition to adulthood. I will argue that gender roles themselves were in flux because of the role of modernity as an agent of change.

During his coming-out party, inverted in this case to a modern transgendered ritual, Raoul recognized the necessity to end his idle life of frivolity and to begin to fulfill the expectations accruing to the oldest son of a successful railroad president. He had been "brought up in the tradition of the self-made captain of industry . . . [and that he] must make a living, and a good one."[7] This declaration is unwittingly ironic: for most of his life Raoul did not have to seek his fortune through work, but found it instead in the riches of his father's estate. What work Raoul did engage in as a young man was usually either ill-suited to his elite temperament, or taken on to demonstrate particular masculinities deemed appropriate for a variety of occasions:

---

of sexuality." Raoul, again, is the exception as his transitions—a sexual rite of passage and transgendered ritual—point to the retardation of assumed sexual attributes instead of an initiation to them.

[7] Raoul, 2. His self-imposed category of a particular manliness is reflected within the historiography of masculinities. Michael Kimmel's *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (New York: The Free Press, 1996), 9, describes "the Self-Made Man—ambitious and anxious, creatively, resourceful and chronically restive, the builder of culture and among the casualties of his own handiwork." Elizabeth and Joseph Pleck, *The American Man* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980), 21-28, conflate the self-made man to "the strenuous life" advocated by President Theodore Roosevelt. In *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1993), 7, Anthony Rotundo describes self-made manhood as "the dominant cultural form." A man's identity was formed in the workplace. Individualism transformed "the old male passion of defiance . . . into the modern virtue of independence," 3. Lorri Glover, "An Education in Southern Masculinity: The Ball Family of South Carolina in the New Republic," *The Journal of Southern History* 59, no. 1 (February 2003), 57, argued how "dress offered man the opportunity to publicly demonstrate their class identity." This observation, directed toward the post-Revolutionary era, was equally true in the late nineteenth century as Raoul's memoir will demonstrate. Additional readings on the formation of masculine identities include David Jackson, *Unmasking Masculinity: A Critical Autobiography* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1990), Judith Surkis, *Sexing the Citizen: Morality and Masculinity in France, 1870-1920* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), David Gilmore, *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), and Gerald N. Izenberg, *Modernism and Masculinity: Mann, Wedekind, Kaninsky through World WarI* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000).

as a Socialist, an advocate of "free love," a union carpenter, homesteader, stump-speaker, accountant, husband, patron of prostitutes, and dutiful son.[8]

Much in line with the historical literature, Raoul writes as if his masculinity was under temporal assault from the turbulent times in which he lived. His memoir tends to problematize those masculine traits usually assigned to young southern men whose conservative upbringing assumed certain essential qualities.[9] Raoul's attempt to conform to normative masculine behavior created confusion about the validity of manly models available to him within his family and peer group. His rite of passage into his sexual life—and his gendered behavior—is accompanied by bewildering juxtapositions: sexual anticipation followed by humiliating scandal; his family's reaction to his sexual *faux pas* compounded his confusion. Masculine variations abounded for the young adult occupying Raoul's body: his father's stated sexual restraint on the one hand and his lusty uncle George's boastfulness on the other.

Reared in elite surroundings in a booming late nineteenth-century Atlanta, William Greene Raoul, Jr., sought what he assumed to be his natural position in society as a "captain of industry" within the South's rising textile mills. Following repeated failures and increased disenchantment with the business world, Raoul discovered socialism and the doctrine of "free love," and thereafter cast aside traditional masculine models for other ones filled with ideals and practices often incompatible with his conservative upbringing. Raoul jettisoned his place near

---

[8] Jo Burr Margadant, ed., *The New Biography: Performing Femininity in Nineteenth-Century France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 9, distinguishes new biographical methodology as one alert to social locations where "a limited number of possibilities from which individuals can create a possible self." The new biography's subject surrenders the coherent self to "a self that is performed to create an impression of coherence." Individuals demonstrate "different manifestations" while evaluating "options of different settings," 7.

[9] Anyone still skeptical of the by now established paradigm of the social construction of masculinities need only to contemplate the analytical categories of how manliness has been identified over the course of United States history: the "agrarian patriarch" of the antebellum South, the "masculine primitive," the gentleman of Victorian restraint, the white male body examined by Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (The University of Chicago Press, 1995) and John F. Kasson, *Houdini, Tarzan, and the Perfect Man: The White Male Body and the Challenge of Modernity in America* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001).

the apex of southern society through his political apostasy and sexual indiscretions in search of an alternative source of honor. His alienation from his family and community would eventually lead to his self-imposed exile in 1916 from his family and the New South.

An analysis of the ways that Raoul framed honor is a critical component of this discussion. Honor headlines as a theme of the Old South but it barely makes the credits in the historiography of the New South. C. Vann Woodward found manifestations of lost honor in the Lost Cause, in widespread interest in genealogy, in a "refurbished" Southern aristocracy "long on its last legs," and in nostalgic illusions about a past less remembered than reinvented.[10] For Edward Ayers, too, honor in the New South is merely implied. Ayers alluded to ideals of honor in his discussions of white Southerners' fear of the North's diversified economy, the lack of respect attendant to southerners being locked out of national politics, and the ritual white condescension of calling blacks by generic names.[11] More explicit is Ted Ownby's argument that honor often resided in rival masculine and evangelical cultures with the rural South after the Civil War and that this dichotomy created tensions that reverberated from church pews to the hunting grounds.[12]

The absence of constructions of honor in the historiography of the New South is contrasted with their ubiquity in studies of the antebellum period. W. J. Cash linked honor to violence in the Old South and explained how racial solidarity among whites democratized both ideals of honor and the readiness to defend it.[13] Kenneth Greenberg's translation of the "dead"

---

[10] C. Vann Woodward, *Origins of the New South, 1877-1913* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951), 157.
[11] Edward Ayers, *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 26, 132.
[12] Ted Ownby, *Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, and Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990).
[13] W. J. Cash, *The Mind of the South* (New York: Vintage Books, 1991), 73. Edward Ayers, *Vengeance and Justice: Crime and Punishment in the Nineteenth-Century South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 33, argued "without the concept of honor, Southern violence remains inexplicable." Richard E. Nisbett and Dov Cohen,

language of honor is examined in opposition to slavery, an institution created and defined by the absence of honor.[14] Eugene Genovese tethers the planters' commitment to slavery to their respective honor, thus making secession and war inevitable.[15] Bertram Wyatt-Brown's key insight on this issue is how honor is played out in public spaces and interpreted by both the individual and the collective.[16] The central theme of editors Craig Friend and Lorri Glover's collection of essays is the connection between honor and mastery in the Old South, the former negotiated in public and the latter essential to self-identity.[17] Raoul's masculine variations—aristocrat or radical—often demonstrated a similar patriarchy in his need to exert authority.

Honor's late nineteenth-century ambiguity was a trans-Atlantic phenomena played out not only in the New South but also in Europe.[18] Similar to the dispersion of honor in the American South during Reconstruction, William Reddy argues honor became democratized after the Napoleonic Wars in France since "any man who could afford respectable clothing and possessed the polish of literacy could contend for honor on an equal footing with the great."[19] Robert Nye links honor to its masculine origins and argues that while it became available to all men in nineteenth-century France, it remained a masculine domain. Indeed, honor's decline

---

Culture of Honor: The Psychology of Violence in the South (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1996), 4, concluded that "the southern preference for violence stems from the fact that much of the South was a lawless, frontier region settled by people whose economy was originally based on herding."

[14] Greenberg, xii.

[15] Eugene D. Genovese, *The Political Economy of Slavery: Studies in the Economy and Society of the Slave South* (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), 8. In *Roll Jordan Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Vintage Books, 1976), 3, Genovese complicated matters by arguing how the reciprocity inherent in planter paternalism dispersed honor (however diluted) among traditionally dishonored slaves.

[16] Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), xv, and *The Shaping of Southern Culture: Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1880s* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 301. In *Honor and Violence in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 14, Wyatt-Brown argued that honor is synonymous with reputation and that its final determination "lies [in] the evaluation of the public."

[17] Craig T. Friend and Lorri Glover, eds., *Southern Manhood: Perspectives on Masculinity in the Old South* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2004).

[18] Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery* (New York: Picador, 2001). J. G. Peristiany, ed., *Honor and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society* (The University of Chicago Press, 1966).

[19] William M. Reddy, *The Invisible Code: Honor and Sentiment in Postrevolutionary France, 1814-1848* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), xii.

"coincided with the gender revolution that has gradually opened to women most former bastions of male monopoly and privilege."[20] Peter Gay connects honor to ritual and asserts how in antebellum America and in the Mediterranean peoples, honor regulated "all significant aspects of life."[21]

Honor is one frame of analysis; memory is another. The tension between memory and history, between what is remembered and what is forgotten, between claims for truth and the narrative conventions by which autobiographical truth is rendered, collapses into a selective "panorama" in Raoul's memoirs.[22] Pierre Nora describes the conflict between memory and history as a temporal struggle because "memory is always a phenomenon of the present . . . while history is a representation of the past."[23] Raoul, in his narrative written between 1933 and 1936, interposes the present into the past to reveal, oftentimes, two or more depictions of his life's events depending on which Raoul is recreating the past(s), the aristocratic man of nineteenth-century southern honor, or the improvisational man of socialist principles. The latter tends to challenge the former and presents alternative narratives, or "counter-memories."[24] Raoul confirms the assertion of southern historian Edward Ayers that "memory makes the cultural political, the political cultural."[25] For instance, Raoul defends the abuse of southern labor, black and white, as traditional and necessary; next he condemns the same as capitalistic exploitation. He assigns women to the domestic sphere on the one hand, and liberates his lovers (and himself)

---

[20] Robert A. Nye, *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), vii-viii.
[21] Peter Gay, *The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud, Volume III: The Cultivation of Hatred* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1993), 112.
[22] Raoul, 485.
[23] Nora, 3.
[24] Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews,* edited with an Introduction by Donald F. Bouchard and translated from the French by Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 128-29.
[25] Edward L. Ayers, "Memory and the South," *Southern Cultures* vol. 2, no. 1, 6.

from conventional amorous restrictions on the other. Raoul reduces cultural conventions to political positions and political stances to embedded cultural traditions.

Raoul operates in the contested terrain between what is remembered and what is suppressed. He might be criticized for treating history as "a genre of memory," or as a "substitute for imagination," but such an accusation would ignore Georges Gusdorf's observation that autobiography "is a second reading of experience, and it is truer than the first because it adds to experience self consciousness of it."[26] As an unknown figure, many of the events of Raoul's memoirs are difficult to verify. Added to this, Raoul speaks with more than one voice—depending on which is remembering and writing, aristocrat or radical. The infinite fragmentation of the subject, the teller of the story, should not mean "the end of autobiography," though it should provoke further investigations into the implications of multiple selves.[27] Historian Jo Burr Margadant argues that "the subject of biography is no longer the coherent self but rather a self that is performed to create an impression of coherence."[28] Margadant's point is especially pertinent to Raoul whose constituent selves repeatedly profess not to remember significant episodes only to go on at length about them. For instance, chapter one of "The Proletarian Aristocrat" is titled "My Coming-Out Party at Twenty-One." Raoul claims "I don't remember much about that far away fete," yet he provides one detail after another about his first, scandalous, sexual encounter as well as his trans-gendered rite of passage, a ritual usually reserved for his elite women peers.[29] Chapter Two, "Meeting a Depression Head On," details Raoul's epiphany about life's economic capriciousness and his subsequent alienation from both his family and society after being unable to find a job in Chicago during the 1893 Columbian

---

[26] Scot A. French, "What is Social Memory?" *Southern Cultures* vol. 2, no. 1, "genre" 10; Nora, 20.
[27] Eakin, 3.
[28] Margadant,, *New Biography*, 7.
[29] Raoul, 2.

Exposition and World's Fair. Yet in his memoir, Raoul writes, "I do not remember a vast amount about the fair."[30] Thus the rituals Raoul endured ("coming-out party," and failure to find work) in both of these chapters trigger memory clusters associated with his later conversion to Socialism—an event that would take place fifteen years later. Raoul gives evidence for Natalie Zemon Davis's argument that "isn't forgetting only the substitution of one memory for another; don't we forget to remember, or remember to forget?"[31] Memories, for Raoul, are useful (or not) for the agenda that links his remembrances into a grand personal narrative: how the injustices of the capitalist system made him a ready convert to Socialism and an alternative masculinity based on radical politics.

Raoul's narrative structure helps to shape his memories. He writes, "ideals interest me, but what people really do interest me more, and that is what I am trying to tell about myself."[32] This declaration is confirmed by Raoul's interminable search for a masculinity proper to the New South, a quest often undertaken in contradiction to elite southern conventions and assumed conservative prudishness; a journey made in the guise of the "self-made man" and the "captain of industry," as a socialist stump-speaker and radical writer, as an advocate of "free love," or plantation manager, business executive, and frustrated husband. Raoul's sojourn from one manly role to another is conveyed chronologically, punctuated with successes and (mostly) failures, humiliations and epiphanies, and through sharp portraits of his family members, peers, employees, business associates, wives, lovers, prostitutes, and ideological enemies and allies. Raoul employs, like his neighbor and peer the novelist Frances Newman, standard fictional

---

[30] Raoul, 16.
[31] Davis, 2. Raoul recalls his tenure as mayor of East Point, Georgia, but cannot remember why he was elected. He thinks he was the chairman of East Point's school board, but is not sure. As an overseer at one of the Roswell, Georgia cotton mills, Raoul "can't remember whether [he] quit or got fired," 80. Later, after leaving another mill, Raoul "can't remember just what broke it up," 157.
[32] Raoul, 182.

devices: the linear passage of time, cause and effect, characterization, scene-setting, villains, drama, comedy, irony, and confession.[33] Raoul's memoir invites speculation about whether memory represents another wrench in the postmodern tool-chest or if it is an epistemological dead-end, guilty, as Hayden White has accused History of being "essentially provisional and contingent," always susceptible "to infinite revision in the light of new evidence or more sophisticated conceptualization of problems."[34]

The tension created by Raoul's conservatism and modernism existing side-by-side sustains a story of rehearsed memories and selected masculinities to uphold honor made tenuous by increasing democratization and bureaucratization. The importance of this study lies in the dialectic between memory and honor in the New South at the turn of the twentieth century. Honor is axiomatic as a topic in the antebellum South, though less so in the New South. Memory is a methodological issue common across the historical profession. Honor, too, is under investigation. Scholars have used both in studying the American South, though not without problems. Memory has been elevated as an epistemological problem since the advent of postmodern skepticism about assumed essentialism, purported "facts," and ostensible truth. Honor delineates the New South by race, gender, and class; yet its formation, as rendered in memory, is too often taken uncritically. Memory as epistemology demands analysis of the

---

[33] Raoul mentions Frances Newman on page two of his memoir. He dated her older sister. Newman's novel, *The Hard-Boiled Virgin* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926), is eerily reminiscent of many themes that emerge in Raoul's recollections. She deploys withering irony to illustrate the constructed nature of gender by allowing her heroine to observe, "that a boy's honorable situation seemed to be the result of his inability to produce a baby rather than to his ability to produce an idea," 30. Newman's protagonist, Katherine Faraday, like Raoul, exemplifies Foucault's irony in describing the Victorian era's silence with regard to matters of sex as her first menstruation, like Raoul's initial intimate encounter, would be best left unmentioned "in a state of innocence her mother through good breeding required," 35. Katherine, too, is concerned with the intricacies of romance and honor. She returns to Atlanta after a trip to New England "with a more ingenious method of doing her hair and with some information concerning methods of rousing ardent but honorable passions in young gentleman," 59. Katherine observes the same social strictures and dilemmas as Raoul: "no gentleman ever thinks of kissing any one except a disreputable girl until he has asked her to marry him," 116. Katherine, like Raoul, is thrown a coming-out party—a ritual equally confusing—though for different reasons as she is introduced to all the people she already knows.

[34] Hayden White, *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 82.

memoir as access to an ambiguous past; honor as a historical problem often relies on those very memories for verification of hypotheses. Issues of memory are at the center of this endeavor as its sources are primarily memoirs, autobiographies, and family histories—all variants of selected memory. The correspondence of this large family, whose archives overflow with literary and historical pretensions, is also central. Issues of honor lie at the heart of Raoul's motivations; it is at this intersection of methodology (memory) and historical inquiry (honor) that this study is situated.

Models of Honor

Raoul's assumption of various masculine roles in his long search for an honorable life is, here, examined thematically instead of chronologically. The remainder of this Introduction, therefore, will briefly lay out the broad outlines of his life while emphasizing those masculine models remembered by Raoul: his maternal grandfather, William M. Wadley, his paternal grandfather, Gaston Cesar Raoul, his own father, Greene Raoul, and his uncle George Wadley. Each man exhibited for Raoul particular masculine qualities that he would alternately seek to emulate or draw ironical contrasts. It should be emphasized that Raoul's business career, treated here almost as punctuation marks in an essay that never reaches a satisfactory conclusion, is notable not for its achievement but for its consistent failure.[35]

Born in 1872, in Macon, Georgia, William Greene Raoul, Jr., the eldest son of Greene Raoul and Mary Wadley Raoul, was as obscure as he was ubiquitous. He spent his youth and adolescence in Macon and Savannah before the family moved to New York where Greene, the father, worked as the president of the Mexican National Railroad. Following failed stints as a

[35] Scott Sandage, *Born Losers: A History of Failure in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005).

student at the Lawrenceville School in New Jersey and the Stevens Institute of Technology, Raoul joined Bradford Gilbert's (a friend of his father's) architectural firm in New York in 1891.[36] But by 1893, Raoul was back with his family in Atlanta where they had recently moved to an elaborate mansion, designed by Gilbert, on Peachtree Street. Raoul spent a troubled summer in Chicago in 1893 visiting the Columbian Exposition and World's Fair. Returning to Atlanta that fall, he worked for the Southern Iron Car Line before struggling over the next seven years (1895-1902) to establish a career in the booming cotton mill industry at various sites in Georgia and Massachusetts. During this time, he also worked as secretary-treasurer for the Southern Saw Works in East Point, Georgia, (where he also served as mayor) from 1898 to 1901. Afterwards, Raoul worked as a manager for the South Atlantic Car and Manufacturing Company in Waycross, Georgia. Following his dismissal from box-car building, Raoul's business-supply store failed in Macon, Georgia. He headed to southern Georgia again as a railroad agent and later as a timber contractor for the railroads. While in Waycross in 1908, Raoul was introduced to Socialism and became increasingly active within the working class and the radical politics associated with the Socialist party after returning to Atlanta. He labored, unsuccessfully, as an accountant while mastering Marx. He left for Birmingham, Alabama in 1909 and edited a radical paper there called "The People's Voice." He struck out for Butte, Montana in 1911 to visit the Socialist administration of that western mining city. While establishing a homestead on the Montana plains, Raoul learned of his father's impending death.

Raoul returned to Atlanta in 1912 and inherited a sizable fortune which sent him into a period of ennui and depression as it appeared his dependency upon his father's money would be extended interminably. His final southern residence was in Millen, Georgia, where Raoul went

---

[36] For Gilbert, see Henry F. Withey and Elsie Rathurn Withey, *Biographical Dictionary of American Architects (Deceased)* (Los Angeles: Hennessey and Ingalls, 1970), 233 and Adolf K. Placzek, editor in chief, *Macmillan Encyclopedia of Architects*, Vol. 2 (New York: The Free Press, 1982), 201.

to help organize one the family's plantations. While there he would alienate himself permanently from his family and southern peers by his marriage to his eighteen-year-old cousin, Winifred Wadley. His self-exclusion from white society was completed through his sexual escapades with Meta Fuller Sinclair (the divorced wife of the novelist Upton Sinclair) and his opposition to the attempted lynching of a black sharecropper who shot (but did not kill) his white land-lord. After an embarrassing divorce trial, Raoul left the South for Greenwich Village before finally settling in Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey, where he would tend house, tinker with his boats, and reflect on his days in the New South, penning the unpublished memoir that forms an important source of this work.

The Raoul family fortune was forged before, during and after the American Civil War through the long career of William M. Wadley, railroad executive, who, following the war, took on his new son-in-law, Greene Raoul as an assistant (later vice-president and president) with the Central of Georgia Railroad.[37] Together, these two men ran the Central of Georgia Railroad until Wadley's death in 1882 and Raoul's unsuccessful re-election bid against Edward Porter Alexander in 1887.[38] Greene Raoul assumed the duties of president of the Mexican National Railroad that same year.

Our Raoul considered his maternal grandfather to be "a Titan," one possessing "magnetic power over men."[39] Though unable to flatter him by imitation, Raoul was impressed by William Wadley's character. "The atmosphere around Grandpa Wadley was something that you felt you

---

[37] For the formative years of the Wadley-Raoul family, see Mary Raoul Millis, *The Family of Raoul: A Memoir* (Privately printed, 1943), and Sarah Lois Wadley, *A Brief Record of the Life of William M. Wadley* (New York: J. C. and W. E. Powers Press, 1906).

[38] Edward Porter Alexander served as General James Longstreet's chief of artillery in the First Corps of the Army of Northern Virginia during the Civil War. Afterwards, he served the interests of the Richmond Terminal in its quest to control and consolidate the southern roads.

[39] Raoul, 145, 12.

could tie to in a storm, or build foundations on with brick and mortar."[40] Raoul's sister, Mary Raoul Millis, remembered her grandfather Wadley as the "brightest blessing" of the "budding family of Raoul."[41] Though impervious to compliments, Wadley was pleased by praise for his mostly inept agricultural endeavors, while similar blandishments about his abilities as an imminently successful railroad executive would only "win his enmity."[42] According to his family, Wadley was without vices. He was indifferent to money and avoided "obligations of any kind to anyone." His ability outdistanced his ambition; his important position was unadorned by pride.[43] In these traits, he was the opposite of his grandson.

When one of Wadley's sons wanted money to invest in the Central of Georgia Railroad's stock, he was peremptorily refused: "I do not speculate on the knowledge of what I will do for the Central, and neither shall my sons."[44] Wadley's oldest daughter (and Raoul's beloved "Aunty"), Sarah Lois Wadley, believed this rectitude a product of his descent from "early Puritan settlers of New England," a "thrifty and industrious people" who scorned largesse and had "contempt for hardship." Wadley's father, Dole Wadleigh, demonstrated the family's impatience with the superfluous by truncating the mostly silent second syllable of their name from Wadleigh to Wadley.[45]

William Wadley's appearance complemented his character. He was a "striking figure," over six feet tall, his expression "grave and his manners reserved," with dark hair and hazel eyes, capped off by his Roman nose. Raoul wrote that the Wadley's were "better built than the

---

[40] Millis, *Family*, 12. Raoul's older sister (by two years) quoted from his unpublished autobiography originally entitled "A Rolling Stone."
[41] Millis, *Family,* 26.
[42] Raoul, 145.
[43] Raoul Family Collection, Mss 171, Kenan Research Center, Atlanta History Center Library, 17, 3 (cited hereafter as Millis, "Autobiography"; and Wadley, *Record.*
[44] Raoul, 145.
[45] For Wadley's New England origins, see Raoul Family Papers, 1865-1982, Special Collections, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University; Mss 548, box 5, folder 3, letter of 8 June 1885 from Sarah Lois Wadley to Greene Raoul, and Wadley, *Record,* for the changing of the spelling of the family's name.

Raouls" and were infected by a "nervous strain" that had taken its toll of death." Raoul's first wife remarked upon meeting the Wadley cousins that they were sweet "but odd looking and made me think that Dickens should have met them and immortalized them in one of his works," thus reestablishing in a literary way the link between New England and the mother country.

William Wadley was born in 1813 at Great Hill, New Hampshire. His father's blacksmith shop must have been a center of activity as "the best work of the neighborhood was done" there. Wadley's early proclivity for tinkering began here as he constructed, at age six, a pair of iron pincers "well proportioned and fit for use." The family made their shoes and spun their cloth. Young Wadley fashioned a device to make combs. He joined steam power to a press to make bulky bales of cotton more manageable. When his father died in 1826, Wadley took up an apprenticeship to another blacksmith. He served only one year. His mother "paid for the rest of his term according to the requirements of his apprenticeship."[46]

Demonstrating the wanderlust later exhibited by his grandson, Wadley, at age twenty, set out for Savannah in 1833 after having "read a little book" about missionaries "sent out to the Indians in Georgia." He went on the whimsical notion that "Georgia would be a good place to go." His daughter and biographer described her father as a man whose strength was combined "with acuteness and inquisitiveness, that practical, inventive turn of mind, quick to find expedients," with a "masterful grasp of material things," and beset with "restless, nervous energy," dominated by "individualism, working for good" and fortified by an "exuberance which comes with freedom."[47]

Wadley arrived in Savannah with his pocket dictionary, coat, and worldly wealth of thirteen dollars, the latter two stolen shortly after his arrival. Luckily Wadley found work (and

---

[46] For Wadley's early life in New England, see Sarah L. Wadley's *Record*, 7-8, 11-12, 18.
[47] *ibid.,* 12

his future wife) while helping to erect Fort Pulaski on the Savannah River's Cockspur Island. He stayed for six years.[48]

Wadley's efforts were not confined to Cockspur. His reputation for competence and honesty become known to those empowered to award contracts and he secured one to construct a bridge over a nearby canal between the Ogeechee and Savannah rivers. While thus employed, Wadley also built a brickyard on the banks of the Ogeechee in Washington County, thereby attracting the notice of the Central of Georgia Railroad while simultaneously, if unwittingly, creeping closer to his future and permanent home.

The railroad age opened in Georgia in 1833, coincidently with Wadley's arrival in Savannah. Georgia chartered three railroads that year: the Central of Georgia from Savannah to Macon, the Georgia Railroad from Augusta to an undesignated spot in the interior (the future site of Atlanta), and the Monroe Railroad for a line between Macon and Forsyth. The purpose of these iron roads was to connect the coastal and riverine ports of Savannah and Augusta with the cotton from the piedmont and piney-woods plantations to the ships that would transport this commodity to markets in New England and Europe.[49]

The Central Railroad began under the sponsorship of Savannah businessmen as an answer to Charleston's own efforts to entice the cotton trade from Georgia planters by building a road into the interior via the Savannah River and Augusta. The Central Railroad represented Savannah's successful efforts to turn back Charleston's raids on Georgia's interior. The Central did for Georgia specifically what the railroads did the nation generally: "it was at once an

---

[48] Wadley, *Record*, 12-17.
[49] For the origins of Georgia's railroads, see James M. Russell, *Atlanta, 1847-1890: City Building in the Old South and the New* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988), 18.

answer to existing problems of transport and a catalyst to settlement and expansion to the west."[50]

Wadley relinquished his public works career for that of roadmaster on the Central of Georgia in 1848. He maintained a fifty-mile section of track. Soon he took over the entire line. A year later, Wadley was appointed superintendent of the Central. In 1852, he accepted Governor Howell Cobb's earnest invitation to assume command of the Western and Atlantic Railroad. Wadley made many "valuable private friendships and business connections" while simultaneously ridding the road of "supernumeraries . . . who had obtained their livelihood . . . through political favor."[51] The new executive found himself in great demand. Wadley returned to the Central a year later with his salary and authority increased. Four years later, he left for Louisiana to take charge of the New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern Railroad at the salary of ten thousand dollars, "then considered a sum almost incredible."[52]

Wadley assumed his new duties in Louisiana and planted his family in Monroe where they would remain, except for one aborted journey to Georgia, for the remainder of the war. While there, in 1861, two event occurred, one transitory, the other decisive for the future of his family: the Civil War, and Greene Raoul's entrance into the Wadley's lives.

Wadley's quarter of a century spent in the South allowed him to enter the Confederate cause "with ardor . . . which he espoused both from principle and feeling." In December 1860, he returned from New Orleans with the certainty that secession was inevitable. His daughter Sarah recorded in her diary her father's assertion that "it is impossible for the North and South to coalesce." She wrote that two month's earlier, her teacher, a Mr. Burr, would not return, as he

---

[50] For the early connections between the Central and the village that would become Atlanta, see Jefferson M. Dixon, *An Abstract of the Central Railroad of Georgia, 1833-1892* ("dissertation abstract," George Peabody College for Teachers, August 1953), 5.
[51] For Wadley's pre-Civil War railroad career, see Wadley, *Record*, 23-25.
[52] For Wadley's increasing reputation and opportunities, see Wadley, *Record*, 26-31.

was "an abolitionist." This interruption in Sarah's education was filled in part by sewing shirts and woolen socks for Confederate soldiers. War news came to Monroe late and usually wrong.[53]

Wadley's military career was brief and reveals less about the Confederacy's railroad superintendent than it does about the difficulties inherent in organizing victory on behalf of Jefferson Davis's government. Wadley's was first recommended to Davis in April 1862 as the "most energetic and reliable man" in the South to remedy the problems on a local line. Seven months later, Wadley was placed in charge of the Confederate railroads. He called a conference of all the Southern railroad presidents to coordinate their policies but was unable to achieve a consensus. He was also unsuccessful in settling bureaucratic disputes with the Confederate quartermaster general. Wadley's argued that railroad employees were much more competent in fulfilling the government's needs than the quartermaster general's soldier. By January 1863, Wadley informed the Secretary of War, James Seddon, that "some additional authority will be necessary to enforce the requirements of the government in this branch of service."[54]

Wadley's report of superfluous quartermaster troops drew an angry response from General Robert E. Lee, who was as short of soldiers as he was of supplies. Numerous government details had constituted a drain on Lee's manpower and he could not believe that these extractions from his army were being put to good use "when Colonel Wadley speaks of a 'full regiment' of Government transportation agents collected at some point on the North Carolina Railroad."[55] The problems of supply were not peculiar to Lee's army; nor was Wadley's reputation confined to one theater of war. His stock remained high and his services

---

[53] For the Wadley family just before the Civil War, see the *Diaries of Sarah Wadley, 1856-1920* (Huntsville, Alabama: Clark Associates, 1995), 58-61, 9, 114.
[54] United States War Department, *The War of the Rebellion, A Compilation of the Official Records* (Washington, D. C., 1880-1891), (hereafter cited as *O.R.*), Series IV, Vol. 1, 1048, Vol. 2, 271-74, 225, 231-32, 373, and Series 2, Vol. 19, 717. Wadley was the acting Superintendent of Confederate Railroads. His daughter believed that her father's New England origins accounted for the Confederate senate's failure to confirm his appointment.
[55] *O.R.*, Series 1, Vol. 25, 639.

were desired across the South until the Confederate Senate refused to confirm his appointment as Superintendent of Railroads, thus ending Wadley's part in the tragic-comedy that pursued Lee's army to Appomattox. Wadley's replacement was named on 4 June 1863, a month before Pickett's charge on the third day at Gettysburg.[56]

Whether Wadley was happy at escaping the intrigues and frustrations of government service is not known; yet his return home to Louisiana confronted him with even more daunting challenges as his daughter Sarah wrote, "Poor Father, he says that for the first time in his life he doesn't know what to do." Vicksburg had fallen on 4 July 1863. A soldier from there ventured by the Wadley house to report the garrison had been reduced to eating mules. Portions of General Ulysses S. Grant's army approached within twenty-four miles of Monroe. Next, Sarah heard one of her father's slaves assure Wadley that he would not go to join the liberating army so near, and that, instead, he meant "to die by you."

In the final stages of the war, the Wadley household began to resemble the Great Hill home of Wadley's youth. Family members and slaves were organized to make shoes, weave cloth, tan leather, twist ropes, all amidst the clanking of a blacksmith shop. The family's aborted trip to Georgia turned out to be a fortuitous disappointment as reports drifted west of General William T. Sherman's march through Georgia. His army took the path of the Central of Georgia Railroad, earlier so assiduously constructed by Wadley, now the site of endless bonfires from "Sherman's neckties" from Macon to Savannah. The Oconee River bridge, one of Wadley's first projects, was put to the torch. Sarah heard rumors of a big battle at Millen, Georgia (where our William Raoul would fight his final battle in the South in 1915). Sarah believed that General Sherman's "audacity is unequalled." She rued the reelection of President Abraham Lincoln and wondered how the Yankees could "be so lost to all self-respect, and love of freedom" to provide

[56] *O.R.*, Series 1, Vol. 33, 1078; Vol. 24, 290; and Series IV, Vol. 2, 579.

another term for a man whose "crimes against liberty and justice" were notorious. Especially noteworthy for our purposes was Sarah's diary entry detailing the Battle of Chickamauga where the Washington Artillery (from New Orleans) was engaged. Sarah confided to her diary, "I do not know [if] . . . Greene Raoul [was] in that division, but oh I hope not." Greene Raoul was the son of a Wadley family friend, Gaston Raoul, from Independence, Louisiana, an hour's journey from Monroe along the railroad. Raoul's Washington Artillery marched with General James Longstreet's First Corps to Gettysburg where he witnessed Pickett's futile charge and, more importantly, met Edward Porter Alexander, also an artilleryman, and Greene's future foe for control of the Central Railroad. Greene finished his civil war service as the Confederacy's superintendent of manufacturing box cars. Sarah was impressed: "What a position for so young a man . . . he must indeed be remarkable; Father says he is."[57]

The Raouls entered the Wadley's lives in June 1860. Gaston Raoul ran the Car Works at Independence, Louisiana where he and his sons manufactured rolling stock for the railroad. Friendship preceded business. Our William Raoul recalled that his "two grandfathers were about as much alike as a St. Bernard and a black and tan terrier," yet, despite their differences in temperament and background, they held each other in high esteem. The two families were further joined in 1861 when Wadley's youngest daughter, Mary (William Raoul's future mother) was sent to the Raoul's home to recover from a bout of malaria. Mary's older sister, Sarah the diarist, recalled the Raoul's as a "perfect household of big boys and girls" where we were "very merry all . . . of the time." Mary Raoul Millis, our Raoul's sister, remembered as a young girl how different was her grandfather Gaston Raoul "from the restrained Wadleys—how keen he was on politics, how excitable, how eager in his manner." Lines of connection and affection grew more complex. Wadley found Greene a most capable and agreeable young man. Greene,

[57] Wadley, *Record*, 45; *Diaries*, 211, 226, 184, 218. See Millis, *Family*, 16.

in turn, took a fancy to the ailing Mary Wadley, recuperating from malaria at his father's house. At the war's end Wadley traveled to Georgia and left his family with the Raouls where "all was freely given to us, not in a time of ease and plenty, but when we were homeless, and our friends comparatively destitute."[58]

For Gaston Raoul, Greene's father and our William Raoul's grandfather, the Civil War just ending provided a second bellicose book-end to a life began in the long shadows of the Napoleonic Wars. The Raoul family of Burgundy apparently took "opposing parts in the struggle then convulsing France." Those left alive drifted westward across an increasingly interconnected Atlantic basin "at various times, probably as the fortunes of their several factions were up or down." Two of these Raouls took up residence in Haiti in time to witness that island's historic slave insurrection: one was killed, the other, his great-great grandfather, Francois Guillaume, "escaped death through the devotion of a Negro woman, who dressed him in her clothes, and aided him to a small sailboat, in which he came to Louisiana."[59]

William Raoul's grandfather, Gaston, assimilated himself successfully into Louisiana society, swapping his middle name Caesar for Turner. His grandchildren never associated him with Gallic ideals or traditions. Our William Raoul said the atmosphere around his grandfather Raoul "was pleasant and fluid and comfortable." New Orleans and Independence were, however, remote from the red clay of William Raoul's childhood and his recollections were imprecise. Grandpa Raoul make take credit for two fortuitous acts: building his house along the line of the railroad—the road run by William Wadley before the Civil War; and siring his son

---

[58] Wadley, *Diaries*, 44, 60, 69, 251; Raoul, 429; *Family,* 3; *Record*, 54-55.
[59] Millis, *Family,* 1-5; Raoul, 428.

Greene, William Raoul's father and Wadley's future son-in-law, lieutenant and successor at the Central of Georgia Railroad.[60]

If William Wadley was characterized by "initiative, daring, [and] iron will," then Greene Raoul, his son-in-law and future president of the Central line, possessed the "coolest of keen judgment, true analytical discernment, and a far-seeing wisdom."[61] Raoul described his father as wise and determined, able to "master . . . practically every situation of which he was confronted"[62] except, perhaps, his temper. It came "quick as a flash . . . sudden, sharp, devastating," and without atonement, for such recognition "was neither necessary nor fitting" in a society bound together in a hierarchy maintained by deference to masculine authority.[63]

Greene Raoul provided his first son with both practical advice and self-revealing cautionary warnings: "William . . . never lose your temper. The man who loses his temper is at a disadvantage. Appear to lose it, when the occasion demands, but do not lose it."[64] Greene was "a master workman" in his son's eyes, carving woodcuts with his pocket knife, skilled at mechanical drawing, and a gifted book-keeper.[65] Greene created a distinct masculine image for his son when he compared their hands, both with "short stubby fingers" and remarked, "that is the hand of the artisan."[66] Executive, craftsman and replete with admonitions for his oldest son, Greene cautioned: "Make all of your mistakes on paper, William . . . Paper is a whole lot cheaper than lumber and masonry." Certainly Raoul followed this advice by confessing his every action and belief, however indiscreet, to be committed, forever, to paper as evidenced by his nearly five-hundred-page memoir. Greene advised his son to discern the consequences of his

---

[60] Millis, *Family,* 7-9; Raoul, 427.
[61] Millis, *Family,* 27.
[62] Raoul, 12.
[63] Millis, *Family,* 94, 43.
[64] Raoul, 14.
[65] Millis, *Family,* 34. Again, the sister quotes her brother's unpublished autobiography.
[66] Raoul, 14

acts, and if they were "detrimental to his interests, refrain from indulging in an act of emotion."[67] This, unlike his other instructions, fell mute on Raoul's ears.

William Wadley and Greene Raoul returned their merged families to Georgia in the midst of Reconstruction. They settled in a region of the country conventionally viewed as a reluctant sectional appendage operating a commodity economy: an area ideal for the extraction of raw materials for northern manufacture with the finished products to be sold back to Southerners. History rarely records that Southerners—even transplanted ones like Wadley—did build a backbone of business bisecting Georgia's plain and piedmont. Wadley's business leadership in Georgia, before and after the war, was memorable in that he built and rebuilt an important industry that had been reduced to General Sherman's twisted "necktie parties" of cross-tie bonfires.

An accompaniment to the financial security afforded by Wadley's presidency of the Central Railroad was the acquisition in 1873 of the Colaparchee Plantation, fourteen miles from Macon, near the Crawford Station (soon to be renamed Bolingbroke in honor of the British Lord, a biography of whom Wadley had recently read) on the Atlanta division of the railroad. His daughter records her father saying, "At my own home and for the first time since the war, slept under my own roof." It was renamed Great Hill Place after Wadley's death in 1882 in honor of his New Hampshire home town.[68]

Great Hill was the central sun around which revolved the highly mobile and often far-flung satellites of the growing Wadley-Raoul constellation. The house sat on thirteen hundred acres. Each of its six upstairs bedrooms had a fireplace, a "marble-topped credenza with a large china bowl and water pitcher." Chamber pots and slops jars rounded out the furnishings. The

---

[67] Raoul,, 43.
[68] Raoul Family Papers, box 47, folder 10; *Diaries*, 260, 323; *Record*, 66-67.

downstairs was dominated by a wide hallway with rooms off to each side. Beyond the kitchen "were the stables, the carriage and wagon houses, blacksmith shop and houses for the domestic servants." And further away, across a pasture, were the "quarters" for the "wage hands." There was a "dairy room" with shelves made of marble "to support big, flat enameled pans that held milk fresh from the cow house as it cooled and the cream rose to the top." In the cow house was a large vat built into a back furnace where "hog carcasses were scalded for cleaning at pig-killing time." Great Hill continued as a working plantation until 1920, when Sarah Wadley died.[69]

The countryside surrounding Great Hill was well overrun with little Wadleys and Raouls. One of William Wadley's sons owned a home a quarter-mile away, and the emerging sets of cousins found numerous diversions to keep them happy and occupied. In 883, Greene gave his son William Raoul his first shotgun when he was eleven years old. Our Raoul was handy like his father, fashioning "three horns, one for powder, one for shot, and one for blowing." A year later the young Raoul made a sling "and killed two birds with it." The hunter, of course spends long intervals between the excitement of finding his quarry, and our William put these dull moments to good use by "thinking of a story" that he could later write "for the benefit of the children." As a boy, William Raoul organized cock fights. In Great Hill's yard he played grass tennis and croquet. In its lakes and creeks he indulged in his life-long love of the water. He suffered from a bout of "malarial fever caused by exerting himself too much in building a dam" on one of the property's streams. Greene provided his two oldest sons, William and Gaston, with the ultimate toys: a Central locomotive for each. Our Raoul remembered, "There was no

[69] *Diaries,* 2-3; Raoul, 141-46; Raoul Family Papers, box 47, folder, 10.

more question in our minds about our ownership of those locomotives than if we had taken them home to the back yard with us."[70]

Greene's sons, William and Gaston, took the short train ride from Macon to Great Hill most weekends: "All we had to do was walk down to the old depot . . . get on the sleeper . . . and tell the conductor we were Captain Raoul's sons and wanted to be put off at Bolingbroke early the next morning." William's little brother Loring recalled that "our clan was one of great loyalty—of intense loves and fierce hates," while his older sister Mary believed "the rooftree of Great Hill was a symbol of the ties that united our family and our affairs against the encroachment of an outside world."[71]

William Raoul's sister Mary remembered this scene with pride: "When I was a child at Great Hill, I loved the Sunday afternoons the best of all . . . for then my Grandfather, Father and uncle [George Wadley] were at home, and they sat on the shaded eastern porch, and talked . . . about the railroad; they examined maps; they discussed endlessly the projects on hand; and they exalted their friends, and damned their enemies, with round good will. They were tremendously in earnest."[72] William and Mary, the two oldest children, and their siblings and kin would gather at their elders' feet to listen and learn, and while "the intricacies of discussion" may have been beyond their young ears, "they could catch the tone of sweet familiar confidence." William Wadley and Greene Raoul built well: railroads, bridges, culverts, privies, depots, brickyards, houses and families. And away from Great Hill's pleasant porch and multiple out-buildings

---

[70] Raoul, 141, 13; Raoul Family Papers, box 18, folder 1; box 46, folder 1, "Family Journal"; Ownby, *Satan*, 76-88; Raoul Family Papers, box 5, folder 9; Raoul Family Collection, box 1, folder 3.
[71] Raoul Family Papers, box 22, folders 17 & 7; box 5, folder 2; box 22, folder 17; Millis, *Family*, 35, 46-47; *Diaries*, 78; Ownby, *Satan*, 115-18.
[72] Millis, "Autobiography," (Appendix: "Reminiscence"), 9.

were built by Greene a "fortress-like granite wall . . . to be the burying ground of this new and powerful family."[73]

William Wadley's son and our Raoul's uncle George Wadley "was the hero of [his] boyhood. He was the strongest, handsomest, most self assured being I had ever known." Anticipating Raoul's future fixation on how attire made the man, he remembered that uncle George "wore magnificent clothes, drove fast horses, and married" a beautiful wife. Most importantly, he "had been in all kinds of scrapes himself." Uncle George loomed large in the opening pages of Raoul's memoir as they ran into each other after the latter's dismissal from the Lawrenceville School for a forbidden dalliance with one of the school's serving girls. Raoul, in dread of confiding this news to his parents, told his Uncle who replied with characteristic savior faire, "Why William . . . that is nothing. I remember well when I was caught at school on the same errand: only we had gotten what we went after. All boys get into those scrapes."[74] In a distinctly different masculine ideal, Greene told his son that he had crossed the line with the serving girl and that he, Greene, had never even put his arms around Raoul's mother until marriage. Raoul, the son, believed this the only time his father ever lied to him.

Raoul's paternal grandfather, Gaston Cesar Raoul, lived in New Orleans and was rarely seen by his grandson who, nevertheless, remembered traits that may have been passed down to him genetically if not by example. Raoul confessed that he "never knew much about what he did, but [he thought] that he must have been the promoter of a number of enterprises, few of which were successful." His grandfather Raoul had a death-mask of Napoleon—in honor of the family's service to the emperor—and, according to his grandson, he "had imagination, and was

[73] Millis, *Family*, 47; Raoul Family Papers, box, 19, folder 7.
[74] Raoul, 4-5.

politically minded."[75] Raoul may have constructed a repository of radical potential here in a man he rarely saw.

These admirable portraits by Raoul the aristocrat have their darker companion pieces etched by Raoul the radical—with the exception of Gaston Raoul whose distance prevented his grandson from ever gaining any genuine insight. Grandfather Wadley's biography, as rendered by his socialist grandson, mentions his steadfast work as a young blacksmith at Fort Pulaski on the Savannah River in the 1830s. A strike called by the laborers there was not unanimous as only the stubborn young Wadley from New Hampshire reported to his post. Raoul remarked that this was "not good reading for his grandson" who had undergone a metamorphosis "into a revolutionist."[76] While not explicit criticism, this vignette demonstrated the construction of one masculine type in opposition to another.

As for his father, Raoul's admiration would always be diminished because of the shame attached to his dependency upon Greene's money, estate, connections, and influence. Perhaps the most bitter single sentiment expressed in his long memoir occurs after Greene had assumed and paid all of his son's debts after the fiasco at the Southern Saw Works in 1902 (discussed in Chapter Two), and had then assigned to him a stipend of one-hundred dollars a month until the errant young man could find employment. Once a job was secured, Raoul remembered that he wrote to his father that "he could terminate the hateful allowance." This, of course, is the voice of Raoul the aristocrat mortified at his continuing dependence upon his father. This shared knowledge of Raoul's absence of autonomy, however well kept, poisoned the well between father and son though it did not prevent occasional warm relations between the two in the future.

---

[75] Raoul, 427.
[76] *ibid.*, 145.

It is interesting that Raoul's criticism of both his father and of his uncle George have their origins, not from a radical critique of capitalism, but from a managerial analysis of errors committed by committed capitalists. Greene Raoul would be criticized by his son for allowing one of their business associates to get "the best of us again."[77] Uncle George would be accused by his nephew of running the South Atlantic Car Manufacturing Company as if it were a branch of the United States government without need to worry over costs and accounts and profits and dividends.

Whatever shades of difference that existed among these masculine models, certainly all were linked by their participation in the capitalist system as executives or managers of large companies or at least the promoters of commercial affairs. Thus when Raoul's radical epiphany arrived, it forever placed the creation of his own identity—to one degree or another—in opposition to those powerful male models that he had admired and emulated from his youth until his political apostasy.

Chapter Summaries

Within the overarching themes of honor, memory, and masculinity, the argument proceeds through five chapters. Chapter One, "Fin-de-siècle Atlanta," situates the Raouls within the context of a city undergoing change across myriad categories: technological, demographic, and sociological. The Raoul family was immersed in this institutional flux and we consider in this chapter Atlanta's role as a modern aberration in a still rural South, and the consequences for the concept of honor this clash would precipitate.

[77] Raoul, 135.

We consider in Chapter Two, "Lost Honor: Requiem for a Businessman," how Raoul's memories of honor underwent change amidst the travails of his failing commercial life in the cotton-mill industry, as an accountant, a saw manufacturer, and boxcar builder. Raoul's quest for a masculine identity appropriate to his class status are central to this analysis of his successes and failures in the public sphere of commerce where a man's reputation was made. His memories describe two personae: the incipient and frustrated captain of industry, and the radical foe of capitalism. The former provokes the latter as Raoul created alternative masculine traits when faced with failure in the economic and business sphere where notions of masculinity are most demanding and *visible*. Increasingly modern practices in southern industry made many nostalgic for old-fashioned paternalism now replaced with an emphasis on the "bottom line."

In Chapter Three, "Intimate Honor: Practicing Sex and Gender," we examine transitions in Raoul's ideals about proper masculine behavior from an early self-imposed celibacy to later, and often reckless, pursuit of sexual partners. Raoul's sexual experiences demonstrated the pliable nature of male sexuality in an era in which society's notions of honor often clashed with an unpredictable future. The masculine roles of sexuality available to Raoul were unsatisfactory, both physically and emotionally as his first wife was chronically ill and genuinely frightened of intimacy. The resulting confusion made his later subversion of traditional gender behavior especially alarming to this family, who viewed his intimate conduct with trepidation as it called the family's honor into question. The underlying theme of this chapter is the series of masculine masks worn by Raoul and how his memories of these façades animated his calculations of honor.

In Chapter Four, "Honor Denied: Reconstructing Race," we examine how memories of honor intersected with race, be it in master/servant relationships, ones characterized by condescension and paternalism, or others marked by forbidden lust and equally forbidden

empathy. By considering how issues of race were remembered, this chapter illustrates Raoul's parallel construction of memories by the conservative elite or the radical iconoclast. The former is criticized by the latter for burning down the shanty of a Negro in his debt while the radical stood aside for the aristocrat's argument against a prospective lynching. The re-assembly of memories of race demonstrates Raoul's fractured self in a quixotic search for honor among those denied its benefits.

In Chapter Five, "Alternative Honor: Socialism and the New Man," we conclude by considering how Raoul's conversion to Socialism allowed him to imagine and act upon a whole other set of masculine behaviors that included remnants of honor and paternalism left over from his earlier life. Vestiges of this previous life continually re-emerge after his political epiphany and contest his new-found convictions while complicating the re-construction of his identity. It is Raoul's conscious embrace of Socialism as a modern political ideology that made it easier to undertake working-class roles that he had previously considered to be beneath his station in life.

CHAPTER ONE

FIN-DE-SIÈCLE ATLANTA

Greene Raoul and his big family began to contemplate the end of their "exile" in New York and a return to the South in 1890 as his duties as president of the Mexican National Railroad could, in theory, be performed from whichever base he chose. Greene and his architect friend, Bradford Gilbert, began devising elaborate plans for the home they would construct on Peachtree Street in Atlanta, Georgia. According to the eldest sibling, Mary Raoul Millis, her father was influenced in this move by her mother who "had come to feel that she must quit this [New York City] life, geared, as it was, to a higher tempo, more formal standards, and much higher price levels, and return to the people whose gentle manners and easy kindliness she remembered with nostalgic longing." Atlanta was chosen because of its "agreeable climate," and because the city provided "the most favorable opportunities for young men in business or industry."[1]

William Raoul concurred with his sister's analysis—with a slightly bitter twist—that their father had chosen Atlanta for the family's permanent home "so that his five sons would have a good southern business environment in which to grow up . . . [although] not one of them lives there now. According to Raoul, their father's "theory was to . . . through them in the water and let them come out successful captains like himself."[2] The oldest son implied that the father had misjudged not only Atlanta as a capitalist training ground, but perhaps also his own sons.

So the Raouls returned to the South and took their place among the elite of the city of Atlanta in their magnificent new home, where, according to Mary Raoul Millis, the oldest

---

[1] Millis, *Family,* 103.
[2] Raoul, 9.

sibling, "there was fresh, new wealth to spend; and it was spent with an enthusiastic vigor of enjoyment undreamed of by those whose wealth had always been a matter of course." Money, and in large supply, was necessary as Mary Wadley Raoul became "the Lady Bountiful, who sheltered and helped the flock of less fortunate relatives" as well as her own "lusty, growing family, whose individual members gave promise of full and useful lives to come."[3] The move to Atlanta found Greene Raoul "at the height of his power and importance in the railroad world."[4] This chapter will explore Atlanta's role as a modern aberration in a still rural South and the Raouls in their bustling new city where change rendered contingent the concept of honor.

On Sunday, 6 January 1890, two years before the Raouls arrived in Atlanta, local merchant S. P. Richards recorded in his diary, "our city is clad in mourning for two celebrated men who have just passed away, the one full of years and crowned with honor in the South and regarded with hatred generally in the North—ex-President Jefferson Davis. The other, Henry W. Grady, whose oratory has lately made him famous and beloved both in the South and the North. He was suddenly cut down in the flower of his young manhood.[5] This diary entry unwittingly placed in juxtaposition two renowned sons of the South whose respective purposes were in opposition, Davis glancing back with regret, Grady assaying the future with enthusiasm, the former a defender of slavery, the latter a promoter of capitalism. Davis was the embodiment of honor humbled while Grady was the apostle of honor democratized by commercial success and economic autonomy for Southerners and the South. By pairing Davis and Grady, Richards the

---

[3] Millis, *Family,* 108-09.
[4] Raoul, 9.
[5] Franklin M. Garrett, *Atlanta and its Environs: A Chronicle of its People and Events,* Vol. II (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1954), 200. Grady served as managing editor for the *Atlanta Constitution* in the 1880s where he used his influence to promote northern investment, homegrown industrialization, diversified farming and white supremacy for what he called the "New South." See Ferald J. Bryan, *Henry Grady or Tom Watson? The Rhetorical Struggle for the New South, 1880-1890* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1994), and Harold E. Davis, *Henry Grady's New South: Atlanta a Brave and Beautiful City* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1990), and *Life and Labors of Henry W. Grady, His Speeches, Writings, etc.* (Atlanta: H. C. Hudgins and Company, 1890).

diarist unknowingly anticipated the longest running historiographical dispute in Southern history.[6]

When the Raouls returned to Georgia from New York, they went to Henry Grady's (and, in retrospect, C. Vann Woodward's) Atlanta, a city casting off the final remnants of the antebellum South for a New South where fortunes were being rapidly made, where reconciliation with the North was deemed in the general interest, and where, according to Mary Raoul Millis, "all manners were fluid."[7]

Henry Grady's thesis, which he never tired of reiterating to audiences north and south, required economic diversity and industrialization for the South. This message rattled the traditional confines of a colonial economy fixated upon cotton as a commodity crop without diversification and inherently dependent on outside markets and expertise. Grady dismissed, although not with contempt, the "feudal . . . magnificence" of the antebellum system, the "shackles" of slave labor that had held the South "in narrow limitations fell forever" with the liberation of the "negro slave."[8] Grady best exemplified his theme of southern dependency with is "funeral" speech. Here the dearly departed, though buried in the midst of a north Georgia marble quarry, was adorned with a tombstone from Vermont, his pine coffin imported from far away Cincinnati though his own region abounded in pine forests. The nearby iron mine was useless as the nails to seal the coffin came from Pittsburgh, the wool and cotton bands for the casket were imported from the North, this despite the presence of unlimited cotton and the sheep

---

[6] The central argument in the historiography of the South revolves around the issue of continuity between the Old and New South. It is most famously epitomized by C. Vann Woodward's assault upon W. J. Cash's thesis of regional unity and transcendence of Southern mentality through war and changing institutions. Historian Edward L. Ayers neatly summarizes the opposing arguments: "where Cash stressed continuity, Woodward stressed discontinuity, where Cash stressed community, Woodward stressed conflict, where Cash stressed gullibility, Woodward stressed pursuit of self-interest, where Cash stressed culture, Woodward stressed economics and politics. Woodward won," from "W. J. Cash, the New South, and the Rhetoric of History," in Charles W. Eagles, ed., *The Mind of the South: Fifty Years Later* (Jackson, Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi, 1992), 118.
[7] Millis, "Autobiography," 186.
[8] Grady, *Life and Labor*, 106-07, 112.

growing country at hand. Grady made his point: "The South didn't furnish a thing on earth for that funeral but the corpse and the hole in the ground."[9] When Grady announced to a New England audience that his New South had "sowed towns and cities in the place of theories, and put business above politics," implication was clear: Jefferson Davis's lament that the Confederacy's tombstone should read, "Died of a Theory," was no longer relevant in the South, especially in Atlanta, which had jettisoned the Lost Cause for the fast buck.[10] He asserted his homeland had "challenged your spinners in Massachusetts and your iron-makers in Pennsylvania." Grady addressed the South's colonial economy with its colonizers: "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."[11] The practical effect of Grady's crusade was measured in the increasing importance of cities like Atlanta acting "as nerve centers of a changing economy and culture that penetrated the rural hinterland and remade the South in the decades following the Civil War."[12] Grady sealed his argument by linking economic autonomy with masculinity: self-sufficiency "is the way to manliness and sturdiness of character."[13] In this way the concept of honor was transformed from the hierarchical superficialities of the antebellum era to the democratizing and improvisational effects of modernity. Grady's argument had, in effect, gendered the two eras: the effeminate and mannered Old South versus the rough and tumble New South.

---

[9] Grady, *Life and Labor,* 284-85.
[10] *ibid.*, 108.
[11] Henry W. Grady, *The New South and Other Addresses* (New York: Haskell House, 1969), 32. For Grady's effort to construct a new Southern businessman, see Daniel J. Singal, "Broadus Mitchell and the Persistence of the New South Thought," *Journal of Southern History* 45 (August 1979): 353-354. C. Vann Woodward presented the opposing point of view in his biography, *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), 115, when he described Grady's pleading for Northern investment as "almost pathetic in its desperation." Grady's influence, in any event, should not be underestimated. According to Ayers, *Promise*, Grady's *Atlanta Weekly Constitution* "went to every post office in Georgia and to every state in the nation, giving it the largest circulation of a weekly paper in the United States," 87.
[12] Don Doyle, *New Men, New Cities, New South: Atlanta, Nashville, Charleston, Mobile, 1860-1910* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1981), xiii.
[13] Grady, *Life and Labors*, 202.

Modernity in the South would begin in Henry Grady's (and the Raoul's) Atlanta, yet its emergence there seemed somewhat artificial and constructed instead of natural and organic—criticisms often directed toward the city itself by those dissatisfied with its un-Southern ways. The old hierarchical social pattern of the antebellum South, its artisanal and agricultural organization, now appeared quaint amidst modern and robust improvisation as bustling cities extended commercial opportunities and the honor accompanying wealth and standing to the able and ambitious, not to the decadent descendants of pre-Civil War firebrands. Honor would thus be tested (and reconstructed) in an usually pristine environment, one that was largely devoid of the planter influence and the presence of former slaves, the two primary factors of antebellum honor.[14]

The artificiality of Atlanta's existence stems from its rather arbitrary purpose and place. Its purpose was to serve Savannah, Charleston, and the towns of the southeastern coastal plain as a conduit to the markets of the Tennessee and Ohio River valleys. It would also act as a portal for Midwestern trade heading south, a funnel conducting provisions from its arteries at Chattanooga, south to Atlanta, then fanning out across the piney hinterlands. Five railroads converged in Atlanta along one of the highest ridge-lines in the southern states. Fabled Peachtree Street straddled this long north-south elevation and jutted northward from the main business district at its intersection with Marietta/Decatur Streets (Marietta west of the Peachtree intersection, Decatur to the east). The various railroad tracks ran parallel to these two main streets. Atlanta may have metaphorically represented the chasm between an obsolete past and an unpredictable profit-driven future, but it was literally, at 1, 085 feet above sea-level, "the highest point or

[14] Greenberg, *Honor*, xiii, argued that "since Southern gentlemen defined a slave as a person without honor, all issues of honor relate to slavery."

dividing ridge between the Gulf on the West and the Atlantic Ocean on the east."[15] Geographically, and otherwise, Atlanta was perched on the edge: it was a site of change in nearly all walks of Southern life. The city symbolized the paradigm shift in southern demographics and commerce from the seaside cities of Charleston, Savannah, Mobile, and New Orleans to growing towns situated along the piedmont, north of the fall line.[16] Piedmont cities emerged as distribution points for converging railroads. Springing up around these new centers of commerce were railroad repair shops, boarding houses, hotels, banks, insurance brokers, brothels, and a variety of retail and wholesale stores. Historian Edward Ayers described as natural the mutual attraction between railroad depots and the accoutrement of modern urbanization where commodities could be gathered in central locations, then sold, stored, or shipped.[17] Atlanta, in particular, took care to rebuild its public market just after the war while encouraging industry and constructing state facilities for use by merchants and entrepreneurs of all types.[18] According to urban historian Don H. Doyle, "Atlanta embodied the raw young power of the New South and was, to all appearances, unimpeded by the dead hand of the past."[19] Despite Atlanta's position as the "nerve center" of the New South, old forms of behavior and rigid antebellum mentalities haunted the structures of the new ways of life, injecting old forms of honor and hierarchy into the explosive cultural mix formed at the meeting point of these converging railroads. The Raouls allow us to pick apart this palimpsest, seeing layers of "old honor" set under the new ones.

Arthur Inman, grandson of cotton magnate Samuel M. Inman ("Atlanta's First Citizen") and life-long diarist could "remember the War being mentioned rarely. There was a spirit of

---

[15] *City Directories of the United States,* Atlanta, 1893, reel 6, p. 83.
[16] James M. Russell, *Atlanta, 1817-1890: City Building in the Old South and the New* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988), 261. Howard N. Rabinowitz, "Continuity and Change: Southern Urban Development, 1860-1900," in Blaine A. Brownell and David R. Goldfields, eds., *The City in Southern History: The Growth of Urban Civilization in the South* (Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1977), 92-122.
[17] Ayers, *Promise*, 56.
[18] Rabinowitz, 97.
[19] Doyle, 16.

progress, of opportunism, of confidence in the air. Fortunes were being amassed."[20] Civic resolution for national reconciliation emerged as early as June 1865 when Atlanta's mayor, James Calhoun, led a group of local merchants in a collective condemnation of President Lincoln's assassination while calling for "speedy restoration of all political and national relations," including commercial ties, with the North.[21] Chronicler of Atlanta's history, Franklin Garrett, wrote how the decade of the 1870s "witnessed the almost complete disappearance of the scars of war within the city proper."[22] Spokesmen for the emerging New South stressed regional progress while proposing a new interpretation of the antebellum South. According to Don Doyle, these New South spokesmen, with Henry Grady in their vanguard, believed "the ideas and men who led the South to secession were honorable but mistaken. The War, from their prospective, had the unintended benefit of purging the South of slavery and destroying enormous obstacles to economic and social progress."[23] Old verities found their currency deflated in the rapidly urbanizing Atlanta environment.

The absence of antebellum influence upon the businessmen of Atlanta drew contemporary comments about the discontinuity between the emerging urbanization, with its quickening pace of life and pursuit of money, with the institutionalized leisure and emphasis upon the local associated with the white elite of the planter period of Southern history. Historian Clifford Kuhn describes turn-of-the-century Atlanta as epitomizing "the tensions between traditional ways and modern times, at the cusp of change in the New South, as well as resistance

---

[20] Arthur Inman, *The Inman Diary: A Public and Private Confession,* Vol. 1, ed. by Daniel Aaron (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985), 34.
[21] George J. Lankevich, ed., *Atlanta: A Chronological and Documentary History* (Dobbs Ferry, New York: Oceana Publications, 1978), 17.
[22] Garrett, *Environs*, 1.
[23] Doyle, 19.

to that change."[24] Economic historian Harold D. Woodman pointed out the transference of Southern capital from slave labor to urban investment, thus hastening rural seepage into the cities.[25] Woodman argued that the ideologies of the Old South and the New were antagonistic, and the later "might best be seen as an evolving bourgeois society in which a capitalistic social structure was arising on the ruins of premodern slave society." This decisive historical rupture heralded "the process of social change, of modernization that the rest of the nation had gone through a half century or more earlier."[26] It was in the cities—the laboratories of modern times—that new conventions were born and where assaults upon traditional ways practiced either purposefully or inadvertently.

In her family history, Mary Raoul Millis referred to a group of "shrewd traders from East Tennessee [who] were coming to Atlanta to find their fortunes."[27] She was referring to, among others, the Inman family that migrated to Atlanta after the Civil War to establish themselves as the city's elite in business, philanthropy, and the railroad industry.[28] The Raoul's would become neighbors of the Inmans on Peachtree Street at the northern edge of the Atlanta city limits and move in their rarified social circle. Bill Arp, lawyer and newspaper writer, characterized this influx of outsiders with the comment, "a new and harder stock has come to the front . . . They now constitute the solid men of the State, and have contributed largely to the building up of our schools and churches, our factories and railroads, and the development of our mineral resources.

---

[24] Clifford M. Kuhn, *Contesting the New South Order: The 1914-1915 Strike at Atlanta's Fulton Mills* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 33.
[25] Harold D. Woodman, *King Cotton and His Retainers: Financing and Marketing the Cotton Crop of the South, 1800-1925* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1968), 324.
[26] Woodman, "Sequel to Slavery: The New History Views the Post-bellum South," *Journal of Southern History* 43 (November 1977), 554. Don Doyle's comments on Woodman's argument imply a link between urbanization and modernity: "But few have followed Woodman's sensible cue by turning to the towns and cities of the South, which are, by definition, the wellsprings of any bourgeois society," *New Men*, xiii.
[27] Millis, *Family*, 108.
[28] See Tammy Harden Galloway, *The Inman Family: An Atlanta Family from Reconstruction to World War I* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 2002), for a brief survey of the Inman family.

They are shrewd and practical and not afraid of work . . . these are but types of the modern, self-made Southerner."[29] The Raouls, then, left New York, the epitome of the modern city, for Atlanta, not as carpet-baggers but as Southerners who recognized Atlanta as modern.

In the few years just before and after the Raouls arrival in Atlanta in 1892, the city rapidly transformed itself from a rambling railroad town to a modern urban center. Its population of nearly 3,000 in 1850 had so increased by the end of that decade that the first city directory was published in 1859.[30] By 1890, according to the *Atlanta Constitution*, the surrounding counties emptied their out-of-work artisans and sharecroppers into Atlanta's urban stew where "wave upon wave, and surge upon surge" poured in until the population passed 65,000, and seemingly expanded the circumference of Georgia's capital city "day by day."[31] As Atlanta entered the nineteenth-century's final decade its population began to surpass the older southern cities of Charleston and Savannah. In 1890, Atlanta trailed only New Orleans, Richmond, and Nashville in size.[32] With the arrival of the Raouls, the city's population grew by ten.

Atlanta's burgeoning population was dominated by the emergence of a new business class, apparently unique in the South and in contrast to the region's older coastal cities, a class

---

[29] Bill Arp, *From the Unicivil War to Date, 1861-1903* (Atlanta, Georgia: The Hudgins Publishing Company, 1903), 56. Bill Arp was the pseudonym used by Charley Henry Smith (1826-1903), a lawyer who lived in Rome, Georgia, and served in the Confederate army. A satiric letter to the Rome newspaper began an enterprise which continued until his death. Arp's pieces poked fun at contemporary political figures and issues. He served in the Georgia Senate and was elected mayor of Rome in 1867. He spent his final decades as a farmer.

[30] Russell, *Atlanta,* 331. Grigsby Hart Wotton, Jr., *New City of the South: Atlanta, 1843-1873* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, dissertation, 1974), 30. Atlanta's population in 1860 was 9,555, in 1870, 21,788 and 104,421 in 1893 by the time the Raouls arrived. From *Atlanta City Directory,* 1893. By comparison, in 1900 New York City's population was 3,437,202, Chicago's 1,698,575, Birmingham's 38,415, and Nashville's 80,865. *Atlanta City Directory,* 1911.

[31] Garrett, *Environs*, 220 quoting from the local newspaper; Gary M. Pomerantz, *Where Peachtree Meets Sweet Auburn: The Saga of Two Families and the Making of Atlanta* (New York: Scribner, 1996), 60, describes how "the plowman, and the freedman, the broken former master and his rootless former slave . . . poured into Atlanta, nearly quadrupling its population . . . between 1880 and 1910."

[32] Russell, *Atlanta*, 233. Ayers, *Promise*, may well have had Atlanta in mind when he argued "the South's town and cities existed largely as trading centers, their fates dependent on the fortunes of their hinterlands and their connections with railroads," 55. According to Garrett, *Environs,* 387, Atlanta's population by 1900 was 60 percent white and 40 percent black.

comprised of men devoid of antebellum influence and infused with sharp trading practices both admired and criticized.[33] H. L. Mencken, in his jocular fashion, distinguished the "philistinism of the new type of town-boomer" as "indifferent to the ideals of the Old South." In Mencken's view, the practices and ethos of this emerging class were "positively antagonistic" to the leisure and hierarchy of planter society.[34] The New South's foremost historian, C. Vann Woodward, described the region's "little islands of industrialization" ruled by "a new middle-class society" that was "essentially new . . . in spirit as well as in outer aspect" from the "old planter class." This new social configuration represented a stratum more resembling similar classes in the North and West than the older southern cities drenched in antebellum tradition.[35] Arthur Inman, scion of Atlanta's first family of industrial wealth and philanthropic power, described post-war Atlanta as a "wreck" rapidly rebuilt and made prosperous by a "close-knit group of veterans," meaning, of course, his own east Tennessee ancestors who converged on Atlanta after the war in search of their fortunes.[36] Inman, a neurotic recluse far removed from the rough-and-tumble entrepreneurial life enjoyed by his illustrious relatives, reflected on the Atlanta of his childhood as an adult in Boston and grudgingly granted the Atlanta elite the praise of "governing well and economically, often with conscientiousness which a Boston politician would, probably could not, understand."[37] Inman admired Atlanta's leadership class because of their single-mindedness toward creating a prosperous city from Civil War ruin—which spoke to the city's new motto: *Resurgens*.

---

[33] Doyle, *New Men*, xiv, agues "that a business class took form in the cities of the New South as its leaders created a set of formal organizations, and helped them form a common view of the goals they wanted to pursue for their cities, their region, and themselves."
[34] Huntington Cairns, ed., *H. L. Mencken: The American Scene, A Reader* (New York: Vintage Books, 1982), 168.
[35] Woodward, *Origins,* 150-51.
[36] *Inman Diary*, 37.
[37] *ibid.*, 34.

Greene Raoul, President of the Mexican National Railroad, quickly joined Atlanta's rising business class after moving into his home at Peachtree and Sixth Streets. The Atlanta business scene was distinguished by its apparent alienation from antebellum values. Evidence indicates new men like Greene Raoul made the New South. Historian Paul Gaston argues these men believed that if the New South was to succeed, then the values of the Old South had to be "drastically altered."[38] Gaston quotes a *Richmond Whig* editorial encouraging men of the post-war South to jettison "all men wedded to old systems, dogmas and prejudices, and take up progressive men, with enlarged and liberal views who draw their inspiration from the present and the future, and not the past."[39] New South spokesman Daniel Harvey Hill pleaded for "business men with brain and hand for work, not the recluses of the library or convent."[40] Henry Grady rejoiced in the emergence of a "great middle class . . . neither drunk with wealth nor embittered by poverty, [that] shall lift up the suffering and control the strong."[41] This rising business class represented an emerging Southern bourgeoisie characterized by the *Macon Telegraph* as "an alien people."[42] According to Atlanta diarist Arthur Inman, the city's "leaders were not the traditional Southerners of leisure."[43] The sudden rise of Atlanta's new leadership class, according to commentator Bill Arp, foreshadowed a future decline as "boys won't work whose fathers are rich." Arp's observation inadvertently points to our Raoul who, like some of his peers, became "proud and vain and no account, and won't work, and finally go down the hill their father climbed."[44] Raoul's older sister, Mary Raoul Millis, was nostalgic for a South before the flux of change shifted the ground from beneath her, when "in our arrogant young eyes there was only

---

[38] Paul M. Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Myth-making* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), 107.
[39] Gaston, *Creed*, 32.
[40] *ibid.*, 30.
[41] Grady, *Life and Labors*, 240.
[42] Quoted in Russell, *Atlanta*,, 178.
[43] Inman, *Diary,* 33.
[44] Arp, *Uncivil*, 163-64.

one class—the gentle-mannered ladies and gentlemen who had so recently possessed all the wealth of the southern states."[45] This observation is especially illuminating as it recalls not the aura of the antebellum South, but the New South amidst the improvisation attendant to urbanization.

Atlanta's history is distinct from other southern cities in its dearth of antebellum values. Again, Mary Raoul Millis wedges herself between the Old South and the New with her nostalgia for "the old system of neighbors caring for one another in time of distress was rapidly vanishing." Manners underwent revolutions. "It was becoming smart to be 'snappy,' one must be erect, alert, even brusque." For Mary, "it seemed a rash pace, and not altogether agreeable."[46] The source of Mary's complaint, the frenzied pace of life, was due, in part, not only to the absence of Old South traditions, but to the anxiety attendant to a society under stress across the social gamut as the New South embraced industrialization and its first fledgling steps toward economic autonomy and away from its traditional colonial economy.

Mary Raoul Millis recognized then what scholars today have since confirmed: Atlanta was unlike other southern cities. Edward King said of the city in 1875, "there is little that is distinctively southern in Atlanta; it is the antithesis of Savannah."[47] Harold Woodman quotes New South partisan A. K. McClure's description of the New South's new bred of men born in opposition of the discredited planter progeny: "the young men are not the dawdling, pale-faced, soft-handed effeminates which were so visible in the nurslings of the slave." Instead, they were "missionaries in the new civilization of the South."[48] These men of the New South obviously

---

[45] Millis, "Autobiography," (Appendix: "Reminiscence"), 4.
[46] *ibid.,* 5.
[47] James M. Russell, *Atlanta, Gate City of the South*, *1847-1885* (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1972), 179-80.
[48] Woodman, *King Cotton*, 328-29. Russell, *Gate City*, 53-54, attributes Atlanta's uniqueness in part to "the absence of the 'Cavalier stock' in northwest Georgia" as well as "the absence of Negro slaves in large numbers in the city's antebellum population."

possessed a different sort of masculinity from that of the antebellum period. Paul Gaston quotes William Wallace of South Carolina who explained the dichotomy between the old and the new: "there is the assurance that we are in no danger of becoming a dawdling or effeminate people." They were not "necessarily intellectual or cultivated in a bookish sense but sensible and shrewd and self-reliant."[49] The recurrence of deprecating adjectives "dawdling" and effeminate" illustrated both the allure and repulsion of Atlanta's masculine ethos. Masculinity became associated with hands-on work and practical results as illustrated in the poem of Margaret J. Preston who wrote in her "Gospel of Labor" that the effete ways of the past should be forgotten and instead honor should be bestowed upon the working man and that all should cherish "the clink of the artisan's hammer." This image complicates an already shifting scene as it celebrates pre-industrial work and brings to mind the trepidation of the arts and crafts movement sweeping both Europe and the South at the same moment that emphasized labor with dignity, artistry, and individuality.[50]

The final factor that made Atlanta conspicuous among its sister cities in the southeast was its perceived sharp trade practices and elevation of business success and the acquisition of wealth to the status of a secular religion. The controversy attendant to the issue was illustrated by Woodrow Wilson, the future president, who resided in Atlanta in the early 1880s. In an enthusiastic letter justifying his reasons for moving to Georgia's capital, Wilson wrote, "there appear to be no limits to the possibilities of her development and I think that to grow up with a new section is no small advantage to one who seeks to gain position and influence."[51] Two years

---

[49] Gaston, *Creed*, 110.
[50] The ambivalence toward industrialization is the subject of William Morris' contemporary novel, *News From Nowhere*, ed., by Stephen Arata (Toronto: Broadview Literary Texts, 2003). See also, T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981).
[51] Quoted in Garrett, *Environs*, 46-47.

later, after leaving Atlanta, Wilson wrote of the city: "here the chief end of man is certainly to make money, and money cannot be made except by the most vulgar methods. The studious man is pronounced impractical and is suspected as a visionary."[52] Masculine types abounded in Atlanta.

Wilson's primary point about the rapacious character of Atlanta's businessmen is well taken as Bill Arp wrote before the turn of the century that "the lines of social standing are broken down, and one man is as good as another, if he succeeds. Success is everything now, especially in making money."[53] Clark Howell, editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, argued in 1900 that "virtue is no longer its own reward, unless it has money in its pocket and an account in the bank. To be truly good is to be successful in trade and business."[54] One Atlanta historian argues the city's aggressive trade practices derived from its merchants' desire "to secure their fair share" of the trade passing through the South's gate-way city to the older communities like Augusta, Macon, Savannah, and Charleston. Those communities benefited from their sponsorship of railroads through lower transport rates, even while Atlanta suffered exorbitantly high rates due to its later origin as a site of railroad convergence.[55] Atlanta's *Daily Intelligencer* reported as early as 1867, "goods are sold here . . . at a smaller profit than in any city in Georgia."[56] These circumstances produced in Atlanta's traders "a bustle not characteristic of other Southern cities."[57] Atlanta's commercial elite, its "wealthy capitalists, and prince merchants, and lordly

---

[52] Garrett, *Environs*, 49. Lankevich, writes that Atlanta's post-war streets were "alive from morning till night . . . with a never-ending throng of pushing and crowding and scrambling and eager and excited and enterprising men, all bent on building and trading and swift fortune-making," 96.
[53] Arp, *Uncivil*, 163.
[54] Thomas M. Deaton, *Atlanta During the Progressive Era* "dissertation" (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1969), 47. For the proliferation of success manuals during this time, see Judy Hilkey, *Character is Capital: Success Manuals and Manhood in Gilded Age America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997).
[55] Russell, *Gate City,* 57.
[56] Wotton, *New City*, 201-02.
[57] Russell, *Gate City*, 52-53. Russell argues, "contemporaries in the dying Southern seaports and plantation belt towns of the post-Civil War decades tended to find the urban-promotive energies of Atlantans both strange and

bankers," acted as "stewards of God."[58] The *Atlanta Constitution* was rhapsodic about these new men and their accomplishments drawing the contrast between the antebellum period and the present: "here is the peculiarity about Atlanta. The incomes are disproportionately large as compared to the fortunes . . . [that] have been scraped out of the post-bellum poverty and ashes."[59] What appeared as cutthroat commercial practices to critics seemed to be the epitome of a new masculine endeavor to its supporters. Henry Grady declared Atlanta's businessmen had "won fame and fortune by no accident of inheritance, but by patient, earnest heroic work."[60] Soft wealth and social position acquired via an accident of birth now took a back seat to the "man in the arena" proving his mettle each day by his commercial instincts and audacity—the very sort of man absent in the antebellum South. In this way, honor among gentlemen became wedged between new forms of commercial predation and traditional civility and its sense of fair-play and reciprocity.

Atlantans' devotion to business, with the accompanying pioneer virtues of doing whatever was necessary for survival and success, drew its critics. Mark Twain, on a trip to the southeast, wrote of the prevailing ethos: "Brisk men, energetic of movement and speech: the dollar their god, how to get it their religion."[61] Edward Ayers quotes a University of Virginia newspaper that lamented "mercenary motives" associated with Northern values, "growing up in the breasts of our fellow Southerners, the sordid, cold blooded, commercial money idea that has always been the marked characteristic of other sections of the country."[62] Recalling Max

---

repulsive. The fast pace of life in Atlanta, the sharp practices of her merchants, and constant calls for progress offended those who lived in cities without a future," 330.

[58] Gaston, *Creed*, 112. Gaston quotes from John C. Calhoun Newton, *The New South and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South* (Baltimore, 1887).

[59] Garrett, *Environs*, 180.

[60] Russell, *Gate City*, 58; Pomerantz, *Peachtree*, writes that the leadership of Atlanta's next business generation, Ivan E. Allen, called this ethos "enlightened self-interest," 88.

[61] Quoted in Woodward, *Origins,* 153.

[62] Ayers, *Promise*, 26.

Weber's point about the link between Calvinists' piety and prosperity, historian Jackson Lears asserts "the disciplined pursuit of individual self-interest was a moral imperative: prosperity was dependent on virtue."[63] Robert L. Dadney, a religious leader in the New South, warned Atlanta's merchants of their greed by declaring those who "make selfish, material good its god . . . [are] doomed."[64] An abiding unease with Atlanta's commercial ambience is nicely summed up by one of its most perceptive historians, James Russell, who argues how "many Southerners appeared to find in Atlanta's growth far too many violations of the South's cultural taboos, and they implied that urban success was perhaps not worth the price."[65] Urbanization created in Atlanta a site of Yankee-like modernity where previously alien values were now accepted and where smart trading practices entailed a complement of mendacity accepted as a price of doing business.

As if to prepare a suitable stage for a lavish production of "modernity" in a southern milieu, Atlanta's urbanization in the 1890s was both self-conscious and deliberate.[66] The city joined its territorial expansion with improvements to its infrastructure, attempts at industrialization, creation of modern institutions like hospitals, universities, and urban recreation, all amidst incessant self-promotion. This was the proverbial sea from which Greene Raoul expected his sons to acquire their business education.

Atlanta's business center lay at the intersection of Peachtree, Decatur, and Marietta Streets near the convergence of the various railroads: from this point the city expanded east, west, and north to accommodate bourgeois cravings for the accoutrements of suburban life, that is, to live at a distance from inner-city blacks, along with the grime, grease, dust, and dirt of an

---

[63] Lears, *Grace*, 20.
[64] Gaston, *Creed*, 157.
[65] Russell, *Gate City,* 2.
[66] Lynn Dumenil, *Modern Temper: American Culture and Society in the 1920s* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1995), 4, argues for modernity's criteria being a "triad of rapid industrialization, sprawling urbanization, and massive immigration."

downtown area dominated (and menaced) by the constant movement of railroad cars.[67] In 1893, Atlanta annexed the city of West End, the first upper-class suburb to join the emerging metropolis.[68] A decade later, Atlanta expanded eastward to the planned suburbs of Inman Park and Druid Hills. Northward, by 1890, from Ellis Street to the city limits at Sixth Street (where the Raouls resided), was a combination of suburban planning and country improvisation. In the northeast, the construction of Olmsted's Piedmont Park in 1910 represented Atlanta's version of New York's more famous green space.[69] To the west and northwest, the Chattahoochee River's feeble impediment to expansion was overcome by bridges spanning its waters at Paces and Powers Ferry in 1903 and Johnson's Ferry in 1906.[70]

Ten years earlier, in 1893, the source of Atlanta's water supply shifted from the South River to the Chattahoochee, the later being robust along its course just northwest of the city while the waters of the former were little more than a stream until they picked up momentum many miles away in their journey to the Atlantic.[71] The sewerage system installed in 1890 left the majority of Atlantans reliant upon privies.[72] Mary Raoul Millis wrote of her family's life in the early 1880s when "one of my Father's extravagances in the little Macon house was the bathroom. At that time, running water in the house, in our Southern cities, was the most modern

---

[67] Blaine A. Brownell, "Urban South," from Brownell and David R. Goldfield, eds., *The City in Southern History: The Growth of Urban Civilization in the South* (Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1977), 136, argues "residential areas became increasingly identifiable according to race and socioeconomic rank. Blacks were found more and more toward the inner city, while white working-class groups moved further out."
[68] Wotton, *New City*, 195. According to Garrett, *Environs*, 283, the well-to-do citizens of West End petitioned to become part of Atlanta after many of its residents lost their residences to a fire. Atlanta had by this time a fire department supplied by city water.
[69] Garrett, *Environs,* 217. Tera W. Hunter, *To 'Joy My Freedom: Southern Black Women's Lives and Labors After the Civil War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 101.
[70] Garrett, *Environs*, 267.
[71] *ibid.,* 6.
[72] *ibid.*, 210.

of luxuries."[73] In contrast, the sanitary conditions in Atlanta in the late 1870s, before the building boom began, were described by a local physician as "handled with criminal carelessness."[74]

The *Atlanta Constitution's* boast of 1892 that "Atlantans who are able to enjoy the luxury of a horse and buggy believe in buying the best that can be had," would seem quaint indeed shortly thereafter as the city's infrastructure became rapidly accommodating to a more enjoyable and mobile urban life.[75] Civic improvements included the reshaping of the dangerous downtown intersection of railroads and city streets, the advent of street-cars, and the paving of streets and sidewalk. Historian James Russell quotes a traveler to Atlanta in 1865 who, infuriated by the interference of trains disrupting downtown commerce and pedestrian traffic, commented how it was "strange that the people of Atlanta could bear such an obstruction in the heart of the town."[76] Russell records how "harried Atlanta merchants, needing to cross the railroads, either stood and fumed for half an hour or risked their lives by crawling between the cars."[77] Atlanta's mayor George Hillyer concurred. In an 1885 speech, he lamented the grade crossings in the heart of the city as "a source of annoyance and danger to our citizens, both from a humanitarian and commercial point of view."[78] The mayor commended Greene Raoul, President of the Central of Georgia Railroad, for his cooperation in restructuring tracks in the downtown congestion so that each railroad company would have a track exclusively its own, thus eliminating the incessant switching of cars from one track to another.[79] Atlanta's street-car era began in 1889.[80] By the

---

[73] Millis, *Family*, 35.
[74] Russell, *Gate City*, 286, writes that "refuse, offal, and fecal matter were dumped right out in the public street until 1878. Sanitary conditions were especially bad along the streets served by the street railroads, since the corpses of dogs and chickens run over by the street cars often lay rotting for weeks on end."
[75] Garrett, *Environs,* 269. Garrett dates the death of the "horse-car era" to 9 September 1894 when the *Atlanta Constitution* ran a story headlined, 'The Last of its Kind,'" 295.
[76] Russell, *Gate City,* 194.
[77] *ibid.*, 47. Russell reports that "after the War, several men, women, and children were killed at these death traps," thus demonstrating the mixed blessing of the iron horse.
[78] Garrett, *Environs*, 88.
[79] *ibid.*

early 1890s, Atlanta had one hundred miles of street railway, the most for its size in the United States.[81] By the mid-1880s, Atlanta had nearly thirteen miles of paved roads and fifty-six miles of sidewalks laid for "dust-and-mud-free walking space for pedestrians."[82]

Atlanta complemented its role as a transportation hub by taking advantage of the burgeoning cotton mill industry. In the early 1889s, Jacob Elsas organized the Fulton Cotton and Bag Company while Hugh and Walter Inman put together the Exposition Cotton Mills in the buildings where the International Cotton Exposition had been held in 1881.[83] Both mills had expanded in space and production by 1897, and the new Whittier Mills opened on the Chattahoochee River a short distance west of Atlanta.[84] William Raoul would soon begin his own cotton-mill career at the Exposition Cotton Mills in his frustrating quest to achieve financial independence and the status of "captain of industry" at a time when the individual was increasingly submerged within larger corporate structures.

Further civic improvements came in 1892 in medicine, politics, and education. Grady Memorial Hospital opened in downtown Atlanta, named for Henry Grady who had died in 1889. The state capitol building was completed in 1890, and the Georgia Institute of Technology was founded in 1888 and its first class of 1892 was attended by Gaston and Tom Raoul. Emory University opened in 1915 and graduated its first female law student, Eleonore Raoul.[85] The

---

[80] Garrett, *Environs*, 254, and on 189 appears an interesting quote from the *Atlanta Constitution*: "Take a Ride on the New Electric Motorline: It slides along just like the rails were greased." Someone remarked on the transformation at hand: "First de nigger was free; now de mules am free."
[81] Lankevich, *Atlanta*, 34.
[82] Garrett, *Environs,* 87.
[83] Russell, *Gate City,* 243.
[84] Garrett, *Environs,* 339.
[85] Raoul Family Papers, box 47, folder 13, newspaper clipping. Millis, *Family*, 111. Raoul Family Papers, box 22, folder 17, Gaston Raoul recalled, "Father was in Mexico, Mother on Staten Island . . . Just then we [brother Tom] learned that the Georgia Tech was holding examinations for what I think was its second year. So, without benefit of parental authority, we put in our applications." Garrett, *Environs*, 290, lists Tom Raoul as Georgia Tech's starting fullback on its first football team, while his brother Gaston had to withdraw due to poor eyesight and "he was sent to Kentucky to take a place as rod-man in a surveying camp on a railroad which was being constructed under our uncle George," Raoul, 199.

establishment of Georgia Tech is especially instructive in the Atlanta ethos of success and desire for economic equality with the North. Henry Grady brought together Atlanta's business class to make a pitch for donations to build a school of technology. When one of the audience asked what such an institution was for, Jacob Elsas, the owner of the Fulton Bag and Cotton Mill, replied, it is "a school to train our boys in electrical and mechanical engineering . . . We are selling our old raw materials at $5 a ton to states that have trained engineers who fabricate it and sell it back to us at $75 and $100 a ton." Elsas remarked that he had intended to send his son to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.[86] The establishment of Georgia Tech made possible a new sort of southern man.

Georgia Tech's football team promised both education and a novel sort of urban spectacle. Mary Raoul Millis remembered that "football was new in the South, even as a technical school was new—but the South was growing."[87] Franklin Garrett wrote that "no sporting event in Georgia attracts more attention, is more colorful or is productive of more rivalry and feeling than the annual football classic between Georgia Tech and the University of Georgia. The series got underway in November 1893. In 1893-94, William Raoul began leasing athletic parks for these games. His poor business acumen was conspicuous at this early date as he let the two schools "get away with a flat price, instead of a fifty-fifty percentage basis, which would have made me." For a game against Auburn University, Raoul turned to promotional techniques to "ballyhoo" the game "by making it a fashionable social affair. [He] hired a coach

[86] Garrett, *Environs,* 170.
[87] Millis, *Family*, 127.

and four, and gave a much advertised 'coaching party' to the game. [He] drove, and a large delegation of the belles of Atlanta sat upon the top, but it was no go [financially]."[88]

Raoul's promotional efforts for football games were matched by Atlanta's business elites' quest for recognition. They organized the Cotton States and International Exposition of 1895 that brought thousands of visitors to the city to witness the New South's technological growth. The Exposition's buildings were designed by Greene Raoul's friend and architect, Bradford L. Gilbert, of New York, who had helped design the Raoul mansion at Peachtree and Sixth Street.[89] Atlanta boasted the South's first skyscrapers, the Equitable Building (where Raoul would hang his accounting sign while mastering Marx in 1908) and the English American Building of 1892.[90] Preeminent in Atlanta's promotional program was the Piedmont Driving Club which opened in 1887. Its "Superintendent," Eugene U. Harris, was described by Garrett as "an old-time ante-bellum aristocrat whose fortune had been swept away by the war, but who preserved in his person all the fascinating charm and characteristics of the old ante-bellum gentlemen." This description, both quaint and condescending, illustrated New South attitudes toward the Old. The earliest extant membership of the Club reads like a list of the Raoul's friends, neighbors, and business associates: Frank E. Block, A. W. Calhoun, Henry Grady, the Inmans, Sam, Walter, and Hugh, A. J. Orme, Hoke Smith, and Jack Spalding.[91]

---

[88] Raoul, 41. Garrett, *Environs*, 268, records this scene: "An hour before the first football whistle sounded in Atlanta, a long line of gaily decorated and fashionable carriages began rolling toward Piedmont Park and many girls were seen wearing ribbons on their bonnets to match those of their sweethearts' sleeves."
[89] Garrett, *Environs*, 310, 321.
[90] Lankevich, *Atlanta*, 34; Ayers, *Promise*, 75.
[91] Garrett, *Environs*, 143-157. From the *Atlanta City Directories* of 1892-94 are: Frank Block, candy and cracker manufacturer and wholesale grocer who resided on Peachtree Street, a few block south of the Raouls. His daughter Isabel moved in the same circles as Raoul. Andrew Calhoun presided over two of Raoul's marriages, first to Ruth Cunningham in 1899 and next to Winifred Wadley in 1915. Henry Grady had died two years before the Raouls arrived in Atlanta, yet his son Henry Grady, Jr., was a favorite friend of Raouls. The Inmans were neighbors and occasional employers of Greene Raoul's sons. Aquilla Orme was a prominent attorney and family friend. I have not found Hoke Smith, future Georgia governor, mentioned as a family intimate, though Jack Spalding of Atlanta's preeminent law firm, was related to Will Spalding of the Southern Iron Car Line where Raoul worked in the late 1880s and early 1890s.

Atlanta's urbanization and quest for modernity went beyond civic improvements, territorial expansion, and the construction of sewers, streets, hospitals, and colleges. I argue that there is a distinction between mere progress on the one hand, and modernity on the other. The ideal of progress indicates, as in Atlanta's case at the turn of the century, a city self-consciously catching-up with institutions and innovations no longer novel elsewhere however new they might be locally. Modernity implies discontinuity with regard to technology and behavior and Atlanta, instead of merely catching up with future, was being met head-on and confronted by changing conventions.

Modernity is marked by a pervasive sense of change within individuals and institutions as technology outraces sustaining ideologies, and by emerging uncertainties about earlier verities. Historians use the modernity as a concept to stress distinctions across historical divides. The example of the American Civil War is clear as its snaps the bone of United States history, allowing scholarly access to marrow on both ends of the break, past and future. Less obvious is the transformation of language as men and women's conversation (and their memories of speaking) shifted from ritualized discourse to "terrible honesty."[92]

Modernity is characterized in opposition to its historical predecessor, Victorianism.[93] Jackson Lears makes the telling observation that while "premodern people simply passed the time, modern Americans saved it, spent, wasted it," thus infusing life's course with fiduciary decisions.[94] Lears' metaphor makes plain money's centrality along with a quickening pace of life. Peter Gay, historian of bourgeois Europe, characterizes modernity as acting upon Victorian

---

[92] Ann Douglas, *Terrible Honesty: Mongrel Manhattan in the 1920s* (New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 1995), 175. In Christine Stansell's *American Moderns: Bohemian New York and the Creation of a New Century* (New York: An Owl Book, 2000), the author asserts, "the mingling of men and women inn conversation came to seem the very essence, the condition of modernity," 89.
[93] For Stansell, *American Moderns*, Victorianism is marked by "its stodgy bourgeois art, its sexual prudery and smothering patriarchal families, its crass moneymaking and deadly class exploitation," 1.
[94] Lears, *Grace*, 11.

society "as inventions speeded travel and the mails, identified diseases and modernized production, the shock of the new became the signature of the age . . . Maps to conduct, policy—and taste—like guides to good manners or efficient household management threatened to become obsolete before revised editions had been drawn up."[95] The historiography indicates modernity as embedded within Victorian ethos—as it emerges, its acts centrifugally upon aging institutions creating fragmentation, pluralism, sprawling urbanization, industrialization, demographic mobility and integration, sexual exploration, and the self-conscious self—in short, a "democratic culture" undermining earlier "patterns of deference," restraint, isolation, and entrenched behaviors.[96]

The rise of cities and the gathering of more and more people there invited urban scholarship to investigate the American *flaneur* seeking the "optics of pleasure"[97]on the one hand, and on the other disturbing metropolitan coalescences of populists, trade unionists, Free Lovers, socialists, spiritualists, and other "class-oriented social movements."[98] Urban spectacle and access to it constituted "a defining quality of 'modernity'" according to historian Vanessa Schwartz in her study of Paris at the end of the nineteenth century.[99] Schwartz argues it is in the cities where modernity and mass culture go hand-in-hand, distinguished, at least in part, both by mass production and ubiquitous consumption.[100] It is in the cities where historians discover the calm headwaters of a formerly entrepreneurial society embodied by a "producer culture," now

---

[95] Peter Gay, *Pleasure Wars* Vol. V, *The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1998), 8.
[96] Jesse F. Battan, "The World Made Flesh: Language, Authority, and Sexual Desire in Late Nineteenth-Century America," in *Major Problems in the History of American Sexuality*, Kathy Peiss, ed., (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2002): 252-263.
[97] Stansell, *American Moderns*, 16-17. She notes how urbanization created "a new geography of culture [with] . . .a fixed relation of periphery to center," 54. The original idea was worked out by Walter Benjamin, *The Arcades Project*, translated by Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999).
[98] Lears, *Grace*, 29.
[99] Vanessa R. Schwartz, *Spectacular Realities: Early Mass Culture in Fin-de-Siecle Paris* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), Introduction.
[100] *ibid.*, 7.

rushing recklessly toward the "consumer culture of a bureaucratic corporate state."[101] Also in the cities, and partly as a result of the economic transition from "small-scale, competitive capitalism" (which had all but disappeared by 1910) to large-scale industrialization, scholars find middle-class male identity faltering as the ideology of the autonomous self gave way to the corporate man's dependence (and subsequent loss of honor) upon forces he did not understand.[102]

Six months before his death, Henry Grady announced modernity's arrival in Atlanta as "the fixed stars are fading from the sky and we grope in uncertain light. Established ways are lost, new roads perplex, and widening fields stretch beyond the sight."[103] The *Atlanta Constitution* in 1891 boasted, "you find here in Atlanta absolutely the latest things out."[104] Mary Raoul Millis remembered how Atlanta's hostesses (including her mother) "had to learn the latest New York etiquette for setting forth the new styles in parties."[105] The Raouls built the first tennis court, remembered by Mary Raoul Millis as "a new idea brought from the athletic north."[106] A tennis court may have been mere progress in the Raoul's eyes; yet, its use on the Sabbath by the many siblings and their friends may have represented something more sinister to near-by church-goers as Raoul remembers, somewhat at odds with his sister Mary, that "it was the only court in Atlanta on which one could play on Sunday," thus implying a subtle breaking of community

---

[101] Lears, *Grace*, xiv.
[102] Bederman, *Manliness*, 12.
[103] Grady, *Life and Labors*, 221.
[104] Quoted in Garrett, *Environs*, 243. Ayers, *Promise*, 73, quotes an 1895 history text for the South with its recognition of the miracle of electricity: "our gas jets are lighted, our bells rung, our organs played, our sewing machines kept running." Russell, *Gate City*, 181, noted the prevailing attitude as "Atlanta hoped to be a model for the South of the future, not a replica of a dead civilization."
[105] Millis, *Family*, 108.
[106] *ibid.*, 111. James C. Bryant, *Capital City Club: The First One Hundred Years, 1883-1983* (Atlanta: Capital City Club, 1991), 49, describes the Raoul mansion and notes "the home, incidentally, was the first in Atlanta to have a tennis court on the grounds." Millis, *Family*, recalls how the tennis court was later plowed up, "and its place taken by a sunken garden" where her younger, and chronically ill, sister Rosine tended her flower garden.

conventions and highlighting the increasing struggle between secularism versus sabbatarianism.[107]

Mary Raoul Millis is a good guide through the murkiness attendant to the transitions manifested by encroaching modernity in the 1890s in Atlanta. She frames her memories, similarly to her brother William, along two tracks: as a prominent and wealthy matron on the one hand, and as a dedicated Socialist on the other. Writing in the early 1940s, Mary, the family historian, averred "the framework of our lives, social, economic, and cultural, has been so transformed that an account of the lives of our parents must seem to their grandchildren like tales from another existence."[108] Mary the Socialist likened the South during Reconstruction as "to those of feudal times," before the "emergence of the machine age, with its great aggregation of capital and its 'mass production.'"[109] Mary mixes her two voices when she remembered modernity—"mass life"—as the thief of "the qualities of simplicity and earnestness" which characterized life in the South before the turn of the twentieth century.[110]

Modernity, in Mary's view, was distinguished by more than mass production, but by "mass life." She wrote in her family history, "the moderate tempo to which our lives were set . . . gave an intimacy to affairs, a personality to service, an honor to individuals, which is lacking now."[111] The quickening pace of life changed "the social customs" of southerners "from year to year."[112] In Mary's memories, these manifestations of modernity took "flavor out of life, which no prosperity of materialism can replace."[113] The vocabulary of a radical ("materialism") is

---

[107] Raoul, 8.
[108] Millis, *Family*, x.
[109] Millis, "Autobiography," 1.
[110] Millis, *Family,* 57-58.
[111] *ibid.*, 58.
[112] Millis, "Autobiography," 1.
[113] Millis, *Family,* 58. Edward A. Pollard, *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates* (E.B. Treat and Company, 1866), 751, argued the defeated southerners "will lose their literature, their former habits

replaced by one of paternalism when Mary's memories note the lost traditions of "caring for the unfortunate, helping the downfallen, extending sympathetic consideration to all."[114] Bill Arp, close observer of southern life, wrote in an elegiac tone: "farewell to simplicity of manners and water without ice, and temperate habits, and contented disposition. Farewell to abundance of time to come and go and to stay, for everybody is in a hurry now—a dreadful hurry . . . to keep up with the crowd, and the times, and with society."[115] Fellow Atlanta and assiduous diarist, Arthur Inman, wrote of the transformation so obviously troubling to Mary Raoul Millis, that "it would not be far off the point to view this 'fin-de-siecle' small-city society as the mid-way effulgence following Reconstruction and leading into the Motor Age, emergence from one and induction into the other."[116]

As a conceptual tool, modernity is valuable because it reveals *emancipations* across a broad spectrum of society while it allows the historian to focus on points of *contestation* (and discontinuity), where power shifted, where languages evolved to explain and justify new circumstances, and where gender and race were observed under continual construction. Modernity's emancipatory capacities make it an attractive thematic device as we examine sexuality freed from Victorian binds, artists liberated from worn conventions, women released from stereotypical roles, and a simpler rural society transformed into an urban one of greater complexity. This combination—the liberating power historians assign to modernity and its concomitant role as a catalyst of conflict—make it an ideal tool for excavating the past.

This point is illustrated by examples of the liberating power of language to provoke and explain changes, and of how meanings of modernity were contested. The Victorian American

---

of thought, their intellectual self-assertion, while they are too intent upon recovering the mere material prosperity, ravaged and impaired by the war."

[114] Millis, "Autobiography," (Appendix: Reminiscence), 4.

[115] Arp, *Uncivil*, 177.

[116] Inman, *Diary,* 35.

discourse on sex, monopolized by "experts" on the one hand and silence on the other, was replaced by another that bandied about "long-tabooed profanity" and slang designed to edge closer to reality.[117] By "reconnecting words to things," explicit language would promote honesty and equality between the sexes and serve as an eye-opening introduction to William Raoul when he finally fled the South for Greenwich Village in 1916.[118] The "modernization of eros" discussed by Jonathan Katz was not exclusive to same-sex relationships.[119]

It is as if the dearth of Victorian expressiveness became suddenly bountiful with meanings. Consider these bodies at texts. Eugene Sandow's sculpted physique subverted "the Victorian conception of the body as a moral reservoir . . . [and replaced it with] a modern conception of the body as an expression of individual desire and site of pleasure."[120] Kate Elinore's portrayals of immigrant Irish women and sexually liberated widows caused inquiries as to her authentic sex: her body sending one message, her behavior another.[121] The collective body of genteel America, endowed with heightened sensitivity, broke down under the anxieties created by modernity. Neurasthenia acted as both ailment and trop: the first helped "patients to re-explain the world to themselves" and the second mediated the transformations of a culture in flux.[122]

Meanings of modernity are contested at multiple sites. Cultural history is enriched when these locales are conceptualized as one. Gail Bederman describes a "discourse of civilization"

---

[117] Douglas, *Terrible Honesty,* 54. Jonathan Katz, *Love Stories: Sex Between Men Before Homosexuality* (The University of Chicago Press, 2001), 66-67, alludes to this silence in his discussion of sodomy and "the repeated Christian injunction not to name it."
[118] Battan, "Flesh," 261.
[119] Katz, *Love Stories*, ix.
[120] Kasson, *Houdini*, 75-76.
[121] M. Alison Kibler, *Rank Ladies: Gender and Cultural Hierarchy in American Vaudeville* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 55-77.
[122] Tom Lutz, *American Nervousness, 1903: An Anecdotal History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 23. Neurasthenia appears to have been a class-centered malady since it lost its appeal and explanatory power to the elite as it seeped into the lower classes.

that conflates issues of gender, race, and class to reveal how constructions of manliness uphold premises of racial superiority. Jackson Lears joins this discussion with a critique of "overcivilization," whereby the weightlessness of modern life creates desires for "more intense forms of physical or spiritual experience."[123] Raoul converted to Socialism for a more genuine—if modern—alternative to the masculine role he had become increasingly and uncomfortably wedged into to. Lears' anti-modernists are joined by Dumenil's moral reformers who seek to "excise the cancer" of modernity through Prohibition, immigration restriction, and calls for harsher enforcement of laws.[124] At stake is cultural authority. Prohibition may have had more to do with the imposition of cultural unity upon an increasingly pluralistic society than is usually recognized. Each of these contested sites of power reveal meaning when conceptualized within a framework of modernity.

It is within this framework of modernity that Mary Raoul Millis (and some of her siblings) conceived of her (and their collective) past(s). Looking back on the turn-of-the-century from the vantage point of the early 1940s, Mary admonished her readers not to forget "that fifty years ago there was nothing to compare with the interchange of knowledge . . . which is commonplace today." Entering the twentieth century was tantamount, according to Mary, to joining "a new world."[125] The manifestations of this "new world" met with mixed results. Mary remembered her childhood house in Macon, Georgia, during the late 1870s and early 1880s, that "possessed the truly modern and . . . revolutionary features of toilet and built-in tub." She was equally impressed at the time she escorted her friends "upstairs to show them these wonders."[126] Mary's memories of excitement over new-fangled plumbing is in contrast to her disinterest over

---

[123] Lears, *Grace,* xiii.
[124] Dumenil, *Modern,* 226.
[125] Millis, *Family,*55.
[126] Millis, "Autobiography," 16.

her family's first telephone which to her "unimaginative and literal-minded little self . . . seemed remarkably useless. Wouldn't it be easier to walk down the hall than to talk into a funny little funnel?"[127] Stationer S. P. Richards with whom we opened this chapter, shared Mary's sentiments with regard to the telephone, noting "I don't know whether it will pay or not but we must in a measure keep up with the times."[128] Again the metaphor of time moving unnaturally fast and forward separates mere progress from surprising modernity.

Atlanta's rapid modernization created "optics of pleasure" for its citizens and visitors by the 1890s.[129] Atlanta had begun to possess, like Paris before her, "something to be seen."[130] Commentator Bill Arp wrote about he and his wife's visit to Atlanta in the late 1880s. The city had been "built up wonderfully" since their last visit some years before. Peachtree Street's "show windows are just beautiful beyond description." Mrs. Arp "stopped squarely before the first jewelry store and feasted her hazel eyes in rapturous amazement."[131] The Arps, and many thousands of their peers, had unwittingly joined "mass culture" by becoming members of a "society of spectators." Raoul, adrift in Millen, Georgia in 1915, implied nostalgia for the big city's sights when he and a small group were invited by an acquaintance to come to and allow him to "show us the town. There was nothing in the town worth seeing, except the picturesque crowds of Negroes on Saturday afternoon."[132] As a center for urban spectacle, Atlanta again demonstrated its role as an agent of discontinuity in the South's history; after all, antebellum leaders had regarded cities as "great sores," where established hierarchy might come under question, where the impetus toward economic diversity blurred the focus on cotton production,

---

[127] Millis, 24.
[128] Garrett, *Environs,* 75.
[129] Stansell, *American Moderns,* 16-17. Kasson, *Houdini*, 13 calls this phenomenon a "new society of spectacle."
[130] Schwartz, *Spectacular,* 1.
[131] Arp, *Uncivil*, 363.
[132] Raoul, 275.

where the model of plantation unity was cast into doubt by citizens without interest in the South's peculiar institution.[133]

Atlanta's "optics of pleasure" included a movie theater and a panorama of the Battle of Atlanta which opened to public view in the early 1890s as a part of Grant Park, Atlanta's zoo.[134] Vanessa Schwartz speculates on similar panorama in Paris depicting the French defeat at Prussian hands in 1871 and asserts "these attractions cultivated patriotism through collective victimization."[135] Images proliferated at Atlanta's first movie house, The Star, located on Decatur Street, an avenue infamous for amusements.[136] The theater opened in 1904. A decade later Atlanta's mayor proposed to play movies on Sunday with the argument, "we are no longer living in a crossroad village, but in a modern, cosmopolitan city."[137]

Movies and panoramas presented multiple images of places out of time (battles) and character types (actors) that blurred the distinction between reality and its representations. Time and place were equally confounded by modern mean of travel.[138] Mary remembered her father's horse at the little house in Macon, Georgia, in the 1870s as analogous to "the first Ford car" for family's at the turn of the century.[139] Her brother William remembered the first cars appearing in Atlanta in the early 1900s. These "horseless carriages" made the "long and painful journey" by horse or by buggy from Atlanta to Roswell, where he worked as an overseer in a cotton mill, a quick trip of an hour.[140] The automobile age began in Atlanta in 1903 when W. D. Alexander

---

[133] Gaston, *Creed,* 56.
[134] Garrett, *Environs,* 184.
[135] Schwartz, *Spectacular*, 160.
[136] Garrett, *Environs,* 464.
[137] Kuhn, *Contesting*, 47.
[138] Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Railway Journey: The Industrialization of Time and Space in the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1977.
[139] Millis, "Autobiography," 19.
[140] Raoul, 78.

"took on the agency for Oldsmobile."[141] The common observation that modernity is marked by speed is demonstrated by the Atlanta City Council's decision in 1904 to make it "unlawful" to drive a car at "greater than a walk at the approaches to Whitehall Street viaduct."[142] Mary and William's "Aunt" Sarah, fourteen years later, identified visiting relatives as arriving "in an automobile," thereby specifying a mode of transportation which would be soon simply implied.[143]

Another mode of transportation, the express train "Nancy Hanks," the brainchild of George Dole Wadley, uncle of Mary and William Raoul, was deemed "too fast and expensive for that era." The train's great speed "caused numerous crossing accidents, in which enough cattle and hogs were killed to stock a ranch." The "Nancy Hanks" made her maiden run on 22 January 1893 and her final run on 13 August 1893 after which she was "taken off the rails."[144] The "Nancy Hanks" demonstrated modernity manifested as speed as she rocketed along the rails of the Georgia piedmont and coast plain creating in her path both wonder and ruin. Atlantans flocked to Fort McPherson, south of Atlanta, to take in the spectacle of north and south-bound "Nancy Hanks" passing each other at speeds heretofore unseen. "The Nancy run so fast, she burnt the wind and scorched the grass."[145] A week after her inaugural run, the "Nancy Hanks" smashed through Nathan Benton's mule and cart. Ironically, Benton and his daughter Molly were friends of "Aunt" Sarah who recorded that Benton "was killed by the Nancy Hanks at Mim's crossing" near Macon.[146] According to "Aunt" Sarah, Benton's "wagon was nearly over

---

[141] Garrett, *Environs,* 416.
[142] *ibid.*, 463.
[143] Wadley, *Diary,* 472.
[144] Garrett, *Environs,* 289. The "Nancy Hanks" was named for the country's fastest trotting horse, not Abraham Lincoln's mother.
[145] Garrett, *Environs*, 289.
[146] Wadley, *Diary,* 328.

when the train struck the back of it. The mule was unhurt but he [Benton] was dashed out and instantly killed."[147]

* * *

The Raouls were keen observers of the world as it changed about them and proud of their active role as agents of change. Certainly their participation in the rise of the railroad industry in the South, beginning with William Wadley and continuing through his sons and Greene Raoul, his son-in-law, marked these men as key contributors to creeping modernity across the region. William Raoul, in particular, often self-consciously sought the latest way of doing things both before and after his radical epiphany. For instance, he went to the more technologically advanced cotton mills in Massachusetts to better learn his chosen craft instead of remaining in Atlanta to train on antiquated equipment. As a socialist, Raoul sought out the company of men—from hoboes to politicians to editors—who he regarded as the most progressive.

The next chapter will track William Raoul's professional progress as he careened from one business track to another in search of a suitable place in life and a proper masculine role to accompany it.

[147] Raoul Family Papers, box 6, folder 3, letter of 29 January 1893.

CHAPTER TWO

LOST HONOR: REQUIEM FOR A BUSINESSMAN

William Raoul's professional life oscillated between two poles: seeking honor and avoiding shame. One path to honor was achieved by attaining a masculinity that mastered the public world of commerce so that he might dominate the domestic world of women and children. Raoul would remain uncomfortable in both the public and private spheres. The metaphor of trajectory does not describe Raoul's public path. Better would be the figurative chasm with Raoul unsteadily perched above the widening gulf beneath him, one foot tenuously planted on the side of honor, the other trembling on the side of shame.

Southern Iron Car Line (1893)

William Raoul's business life began in the early autumn of 1893 when he secured a position with the Southern Iron Car Line by begging.[1] It ended less than a year later when Raoul, having risen in authority, terminated the employment of a long-term and more valuable man, refused to reinstate him when ordered to do so, and quit instead of sacrificing his honor. The course of Raoul's professional life conformed to this pattern with alarming frequency. Coupled to this reoccurring situation was Raoul's chronic status as an "interloper" or "supernumerary" (Raoul's terms) within an already established business hierarchy. He invariably found himself beneath an owner or superintendent, and above various assistants with much longer tenure. More than once, Raoul secured a place within a company due to his

[1] Atlanta City Directory, 1894, list Eugene and William Spalding as general manager and superintendent, respectively, of the Southern Iron Car Line, 1125.

father's, or some other patron's influence. This often alarmed both those above and below Raoul and created chronic difficulties for him throughout his professional career.

Raoul returned from a trip to Chicago in the late summer of 1893 after visiting the Columbian Exposition and World's Fair at the behest of his father who had instructed him and his two brothers to see all the wonders offered by the Fair and to report on them upon their return to Atlanta. Raoul, having already pledged to remain in Chicago should he not be summoned by some prospective employer back to Atlanta, remained in the Windy City in a futile search for work in a city bursting with men who had earlier arrived to gain employment in the construction of the White City and other auxiliary structures associated with the Exposition. (This traumatic episode will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 5.) In desperation, Raoul returned home and, after an uncomfortable reunion with his family where the scent of failure made breakfast less appetizing, went to the Southern Iron Car Line the very next morning and implored Will Spalding: "I wanted work before I left, but now I just must have it. I will do absolutely anything, Mr. Will, at any price, or no price, but I just must have work."[2] Raoul's exaggerated supplication would render his later critique especially ironic.

The Car Line's business was to repair its rolling stock and to "collect the rent[s] upon them." Raoul was paid thirty dollars a month to post rent cards on the cars and he worked "under a crabbed old codger named Knight" who had "a proper contempt for me, both because of my aristocratic upbringing and because I was a dangerous supernumerary." His contempt was reciprocated as Knight's father had worked as a "gate watchman" for the Central of Georgia Railroad under the Raoul's grandfather, William Wadley. Raoul did not worry about the low pay since his expenses were confined to expanding his wardrobe. He remembered that "naturally the work didn't interest me. I plunged at once into the social activities of the younger

[2] Raoul, 27.

set." Raoul recalled how the Spaldings "were rather [social] climbers" and how they "took a paternalistic pleasure in listening to me talk to the socially prominent over the telephone."[3] Raoul's memory drips of condescension even after the passage of forty years.

Raoul possessed an asset denied to most workers—his name. The Spaldings enjoyed introducing him, "the son of Captain Raoul," to visiting railroad executives who all knew the illustrious pedigree. Raoul stated his opinions freely, even indiscreetly. He criticized his company's design for the Sea Board Air Lines' cars with its president present and explained how it might be improved, eliciting from one Spalding brother to the other, "this is the damnedest man I ever saw." Raoul was at ease and remembered how "railroad managers held no terror for me" since he shared a "table daily with a president and often expressed differences even with him."[4] Raoul often acted as if proximity to power was sufficient to have it attributes bestowed upon him—another patriarch under construction.

Raoul soon assumed the position of storekeeper after "a capable middle-aged man named Smith . . . was let out on some trumped up excuse" so Raoul could take his place. Another assistant, one Forrest Green, "held sway in the actual storeroom," and "furnished all the brains of that department, and a good deal for the rest of the outfit." Raoul remembered Forest had "the face of a cherub and a profound contempt" for nearly everyone else. In addition, and especially noticeable to sartorial-minded Raoul, were his "ill-fitting, ill-kept business suits and an antiquated derby hat." Apparently like clock-work, Forrest condemned the actions of others with the insult, "that fellow hasn't got sense enough to piss a hole in the snow"—an "encomium" that did not spare Raoul. Forest and Raoul finally "tied up," though the reason has been lost to memory. Raoul speculated that "doubtless my dignity or authority was in some way

---

[3] Raoul, 28-29.
[4] *ibid.,* 29.

questioned." As a result, Raoul "discharged" Forest since he believed this was the "way such situations should be handled." He followed the two most powerful masculine models of his life, his father Greene Raoul and his maternal grandfather, William Wadley, both railroad presidents. He had heard similar conversations between these two exemplars of business, both of whom had "ruled the Central Railroad with an iron hand."[5] As if by osmosis, Raoul believed proximity to authority conveyed authority.

Raoul, acting with the same certainty of his father and grandfather, fired Forest without telling either Spalding brother. Having used authority that did not belong to him, Raoul was soon confronted by Eugene Spalding who implied that Forest "at less salary was worth many men like me." Forest was promptly reinstated. Raoul, the "interloper" quit in response to this loss of face. This public rebuke of his aristocratic authority was a real diminishment of his honor and emasculation in the workplace. Raoul's reaction to this imbroglio initiated a sustained pattern of personal honor taking precedence over professional common sense in business. Raoul the radical distinguished between masculine types while admitting with paternalistic condescension that "it would have been a shame to have sacrificed a capable, really superior, working-class man like Forest, for a social gad-about like me."[6]

Into the Cotton Mills (1895)

Having lost a job but retained his honor, Raoul moved forward to his next endeavors with equanimity. Raoul's self-portrait of himself as an irresponsible dandy had more do with his radical memory criticizing his aristocratic other than with his contemporary sense of station. He

[5] Raoul, 30.
[6] *ibid.,* 31-32.

remembered how the loss of his position at the Car Line "didn't take any of the starch out of me" and that he had "never got shed of a job but what [he] had a feeling of elation. Free again!" He relished the silence that "a damned whistle" or some "stuffed up somebody" would otherwise fill with demands. Raoul sought "a good boss," while refusing to be a "subaltern" or "yes man." Since his temperament did not qualify him for subordination, he would spend his professional life "tying up with some superior who, according to my notions, didn't have sense enough to—but I refrain from borrowing Forest's unique simile." In retrospect, Raoul believed that his "head was getting too big for [his] hat." He was spoiled as the first son of a "prominent family." He had begun, "without any reason whatever . . . to have the idea that [he] had 'ability' and that [he] was going to do things."[7] Aristocracy never transformed into meritocracy in Raoul's mind. Instead, the Marxist categories of capitalist, bourgeoisie, and working class allowed him to construct an alternative masculine identity based on the later in opposition to the former. Raoul's radical vocabulary will be discussed in more detail in chapter five.

Carriage rides, flirting with society girls, and mint juleps at the Piedmont Driving Club did not qualify as a job search and, besides, "spending money was running low." Family meals may have become uncomfortable as "Father never denied his sons his house and table, but if you sat there long as an idler, his conversation ceased its entertaining quality." In response, Raoul fell into leasing fields for football games. With Georgia Tech and the University of Georgia, Raoul negotiated a "flat price, instead of a fifty-fifty percentage basis, which would have made me." Next, Auburn's team arrived in Atlanta to play Georgia. Raoul leased the field on a fifty-

---

[7] Raoul, 31-32. "Subaltern" is initially redolent of radical vocabulary, yet Raoul remembered his father reading Sir Walter Scott's novels to him and his siblings as a child. In *Ivanhoe: A Romance* (1820), The Edinburgh Edition of The Waverly Novels, Vol. VIII, ed. Graham Tulloch (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998), 65, Sir Walter Scott described the English people during the intrigue between the captive King Richard and the future king, his brother John as "prey to every species of subaltern oppression." Thus even vocabulary may fluctuate across class lines as the use of this particular term possesses different connotations depending on which masculine perspective is utilized: the oppressed or the oppressor.

fifty basis, but from a box office point of view [it] was a wash out." Raoul attempted to make the sporting event into "a fashionable social affair." He hired a "coach and four," complete with "a large delegation of the belles of Atlanta," all to no avail.[8]

About this time, in late 1894, according to Raoul's memory, he suddenly became "very much in earnest about making a living, and making a fortune." He claimed that after ruminating over his prospects, he "came to the conclusion without any assistance from my father or anyone else, that the cotton mill offered the best prospect for a future in the South." Raoul made Henry Grady's argument in retrospect: cheap southern labor, "lax laws, and adjacent raw material," combined with the movement of northern mills to the South, convinced him to "master a knowledge" of the mills. He went to the Exposition Cotton Mills and "wrangled a job out of the amused manager" who must have been surprised to interview an immaculately dressed young aristocrat for a position requiring a nose mask to prevent suffocation while working.[9] Raoul thus began to rework himself by immersion into an alien, working-class culture long before his conversion to Socialism.

Raoul's transition from social dandy to cotton mill worker had rude surprises. He "had been under the impression that no work of any kind began before seven in the morning, but discovered that here it ran from six to six." He worked in the picker room where the cotton bales were received and "fed into a hopper" and from there to a "powerful beater revolving at about eighteen hundred revolutions a minute." Raoul learned that his was the "only heavy physical labor in the mill." His complaints mounted: the machines' noise was "deafening," one had to

---

[8] Raoul, 41-42. Garrett, *Environs*, 267. "'Greatest battle known to college athletics in the South.' So read the headlines of local papers when the first intercollegiate football game in Georgia was played in Atlanta on February 20, 1892. The contestants were the University of Georgia and Auburn, and the initial match occurred in the oval at Piedmont Park. Great excitement was aroused by the event. The newspapers carried advertisements for days before, and the city in general boosted the beginning of a new sport."

[9] Raoul, 43. Wadley, *Diaries*, 338. On 21 January 1895, Aunt Sarah noted without comment that "William Raoul had gone to work at the Exposition Mills as a laborer."

shout "within a few inches of [another's] ear" to be heard, and the "dust and lint is stifling until you learn how to keep the mouth strictly shut, and to allow the lint to accumulate on the nostrils, eyebrow, and lips." This was "the first continuous labor [Raoul] had ever indulged in." It was dark when he arrived to work, and dark when he went home. The workers had a half hour to eat and worked extra hours without overtime pay. Raoul prayed for the machinery to break down. Finally, he had assumed that "the least of manual laborers received two or three dollars a day; so he was astonished to discover that he was being paid "at the munificent rate of 60 cents for eleven hours work.[10]

Raoul does not recall being discouraged by these conditions. He had been indoctrinated into the "wonderful 'iron law of wages,' as propounded by Adam Smith and my father" which promised all men compensation for their worth. Raoul resolved that "others had stood the gaff to get on top, and so should I." Anticipating his future (in retrospect), Raoul believed that he would manage these cotton-mill workers "doubtless kindly, but the thought of enduring these degrading conditions and paltry pay for a lifetime, never entered my head."[11] Aristocratic and radical memories crowded themselves in this passage where paternal condescension rubbed uneasily against socialist contempt for capitalism's verities and their champions.

Raoul solicited the friendship of the Exposition superintendent, "a Yankee from Lawrence, Massachusetts, and informed him of his plans and ambitions" to master cotton-mill machinery and to become a manager, or agent, within the industry. His superintendent told Raoul that he was wasting his time "at the Exposition with its outmoded machinery" and that he should head to Lawrence and to begin serious training there. Raoul gathered letters of introduction and prepared to move to Massachusetts. Also in preparation for his new adventure,

---

[10] Raoul, 43-44.
[11] *ibid.,* 44-45. The "iron law of wages" was proposed by David Ricardo, not Adam Smith.

though considerably more irksome, was collecting a check from his father for six hundred dollars "to square up [his] debts." These incidents comprised Raoul's most painful memories as they unmasked his dependency and degraded his estimation of his own masculinity. He would spend days "screwing up [his] courage to face him, and making out a list for his perusal." Next would be an interview in his father's study. Raoul admitted "that painful was the word" to describe this not infrequent humiliation.[12]

Lawrence, Massachusetts (1895)

Raoul arrived in Lawrence in March 1895 and found both board and lodging and a job in short order.[13] He began at the Everett Mills in the card room. The contrast between Massachusetts and Georgia mills began (as always with Raoul) with clothing. At the Exposition Mill, workers wore the same clothes to work that they wore outside the mill; at the Everett Mill, the workers wore clean overalls and the women wore clean aprons. More surprisingly, and in violation of the "iron law of wages," was the difference in compensation between the two states. At Everett, Raoul worked only fifty-eight hours a week and earned $1.25 "for doing exactly the same thing I had done in Georgia for 60 cents." Raoul coupled this memory with his earlier disappointment when in Chicago he discovered the old adage that "men who were willing to work could always find work" was a misconception. These observations were heavily weighted by the radical critic that would later understand the "falsity" of these beliefs, and that would lead him "to form the basis of an entirely different attitude towards life, and ambition, and the

[12] Raoul, 45-46.
[13] Wadley, *Diaries*, 339. Aunt Sarah was always useful for dates as her nephew never mentioned a date throughout his long memoir. Her entry for 14 March 1895 noted that "William Raoul left home for Lawrence, Massachusetts where he intends to work in a cotton factory preparatory to entering the business of manufacturing."

struggle for wealth and power." Raoul confessed that "it took years of observation, defeat, and bitter humiliation to bring me to a parting of the ways" with bourgeois culture and capitalistic economics.[14]

Raoul enjoyed both the food and the company at his boarding house near the Everett Mill. He remembered being both "astonished and amused" to discover "several kinds of pie on the table for breakfast every morning." Dinner "fare" was "better than most country hotels in the South." Raoul remembered a story involving his boarding-house friend, John Sharky. The two cotton-mill workers were walking along the bank of the Merrimack River on a Sunday. Raoul asked his friend about a building on the opposite bank with the remark that it "looks like a boat house, let's go over and have a look." Sharky corrected him: "That's what they call a yacht club. It's for the sons and daughters of the bosses. It's no place for such as you and me." This narrative, told without a trace of irony, demonstrated Raoul's no mean skill as a memoirist as he undoubtedly left it to his audience to delight in the author's secret.[15]

While working in the various mills in Lawrence, Raoul divided his time between flirting with the girls he met there and mastering the "weight of authority given to each position, and the plan of the mill organization. He provided a detailed analysis of a mill's hierarchy, from the agent at the top to his overseers and the second hands and section bosses nearer the actual work. To supplement his study, Raoul bought books describing the management of a mill which he read in the evening when he was not (platonically) entertaining one of his girlfriends. Furthermore, he mastered, in theory at least, the various "rooms" of a mill: picker, card, spinning, and weaving. Thus prepared, Raoul "informed the heavy jowled overseer that [he] was quitting"—this, according to Raoul's memory, "just when [he] was becoming really useful."

---

[14] Raoul, 47-48.
[15] *ibid.,* 49.

Raoul recalled that it took "all the nerve [he] had to stand up to his contemptuous questioning." He did not tell his overseer that he was "aiming far above his august head, in the management of a mill."[16]

Now, having mastered mill organization and much of its machinery and techniques, Raoul put the second part of his plan into action by bringing his letters of introduction "into play." He had already used one of these entrees with a mill agent to "steal off from [his] working-class friends . . . for Sunday evening supper, or afternoon tea." This tactic was not entirely successful since, according to Raoul's memory, "the Yankees were not long on unconventional hospitality and did not make much of a romantic southerner out on a tour of adventure." Raoul's use of "unconventional" in this case probably referred to the confusion among his hosts about their guest's class status: ostensibly a mill worker (who would not be invited to tea), or a southern aristocrat appearing in the façade of the working class for reasons known only to him. Nevertheless, Raoul discovered on one of these Sunday jaunts that the Lowell Mill intended to construct a new mill at Lindale, Georgia. Another introduction allowed him to met with the Lowell agent, a Mr. Southworth, who Raoul convinced to not only let him transfer to the Lindale mill, but to train at the Lowell mill in preparation for his future duties.[17] By the time Raoul departed Massachusetts for his new destination at Lindale, he could "operate, repair, and demonstrate the theory of every machine in a card room, and was fairly familiar with the theory and practice of spinning and weaving."[18] He wrote to his mother in October 1895 that if he should find himself vexed by some technical detail, he would always "have the second hand

---

[16] Raoul, 55.
[17] i*bid.,* 55-56.
[18] *ibid.,* 57.

to fall back on . . . but thanks to my careful observations and thorough knowledge . . . I don't think I shall."[19]

Lindale (1896)

On an October evening in 1896, William Raoul rode his bicycle the six-mile journey from Berry College back to his home just south of Rome, Georgia near the Lindale Cotton Mill, where he worked as an overseer.[20] He had earlier that day made the trek to Martha Berry's home for an afternoon "frolic."[21] Raoul had remembered Martha Berry as "a pleasing stranger" when she toured the Lindale Mill six months earlier. He had wanted to take her on a tour of the facility then, but his "native timidity held . . . [him] back."[22] Now, as he returned home that evening, Raoul found a note from his superior, a Mr. Hunking, the mill's agent, instructing him to come by his house "no matter how late I returned." Raoul "knew at once" the reason for the summons.[23] Anticipating trouble with a fellow gentleman, Raoul "slipped . . . [his] Colt into my pocket . . . just to be sure we would be on equal footing."[24]

---

[19] Raoul Family Papers, box 18, folder 6, letter of 8 October 1895, from William Raoul to Mary Wadley Raoul.
[20] Michelle Brattain, *The Politics of Whiteness: Race, Workers, and Culture in the Modern South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 33, described the mill's origins: "In 1896 a Rome cotton dealer and the Lindale Company, a local promotion group for a town immediately south of Rome, persuaded Massachusetts Mills to build a new factory in Floyd County. Massachusetts Mills' Lindale plant became the county's largest employer, with over twenty-five hundred people on the payroll."
[21] Raoul, 73. Rob Yallup, "Berry College Campus Preservation Plan," (Atlanta, Georgia: Lord, Aeck and Sargent, 2006), 1, "Founded in 1902 to provide educational opportunities for the poor children of the Southern Highlands," Martha Berry decided sporadic attendance due to agricultural duties could only be side-stepped by creating a boarding school that became The Boys Industrial School. For a comprehensive history of the institution and its founder, see Ouida Dickey and Doyle Mathis, *Berry College: A History* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2005). Thanks go to Jennifer Dickey, Curator, Oak Hill and the Martha Berry Museum, Berry College, for these sources. Millis, *Family,* described how their mother, Mary Wadley Raoul, in 1931, "participated in the ceremony of breaking ground for the Mothers' Building at the Martha Berry School," 205.
[22] Raoul, 62.
[23] *ibid.,* 73.
[24] *ibid.,* 73-74. Woodward, *Origins*, 159-60. "The South seems to have been one of the most violent communities of comparable size in all Christendom . . . Race violence there was, undoubtedly, but it was only a part of the general milieu of Southern violence and can be understood best against that background. Nor could lower-class whites bear disproportionate blame, for the newspapers of the day were crowded with homicidal frays between lawyers, planters, railroad presidents, doctors, even preachers, and particularly editors." James C. Klotter, *Kentucky*

Earlier that same day, Raoul had fired his second-hand (his factotum within the mill) without informing Mr. Hunking, the mill's agent, or general manager. This second-hand had worked at the Lindale Mill for many years and was easily ten years older than Raoul. Raoul remembered him as the "perfect type of yes man . . . not to be depended upon nor trusted."[25] He resolved to replace his ineffectual assistant with a recruit of his own, "a young man lashed to the mast by marriage, and without enough imagination to realize that a cotton mill was a blind alley." The source of this cynicism was Raoul's aristocratic self, not, as we might assume, the natural critic of capitalism's abusive practices, his radical counter-self. Raoul trained his new assistant to fill any position necessary, a job "theoretically" performed by his second-hand, who was "becoming more and more of a source of irritation to me. He was a useless piece of timber and really hampered my dealing with the other foremen." Mill organization required orders to be transmitted through the second-hand, yet Raoul's was "a weak brother who could not face either the workers or me."[26] Raoul's confidence in his "careful observations and thorough knowledge of the principles of the machines" had made his second-hand superfluous.[27]

Raoul resolved to rid himself of his ineffectual minion and to put his newly trained man in his place. Raoul believed this "a well reasoned plan" as he had become "a student of management" and believed he knew what would work best. He neglected to inform his boss, Mr. Hunking, of his plans as the agent always seemed "too busy" to bother. Raoul's sarcasm was evident upon reflection that he "should not have undertaken anything so revolutionary" without the agent's consent.[28] Raoul marked the class distinction that separated a mill's agent

---

Justice, Southern Honor, and American Manhood: Understanding the Life and Death of Richard Reid (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003).
[25] Raoul, 61,
[26] *ibid.,*, 68-72.
[27] Raoul Family Collection, Mss 548, box 18, folder 6, letter from Raoul to his mother, Mary Wadley Raoul, 8 October 1895.
[28] Raoul, 73.

from his employees. The "rank and file," according to Raoul, rarely rose beyond the position of overseer. Raoul wrote that he "never knew an agent risen from the ranks. The timber of which an agent is made shuns the cotton mill as he would the plague." Agents moved horizontally from other careers as "lawyers, merchants, doctors, engineers, or what not; but never a fly-frame tender."[29] Thus did class intersect with gender as Raoul easily constructed hierarchical parameters for elite positions, like agents, within the mill His second-hand was dismissed with "a brief explanation and hand shake."[30] Afterwards he rode his bicycle to the Berry residence.

Raoul had anticipated this trouble when he returned from the Berry's and "sat [himself] down for a brief consideration." He resolved that he "would not reinstate the man" and would instead "do [his] best to convince Mr. Hunking of his worthlessness." Raoul remembered "the interview was brief and stormy." Two ultimatums followed: Mr. Hunking's demand that Raoul's second-hand be back to work by Monday, and Raoul's that, in that event, he would not be at the mill Monday morning. Upon reflection, Raoul remembered that this "was a false position for me to have taken." In retrospect, Raoul believed that he should have allowed Mr. Hunking to reinstate his second-hand and then stood back and watched the consequences as his successor was driven from the mill in only a few days by "some irate operative . . . with a brick bat."[31]

Having apprenticed for more than a year at cotton mills in Atlanta, Georgia and Lowell, Massachusetts, William Raoul had acquired his first position of authority in 1896 at the new mill in Lindale, Georgia. Yet both his initiation into his new post, and his dismissal from it nearly a year later, presaged a pattern of professional difficulties that would diminish his business reputation, his financial independence, and mark him as a man whose character and potential

---

[29] Raoul, 67.
[30] *ibid.,*, 73.
[31] *ibid.,* 73-74.

success were doubtful. In business, the market where reputations were made, Raoul's value and, thus, his honor, would become increasingly questioned as one failure followed another. Raoul's troubled business career conformed to a pattern that inevitably diminished his honor, both in his own eyes and in those of his peers. This pattern began with chronic dependency upon his father's—or some other well-placed person's—influence in securing him a position within some business establishment, cotton mill or otherwise. One result of his seemingly perpetual dependency was Raoul's self-described status as an "interloper" or "supernumerary" within an already established hierarchy. As an "interloper," Raoul invariably perched uncomfortably just beneath a general manager or owner who usually had nothing to do with his hiring on the one hand, and on the other, underlings who resented Raoul's sudden and apparently favored status among others with longer service and greater experience. Raoul would often find himself at odds with both his assistants beneath him and their collective boss above them. After repeatedly dismissing assistants, for myriad reasons, Raoul would receive an ultimatum to restore the fired employee or face termination of his own employment. Raoul always chose the later as the only course consistent with honor. Violence was rare in these transitions, though it lingered nearby.

This auspicious beginning to Raoul's "first position of responsibility" was immediately undermined, at least in Raoul's memory, by his attaining so soon a position that a fellow overseer, a Mr. Johnson, had worked his whole life to achieve. Mr. Johnson was "doubtless . . . irked" by Raoul's rapid advancement all "because of pull."[32] Mr. Johnson's expertise was negated, according to Raoul, by his northern temperament. Raoul remembered that while northerners could operate effectively as "Superintendents, they could not be used as overseers" as their "habit of speaking to one in a sharp and abrupt manner" was likely to offend a southern

[32] Raoul, 58.

gentleman, and in the South "we were all gentlemen, if white."[33] An ideology of racial exclusion here hints at the source of this aristocratic memory as Raoul ignored the Socialist critique of southern racism. Raoul's capacity to shift from this conservative line of memory to a radical recall makes his memoir of life in business especially interesting as it juxtaposes viewpoints in opposition.

Raoul remembered that year at Lindale as a "happy" time filled with "days of increasing confidence, and of pride in work well done." He was paid three dollars a day, given a house and servant, and put in charge of about one hundred and ten mill workers. Raoul had only "a little shelf of about two feet wide upon which to make my reports and build my dignity."[34] He was absorbed with more than honor. Pre-occupied with his youthful appearance and the fact that his workforce was older than himself, Raoul sought "to lessen this incongruity of age" by growing a beard on the assumption that facial age would add not only a façade of age but also of authority.[35] He made his home "bachelor's hall" and socialized with railroad friends including his cousin William M. Wadley. Raoul's home was a refuge from "swarming" children and "about the only house where you were sure of being offered a drink."[36] Raoul's presence in Lindale demonstrated an alternative masculinity: one not dedicated to work, wives, children, and abstinence.

Raoul remembered his own managerial techniques as both a full-fledged capitalist and as an equally committed radical. These parallel paths of memory provided the latter opportunities to critique the former. Contradicting Broadus Mitchell's New South paternalism, Raoul believed that with a work force of more than "a hundred irresponsible people" there would inevitably be

---

[33] Raoul, 59.
[34] *ibid.,* 54.
[35] *ibid.,* 60-61. Looking back during the 1930s as he wrote his memoir, Raoul noted that his beard did not make him look "either ancient or dangerous."
[36] *ibid.,* 65.

absences each day. His remedy was merely "to hire about ten percent more than you need, and if all want to work at the same time, it's just too bad—for them."[37] However cynical this aristocratic observation may have been, Raoul the radical juxtaposed the criticism that the mill owners "pay starvation wages" with the equally disdainful observation that "in order to utilize this mindless mass, the few capable and resourceful men at the top regiment and systemize, to the end that things run as nearly automatically and brainlessly as is mechanically possible." These remembrances perfectly illustrate the conflicting perspectives of Raoul's parallel paths of memory: the New South manager, informed by class contempt and capitalist exploitation on the one hand, contrasted with Socialist sympathy for uneducated workers dependent on "starvation wages." It is no accident that Raoul used the adjective "gaunt" more than once in his description of mill laborers.

---

[37] Raoul, 68. Here, Raoul enters the old argument about whether, or to what degree, did southern cotton mill managers consciously maintain a paternalistic attitude toward their workers. This historiography began with Broadus Mitchell, *The Rise of the Cotton Mill in the South* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1921), 127-132, who argued that New South cotton mill managers sought to "help a community to its feet," to "invigorate a place that was languishing," and that they were motivated more by "philanthropic incentive" than the profit motive. Mitchell likened the South, after Reconstruction, as a convalescing patient that had only began "to sit up and take solid food" around 1880, 59. Cash, *Mind of the South*, 200-01, carried Mitchell's argument into romantic mythology with his eloquent assertions that New South cotton mills were "indistinguishable" from the old agricultural arrangements of the antebellum South. Pre-Civil War paternalism "had literally been brought bodily over" to an industrializing South. Cash likened southern managers to feudal lords whose society relied upon reciprocity and mutual obligation up and down the class hierarchy. Cotton-mill employment, according to Cash, was a "benefaction" natural to the South where "the old easy personal relations" survived Civil War and weathered emerging industrialization and capitalistic organization, 209-212. More recent social, labor, and intellectual historians of the South have revised the old paradigm. Mitchell's insistence on southern continuity from the antebellum to the New South was discredited by Daniel J. Singal, *The War Within: From Victorian to Modernist Thought in the South, 1919-1945* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press), 66-67. According to Singal, Mitchell's reliance on the "Cavalier myth" clouded his judgment and obscured the emergence of the capitalist ethos and the disappearance of traditional southern paternalism. Jacquelyn D. Hall, et. al., *Like a Family: The Making of a Southern Cotton Mill World* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1987), xvii, argued that the family metaphor described less the workers' dependence "on a fatherly employer so much as they were explaining their relationships with one another." Allen Tullos, *Habits of Industry: White Culture and the Transformation of the Carolina Piedmont* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 77, reasserted paternalism by arguing that it "constituted a deep legitimizing force within white Piedmont society from the time of backwoods settlement through the era of capitalist industrialization." Douglas Flaming, *Creating the Modern South: Millhands and Managers in Dalton, Georgia, 1884-1984* (Chapel Hill: The University of Georgia Press, 1992), xxvii, argued for the "entanglement" of mill-workers and managers as he sought "to reposition corporate paternalism at the center of southern labor history."

Two other incidents at the Lindale mill reveal subtleties of southern masculinities, one confirmed here, and another under construction there. First, Raoul met the daughter-in-law of one of his workers "who was quite attractive." The young wife was afraid of being left by herself at home and Raoul proposed to give her lessons with his pistol for protection. This task required both daylight and a place where innocent bystanders would not be at risk. Therefore, on a couple of occasions, Raoul left the mill and walked the young lady out into the nearby woods "where we wouldn't hit anybody." Raoul quickly discovered that this tutelage "wouldn't do." He recognized that the villagers did not know about his "sex sublimation," but that they did understand the one good reason a man might take another man's young, attractive wife on a sylvan stroll, and that reason "called for talk, and sometimes, for action." Raoul's celibacy was a secret, yet he "craved the society of women."[38] These qualities were in contradiction and did not fit any known categories for masculine behavior in the Lindale village.

Secondly, failure followed success for Raoul at the Lindale mill as an accomplishment on the mill floor broadened his understanding of masculine qualities—or, at least, that's how Raoul's memory would have it. His "oldest and best grinder" took a week's vacation and Raoul seized the opportunity to demonstrate his mastery of the mill's most difficult job. Upon his return, the worker noticed no diminishment of quality from his "card" and got an affirmative answer to his query, "Mr. Raoul, did you grind that card?" Praise remembered after decades made an impression on the old memoirist who recalled with relish his old worker's observation, "I couldn't have done it better myself." Initially, he did not think Raoul "knowed (sic) too much about this here machinery; but I see where I was wrong." Raoul regarded this incident as a "triumph." The radical commentator on his memory remarked how he had "already proven [himself] the master, as a captain, as a diplomat, and as a driver, and now I won as a mechanic,

[38] Raoul, 65.

probably the most respected of all."[39] Pride in a job well done at the time became later, in memory, confirmation of those masculine qualities of the working man who could master difficult machinery and in whose ranks Raoul would in time join.

This distinctly radical remembrance of cotton-mill life was both contrasted and reinforced by various contests of wills that reflected on myriad masculinities within the mill. Raoul instituted a new procedure upon his arrival at the Lindale mill and it was not met with enthusiasm by all the workers. He required all the machinery to be cleaned and the floors swept four times daily, although he increased this interval when anticipating important visitors. The language used by Raoul in his reconstruction of these incidents is telling. He "summoned a tall gaunt Georgia mountaineer," the "father of a large family which we were exploiting," and told him that Raoul would be "gladdened by the sight of his sweeping the floor" at the top of every hour. Raoul the aristocrat remembered the credit he received for this action; yet, his scorn for the man who would eventually fire him was evident in his description of Mr. Hunking as a "piece of useless dog"[40] that he was prepared to shoot but did not.

Raoul instituted fines for negligence on the mill floor. In his efforts to "turn up some evidence of slackness," Raoul discovered that "some of the prize fast operators" in the mill "were found to be the worst offenders." The fines imposed on these experienced mill workers "cut the pay of the hare down to that of the tortoise." Challenges came. "One gaunt (the repetition of this adjective reinforces the radical remembrances of workers being paid starvation wages while accentuating aristocratic stereotypes of workers as naturally poor) six-foot-four son of Georgia . . . informed me that he wouldn't stand" for Raoul's fines. When told that Raoul would make no exceptions, the worker "let go a choice line of invective which was not designed

---

[39] Raoul, 69-70.
[40] *ibid.,* 62-63.

for the ears of another Southern gentleman without giving offense." Raoul had no doubt as how to answer this challenge. He went "without a word . . . to [his] desk, made out a slip of his time, with the deductions, and told him that he was through." The "gaunt" and recalcitrant worker told Raoul that when he "came out of the mill that night, he would take it out of my hide." Raoul the aristocratic memoirist recalled that his "code" then "was that I would not accept a fight with a disgruntled man, would not answer back an insult, but if any such laid a hand upon me, I would kill him." Though honor, according to Raoul, extended to all southern men, if white, it is clear that distinctions were made according to class and that honor was not apportioned equally. According to Raoul, his stance on the question was known since he "always went armed," and occasionally, he "would have to lay his Colt aside to crawl under some machine which baffled the fixer." Yet, with his honor engaged, Raoul recognized that "there was nothing to be done about it." When he left the mill that night, he "didn't now whether [he] was going to jail or to my house." Raoul walked the gauntlet past the threatening worker "without seeming to see him" on to his house and "not a word was spoken."[41]

Fitzgerald (1902)

One incident in Raoul's continuing series of failures within the cotton-mill industry took place in 1902 in Fitzgerald, Georgia, where he hoped to become superintendent of a new mill there. Remnants of this further reversal left little trace in his memory as it was recounted in one brief paragraph of his memoir. Yet Raoul's contemporary account of this disappointment demonstrated the pernicious pattern of the role of honor in his business life.

[41] Raoul, 64.

Raoul remembered negotiating for the position of superintendent of the new mill which would open soon. The mill's owner, a hardware merchant who, according to Raoul, knew only that such mills "sometimes made money . . . had the most extraordinary notions about what a superintendent should know and do." Raoul does not list these ostensibly unreasonable demands but it is not difficult to speculate about they might have been. Raoul rarely lacked for self-confidence and he certainly had sufficient experience in virtually all aspects of mill management, in addition to his accounting skills, to surmount most problems. Raoul served as superintendent for a couple of weeks and, though he claimed he could not "remember just what broke it up," he does remember that the mill soon went "into the hands of a receiver."[42]

In contrast to this terse rendition of the Fitzgerald mill episode in his "Proletarian Aristocrat," Raoul's letters of that time reveal a desperate man whose honor was at stake. With his unhappy tenure as railroad agent in Nichols, Georgia, drawing to a close, Raoul wrote to his mother that if he were "obliged to force my services on the market at any price in any line I want to go where mine are the scarcest."[43] His adherence to market bromides make plain that these events predated his conversion to Socialism. He mentioned to his mother his optimism about his efforts to become superintendent of the new Fitzgerald mill.

In February 1902, Raoul wrote home triumphantly that he felt "like a new man" after finally getting the position he had sought at the Fitzgerald mill. Perhaps most importantly, he hoped that he could soon "carry Ruth to a new settled house."[44] His wife of one year had suffered through her husband's peripatetic professional life and longed for a stable household. Failure, that most consistent aspect of Raoul's business life, emerged two weeks later when

---

[42] Raoul, 157.
[43] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, box 18, folder 10, letter of 14 September 1901 from Raoul to his sister Mary Raoul Millis.
[44] *ibid.*, letter of 21 February 1902 from Raoul to his mother Mary Wadley Raoul.

Raoul wrote that he "may have to give up the place before I get started." The mill's owner was a "most unsatisfactory man to deal with" and though Raoul intended to try and iron out their differences, he had little hope for success as his boss would "not be reasonable." Raoul assured his mother that he would not "be unreasonable" himself because he knew that he could not "afford to, but was adamant that his and the new mill's success depended upon his being "in charge of the operating management."[45] This admission hints at the source of difficulties between Raoul, newly appointed the mill's new superintendent, and the mill's owner. The issue in question was a recurrent one. There was apparently a dispute over Raoul's authority over all aspects of the mill's operations. This deduction is easily made since Raoul's past (and future) problems had generally stemmed from his inability to dismiss subordinates or to operate outside the purview of mill agents. Perhaps the Fitzgerald mill owner wished to exercise his patronage powers by appointing Raoul's assistants over his new superintendent's desire to hire his own people. Raoul's stubborn insistence on complete authority was probably born of his chronic position as supernumerary or interloper within an already established mill hierarchy. Thus in his quest for complete authority, Raoul in all likelihood sacrificed his position as superintendent and, as a result, his autonomy and the accompanying honor.

In the letter to his mother announcing his most recent failure, Raoul hoped "from the bottom of [his] heart that [he had] done the right thing" while trying to face the future with as calm a determination as possible."[46] Perhaps Raoul knew that his previous promise that he would be reasonable in his negotiations with the mill owner was belied by his refusal to abide by the owner's wishes. In his own mind he may have understood that he had done the "right thing" in refusing to go along with a scenario that presaged failure as it had in the past, though he knew

---

[45] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, box 18, folder 10, letter of 2 March 1902 from Raoul to Mary Raoul Millis.
[46] *ibid.* Raoul's letter of resignation was dated 3 April 1902 and addressed to T. W. Garbutt, President, Irwin County Cotton Mills.

it would be hard to explain these subtleties to his wife who had expected much more of her married life. Three months later, Raoul wrote that he had tried to put the past out of his mind, but that he had had "some hard struggles . . . and at times feel very desperate."[47] In another letter from Fitzgerald, and from its context it is clearly from the same time, Raoul exposed his greatest vulnerability when he expressed his desire to "give [Ruth] what she had reason to expect when she married me."[48] Thus public failure intruded upon private obligations as Raoul's non-performance in the former tended to negate his capacity as breadwinner.

Raoul's fears now crowded round him: his masculine responsibilities required that he be a decent provider for his family—his wife, Ruth Cunningham Raoul had, after all, not been plucked out of an Atlanta slum, but had been a prime catch as the daughter of a local and well-respected judge.[49] In addition to this, his repeated failure to secure permanent employment raised questions about his character since general opinion agreed that a man's worth was most readily revealed in the capitalist marketplace where one engaged in commerce and demonstrated one's mastery over other men.

The Fitzgerald episode ended with Raoul reverting to a familiar pattern: dependency upon family connections for a new position. He wrote to his sister, Mary Raoul Millis, in August 1902, to say that their Uncle George Wadley, an official with the Central of Georgia Railroad, would appoint him supervisor if he wanted to continue in railroad work. Raoul remarked that he was considering the "advisability of making that my business."[50]

---

[47] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, box 18, folder 10, letter of 24 June 1902 from Raoul to Mary Raoul Millis.
[48] *ibid.*, an undated letter postmarked Fitzgerald, Georgia, from Raoul to Mary Raoul Millis.
[49] Franklin Garrett, "Necrology, 1822-1933" and "Obituary Abstracts, 1892-1896," 144, Georgia Department of Archives and History, Atlanta, Georgia. Ruth was born in 1875, three years younger than Raoul, and died at thirty years of age in 1905. She was the daughter of Judge John D. and Cornelia Cunningham and was raised in the West End suburb of Atlanta.
[50] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, box 18, folder 10, letter of 10 August 1902 from Raoul to Mary Raoul Millis.

The discrepancy between Raoul's succinct memory of the Fitzgerald episode in his autobiography and the painful details of the same event derived from contemporary letters reveal the ambiguity of memory as epistemology. These differences will not discourage the cultural historian who seeks the meaning of memories instead of their more prosaic use to merely confirm a newspaper account or some other secondary literature. It is the memory of the event rather than the incident itself that reveals the past in its complexity, its ambiguity, its inaccessibility—a remoteness that requires interpretation and understanding of historical context to extract meaning from the ostensibly mundane "facts."

* * *

In his memory, Raoul punctuated the narrative of his erratic business career with occasional re-assessments. Failure, and its emasculating consequences, lingers just off stage always threatening to steal scenes. After his tumultuous tenure as both worker/apprentice and manager of various cotton mills in the South and in Massachusetts, Raoul, with his father's prompting, became an executive with the Southern Saw Works of East Point, Georgia, a suburb of Atlanta in 1901. When his career there came to an abrupt end, with the added humiliation of debt that would have to be paid by his father, Raoul again sought the familiar confines of the cotton mills only to be informed by one prospective employer that the services of the son of Greene Raoul, the president of the Mexican National, was not needed. He opined that his opportunities were ironically limited by his association with the "influential and the wealthy." Raoul had begun to suspect "that people did not want the son of so successful a man in a lowly place, unless he was backed by his father's money." Questions about character arose: "Why did

not the Captain, with all his power, place his son himself?" Thinking vicariously, Raoul concluded that prospective employers must think that something was "wrong" with him.[51]

Roswell Cotton Mill (1897)

After losing his managerial position at the Lindale cotton mill, Raoul remembered that he was "in no wise abashed, or downcast" by his termination. Rather, his "spirits rose as the steam in a safety valve." During the interval before his next position, Raoul prepared for a social affair in Rome when he discovered he did not have the proper trousers. He visited the local tailor and "demanded that he produce a pair in six hours. He said it was impossible, but it wasn't, and I wore them as designed." This incident made an impression in Raoul's memory since it demonstrated his "ability to get things done by sheer force of personality," an attribute in his "handling of factories in the future."[52] Raoul's dual memories made easier his dismissal and subsequent dependence upon others for another position. The metaphor of "steam in a safety valve," of course, suggests other less cheerful outcomes—an explosion.

Raoul got an introduction to the president of the Roswell Manufacturing Company who made him an overseer at the cotton mill number two in Roswell, Georgia, about twenty-five miles north of Atlanta near the Chattahoochee River.[53] Conforming to the precarious pattern already established, Raoul was placed above the mill's superintendent and he understood the

---

[51] Raoul, 149.
[52] *ibid.* 76.
[53] Raoul's patron was Col. James W. Robertson, President of the Roswell Manufacturing Company. See Richard G. Coleman, "A Short History of the Roswell Manufacturing Company of Roswell, Georgia, Home of 'Roswell Grey,'" 1 March 1982; and Sherron D. Lawson, *A Guide to the Historic Textile Mill Town of Roswell, Georgia* (Roswell, Georgia: Roswell Historical Society, 1996). According to the *Alpharetta Review* 15 January 1987, "Chronological History of the Roswell Mills," 23, the mill complex where Raoul worked reached its peak in the 1890s with more than 600 employees. The Roswell Historical Society has a wealth of information on the history and recovery of the mill complex that thrived there through the late nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century.

precarious "possibilities in such a situation."[54] Raoul remembered his short tenure at the Roswell mill as "somewhat hectic." He was "regarded as an interloper." The superintendent had not hired him and believed his sudden appearance "as endangering his position." To compound these difficulties, Raoul's second-hand "belonged to one of the old Roswell families, and was in line for this job of mine." Worse still, his second-hand's "easy going ways" contrasted unfavorably with Raoul's "strict discipline" which did not make the new overseer "popular with the employees."[55]

It is surprising that Raoul the radical does not take the opportunity, in hindsight, to criticize the use of child labor at the Roswell mill. Raoul does not go so far as the historian Broadus Mitchell's characterization of working children as representing Southern "philanthropy" instead of "avarice"; their presence was less "exploitation" than "generosity and cooperation and social-mindedness."[56] Raoul, the capitalist manager of labor, instead, remembered their dexterity as "their nimble little fingers [became] extraordinarily quick," so fast that "no grown up could keep pace with them."[57] Raoul's admiration of these children's work revealed memories motivated by neither socialist condemnation nor class exploitation. Their retrieval was apparently without motive—an aberration in Raoul's autobiography.

Raoul shipped all of his things to a Roswell house and "set up bachelor's hall again." Similar to his feelings when he decamped at Lindale, Raoul remembered his intention of staying put "forever." This happy memory was juxtaposed in the following line with, "When I was

---

[54] Raoul, 76-77. Wadley's *Diary* has Raoul departing for his new job on 19 November 1896, 344.
[55] Raoul, 77.
[56] Broadus Mitchell, *Cotton Mills*, 95.
[57] Raoul, 77. Thomas M Deaton, "Atlanta During the Progressive Era" (Ph.D. diss., The University of Georgia, 1969), wrote, "In 1900, 4,479 children were employed in textile mills, representing 2.4% of the mill operatives. These children were paid from ten cents to fifty cents a day, while the mills were declaring dividends of from 60% to 95%. Many of the children began to work in the mills at age four or five as the unpaid helpers of parents or older siblings," 154.

compelled to leave, I resolved, in disgust, never to own anything again that I couldn't put into a steamer trunk."[58] Though his disappointment and anger was evident, its focus was not: did Raoul regret the accumulation of material things that had to be continually moved as he lost one position after another, or did this bad memory revolve round his chronic contretemps with bosses, or with the fundamental unfairness of the capitalist system. Either is possible since Raoul imposed his own interpretation upon his life's narrative and often interjected socialist criticism into situations that occurred long before his radical conversion.

Raoul's managerial techniques, no doubt adopted from his Massachusetts' tutors, were not popular at the Roswell mill with either the employees or his superior. After assuming his duties, Raoul announced to his "under bosses" his "custom" of shutting the plant down one hour before the shift ended, have everyone clean the place spotlessly, then to wait while he inspected the floor and machinery. Although the workers were enthusiastic about the shut down, they believed they should be allowed to leave once the clean up was finished. For Raoul, "that wouldn't do at all." He had no intention of inspecting a dirty room without the guilty party being there "to scold."[59]

The reader will remember the previous trouble Raoul had at the Lindale mill with the "gaunt six-feet-four" worker who threatened trouble after work over fines imposed by Raoul. Here at Roswell, serious protests over Raoul's new policy emanated from "one lanky, ill favored mountaineer" who sent word that he intended to leave when he finished cleaning his area "regardless of [Raoul], or the whistle." When all the cleaning done a half-hour before quitting time, Raoul's employees lined the wall (and crowded the windows) waiting for their boss to finish his inspection. The disgruntled and disobedient "mountaineer" did not remain but left the

---

[58] Raoul, 78.
[59] *ibid.,* 79.

building in plain view of his peers. Raoul remembered how relieved he was that no one "followed his example." He would have been placed in an untenable position if he were forced to either "fire the whole room" or capitulate on his policy.[60]

Raoul fired the recalcitrant worker, paid him his wages due, and replaced him only to be visited a few days later by the "slimy, taciturn superintendent" who urged Raoul to re-hire the dismissed employee since he had been "punished enough." Raoul replied that the worker might have reclaimed his job had he come to see him about it instead of going over his head. Raoul, in retrospect, complained about how "isolated" the "damned town" was, how "everybody was kin to everybody else, and how there was nothing else to do but to work in the mills. In these circumstances it was unusual for anyone to be fired, thus making the Roswell plant the "slackest twisted mill" in which Raoul ever worked. He believed his superintendent used this episode to encourage the mill owner to terminate his employment. According to Raoul, he could not "remember whether I quit or got fired, but after a long unpleasant argument, it was all over."[61] Raoul's return to Atlanta following this latest debacle was confirmed by his mother's letter to his sister: "William will be here on Tuesday but the cause of his presence is not very inspiring. He has given up his place again. His success in life is beginning to look very doubtful to me."[62]

Within a couple of months, through the help of a friend who knew an official at the Lanett Mills in West Point, Georgia, Raoul was back in the cotton mills only this time at sixty cents an hour instead of an overseer's salary. In his memory, Raoul portrayed this episode benignly, remarking that his work as a weaver furthered his "education" since this was the one department of a mill with which he "was not entirely familiar." Raoul recalled with pride how the overseer put him on a particularly difficult task—one that had prompted others to quit—that

---

[60] Raoul, 79-80.
[61] *ibid.,* 80-82.
[62] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, letter from Mary Wadley Raoul to Mary Raoul Millis, 10 January 1897.

he regarded as "terrific work for a beginner." Raoul, of course, was a worker in disguise. He had dinner with the Laniers on Sundays while carrying on "a mild flirtation" with their daughter.[63]

Southern Saw Works (1898-1901)

This voluntary descent into the working class ended in March 1897 when Raoul's father summoned him to Atlanta "to talk over some business matters with him." Mary Wadley Raoul wrote that her son "looks better than he normally does when he comes out of a mill, but I wish he had somewhere else to work."[64] Greene Raoul then "one of the strangest things that" his son could imagine. He "made the astounding proposal that I give up the profession of cotton mill executive at which I had spent so much time and done so well."[65] There was no trace of irony in Raoul's recollection of this episode. It would have been more accurate to say that the cotton mills had given up on Raoul because of his managerial techniques, his high-handedness, and his preoccupation with his overly-sensitive honor. The reader will recall how Raoul often operated as if there were no superiors above him and no consequences to his decisions, whether they be the termination of an employee or the installment of new policies. The debacle at the Lindale mill had been followed by the disastrous Roswell episode, the denouement of which had segued into an embarrassing stint with Raoul back as a common mill worker. Yet, Raoul professed to not knowing why his father intervened at this point in his careening career. He admitted one possibility: "that [he] was pretty close at home to be working in overalls at sixty cents a day as a

[63] Raoul, 86.
[64] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, letter from Mary Wadley Raoul to Mary Raoul Millis, 28 March 1897.
[65] Raoul, 86-87.

common mill hand." Nevertheless, Raoul believed this justification "entirely unworthy of my father, and entirely unlike him."[66]

Raoul found his father's proposal so startling because, according to his own remembrances, Greene "had never in all my life used any of his influence with me, or even given me the benefit of his usually excellent judgment, in determining any decision about my economic life." This would appear to be a very selection memory since it was his father who sent him to the Lawrenceville Preparatory School, then to apprentice with the New York architect, Bradford L. Gilbert, then to the Columbian Exposition and World's Fair in Chicago, and who now used his influence to acquire a position for his son at the Southern Saw Works in East Point, Georgia, a southern suburb of Atlanta.[67] Greene proposed to invest fifteen thousand dollars in the Saw Works which were owned and operated by Captain Isaac Boyd, a close neighbor of the Raouls on Peachtree Street in Atlanta. Raoul would start as a book-keeper and "work up."[68]

Raoul, the son, was skeptical of strategy because the timber of the South was being rapidly diminished and he believed this to be an industry in decline. This knowledge, however, may have been acquired after the fact and inserted into his memory as a justification for his uneasiness to join "one of the smallest units" in the country that manufactured circular saws. The Saw Works, referred to retrospectively by Raoul as a "little two by four factory, poorly built and poorly equipped," only employed a few dozen people. His "extreme reluctance" was overcome by his father's "powers of persuasion" and he initially agreed "with the proviso that if later I saw things in another light, I might retire from this enterprise." Greene would not

---

[66] Raoul, 87.
[67] Garrett, *Environs*, wrote that East Point lay six miles south of Atlanta with 250 residents. Also, that it had become an incorporated municipality in August 1887.
[68] Raoul, 87. *City Directories of the United States, Atlanta*, 1898, list Isaac S. Boyd as president of the Southern Saw Works in East Point with his residence at 695 Peachtree Street in Atlanta, 511.

acquiesce in this stipulation and insisted that his son's acceptance be "irrevocable."[69] Doubtless Greene had tired of his son's erratic professional career and the loss of honor attendant to one reduced to strapping on lint masks to keep from choking while working. Raoul finally "signed upon the dotted line—signed away my chances of becoming a leader in the largest industry of the South."[70] Raoul, for all of his candor, penned this memory without any irony whatsoever.

Raoul the memoirist was of two minds about this decision to abandon the cotton mill business for a place in the Saw Works. After admitting that he "was at fault in not refusing" his father's demands, he went on to list why he took the position: his father's prestige, his own "rather bad breaks" and the fact that he was "taking some pretty hard punishment" by living on the wages of a cotton mill worker, and that relocating to East Point might enhance his romantic prospects. Having grown weary of his celibacy—declared after the Lawrenceville scandal with Josie the serving girl—Raoul hoped his new position would "lead to other fields of conquest." One of his "great ambitions" was to find the right girl and get married. Finally, Raoul wrote that despite his reservations, he had not entered his new profession "in any downcast mood, quite the contrary. [He] was still riding the wave." He enjoyed "new experiences" and, besides, Greene had "filled [him] up with the idea of the dignity, importance and authority of being an 'owner' in the business." As if to demonstrate his commitment, the "first thing that [Greene] did was to insist that a new brick office and storeroom be built." This addition was to enhance what Raoul described as "a ramshackle old one-story building," and to eventually "supercede" the "old fire trap."[71]

At the Saw Works, Raoul joined a hierarchy already in place as he "took over the books at once." The previous book-keeper, a Mr. Chaffee, remained on the job, yet, according to

---

[69] Raoul, 87-88.
[70] *ibid.,* 88.
[71] *ibid.,* 88-89.

Raoul, was "marked for the slaughter" by both Captain Boyd and Greene Raoul—and elimination held in abeyance until Raoul demonstrated that he was up to the job. Raoul's remembrances of his accounting skills are slightly confusing and somewhat subtle in their distinctions. He claimed to possess "a natural capacity for the understanding of figures, but was never swift or accurate in the handling of them." All of the younger men he taught the craft soon exceeded him "in speed and accuracy, but had to come to [Raoul] when it came to making a complicated journal entry, or analyzing and arranging a balance sheet so that a layman on the board of directors could understand it." He remembered an exceptional instance of "triumph and satisfaction" upon finding, after interminable nights of scrutinizing numbers, an "obdurate error" that had vexed him over much anxiety and many cups of coffee.[72]

Raoul confirmed Henry Grady's despair over the South's colonial economy by his admission that the Saw Works' products were fashioned from "circular plates" that "were shipped to us from Pittsburg." Upon their arrival in East Point, these plates were "punched, ground, hammered, and polished." Raoul, who tried many professions, confessed that "saw hammering comes nearer to being a black art than any trade I have ever undertaken." Hammering out the warps in a circular saw, according to Raoul, was "the one trade that cannot be mastered in a comparatively short time." For instance, "bumps" in the plate cannot be simply hammered down as such blows will create another bump elsewhere. The secret was to "draw" excess metal away, to dissipate the "bump." Raoul recognized this skill as the "weak spot" in the Saw Works. A Mr. DeVeaux was the Works' only conjurer capable of eliminating troublesome warps and imperfections from the circular plates. Raoul sought to learn this trade so as not to leave the business at the mercy of one man's obscure skill. He admitted to never

[72] Raoul, 91.

getting "any further than a theoretical understanding of the thing, and a reasonable ability to judge of the excellence of a job."[73]

After Mr. Chaffee, the previous book-keeper, was let go, Raoul became the Saw Works' secretary and treasurer and "gradually took over all the active management." Captain Boyd treated him like family and Raoul, at least in one memory, recalled in him "a valuable instructor in the ways of business." In another memory, on the same page of his memoir, Raoul mentioned Captain Boyd's "incompetence."[74] From the context of the memoir, Raoul may have been referring to the Captain's inability to manage numbers specifically instead of business generally. The new executive's salary was $136.50 per month and Raoul remembered "living squarely up to it"[75]; that is, he spent all he had in addition to accumulating debt—an encumbrance that would soon spell disaster for Raoul as his autonomy, and thus his honor, would be severely diminished.

Raoul was elected mayor of East Point while managing the Saw Works in addition to serving on the local school board. As mayor, he resolved disputes between citizens and promulgated the principle that the "man who struck the first blow was at fault." While presiding over a school board meeting, Raoul had an opportunity to "cut" a doctor who testified against a teenage girl for allegedly having improper relations with an older man. Raoul claimed to have always believed "that what a woman did with her own body was her own business, and that those who undertook to meddle should be frowned upon." This attitude was certainly consistent with his later advocacy of Free Love, though Raoul may be retrospectively—and anachronistically—fitting his beliefs with a later more innovative stance. As for the doctor "who couldn't lie like a gentleman, he was beneath [Raoul's] contempt."[76]

---

[73] Raoul, 92-93.
[74] *ibid.,* 94.
[75] *ibid.,* 97.
[76] *ibid.,* 98. See chapter one of Greenberg, *Honor and Slavery*, 3-23.

Raoul's sense of self was enhanced by his leadership roles at the Saw Works and in East Point generally. While mayor, Raoul, for reasons left unexplained, "accepted that bastard political faith called Populism, and made a pilgrimage down to Thomasville to hear its exponent Tom Watson speak."[77] Raoul neglects further discussion of Watson, though his memory places the fiery Georgia politician in a much wider ideological context imposed decades later. As if to excuse his temporary enthusiasm for Populism, Raoul wrote that he "had not the slightest inkling that the game of organizing and driving the workers, and then legally extracting the product of their toil, in the shape of profit, was at the root of the whole trouble." This distinctly radical path of memory seeks to locate Raoul far to the left of the Populist's political agenda. At the time of his visit to Thomasville, however, Raoul was solidly entrenched within an Atlanta society conservative in its outlook and skeptical of federal interference in the economy. His father, after all, as president of the Central of Georgia Railroad, had spilled much ink in fighting the Railroad Commission's power. This paragraph ends with Raoul's admission that he "was an enthusiast in the game and certainly believed that it was an essential [part] of industrial life and progress. The pronoun "it" above referred to class exploitation which Raoul actively engaged in.[78]

Raoul related an example of this class antagonism which uncovered his own ideal of himself as a man in relation to others. At his house in East Point after work, Raoul admitted a "drayman" to deliver a table. Unhappy with the piece of furniture, Raoul told the driver to return it to his cart. He refused and made to leave. Raoul tossed the table onto the lawn and "ordered" the driver to pick it up. Being ignored, Raoul "ran out to the road, took the horse by the bit, and backed it so violently that the man was thrown from the box." Although the man drew a knife, Raoul remembered his own "threatening" advance as his armed foe was "backing away."

---

[77] Raoul, 101. For Tom Watson and Populism, see Woodward, *Tom Watson*.
[78] *ibid.,* 101.

Suddenly, one of Raoul's workmen appeared and grasped the drayman's wrist while dislodging the knife. He subsequently sued Raoul for an injured ankle, while the defendant admitted that he "evaded" either the charges or a trial in some fashion. In retrospect, Raoul confessed that he "should have been ashamed of this arrogant conduct, and anxious to have made amends by paying him. Alas, that was not the case."[79] In these parallel paths of memory, Raoul the radical is free to criticize the aristocratic Raoul for his superior temperament and abuse of those beneath his station. The prerogatives that accompany elite masculinity do not adhere to the socialist man that Raoul would become and who edits the prose of his other elite self.

Raoul's elite masculinity freed him from conventional restraints, as demonstrated in the above examples, and as he related in a story about one of his final acts as mayor of East Point. The issue was the Atlanta Rapid Transit Company's wish to lay tracks over the newly paved main road running from Atlanta to East Point. Raoul, the mayor, was quoted as saying, "to allow the street car tracks on the main road now would give us a sorry street car track and a sorry road, and I am heartily in sympathy with the opposition."[80] At a town meeting one evening, Raoul did not like the idea but insisted the transit company should "pay the town for the franchise" should it use main street as its path. Various speeches were made, both pro and con. Raoul had misread the people's desire for a closer transit station that would alleviate their long walk to the city's limits. Raoul and newspaper writer, Henry Richardson, went back to the mayor's house for "another drink." Richardson told his host "that was the most remarkable political speech" he had ever heard, as it ignored popular sentiment and instead of telling the people what they wanted to hear, he proclaimed "what he thought was the right thing to do." Raoul's position was

---

[79] Raoul, 101-102.
[80] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, box 46, folder 1, clipping of 23 February 1899 from the Atlanta Journal contained in a Raoul "Family Journal."

apparently correct both contemporarily and in hindsight. Thirty years later, he recognized the crowded highway, with its street-car tracks, and confirmed the "mistake."[81]

Raoul's three years at the Southern Saw Works were probably the apogee of his business career. He commanded the respect of the community and was proud of the organization he had imposed upon the shop. His father, Greene, had supervised the building of a new residence for his son on the Works' property, and Raoul took advantage of these factors to rejoin the Atlanta social scene in search of an illusive wife which would complete his masculine image as a man of commerce and a family man. Yet his very freedom to relish all aspects of his masculine life led him inexorably into further and deeper debt until his autonomy and standing in the community were shattered before his father's wrath upon discovery of his son's hidden debts.

Further failures would be required to trigger Raoul's conversion from capitalism to socialism, from one sort of masculinity to another; but for now, as he resided over the Saw Works and courted Ruth Cunningham of West End, a suburb of Atlanta, he believed his chances of landing the young lady were better than his peers and competitors. For instance, Frank Orme "could ponderously explain Huxley's" view of Darwinian theory while Hugh Foreman "could expand [on] the actuary's tables; yet, these were "not the *world of men in action*. (Emphasis added.) Raoul was confident that he had "outsailed them when it came to conversation."[82] (Raoul's courtship and marriage are discussed in chapter three.)

Raoul's façade of success—manager of the Saw Works and well married—cracked under the strain of debt. After an elaborate honeymoon paid for by Greene Raoul, "things began to move swiftly." Raoul remembered being "heavily in debt . . . for a man of my salary and habits." In a March 1890 letter to his mother, Raoul wrote that he had been looking over his

---

[81] Raoul, 103.
[82] *ibid.,* 107.

"accounts and am much astonished at some of the figures. I am certainly a rather reckless spender and must try and cultivate" (here the script is illegible, though its meaning is reasonably clear) moderation.[83] Raoul, like his boss Captain Boyd, covered up a substantial portion of what he owed by conducting a ballet with the books—he concocted a note under "bills receivable" to maintain a debt that he recalled "was not in very good shape." Raoul's increasing indebtedness was unknown to his father. The son had gone so far as to purposefully conceal this embarrassment from the father to "prevent its discovery." On occasions like this Raoul's candor disarms his reader so that any confession sounds credible—after all, if he admitted *this* how can we doubt him on *that*? He wrote that he had not deliberately lied to Greene, but "did what was tantamount to it" by deceiving him "knowingly and purposefully."[84] This candor was made possible by Raoul's radical path of memory casting contempt on capitalist institutions: his failures under the capitalist regime could generally by laid at the door of an impersonal and unfair system.

His "conscience" increasingly "pricked" by these circumstances, Raoul resolved to find a way out of an accumulated debt "where [his] scale of life, plus [his] fixed charges, exceeded [his] income." Having secured the trappings of the masculinity esteemed by himself, his family, and peers, Raoul now began to understand the expense of maintaining a public reputation. He remembered there was "plenty of pressure behind me in the way of concealed debt, my young wife, and the growing expenses." Anxiety and arrogance mixed in a dangerous alchemy of fear and ambition. He devised a "far-flung scheme to contest some the Southern territory with our more powerful rivals," but knew it required "both daring and a risk of money." His calculations went on without the benefit of Captain Boyd's council as an illness kept him home most days.

---

[83] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, box 18, folder 8, letter of 22 March 1900 from Raoul to Mary Wadley Raoul.
[84] Raoul, 133.

Not only would his plans require secrecy from Captain Boyd, but he also wanted both the credit for his coup and a salary commensurate with his superior. This whole scheme was undoubtedly cooked up to extricate himself, covertly if possible, from an embarrassing debt. Raoul remembered his grandiose estimation of himself as "a sort of young Napoleon" about to cross his own "Bridge of Arcola."[85]

Raoul (partially) confided his plans to his father without mentioning that the purpose behind his plan was to put his debt to rest without relinquishing his honor. The existence of former in excess tended to diminish the latter proportionately as it reduced personal autonomy and rendered him a lesser public player. Apparently persuaded, Greene Raoul "decided to build a fire under" Captain Boyd by offering a "give or take" proposition: one side or the other would buy out the other side's entire "stock holdings." Raoul's strategy was to take advantage of the deal either way. Should Captain Boyd elect to buy out the Raoul's, then Raoul the son would pocket the proceeds in anticipation of beginning another business. This idea was presented to Greene without telling him that much of the money would necessarily go to "liquidate [his] concealed notes." Unknown to Raoul, his father's skepticism had been already aroused. In a letter of June 1901, Raoul's mother wrote to her oldest daughter of her brother's scheme of using the capital already invested in the Saw Works for a future endeavor. She went on to say that "Father says that this would be best if William had capacity; but this we are beginning to fear that he hasn't." Raoul's mother concluded, "I am truly troubled about him but there is nothing that we can do." In the same letter, Mary Wadley Raoul confessed that her oldest son "will not talk to me and always get irritated if I ask him a question. He may be close to getting out of the

[85] Raoul, 134. The reference to Arcola recalled Napoleon's gamble to achieve victory against the Austrian army in the Italian campaign of 1796. Coincidently, historian David Chandler, the foremost authority on Napoleon's military career, titled his chapter on Italian campaign, "In Search of a Reputation," inadvertently linking the similar motivations of Raoul and Bonaparte in their quest for honor.

Saw Works."[86] Should it go the other way, then Raoul would have the business as his own to manage with a larger salary that would satisfy his creditors. Either way, his debt would presumably remain quiet. All of these calculations came to nothing, however. Captain Boyd and his wife, apparently playing upon sympathy because of his illness, convinced the Raouls to allow him to buy them out at price so low that not only was Raoul's debt discovered, but father and son blamed one another for making a poor business bargain. Raoul remembered the denouement with some bitterness. Captain Boyd had hired Greene's son with the understanding that the elder Raoul would invest in the Saw Works, thus gaining needed capital while "paying a very small salary to a most efficient young man," before buying out "that capital" at a fraction of its worth.[87]

In perhaps the bitterest tone exhibited throughout his long memoirs, Raoul remembered "the repercussions" of losing leverage in the Saw Works were "swift and humiliating." Greene was told of his son's "whole financial situation" and "rose in his wrath, and said things that were hard to bear, even from him." Raoul's notes, house, and all other debts were taken over by his father. He sold the house and settled the debts. Greene informed his son that he would send a one-hundred dollar check "each month until such time as I could find work." Raoul confessed to being "deeply humiliated . . . [and] crushed." In his memory, he declared that "never in the world would I have accepted one dollar of his money, thus insultingly given, had it not been for the beloved Ruth, whose sweet face shone with hope at the glowing prospect of our unborn child."[88]

---

[86] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, letter of 8 June 1901 from Mary Wadley Raoul to her daughter, Mary Raoul Millis.
[87] Raoul, 135.
[88] *ibid.,* 135-36.

Raoul went to Waycross, Georgia, with hopes of securing a position in another cotton mill when he fell into a discussion with a couple of old railroad friends of his who proposed that he move to Nichols, Georgia, as an agent for the Waycross Air Line, whose general manager, George Wadley, was his uncle. Upon finding that the job required only "a little bookkeeping" and that his friends would arrange a raise in salary from thirty to fifty dollars a month, he accepted the position and reported to work immediately as Nichols was only a short distance west of Waycross. Raoul's excitement about this job—"the blood surged in my veins"—had less to do with his duties than with the letter he would now send to his father telling him "that I had a job, and that he could terminate the hateful allowance."[89]

Office Outfitter and Accountant, Macon, Georgia (1903-04)

After the debacle of the Fitzgerald Cotton Mill, Raoul began the new year of 1903 by settling in the town of his birth and opening an office supply store with a loan of two thousand dollars from his father.[90] He stocked his store with "Desks, Typewriters, Iron Safes, Unit Vertical Filing Cabinets," among other items which he hoped to sell along with practicing accounting on the side.[91] Raoul's anger over his father's explicit recognition of his most recent failure at the Saw Works had dissipated, at least in memory, sufficiently enough for him to reflect on Greene's business sense. Unlike the "hard-fisted business men" whom he admired, Greene Raoul "built for use and not for profit." His son concluded that it was "foreign to his nature to drive a hard bargain."[92] The son's ambiguity may be interpreted two ways. It either

[89] Raoul, 150-51.
[90] Wadley *Diaries,* 353.
[91] Wiggins' *Macon Directory*, 1903, 462 and "back cover" for Raoul the "Office Outfitter."
[92] Raoul, 166.

stands as an implicit comment on how the Saw Works' debacle came about—because the elder Raoul was outfoxed by Captain Boyd. Or it might be the radical Raoul's grudging respect for the anti-capitalist elements of his father's personality, of how his artistic temperament dominated his commercial instincts.

Raoul's business-supply store closed by late summer and his memories of this latest failure were cast in a decidedly radical recollection.[93] Learning again that he "had not the qualities of a good businessman," Raoul mitigated this verdict with the qualification that success in the capitalist system required "good judgment, and a constant and innate desire to get the best of the other fellow." Lacking this exploitive gene, Raoul discovered himself eight-hundred dollars in debt. Greene, in his anger and disappointment, "washed his hands" of his eldest son, leaving Raoul's rescue to his brothers who took his notes and settled with his creditors. Greene apparently paid them back after cooling off. In retrospect, and with the contempt accrued over more than thirty years of active participation in the Socialist party, Raoul reflected that "this does not seem like much of an incident after this length of time, but it was a terrible tragedy then. Ruth was all broken up over it."

Raoul reassembled his wife Ruth Cunningham Raoul, in mostly stereotypical terms enlivened only by her one idiosyncrasy, her interminable illnesses and fear of intimacy. Her anxiety over the store closing and the awkward settling of their debt, must have revealed the couples' independence an illusion and, worse, uncovered the now increasingly possibility that Raoul would not ever become a good provider. Honor and shame lurk in the same locale, the latter in the shadows but never far behind the former.

---

[93] Wadley, *Diaries*, 358.

Box Car Builder (1905-06)

Redeemed by his brothers from his failure to make a go of his business-supply store in Macon, Raoul would now be rescued by his Uncle George Wadley for the second time. As president of the South Atlantic Car and Manufacturing Company in Waycross, Wadley hired his nephew as secretary and treasurer at $125 a month. Raoul's readers will experience a queasy foreboding upon opening this chapter. The first sentence, "My immediate superior in the car works was Mr. McGee, the general manager," served the same purpose here as Chekhov's proverbial revolver in plain view in scene one. Raoul set the stage for what would inevitably follow with the observation that his Uncle George, "with all of his gift[s] for management, was often a poor chooser of his subordinates . . . plac[ing] loyalty and admiration of himself above ability." McGee, Raoul's new boss, was "one of those poor choices." He had previously served the Central of Georgia Railroad under George Wadley and "in intelligence rose exactly to the height of a shop foreman." Aside from Raoul, no one in the company had experience in manufacturing for profit; instead, the Car Works was staffed from top to bottom with railroad men. Raoul explained that the Car Works, like all railroad shops, were run as if "it were a part of the United States government . . . [without] competition to keep people standing on their toes . . . [and] no keen interest in just what a thing costs." No one at the shop was concerned with "the relation of overhead to sales or in new and better methods" for the orders had to be filled "and it [was] all in the family."[94] Raoul's radical critic made no comment on this insightful analysis of capitalistic practices undone.

Raoul's portrait of his McGee reduced his nemesis to an incompetent bureaucrat who had secured his place through little more than nepotism—a charge that could have been made against

[94] Raoul, 171-72.

Raoul except that he did possess the Car Works' missing ingredient, building for profit. McGee represented for Raoul a particular type of man: soft, ignorant, arrogant, full of his prerogatives but without any dynamism; a man protected by sinecure with neither the daring nor ambition of the capitalist, or the heroic virility of the proletarian. McGee was "fat, phlegmatic, and [a] rather handsome man . . . [with] a red face . . . [who] sat impressively, and idly" in his office dictating a few letters daily "to a male stenographer, who had no other duties." McGee jealously guarded his "department," where all orders for materials originated and where "all letters quoting prices or submitting bids were addressed." Raoul thought it contradictory that McGee should exercise such control over the company's finances while holding the Car Works' books in "naïve awe" and, indeed, without "any understanding of what they were for, or what were their limitation." Raoul looked over the books and declared them "hopelessly inadequate for a manufacturing establishment."[95]

Raoul became anxious about his work as a boxcar builder as he dug deeper into the company's books. The Car Works' first big contract was to build five hundred box cars for the Mexican National Railroad whose president, of course, was Greene Raoul. George Wadley proudly declared a "fat profit" and "suggested the declaration of a dividend." Raoul wondered about the company's strained credit while fulfilling this order and about working capital should a dividend be awarded. Raoul discovered, while examining the books, that "the total pay rolls of all the shop departments had been charged directly to 'buildings,' a capital account." This, according to Raoul the accountant, "was very extraordinary. The buildings had been completed before the cars were begun." George Wadley's dividends were being issued on "false profit."[96]

---

[95] Raoul, 172-73.
[96] *ibid.,* 183-84.

In other words, there had been a ballet with the books at the Car Works that could lead to charges of financial malfeasance and ruined reputations.

Raoul gained an influential ally in his father, also trained as an accountant, and convinced his Uncle George that he might have to face embarrassing questions in the future if he did not do something now to remedy the disconnect between production and the company's financial records. George Wadley proposed a "revolutionary" solution to Raoul's taste: he would make Raoul superintendent of the shop (in apparent opposition to McGee's office) and elevate his pay to give the position "prestige." For McGee, this "was a bitter pill . . . but he had to swallow it." Thus an "open feud" issued between the two.[97]

As superintendent of the shop, Raoul stressed incentives for production, good order, finishing one job before beginning another, limiting inventory, and weekly meetings to boost morale. His purpose was to get control over spending and bring the books into proper order so that future profits would not be fashioned with misappropriated funds. With pride, Raoul remembered "the affect upon the shop was like magic."[98] He had more than a dozen foreman and five hundred men in his charge and had by all appearances finally found the steps leading to the exalted status of a Captain of Industry.

Raoul remembered his tenure at the Car Works as "great sport." Under his direction, the shop had averaged one hundred and fifty cars a month, nearly doubling its previous productive capacity. He believed the Car Works gave him the greatest opportunity to demonstrate his "executive ability" and "ingenuity." He may also have known that his stay "was destined to [come to] a dramatic close."[99]

---

[97] Raoul, 189.
[98] *ibid.,* 190.
[99] *ibid.,* 194.

Raoul spent the following year in Chattanooga, Tennessee where he lived with his brother Gaston and worked for the ACME Kitchen Furniture Company, and the Herron Pump and Foundry Company as an accountant. Afterwards, he would reassess his talents and determine that, "not having the capacity of rubbing one dollar against another, and making two, I was soon looking for a master who was a better coordinator of the slot machine economy."[100] Raoul's use of imagery here is indicative of the radical critique of capitalism that animates his memoirs. Capitalism, in his construction, is characterized by magic instead of manliness since only an alchemist, or another blessed with luck, could successfully create profit in an economy dominated by the pure chance of a "slot machine." In this way, Raoul's parallel paths of memory made possible the diminishment of those masculine qualities deemed essential for the successful man of the late-nineteenth century by ascribing success to serendipity instead of those presumed traits of marketplace cunning whereby the power to engage in commerce defined a man's character.

Raoul remembered taking stock of himself again in 1908, just before his radical conversion, as he worked indifferently as an accountant in Atlanta. He had "filled some positions of considerable responsibility" and was "justly proud" of some accomplishments"; yet, he had "nothing . . . to show for it." He had become "a rolling stone, and had not gathered either the moss of business reputation or of financial power." Instead of persevering with one company and becoming its president, "like the men in the story books and like some of my friends," Raoul "always seemed . . . to become the storm center of some question of policy or procedure, which eventually eliminated me from the picture." His use of "story book" here served the same

---

[100] Both the ACME Kitchen Furniture Company and the Herron Pump and Foundry—as well as his brother Gaston Raoul's Odorless Refrigerator Company—are listed in the *City Directory of Chattanooga and Suburbs, 1907,* Volume 27. Raoul, 217. With reference to the theme of dependence and its diminishment of southern manhood, Raoul, while in Chattanooga, resolved to avoid charge accounts in the future, 229.

purpose as his earlier use of "slot machine" in his radical recollection of how capitalism's capriciousness reduced those traditional masculine qualities assumed natural for success in business to little more than a combination of luck and greed.[101]

Reflecting vicariously, Raoul imagined his peers' assessment of him: "Raoul's all right. He's resourceful, brilliant, capable, without a doubt, but there's a screw loose in Raoul." Was his history of failure in business due to a "loose screw," or had he been forced to work in a business environment for which he was "temperamentally unfitted?" He admitted that those business executives known to him and his family "were not breaking their necks to make contacts for [his] valuable services." Had he established the reputation of an "unruly subordinate"? If so, he now resolved "to make an effort in a field where I believed that I could rid myself of the superior officer with whom I had always seemed destined to find myself at cross purposes." He decided to open an office in Atlanta and to solicit accounting business. Yet his determination to achieve autonomy began by relying on the influence of state legislator Joe Hill Hall, an old friend of Raoul's described as the "rebel member of the Georgia legislature," who arranged for Raoul to travel the state with government auditors in examinations of state banks.[102] For Raoul, the rhetoric of manly independence would always be underpinned by the reliance upon others' influence.

---

[101] Raoul, 229-30.
[102] For Joe Hill Hall, see Allen D. Chandler and Clement A. Evans, *Cyclopedia of Georgia,* Volume 2 (Spartanburg, SC: The Reprint Company, 1972), 184-85.

Epiphany: Waycross to Atlanta

Raoul's bad memories of his Chicago ordeal informed his conversion to Socialism. Continued personal and business failure acted as a catalyst for transformation. Home from Chicago, Raoul wondered whether he was "the same stout heart" that had departed Atlanta for the Columbian Exposition three months earlier. Never personally religious, Raoul nevertheless may have borrowed this Baptist vocabulary from the Protestant ambience of the South. Personal failure was allayed by assigning blame on an exploitive system. He had been told that "every man who was willing to work [could] earn his living." This bromide "was a damned lie."[103] On the verge of switching class allegiances, Raoul ruminated on how he had "nothing, or near to nothing" to show for his fifteen years of varied business endeavors. In that time, he had become a "rolling stone" without gathering "either the moss of business reputation or of financial power." In his memory, Raoul "always seemed, in some unaccountable way, to become the storm center of some question of policy or procedure, which eventually eliminated me from the picture."[104] Self-doubt made him ask, "was there a screw loose in Raoul?"[105] Raoul's anxious sense of his own unfulfilled masculine identity combined with his frustrated expectations to make a volatile mix. His sexual life had been narrowed to prostitutes after an unsatisfying marriage; his business career had been reduced to temporary positions without prestige and performed by one increasingly peripatetic. Thus, Raoul's two primary outlets for masculine expression, as a husband and as a businessman, had been so far disappointing. An epiphany awaited that would provide an alternative path to gender happiness.

---

[103] Raoul, 23.
[104] *ibid.,* 229-30.
[105] *ibid.,* 233.

In Waycross, Georgia, in 1908, on a small accounting job, Raoul stayed for dinner with his uncle John Wadley, then president of the First National Bank of Waycross. While "mixing toddies at the sideboard," the two discussed politics and economics "in an academic way." After an inebriated discourse on a subject lost to memory, Raoul was told by his uncle John that one of his ideas was "socialistic." An authority on this unusual political subject was "a shoemaker here in town" who had given John Wadley some socialist literature. Raoul asked for the pamphlets. His aunt Hennie, treating the material as if it were taboo, happily complied with the comment, "here, William, here they are, take the dirty things. I'll be glad to get them out of the house."[106] It would be interesting to know why aunt Hennie had kept such forbidden material.

On the train home to Atlanta, Raoul began to thumb through the various pamphlets. He remembered one such "book," the "ABC of Socialism" by someone named Clemons who turned out to be Mark Twain's brother.[107] By the time he reached Atlanta, Raoul was in an "excited frame of mind," his imagination and reason "captured" by the various radical economic arguments. His "mind flashed back over the experiences of [his] life. Why was I not given work way back in Chicago when I was a beggar for it? Because the silly system had tied itself in a knot and no one could make a profit out of my labor." Raoul remembered how low wages in the Atlanta cotton mills and his high wages at the Lowell Mills in Massachusetts and realized that "one set of robbers could get more than another out of you, that was all there was to that."[108]

Back in his office in downtown Atlanta, Raoul's "blood surged back into my heart as I paced the room." He was animated by "hope, fight, and defiance." He ordered socialist

---

[106] Raoul, 234-35.
[107] Sandage, *Born Losers*, 256, discussed the flip side of the Gilded Age: "Even Mark Twain had to abandon a novel called *The Autobiography of a Damned Fool*, based on his elder brother Orion's hapless career as a lawyer, politician, inventor, land speculator, author, proof-reader, and chicken farmer. After giving up on *Damned Fool*, Samuel Clemons cruelly suggested that Orion himself write a memoir and call it *Confessions of a Life That was a Failure*." J.R. LeMaster and James D. Wilson, eds., *The Mark Twain Encyclopedia* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1993), 158-59.
[108] Raoul, 235-36.

literature and read voraciously. A light went on. "Maybe I was not a failure after all."[109] He began thinking of "a better world" in which he could participate. Raoul was "reborn, transformed, exalted, with this vision of what might be." He began to regard his past values and behavior with contempt. This language indicated a genuine conversion. Raoul's epiphany transformed his narrow conception of proper masculine behavior and of how a southern gentleman could acquire honor in a society where masculine reputation accrued via business success. He seemed, suddenly, "to stand for the moment far and aloof from . . . this painful, humiliating, money grabbing ambition."[110] He enjoyed, at least in memory, the irony of reading subversive literature at his "big comfortable desk in my comfortable office." His Dickensian-named stenographer, Miss Crosthwait, implored him in the stylized language Raoul reserved for nearly all women, "Oh, Mr. Raoul . . . if you would just put the energy in looking around for work that you do in reading those Socialist books, I know that you would get a lot to do." Traditional condescension fled in the face of uncharacteristic fury. Raoul turned "almost savagely" on his secretary: "Miss Crowthwait . . . just get this through your head. I have crawled around and begged for my last job. I'm going to sit here and read these Socialist books just as long as I want to, and when I get through doing that, I will be ready to tell you what I am going to do."[111] Miss Crosthwait, an idealized foil, and her impertinent advice, combined with his disgust of supplication, hastened Raoul's transition from a desk-bound masculinity to one with calloused hands.

---

[109] Sandage, 3, discusses "America's unsung heroes: men who failed in a nation that worships success . . . when capitalism came of age and entrepreneurship became the primary model of American identity . . . the era of self-made men and manifest destiny."
[110] Raoul, 236.
[111] Raoul, 237. Millis, "Autobiography," wrote that her brother "gave up his office, ceased to solicit work, and settled down to a daily study of economics, to the history of the socialist movement in Europe, and the writings of the leaders, such as Marx, Engels, Kautsky and so on. He took me for a pupil, and he shared his new knowledge with me," 325.

After spending a few days alone in the wilderness—chopping wood, eating inedible squirrel, and thinking—near the sawmill of an old friend, Raoul resolved to "make an honest living," to give up "reputation and influence" and depend, instead, on his "muscle and skill as a workman to supply my modest requirements." Raoul substituted one set of masculine criteria for another. "An honest living" meant one more genuine since it would be procured with muscle instead of deception. In contrast, "reputation and influence" were artifices of capitalism's exploitive system. Raoul would replace the artificiality of elite connections with the authenticity of manual labor; yet, remnants of his aristocratic upbringing would keep Raoul a liminal figure (in both his life and memories) easily able to penetrate the porous boundaries of whichever masculinity he chose to inhabit. Raoul possessed little muscle and less skill as he embarked on his search for a new masculinity. His "modest requirements" was not meant ironically. He had "begged and flattered and cajoled to get a chance to make a living for the last time." Henceforth, he "would quit lying about how prosperous [he] was and [his] prospects." As for his peers, he remembered that he was "through with their standards, and through with them." Instead, he would venture into the working-class world, carrying the "lance of the proselyte" and the naivete that he "would move among people who could understand what [he] was talking about."[112]

In this "exalted and rebellious state of mind," Raoul received a letter of complaint from a bank president whose books Raoul had earlier examined. He was angry that his cashier had been stealing from him for years and yet he, the bank president, had caught the thief instead of Raoul, the accountant. In the letter, he asked what good did it do him "to hire high priced accountants, if it is left to me to catch the defaulter?" Had such a letter arrived before Raoul's conversion, it would have thrown him "into a cold sweat. Now the privilege of answering it amused me immensely." "Joyously," Raoul wrote back that his advice "was to dispense with the

[112] Raoul, 242.

accountants, and do all the work himself." Raoul, a new man, would no longer abide "lecturing from anybody."[113]

* * *

Raoul's conversion to Socialism would not alter the pattern of parallel memories imposed by our retired radical upon his entire autobiography. As we have seen, he interpreted events that occurred previous to his conversion from a socialist perspective. His conversion did, however, create a literary double coda: the new man in both the intimate and political arenas. The next chapter will chart how Raoul remembered his love life, from his self-imposed celibacy to his wanton quest for sexual satisfaction—the first a symptom of the world he abandoned, the second a consequence of both an unsatisfying marriage and a later advocacy of the doctrine of "free love."

[113] Raoul, 242-43.

CHAPTER THREE

INTIMATE HONOR: PRACTICING SEX AND GENDER

The memory of sexual adventures rendered on the page risks condemnation, ridicule, or accusations of excessive vanity. William Raoul took this chance in his autobiography that overflows with intimate imbroglios. By unmasking himself, Raoul avoided the taint of dishonor by assuming an alternative, radical masculinity with an alternative system of values.[1] Having rejected the choices of masculinity common to his class and upbringing, he appropriated, instead, a manliness styled in part with socialist criticism of bourgeois values, and in part by advocating the New Woman (whose subversion of traditional gender expectations made easier his own sexual recklessness).[2] Raoul's memories weave together the private (his sex life) with the public (his honor) to reveal how he sought to reconcile his honor amidst the ambiguity of masculine performances.

Historian Bertram Wyatt-Brown argues that the honorable man's greatest fear was of "public humiliation."[3] Kenneth Greenberg concurs that "the public display of character . . . was at the core of the politics of honor."[4] Greenberg emphasizes the superficiality of Southern men of honor who "were concerned, to a degree we would consider unusual, with the surface of

---

[1] Greenberg, *Honor and Slavery*, introduces the link between honor and "unmasking" as the man of honor had the power to prevent his being unmasked; "anyone could unmask the dishonored," 25.

[2] Cultural historians owe a debt of gratitude to Joan Scott for establishing gender as a category of analysis, and Judith Butler for guidance on how to detect subversion of so-called normative gender roles. Joan Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," from *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999): 28-52; Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble*: *Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 32-33.

[3] Wyatt-Brown, *Honor and Violence*, viii. Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Culture*, continues his argument that the ethic of honor "depends on public display," 301. James Oakes, *Slavery and Freedom: An Interpretation of the Old South* (New York: Vintage Books, 1990), argues "honor and dishonor refer chiefly to reputation, to one's public persona, and as such they are expressed in symbols more than ideas," 15.

[4] Kenneth Greenberg, *Masters and Statesmen: The Political Culture of American Slavery* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), 12.

things—with the world of appearances."[5] Steven Stowe challenges the ostensible dichotomy between "words and actions," while stressing "language is a kind of activity" that requires interpretation of motive.[6] A man's honor, along with his life, could well be determined by the subtleties of language that served as prelude to a duel where the public display of one's honor may be the ultimate act. This historiography of the antebellum South assumed the link between honor and masculinity; even the illiterate poor whites would always share with the planters an honor based on mutual whiteness. Raoul complicated this connection in the New South by not only making use of many masculinities, but also by taking advantage of honor's gradual democratization across gamut of society's changing expectations and opportunities.

The difficulty in determining the role of honor in the sexual and gender activities of Raoul (and his sister, Mary) lies in the epistemology of memory, the tenuous link between history and its recollection, between the conveyance of reality or of representation.[7] Raoul's reconstruction of events thirty or forty years removed invites skepticism about the epistemological value of memory that scholars should welcome as the resulting ambiguity invites interpretation and the search for meaning amidst the words of an old man in search of (justifications for) his younger self. Raoul's memories, in other words, are more important than his deeds.

This chapter will examine how sexual honor was revealed on the one hand and on the other how the performance of gender both met and subverted normative expectations of honorable behavior through a close reading of Raoul's autobiography, juxtaposing when

---

[5] Greenberg, *Honor and Slavery*, 3.
[6] Steven M. Stowe, *Intimacy and Power in the Old South: Ritual in the Lives of the Planters* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 4.
[7] Joan Scott, "The Evidence of Experience," *Critical Inquiry* 17 (Summer 1991): 773-797, calls for historians to problematize "experience" as a way of knowing the past, to strip away its ostensible authenticity and reveal its epistemological flaws since "experience" is merely a product of memory.

appropriate his memories with those of his sister Mary. We will begin by analyzing Raoul's sexual confessions and correlating them with his own prescribed code of ethical intimacy. Then we will examine Raoul as a single man, a client of prostitutes, and spouse. Next, we will consider his gendered behavior to reveal Raoul's doubts about the apparent naturalness of masculinity and how his honor was rendered both directly and by implication. Here, too, we will proceed by looking at Raoul's gendered behavior as a young man, as a john, a married man, and as a divorcé. Finally, and here his sister Mary's remembrances are important, we will explore the omission of certain memories as a deliberate act accentuating the danger of memory as a historical source by pursuing the silences attendant to the Raoul siblings' sexual and gendered lives. After all, what is forgotten may be as important as what was remembered.[8]

Remembering Sex with Honor

The tension between memory and history, between what is remembered and what is forgotten, between claims for the truth and the narrative conventions by which autobiographical truth is rendered, collapses into an impressionistic "panorama" in memoir.[9] Raoul, by his selected remembrances, sought to reconcile the temporal conflict Pierre Nora described between memory as a servant of the present and history as "a representation of the past."[10] Raoul, in his narrative, interposed the present into the past to reveal multiple interpretations of his life's events

---

[8] Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, translated by Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004), 413-14. Ricouer fashions a number of metaphors to describe the relationship between memory and forgetting. First, "forgetting is experienced as an attack on the reliability of memory. An attack, a weakness, a lacuna. In this regard memory defines itself. . .as a struggle against forgetting." Second, "could memory have to negotiate with forgetting, groping to find the right measure in its balance with forgetting?" It should be noted that memory may also be likened to a recapitulation of a performance with forgetfulness acting as a self-critical agent of editing those events that do not accentuate the narrative recall.
[9] Raoul, 485.
[10] Nora, 3.

depending upon which Raoul was re-creating the impression, the aristocratic man of old-fashioned honor, or the modern man of socialist principles.

The threshold between sex and gender is not always clear. Raoul assumed the correct performance of the latter would necessarily lead to the former.[11] Raoul, a student at the Lawrenceville Preparatory School in New Jersey, escorted Josie, a "serving girl," to a bucolic spot on the school grounds. His narrative set the scene with familiar literary tropes: the trouble began "in that little woods near the pond, on that never-to-be-forgotten moonlight night, when the flowers were abloom in the Spring, and the young blood ran hot in our veins for an expression of our demanding sex." This ambience, whether contrived or not, is formulaic and redolent of the conventions of romance fiction. To anticipate our discussion of forgetfulness, or remembered silences, Raoul wrote that he "had never heard anything to indicate that there was anything wrong about sex expression. The only trouble was that I had never had an opportunity to gratify this instinct."[12] After their moonlight tryst, he "walked as a God" as he escorted Josie to her room across the campus. The honor accruing to divinity evaporated upon Raoul's return

---

[11] Raoul's usurpation of a feminine ritual is subversive of gender because of the confusing messages conveyed for both his peers and himself. Geertz, *Interpretation*, 89, is helpful in emphasizing the "pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge and attitudes toward life." Culture is, of course, rendered tangible through ritual. For Geertz, rituals represent "plastic dramas [where] men attain their faith as they portray it," 114. Raoul's masculinity may have instead been diminished by his "coming out party," an ostensibly "modern" innovation concocted by his mother with unanticipated consequences. Arnold van Gennep, *Rite of Passage*, 67, is helpful with regard to Raoul as he describes the "rites of separation from the asexual world. . .followed by rites of incorporation into the world of sexuality." Raoul, again, is the exception as his transitions—a sexual rite of passage and transgendered coming out ritual—point to the retardation of assumed sexual attributes instead of a happy initiation to them.

[12] Raoul, 3. This is reminiscent of the many silences incorporated within the Victorian discourse on sexuality as described by Michel Foucault in *The History of Sexuality, An Introduction: Volume 1*, translated from the French by Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1990), 27: "There is no binary division to be made between what one says and what one does not say; we must try to determine the different ways of not saying such things, how those who can and those who cannot speak of them are distributed, which type of discourse is authorized, or which form of discretion is required in either case. *There is not one but many silences,* and they are an integral part of the strategies that underlie and permeate discourses." (emphasis added.) Upton Sinclair, *American Outpost* (Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1932), 39, contributed to this discourse in his memoir: "I was taught to avoid the subject of sex in every possible way; the teaching being done, for the most part, in Victorian fashion, by deft avoidance and anxious evasion."

to his dormitory when his indiscretion became public knowledge as his "House Master" waited in his room and demanded an explanation for his being out at night with a young lady who was not a student. Raoul refuted his dorm steward's accusations: "there was no rule against love making and that therefore I had violated none."[13] This oblique defense did not save Raoul's reputation even as he attached honor to his actions: "Alas! My *gallantry* in escorting Josie home was our undoing. There was a general roundup. We were separated, and cross-questioned incommunicado!"[14] Raoul retained a fragment of his honor as one of his confederates lied about the young men's purpose out after dark. Upon discovering that Raoul had not, his friend exclaimed in resigned admiration, "I knew that you were going to tell him the truth."[15] He was sent home humiliated with the troublesome task of explaining his expulsion from school to his parents. The public nature of honor must have now for the first time made its immense weight felt on Raoul as he contemplated not merely his own disgrace but the peripheral shame apportioned to his parents, Greene and Mary Raoul.

Whatever "paroxysm of delight" Raoul may have experienced with Josie must have seemed poor compensation for his tortuous journey home. He met his uncle George Wadley en route from the Lawrenceville School to the Raoul's temporary home in Staten Island, New York. His uncle George reassured him that he, too, had encountered similar situations as a young man with the exception that he and his friends "had gotten what we went after."[16] Such bravado presumably made Raoul's confession no easier. Confronting his father, Raoul said that he had only put his arm around Josie's waist. For the only time in his life, Raoul did not believe his

---

[13] Raoul, 3. "Love making" in the late nineteenth century was not synonymous with sexual intercourse; it was rather a combination of physical proximity and mutual desire. Ayers, *Promise* wrote, "in the late nineteenth century, sexual relations did not have to end in intercourse or even physical contact to be considered intimate and dangerous to a woman's reputation and self-respect," 140. Of course, in this case, it was not the woman's reputation at stake.
[14] *ibid.*, 3.
[15] *ibid.*, 4.
[16] *ibid.*, 5.

father when Greene told him that he had never put his arm around his mother before they were married. His mother's reaction to the bad news only reinforced his father's admonitions as her tears served metonymically to represent all women of Raoul's "aristocratic" memories as sentimental if not hysterical when confronted with any reversal or problem that might have reflected poorly on the family's reputation.[17]

These conversations with his uncle George and his father and mother created confusion in Raoul's mind on how to reconcile his sexual desires and the expectations of his family and social class. He claimed to have "never heard anything to indicate that there was anything wrong about sex expression."[18] In response to his relations' collective reaction, however, he admitted, "there must be something wrong about this business of sex that I hadn't heard about."[19] Raoul did not hold his own actions culpable; instead, he believed his sexual difficulties were discursively generated by an unfathomable combination of commission and omission. Furthermore, Raoul "had a vague, deep conviction that the trouble was that the girl was not of my social strata. That this made my intentions 'not honorable,' and that if she had been so the situation would have been even more alarming."[20] In other words, class obligations ran horizontally, not vertically: indiscretions with servants were less dangerous because their class could not afford the costs of lawyers; nor did they usually have the capacity (and often the incentive, especially if their employment depended upon discretion) to make the matter public. Liaisons with peers were more precarious because of the code of honor among white elites who

---

[17] Raoul, 6.
[18] *ibid.*, 3. This is reminiscent of the many silences incorporated within the Victorian discourse on sexuality as described by Foucault in *Sexuality*, 27. Raoul would later illustrate Foucault's notion of an illicit sexual discourse outside the dominant discursive ambience created by Victorian authorities.
[19] *ibid.*, 6. According to Foucault's argument in *Sexuality*, Raoul violated proper sexual spaces and purposes; his act was neither "utilitarian" nor confined to domestic space with an appropriate partner, 3.
[20] *ibid.*, 7. Rotundo, *American Manhood*, writes about cross-class sexual liaisons between elite young men and lower-class women. These young adults "raided the amusement parks or the evening streets in search of girls that could be frankly pursued for their physical charms." Common was the young gentleman who "tested his passions on women of a different class whose humanness he recognized only fleetingly and with surprise," 125.

had previously required satisfaction with pistols now paid attorneys to resolve financial and social grievances. It seemed that elite men had sexual access to working class women—or wanted to; and when these liaisons included cross-racial components, it was even more titillating (cf: Strom Thurmond).

The servant girl, Josie, did not reappear in Raoul's autobiography although he continually found her surrogate in the years to follow in his frustrating quest for sex. Raoul's erotic template was formed in this moment and working women remained an object of desire (not just an avenue of access) for years thereafter. Raoul took his own honor for granted even if his partners did not. He sometimes acted as if desirable working class women should surrender their body and affection to him while simultaneously trusting his inherent paternalism, with its implied honor, to make the proper judgment about the relationship's future course. The confusion created by cross-class romances would cause Raoul quandaries (and his family great anxiety) in the coming years.

This late adolescent/young adult trauma with Josie the serving girl, combined with his parents' reaction to the sexual activity itself, its possible public ramifications, and the class complications it threatened, resulted in Raoul's decision to avoid sex, "this cherished and demanding adventure until I was . . . married."[21] He was rueful that marriage did not automatically come at the age of majority. Marriage was tied to money, a career, and business reputation that remained vexatious in Raoul's life—thus reaffirming the eternal connection between money and sex. With apparent anger, he remembered keeping this resolution on celibacy until he was twenty-four years old, while "not denying some occasional, and bitterly

[21] Raoul, 7.

repented masturbation."[22] Raoul's memory lingered over this lasting resentment about what he considered unnatural restraint. He complained about how his "sex instinct had been more or less sublimated" in contrast to his brothers, Gaston and Tom, who "took the conventional attitude toward sex. It existed, but was not then to be dealt with."[23] According to Raoul, his celibacy was a "false ideal, indicated, rather than stated to me, by my parents," an omission that denied him "a normal physical life. Under the code of my class, marriage was impossible at that age, and this ideal made any other sex expression equally impossible." He "always regretted" the sexual restraint of his early adulthood and believed it left him with "a certain timidity about any intimate caress which persists until this day. I have an unreasoned fear of a rebuff."[24]

Because Raoul reveled in confession and self-criticism, the opprobrium he apportioned to his parents for their collective silence and nearly mute disapproval indicated genuine anger and disappointment. In fact, the pattern of his complaints could be categorized as a search for "authentic" experiences amidst a tenacious Victorian shroud. Raoul's regrets might also be interpreted as the personification of what historian John Kasson described as the dichotomy between the emerging view of the "body as an expression of individual desire and site of pleasure" with the "Victorian conception of the body as a moral reservoir and instrument of

---

[22] *ibid.*, 7. Masturbation, the sexual equivalent to silence, is discussed by Foucault as the target of a discursively produced "medico-sexual regime" designed to keep male seed where it belonged—between conjugal sheets instead of being perversely wasted for pleasure alone, 42. Singal, *War Within*, argues Victorian culture "stood for a traditional moral discipline, instilled in a child through education and a proper upbringing, which enabled him to keep his baser emotions in check," 5. Thomas Laqueur, *Solitary Sex: A Cultural History of Masturbation* (New York: Zone Books, 2003), quotes Havelock Ellis, "for both sexes, masturbation in adolescence causes morbid self-consciousness and lack of self-esteem, because it fails to deliver on the ego-boosting 'sense of pride and elation' that comes from being kissed by a desirable person of the opposite sex," 378. Raoul may have assimilated the "deep guilt about and hostility to masturbation" that marked the career of Anthony Comstock, 48. Sinclair, *Outpost,* wrote that he had "never entered into sex relations with any woman until my marriage at the age of twenty-two" and that "for a period of five years or more I was subject to storms of craving; I would become restless and miserable," 64.
[23] Raoul, 16.
[24] *ibid.*, 7-8. Sinclair, *Outpost,* wrote in 1932 that "nowadays we hear a great deal about mental troubles caused by sex repression; it is the mood of the moment," 66.

productive labor."[25] Raoul would, in time, reject the values of his family as, in the words of historian T. J. Jackson Lears, a "hothouse of suffocating repression and insoluble personal conflict."[26] Was Raoul in search of "authenticity" or sex—or do they swell in his psyche to amount to the same thing? He rejected the bourgeois ideal of the Victorian home as a refuge of domestic tranquility as his first wife Ruth suffered repeated miscarriages and, as a result, abhorrence to intimate contact. Raoul's earlier complaints that marriage did not arrive with his majority were now replaced with complaints that marriage did not guarantee a happy sexual union. Only in 1915 would Raoul create his own version of the "New Woman" in his younger cousin Winifred Wadley, encouraging her to smoke in public and wear masculine overalls and other gender-subversive activities designed to gain both her confidence and possession of her body.[27] Raoul's construction of a "New Woman" from Winifred's parts pushed his family (and community) past amused toleration to suspicious hostility. Furthermore, by bringing Meta Fuller Sinclair, who was seen as a "genuine" "New Woman," to the family plantation in 1915, Raoul revealed an indulgent masculinity unsuitable for a man of his class, though perhaps apropos to an advocate of "free love." His later recklessness may have been the result of his earlier intimate timidity and rage against imposed sexual restrictions. He may have simply been in love with two women at the same time and reasoned that the modern Meta could accommodate his whims; yet, his rash behavior alienated all—those gazing longingly toward a certain past, and those looking ahead to an improvised future.

---

[25] Kasson, *Houdini*, 75-76.
[26] Lears, *Grace*, 6.
[27] Kasson, *Houdini,* 13: "the 'New Woman' was a capacious term for middle- and upper-class women who in various ways conducted themselves with a new independence and assertiveness, whether by shopping in department stores, smoking in public, playing tennis, expressing interest in sexuality, earning advanced degrees, entering traditionally male professions, calling for social and political reforms, or agitating for the ballet."

If Raoul, while remembering his intimate history as a single man, did not always explicitly put honor and sex in the same bed, the two are at least in the same room with the latter trying to convince the former to follow its lead. After Raoul's wife, Ruth, died in 1905, he went to Chattanooga to work as an accountant for his brother Gaston who managed the Odorless Refrigerator Company. Raoul took a room in his brother's house while objecting to Chattanooga's social backwardness and lack of entertaining. Decked out in their "linen suits," the brothers traded glances with "a striking young woman" who passed their porch in the early evening. She was dubbed the "Flower Girl" because of the blossom carried "between her lips." Gaston's interest in this botanical/bodily display was "academic" while Raoul's was "highly personal."[28] After the young lady telephoned one evening, he made excuses to visit her. Raoul remembered, "We went into a clinch the first night, as we stood together, toying with something on the mantel, and kissed until we were dizzy."[29] Raoul coaxed the Flower Girl to receive him "without corsets, and she, like Mae West, had something to put in them."[30] He investigated "these upper glories" and caressed them. Locked in as firm an embrace as their clothes would allow, on the sofa or the floor, Raoul was nevertheless foiled in his attempts to "consummate the embrace." The hours spent "toying and kissing" provoked the potential lovers "to madness." In desperation, he confided to her that he had come "armed," and "there is no danger of your becoming pregnant." Her "storm of weeping" upon hearing this apparently dubious—if not dishonorable—inducement to sex left Raoul confused. He reasoned, in his remembrance, that the Flower Girl may have expected a proposal of marriage instead of a quickie on the couch. If so, Raoul wondered, "would it not have been much better to have become pregnant, and taken

---

[28] Raoul. 201.
[29] *ibid.*, 202.
[30] *ibid.* Anachronistic of course as Mae West became famous in the twenties and thirties, though she clearly made a lasting impression upon Raoul.

chances of that effect on me, than to have indulged in all of this undignified pawing and teasing and kissing."[31]

Honor is clearly the third party in this confusing *ménage-a-trois*. The Flower Girl was undoubtedly hopeful that Raoul, an ostensible man of honor by virtue of his appearance and position in society, might elevate their relationship above the "undignified pawing and teasing" by taking her as his wife. Raoul, on the other hand, perceived the Flower Girl's passion as identical to his own and believed his condom sufficient protection to cause consummation. This tactical error was compounded by the larger strategic mistake of presuming his class status bequeathed unto him a superior judgment born of implied honor so that she should have accepted the risk of pregnancy and "taken chances of that effect" on Raoul. He, of course, never revealed his ultimate intentions, though by reconstructing this episode in this manner, he put his reader in the ironic position of siding with the Flower Girl whose skepticism his wider audience was bound to share. Raoul's apparent candor throughout his autobiography diminished the notion that this intimate re-creation is merely disingenuous; yet, to accept his premise that the Flower Girl had only to trust in his judgment, was to reveal the ascendancy of one pattern of memories, those of his earlier, aristocratic self over another collection of memories aimed at convincing his readership (if not himself) of his essentially progressive nature.

In an unlikely juxtaposition, Raoul's Flower Girl was followed by a young lady dubbed the "Butcher's Girl." This dalliance, even more than his previous Chattanooga encounter, demonstrated how honor was constructed through memory. After spotting her working as a cashier in her father's butcher shop, Raoul soon invented reasons to visit. "She was a rich brunette, with a mass of wavy black hair, and full voluptuous lips." These obligatory descriptions offered by Raoul were prelude to stories whose endings were mostly unfortunate for

[31] Raoul, 202-03.

all concerned. The reader of his memoir will notice the red flag in his second paragraph concerning this particular episode: "Her father was a day laborer."[32] In Raoul's world, this announcement was tantamount to a conflict across classes whose first casualty was honor when the demand for sex overcame all other considerations.

Raoul made plain the inappropriateness of this relationship while creating narrative tension through the lust that he could barely contain. The reader is left wondering how far will he go to acquire his desires, combined with how will he reconcile (that is, remember) his honor to circumstances inherently dishonorable due to class differences and intentions. Raoul admitted to being "serious about the girl"; next he confessed, "there was absolutely nothing in common between us, save the call of sex, which, for all I know, may be the best reason in the world for marriage. God knows, a satisfactory sexual mating is rare enough in that contract."[33] Here Raoul recalled his marriage to Ruth, whose chronic pain and fear of pregnancy prevented any semblance of a normal sexual life.

Class impediments make problematic Raoul's confusion between lust and love. The "Butcher Girl's" sister entertained a man who was "keeping company," an "odious expression" in Raoul's estimation. Raoul disliked any parallel between his own sexual pursuits and this other man whom he loathed. This cretin apparently lived with the sister "without any intention of going further." Raoul did not want anyone thinking the same of him, though the source of his contempt was unclear: by not "going further" did the other man have no plans of marriage? Raoul's disdain was undoubtedly due to class differences as one might expect with a Chattanooga meat seller, his daughters and their boyfriends. This aside, Raoul wrote that he and the "Butcher Girl's" interminable kissing created "pressure" that they could stand "no longer."

---

[32] Raoul, 206.
[33] *ibid.*

He "had quit the whore houses" and the unlikely couple "decided that we would get married at once."[34] This would not be the last time Raoul's desire would provoke him into a rash rush to matrimony.

Raoul remembered how his family's honor came into play when he announced his intentions to marry the "Butcher Girl." He anticipated a "big blow up." He informed his mother, and the "pain of the scene comes back to me now. She burst into tears, and would hear little more from me after the manner of meeting, and the girl's occupation was disclosed."[35] The tears, of course, were anticipated; Raoul's narrative conventions permitted few deviations from this standard feminine response to any adversity. "William, my son! A butcher shop! A butcher shop! William, oh William, you don't know what you are doing my son. You don't know what you are doing. A butcher shop!" Here we see how the texture of Raoul's memory was perhaps burdened by gendered expectations. His mother was unlikely to have engaged in such histrionics; the evidence we have of her emotional life—her letters—do not reflect this same emotional intensity or stereotyped speech. Mary Wadley Raoul's disappointment in the relationship was matched by her son's. Raoul wrote that "no man can reach the age of thirty five, especially is he has been married before, without realizing that love plays but a small part in the outcome of that contract, enforced by law, and all the power of public opinion."[36] It is unsurprising that "public opinion" would enter into his calculations as he knew its power to bestow or retract respect based upon (dis)honorable behavior.

The power of public opinion may have been sufficient to halt Raoul's precipitous rush into marriage to satisfy sexual cravings. After telling his mother of his plans, he took a vacation at the family's manor at Asheville, North Carolina. There he encountered other women more

---

[34] Raoul, 207.
[35] *ibid.*, 207.
[36] *ibid.*, 208.

appropriate for his amorous intentions, and he forgot the "Butcher Girl." When they last met, "she met me with a haughty stare. I left, with my head high, but feeling like the cur that she doubtless thought me, and which probably I was." This apparent admission of dishonorable conduct was diminished by his admission, "strangely enough, I cannot remember either the first or last name of this girl."[37] The final word lay with the man with pen and paper and his ability to both introduce and erase from history this unknown young woman whose story will never be told outside of the role of the "Butcher Girl" she plays in Raoul's re-creation of his sexual past. He admitted that his behavior resembled that of a "cur," an animal without either beauty or honor. It is worth noting that this self criticism derived, not from his radical self, but from his old-fashioned aristocratic scorn.

Raoul's recklessness in pursuit of sexual satisfaction—damaging to his family, himself, and his mostly-forgotten partners—was always alloyed by his recognition of the role of honor, whether in his favor or not. One curious incident revealed the ways that honor continued to exert a tense hold over his behaviors and actions, a brake on the fulfillment of his desires. As a radical hobo in 1911, Raoul traveled to Butte, Montana where a socialist mayor had assumed civic leadership. He stopped overnight in Kansas City, Missouri, where he found a hotel room. Upon entering, he observed two beds with "two sleeping women, entirely naked." We may imagine the "wild bedlam of visions" that crowded Raoul's imagination. He envisioned not an orgy, but the women "suddenly awakening to find a strange man standing over them. Wild screams, the house alarmed, too much racket for me to explain, the little town awakened, a mob formed, and then me, an unknown *working man*, never seen in the town before, with the job of explaining

[37] Raoul, 208.

why I was invading the room of the naked ladies."[38] (emphasis added.) It is hard to imagine a memory more in need of unpacking.

It is interesting that this episode, while occurring in Raoul's life when his dedication to Socialism was at its apex, was remembered almost entirely as a Southerner familiar with the dangers of transgressing local community standards. His visions of a lynch mob, a transracial nightmare in this case, animated Raoul's fear and was a catalyst for his flight. His presence in a room with hysterical, naked white women, his working-class appearance combined with his status as a newcomer, without anyone to vouch for his character, was enough to make Raoul inadvertently empathize with the black man. His dress would contradict any explanations and these, if believed, would beg more questions about his masquerade as one type of man when he claimed to be another type of man. That he betrayed no indignation over this particular memory, that is, over the anticipation of his anxieties being fulfilled, demonstrated how Raoul's aristocratic memory assumed hegemony, in this particular incident, over his progressive reconstructions of his sexual past.

Eight years later, in 1915 at the family's plantation in Millen, Georgia (about midway between Atlanta and Savannah), Raoul, instead of restraining his sexual desire as he had with the "Montana milk-maid," (discussed later in this chapter) proposed marriage to Winifred Wadley, a cousin half his age, specifically for carnal reasons. Raoul's memoir dismissed those family members aghast at such an "emotional bombshell."[39] He told Winifred that marriage would be "a more satisfactory relationship than the one we had then entered into." Raoul remembered that this astounding proposal was made "without any previous consideration of the subject."[40] Presumably to sweeten this dubious deal, he assured his eighteen-year-old cousin that if the

---

[38] Raoul, 267.
[39] *ibid.,* 346.
[40] *ibid.,* 345.

union proved undesirable, "it could be easily dissolved." And then, as if to reiterate the innocence of the whole arrangement and his subsequent surprise at the vehement opposition, Raoul added a coda: "Alas, we both had much to learn."[41]

Raoul's pursuit of sex, pathetically stymied for myriad reasons, his reckless decisions based on lust here, his timid restraint and later self-loathing there, all comprised the separate selves of a man remembering his own conduct from various vantage points. Not only do Raoul's memories shift from an aging aristocrat to a somewhat younger radical, but with these two perspectives emerge various perceptions of honor as well as the radical predilection for equality between the sexes that mitigated what would have been considered questionable behavior for the aristocrat.

The preceding paragraph made plain the elusive role of honor in Raoul's sexual life as a single man. He feigned surprise that his family reacted badly to his inappropriate marriage to his much younger cousin that threatened the family with scandal.[42] Raoul's mother, his aunt Sarah, and most of his siblings simply imposed a wall of silence between his maladroit behavior and their collective embarrassment (and dishonor) at what appeared to be a monstrous indiscretion all for the sake of sex. Winifred's older sister, Florence, "put up the hardest fight, and wielded the greatest power. She and I had several battles, in which things were said, not yet forgotten."[43] His sister, Mary, the closest of his siblings and sympathetic to his political beliefs, cast a jaundiced eye toward his inter-family marriage. This general opposition was brushed aside with the insouciance of a man comfortable with improvisation having earlier jettisoned the restraint attendant to gentlemen's code of conduct. Raoul's confession that he had not fully considered

---

[41] Raoul, 346.
[42] *The Atlanta Constitution*, 28 January 1915, 7 carried the announcement without embellishment, though the bold heading Wadley-Raoul must have been a shock to peers, friends, and family member in Atlanta, Macon, and Savannah.
[43] Raoul, 346.

the ramifications of his proposal, coupled with his assurance to Winifred that marriage might be as easily terminated as consummated, demonstrated a man whose moral moorings have not been so much severed as tied to alternative posts of honor, from artificial traditions to authentic living.

The Honorable John

William Raoul attributed to prostitutes a capacity for honor equal to that of other women in his society.[44] He did this in part to leave unscathed his own sense of honor as frequent sexual purchases might otherwise sully his self-esteem or, worse, his public reputation. Raoul's memories also acted as a radical critique of the hierarchies of late nineteenth-century America, the presumed role of women, and the dearth of sexual outlets for men like himself, too young, too timid, too financially dependent. He remembered with apparent jealousy social functions at his parents' Atlanta home where his peers gathered. Raoul, of course, was cocooned in celibacy "but I was no damned fool, and I knew . . . perfectly well that everyone of these finely dressed and soft-spoken gentlemen who called upon my sister made regular tours of the houses of prostitution down along the railroad tracks."[45] Dissecting the sexual world of his youth and

---

[44] Millis, "Autobiography," spends little time discussing prostitutes although her attitude toward the institution is revealed in her youthful confusion over the name of a local estate pronounced "Paramour" Hill but spelled "Parrymore." Mary writes, "my budding intelligence had learned the significance of the word, and I was troubled to find such a word out there among the lovely pines; I felt it was wicked and distinctly out of place," 12-13.

[45] Raoul, 36. *Atlanta City Directory, 1894,* listed seven Madame's addresses on Collins Street adjacent to the downtown cluster of railroad tracks, located on property now occupied by Georgia State University. Hunter, *'Joy My Freedom*, describes prostitution as a "thriving business beginning in the 1880s and 1890s as the commercial fortunes of the city rose and attracted traveling businessmen, railroad men, and visitors to fairs. . .In 1900 there were ten identifiable brothels on Collins Street [bisecting the campus of Georgia State University as part of the old underground Atlanta], eight of them were occupied by white prostitutes, two by blacks," 112-13. Kuhn, *Contesting*, describes the same area extending along Decatur Street as "a border zone, where people from different classes, races, and ethnic backgrounds regularly commingled," 47. Kuhn writes that Atlanta promoters enhanced the visibility of prostitutes "by issuing a pamphlet in 1911 that showed on its cover a picture of Atlanta as a seductive woman luring prospective conventioneers to the city," 51. By comparison, Alecia P. Long's, *The Great Southern Babylon: Sex, Race, and Respectability in New Orleans, 1865-1920* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004), writes New Orleans' city officials in 1900 "reported that there were 230 brothels and 60 assignation

middle age, Raoul wrote of a time when "no woman who ever expected to marry could gratify her natural sex instinct until she was married, and in which the men did not for a moment accept any law governing their polygamous natures."[46] Again, essential to Raoul's critique of the sexual restrictions of his society lay in elevating women (including prostitutes) to a sexual status equal to men. This strategy served two purposes: it made his own access to sex presumably easier, while attacking an economic and social order exploitive and unfair in the eyes of a Socialist whose political apostasy was triggered by his failures in that very system.

Prostitution served American society by allowing a social space for masculine (gendered because of an absence of similar spaces for women) activities otherwise kept sequestered. Raoul glibly quoted one mysterious divine who allegedly preached, "the prostitute is the bulwark of the home."[47] On a purely personal level, Raoul recalled that he "never could withhold a certain homage and affection for any woman who granted me the ultimate favor, whether paid for directly, or indirectly, or not at all." On an ostensibly loftier level, he confessed, "I could never hold these women in the contempt that most men did. I had observed enough to know that marriage could be a prostitution and that it often was. These girls had more control over their minds and bodies than some married women whom I know."[48] Raoul's "homage" may be attributed to his sheer relief at gaining sexual satisfaction in a life vexatious in its intimate sphere. His following comparison, however, between the relative autonomy of prostitutes with "some married women whom I know" was potentially more than mere criticism. Mary Wadley Raoul, his mother, may be the implied target of this devastating observation.

---

houses in the district [identify the district]. These figures do not take into account the dozens of cribs, saloons, dance halls, cafes, and restaurants where prostitutes solicited and sometimes even did business while tourists or local slummers looked on," 158. Long's book is especially good on the construction of race in the attempts of New Orleans' city officials to diminish the sexual allure and economic success of mixed race octoroons.

[46] Raoul, 83.

[47] *ibid.*

[48] *ibid.*, 85.

For twenty years, from 1870 to 1890, his mother had given birth to ten babies and raised nine of them to adulthood. According to Mary Raoul Millis, the oldest child, their mother "was terrified by childbirth. The birth of her first child (the author) was a nightmare, which she could not recount without shuddering." After the birth of her fourth child, Thomas, in 1876, Mary Raoul "told her own mother…that never again would she endure such suffering. 'I shall take chloroform. You say it may kill me. Well, I would rather die than go through this torture.'"[49] Raoul may have linked his first marriage to Ruth Cunningham, where sexual intercourse amounted to Russian roulette creating torturous pregnancies, avoided intimacy, and eventual death, with his own mother's obligatory misery over two decades of relentless, dreaded childbirth. He may have also connected his mother's interminable state of pregnancy with his and Ruth's inability to access proper birth control methods—not a trivial matter in either case.[50] With these factors in mind, it is not difficult to understand Raoul's envy of prostitutes who could control their rate of sexual activity, prevent pregnancies by proper birth control, and exercise a degree of autonomy over their personal lives often denied the Victorian matron.

Raoul became an avid consumer of prostitutes at the age of twenty-four. He sampled their wares in Atlanta, Chattanooga, and Butte, Montana. His observations on the sex trade

---

[49] Millis, *Family,* 37. According to Mary, her mother spoke of childbirth in terms comparable to those employed by Tolstoy in *Anna Karenina* and Sigrid Undset in *Kristin Lavransdatter.* Millis, "Autobiography," described the consequences of her mother's fear of childbirth: "she was so insistent, and painted in such very dark colors the penalty I would undoubtedly pay (perhaps losing the baby, or even my own life), and elaborating so upon the unimaginable pain of the ordeal of childbirth, that I was overborne, and consented to go home about one month before the expected time of the event," 183.

[50] Mary Beth Norton and Ruth M. Alexander, eds., *Major Problems in American Women's History: Documents and Essays* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003), "Letters to Margaret Sanger, Birth-Control Advocate, from American Wives and Husbands, 1920s." One woman writes that she had been raised in town but after her marriage had moved to the country where the local "thought I knew and appealed to me," 292. A husband writes about the delicate health of his wife and how conception "probably meant her death." After professes his love for her, he virtually pleads for contraceptive advice so his spouse "could obey nature without the shadow of death," 292-93. Another wife and mother of six worried that her husband stayed away from their home in fear of the temptation of intercourse that would "make the family larger." She tells Margaret Sanger, "I think Birth Control would be all right in our case. I love babies but I think we have had our share," 293.

reiterate his inclination to remember it merely another form of commerce without the social stigma of shame. Raoul told his best friend of his celibacy, his disappointment that marriage did not arrive coterminous with his majority, and how his sexual restraint had been a mistake. He wrote, "I was taking the first reasoned philosophic steps to the left about legal marriage, and I was destined to take many more."[51] Raoul's pattern of memories here obviously derived from his socialist self, though the reader should be alert to Victorian counter-memories. He told his friend that he was finished with celibacy "and wanted to go over the line, but that I didn't know my way down to Collins Street, or what next to do when I got there."[52]

The two young men eagerly made their way to a large and comfortably furnished house near Decatur Street along railroad tracks in the heart of Atlanta. A Negro maid admitted them into a large drawing room whose furniture had been arranged to permit dancing. An unspecified number of girls arrived "dressed in something between full evening [ware] and bed-room negligee."[53] Next appeared the "Professor," described by Raoul as "some broken down, discarded, or disgraced musician, who furnishes the music for the socially inclined guests to dance by. He never addresses, or even looks, at anyone."[54] Here the older Raoul of paternal condescension makes this memory his. Neither Raoul, his friend and guide, nor the prostitutes earn a word of opprobrium in his memories; yet, an unknown white man (presumably if he had been black, Raoul would have certainly said so) was regarded with contempt for working at a place where Raoul solicited sex from strangers. This "Professor" (the quotation marks connote irony by juxtaposing his musical skill against his place of employment) is "broken down,"

---

[51] Raoul, 82-83.
[52] *ibid.*, 83.
[53] *ibid.*, 84.
[54] *ibid.*, 83. In *Southern Babylon*, Long writes of New Orleans' brothels that some "offered piano music, fine wines, thick walls, heavy doors, numerous bedrooms, and self-conscious decorum, all of which muffled the sounds of sexual commerce," 162.

"discarded," or "disgraced." Like an obsequious Negro, he is invisible and without speech or the power to gaze. Raoul's evaluation of this man must have been formed in mere seconds, and it is curious that with all the residual shame collected in this parlor that Raoul should select the piano player as the repository of everything degraded. That he was white probably made Raoul's contempt even easier as a black man might be expected to subsist in such surroundings. His presence was fortuitous as the embodied the opposite to Raoul's idea of honor. By extracting all honor from this "Professor," there was more to apportion to himself, his guide, his "girl."

In an evening of never-ending surprises, Raoul danced with girls without corsets, thus contradicting, in the most delightful way, his mother's repeated admonition that "corsets could not be done away with." Beer arrived after the dancing. The maid distributed quart bottles for a dollar each and lots of "little glasses. You couldn't get away with a dance without ordering beer. If you didn't think of it, you were reminded. The 'Madame' saw to this," though the 'Madame' herself was seldom seen.[55] Raoul, the future Captain of Industry, may have appreciated this marketing ploy and persuasive sales pitch; after all, the proprietor may have made a higher percentage of profit on the bottles of beer than she did on flesh.

In time-honored tradition, in or outside of brothels, then and now, beer was followed by sex. Raoul, according to his friend, had merely to repeat the incantation, "let's us go up stairs," to the girl of his choice; then! "no hanging back, no coquetry, no argument about whether it would be right or safe. Instant assent!"[56] Once upstairs in the boudoir, the wheels of commerce continued to grind as the maid arrived with more beer. And after a decent interval, the maid/cocktail waitress would serve the happy couple even in bed. Raoul's enchantment might have been complete had he sufficient funds to visit more often. Here, his honor was called into

---

[55] Raoul, 84.
[56] *ibid.*

question as his dependency upon his father's largesse diminished not only his capacity for consuming sex, but also his reputation as a player in the world of business.

Raoul's next visit to "the district along the railroad tracks" took place after the death of his wife Ruth in January 1905. He remembered that "there was no question but that I was deeply moved" by her passing; yet, "the pent up desire of sex was immediately demanding." We should note that his marriage to Ruth was tantamount to a full-time nursing position instead of that of a husband. At the brothel after the funeral, Raoul picked out a girl he remembered afterwards "for her pretty face, and for other reasons. Soon after I returned to Waycross I discovered that I had gonorrhea."[57] Raoul continued his comedy: his south Georgia physician "took me in hand, and was fortunately able to affect a prompt cure."[58] The humor with which this distasteful detail was related pointed to the absence of vanity by the author in provoking laughter at his expense, while manfully accepting the medical difficulties and embarrassment entailed in treatment. After all, masculine virtue required nonchalance in the face of adversity. For the historian, Raoul's selection of this memory is more important than its veracity. Its use skillfully disarms the reader and renders Raoul's recollections credible.

Shortly after Ruth's death, Raoul moved to Chattanooga to work as an accountant and to live with his brother, Gaston. We have already discussed Raoul's amorous adventures there with the "Flower Girl" and the "Butcher's Daughter" as a single man with unmarried women. In this city wrapped in the coils of the Tennessee River, Raoul also pursued sex for sale. These were solitary adventures since he had only business acquaintances in Chattanooga, plus, of course his "sexless" brother, Gaston. Raoul began his quest in an unlikely way. Quite by chance, he saw "a remarkably handsome policeman directing traffic." Within days, the same

---

[57] Raoul, 182.
[58] *ibid.*, 183.

patrolman appeared at his office at the ACME Kitchen Furniture warehouse and dissuaded him from the red light district: "I know a young married woman, who is not on good terms with her husband, who is quite a wonder, and if you want me to, I will arrange a little trip some night this week, and we will all go out together." Our author seemed to have deleted material from this story where serendipity seemed to play too great a part. Raoul's risk was now multiplied: a police escort to a married woman who worked as a prostitute. The two took the incline to the top of Lookout Mountain. Raoul's "partner was nothing to commit a crime about, but she was a good looker." The policeman's lover "was this one's mother. Just one look at her was a shock."[59] Raoul accomplished his "purpose" by "sitting in a chair"; a novel position for Raoul who was asked to hand over a five dollar bill while the two of them "were in this crucial position."[60] When Raoul asked if this episode "sounds a little sordid," he intentionally drew his readers further into his confidence by allowing them to vicariously share in the sordidness of an "authentic" experience while appreciating his candor.

Raoul forsook his ride atop the incline for the "comparatively safe and unemotional public house" where the consumption of sex came with a variety of choices.[61] His visit to a Chattanooga brothel brought to mind Cora's house of pleasure in Atlanta. He chose "a handsome, full-breasted blond" whose "baby blue eyes" and "glorious head of hair" looked familiar.[62] Pearl, the prostitute, recognized Raoul and called him by his nom d'amour, Willie Greene. Raoul picked Pearl "for old time's sake" though he reported that she had been considered "passé" even a few years back in Atlanta. Apparently, Pearl had violated what Raoul referred to as the traditional length of such a horizontal career: "four years is the life of a

---

[59] Raoul, 203.
[60] *ibid.,* 204.
[61] *ibid.*, 204.
[62] *ibid.*, 204-05.

whore." The inevitable bottle of beer appeared at the usual price. Pearl solicited and was *granted* a pre-"reunion ceremony" gratuity. Afterwards, he and Pearl discussed "what had happened to everybody in her world, and mine," an implied leveling of classes. Upon leaving, Raoul placed "the regular fee" on a bureau when Pearl asked for another tip. Now angry, he refused and stormed out with the memory that, "I am afraid that I never was a generous tipper, and a fellow doesn't like to be nagged for small change both before and after." He returned a week later to apologize for losing his temper only to be informed by the Negro maid that "Miss Pearl is done dead. She buried yesterday."[63] It is hard to account for this. Raoul mentioned no signs of ill-health in his visit a week before, nor does he report any crime in this regard.

Aside from the semi-comic (and tragic) series of images produced by this narrative—Raoul repeatedly out of bed, padding around the room looking for loose change, his lascivious and greedy lover reclined against the pillows, her ankles locked and her purse open—the cultural historian may reflect on implied infringements against Raoul's honor. Remember that Pearl had been his initiation into the world of prostitution and the novice, of course, was an easy mark for manipulation by pressure selling in the form of bottles of beer at inflated prices and extra gratuities. In the meantime, Raoul had acquired some experience at paying for sex and realized that he was being taken advantage of by Pearl's incessant demands for more money. Cheating a virgin is one thing, but attempting the same to a man of the world is tantamount to unmasking him. So, aside from Raoul's natural penuriousness, his honor was also in play while with Pearl a week before her mysterious demise.

When Raoul wrote, "the prostitute has played but a small part in my life," his reader must assume, then, it played a larger part in his imagination because of the time spent describing his various purchases of sex. The detail with which he recalled his intermittent career as a sex

[63] Raoul, 205.

consumer indicated once again a memory at work along two separate tracks. The earlier admiration bestowed on the relative autonomy of prostitutes in comparison with other women of the times, a Socialist reconstruction both justifying the institution and his participation in it, is contradicted by his aristocratic confession that he "never could see how a man could make love to a girl he held in high regard on one night, and then go to bed with another whom he held in some contempt on the next."[64] In his life, Raoul was able to have it both ways; so too in his memory.

The Honorable Husband

Raoul's marriage to Ruth Cunningham of Atlanta was characterized by her chronic sickness and the paucity of their sexual relations, the latter as a result of the former.[65] Her obituary read, "she enjoyed a prominent social position in Atlanta, and was considered one of the most beautiful women in the south."[66] Ruth was a poster girl of Victorian conventions: a truncated smile, passive stare, hair bound and piled high on top; her neck hidden by high collars, her ruffled sleeves and multi-layered clothing both disguising and symbolizing her femininity. She became nauseous at the hint of intimacy because sex foretold pregnancy. Her "alarming tendency to premature child birth" could be triggered by a mere caress; her chronic pain led inevitably to morphine addiction.[67] Ruth's pregnancies heralded death's approach, first for her and Raoul's three still-born babies and then, finally, for Ruth herself in December 1905.

---

[64] Raoul, 85-86.
[65] Franklin Garrett, "Necrology, 1822-1933" and "Obituary Abstracts, 1892-1896," 144, Georgia Department of Archives and History, Atlanta, Georgia. Ruth was born in 1875 and died at thirty years of age. She was the daughter of Judge John D. and Cornelia Cunningham and was raised in the West End suburb of Atlanta.
[66] *Atlanta Constitution*, 14 December 1905, 8.
[67] Raoul, 148. *Diaries*, Aunt Sarah reports Ruth received treatment in Atlanta from a Miss Ewing the "osteopath doctor," 363.

Ruth's interminable maladies resulted in guilt. She wrote to Raoul's mother that when she regained her strength she would strive "to be a wife to William in every sense of the word" though an upcoming operation would delay this hope for months. Mary Wadley Raoul should also know, according to Ruth's letter, that her son "took pride in being true to me in every way."[68] Raoul's virtuous restraint reflected well on his honor; yet, the sources of his fidelity may have included more than simple spousal devotion. His discovery of that he had tuberculosis (or least its symptoms) "made me a very good boy indeed. I might even go so far as to recommend it for rampant young husbands."[69] The fear of transmitting a contagious disease may have aided his fidelity just as Ruth's fear of consummation frustrated his desire.

Raoul moved to Waycross, Georgia, in 1905 to help manage the manufacture of boxcars at his uncle's factory. Ruth arrived when fit enough to travel and the two of them rented one room in a boardinghouse. This arrangement, according to Raoul, predated the modern "contrivance" of twin beds and complained, "Continence under these conditions was hard sledding."[70] Ruth's doctor had warned against another pregnancy but neither she nor her husband knew "a God's thing about contraception."[71] The resulting stress, sexual and otherwise,

---

[68] Raoul Family Papers, 1865-1982, Mss 548, letter from Ruth to Mary Raoul, 14 January 1904, box 9, folder 9.
[69] Raoul, 177-78.
[70] *ibid.,* 155.
[71] *ibid*. Janet F. Brodie, *Contraception and Abortion in Nineteenth-Century America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), points out that Raoul and Ruth were not alone in their ignorance. "In the nineteenth century there was no established language for what today we call 'birth control,' 5. Adele E. Clarke, *Disciplining Reproduction: Modernity, American Life Sciences, and "the Problems of Sex"* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), discusses Margaret Sanger's distinction often ignored in Victorian society: that reproduction and contraception are primarily physical matters and medical issues instead of questions of morality. M. L. Bush, *What is Love: Richard Carlile's Philosophy of Sex* (New York: Verso, 1998), summarizes Carlile's argument would have found a sympathetic reader in Raoul: "At the root of the problem. . .is the Christian religion, which through discouraging sexual intercourse is a wrecker of health and beauty. Since it promotes 'secret indulgence' (i.e., practicing masturbation or resorting to prostitutes), 'religion is an unnatural vice,'" 11-12. Martin H. Blatt, *Free Love and Anarchism: The Biography of Ezra Heygood* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), points out the widespread use of douching as a contraceptive. It use for medical purposes allowed it to pass in the mails without "censorship and prosecution," 144. Candace Falk, *Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1984), see chapter nine, "Birth Control and 'Blood and Iron Militarism,'" 221-255. Taylor Stoehr, *Free Love in America: A Documentary History* (New York: AMS Press, 1979), for discussion of contraceptives and male continence, 46-63. Walter Hofmann, *The Contraceptive Revolution: Bearings on Social Reality* (New York:

led Ruth to exclaim in the narrative style Raoul reserved for his female characters: "Oh, William . . . I feel that I ought to release you, ought to allow you to go out to some other woman who can satisfy you. But . . . if you do so, won't you please try to get an ugly one?"[72] Apparently, Raoul nearly did so in Savannah on a trip with some friends to "meet a lot of girls, drink a lot of liquor, and do a lot of dancing and joking."[73] When plans became diverted to a "second class whore house," Raoul returned alone to his hotel. Like Ashley Wilkes, "he [could not] be faithful to his wife with his mind or unfaithful with his body."[74]

Gender Remembered and Subverted: Honor Too?

This examination of William and Mary Raoul's gendered behavior would appear anachronistic as neither ever used the term "gender" in their writings, nor would they likely regard it as a suitable category of analysis since how men and women acted was dependent upon their sex; or to put it simply, biology is fate.[75] Yet both siblings noticed when their, or someone else's, behavior ran contrary to expectations. Both remembered and commented on the

---

Sylvania Publications, 1969). Sinclair, *Outpost,* 107, reports that his marriage to Meta Fuller "was dominated by the most pitiful ignorance" not only of sex but especially of contraceptives. The consequences of sex, according to Sinclair, were "harrowing, and made indelible scars upon two young and oversensitive souls." Sinclair complained that those "aspects of life which should have been full of beauty and dignity became freighted with a burden of terror and death." The couple considered abortion but they also had to contemplate its consequence as a "prison offense," 113. According to Sinclair, "birth control, as explained by a family doctor, had failed, and could not be trusted." As a result, "it was necessary that caressing should be omitted from the daily program, and love-making confined to noble words and the reading aloud of Civil War literature," 135.

[72] Raoul, 156.

[73] *ibid.*, 176.

[74] Joel Williamson, "How Black was Rhett Butler?" from Numan V. Bartley, ed., *The Evolution of Southern Culture* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1988), 100.

[75] Lears, *Grace*, describes the contradictory Victorian gender roles of both sexes: "Victorian women were expected to be not only submissive helpmates but pillars of strength in times of troubles and repositories of moral and cultural authority," xvii. Self-effacement and self-reliance were thus put in opposition. Men's behavior was directed by spaces: outside the home they were expected to exhibit individual initiative in competition with other men, inside the home "they were expected to conform to domestic models of social harmony," 16. Ownby, *Satan*, traces this spatial factor through the theme of recreation and play. Ownby finds identities constructed from oppositions: purity inside the home, sin on the outside. Male gender characteristics are predictable within specific recreational settings, the tavern, the ball-field, the cock-fight, as they are within feminized locales: church, home, funerals.

occurrence and consequence of what we today would describe as gender subversion.[76] The Raouls may not have known what to call it, but they certainly recognized the subversion of gender when they experienced it. For instance, at age twenty-one and living in her parents' house on Peachtree Street in Atlanta, Mary joined one of the neighbors, a Colonel Lowry, for a ride on his "tally-ho." In her "childish innocence," she assumed the Colonel "would be pleased and interested to discuss national politics—but he wasn't!"[77] And, of course, she was not invited back to that horse and buggy as her impertinent remarks rendered her ineligible for the Colonel's company.

This subversion by commission was contrasted with her brother's subversion by omission. A lady friend of Raoul's, whom he dated in later years, would announce in public and in his presence, "I could travel around the world with William, and sleep in the same room with him, and always feel safe." Thus the virtue of masculine restraint was transformed into timid masculine behavior. Raoul interpreted this "jibe" as an oblique attack on his masculinity and, thus, his honor.[78] His sexual restraint, though expected in certain domestic spaces and places gendered feminine, called into question his masculinity when a woman with whom he is familiar, jocularly boasted of her sexual safety when alone with him in places were sexual activity might be reasonably expected to happen.

This analysis, accordingly, will search for the subversion of normative gender roles by the Raoul siblings by examining their respective memories of circumstances where honor was at

---

[76] Butler, *Gender Trouble*, describes this process as the disruption of "the repeated stylization of the body as a. . .natural sort of being," in addition to "subversive repetition" designed to "call into question the regulatory practice of identity," 32-33. Scott, *Gender*, encourages the upsetting of notions of gender "fixity." She asserts "normative" gender positions are usually assumed as the "product of social consensus rather than conflict" and presented as the only possible arrangement, 43.
[77] Millis, "Autobiography," 145.
[78] Raoul, 7-8.

stake. We will search for these incidences in categories similar to those presented in the first half of this chapter: honor gendered in single life with the other sex, in marriage, and divorce.

Gender and the Single Man

Gender behavior is especially conspicuous during those periodic rites of passage that mark the transformation of a single person to a married one, of an adolescent to an adult, of an apprentice to a professional, of a recruit to a marine. When William Raoul returned to Atlanta in 1892 from his truncated education in New Jersey and unsuccessful apprenticeship to architect Gilbert Bradford in New York, he anticipated his twenty-first birthday. "Several of the girls had had coming out parties, and Mother said that she didn't see why the boys shouldn't have coming out parties too."[79] Raoul was the focus of this event, though his mother, Mary Raoul, is the one to overturn the ordinary by organizing a coming out party for her son similar to the ones she would throw for her daughters.[80]

The confusion lay in the meaning of the ritual: did Mary Raoul's debut party for her oldest son merely demonstrate the arbitrariness of traditional gender exclusion for coming out parties, or did it imply the diminishment of gender hierarchy, whereby both young men and women may enter society in the same way? Or worse, does it suggest an uncomfortable proximity of American masculinity to its presumed opposite, femininity? For Raoul, who linked this party on page one of his autobiography to his disastrous dalliance with Josie, the serving girl,

---

[79] Raoul, 1.

[80] Margadant, *Biography*, describes how the "public selves these women fabricated were necessarily subversive," 2. It is tempting to speculate that Mary Raoul's may have been fashioning her own trans-gendered coming-out party for her son. A few years later Mary wrote an essay for her Saturday morning ladies book club describing the importance of women's roles in the historical success of men hints of a maternal inclination to sabotage "essential" gender traits and the presumed purpose of rites of passage.

at the Lawrence Preparatory School from which he was expelled, the rite may have exacerbated his uneasiness about which masculine model he should emulate. He had seen, and taken note of, a variety of masculinities. Mary, his sister, was especially sensitive to a gamut of sentiments and behaviors that encroached upon increasingly complicated if not ambiguous line of demarcation between what was considered proper and improper for young women of her class.

Mary Raoul's uncertainty about appropriate behavior for women included her bewilderment of being alone in public spaces traditionally gendered masculine.[81] As a nineteen-year old girl in Philadelphia, she wrote to her mother that checking into a hotel on her own "is so novel that I can hardly realize it is so."[82] Mary's memory did not betray her contemporary surprise as she recalled decades later, "in those days it was unthinkable that women should go into the street alone after dark" or to appear at a party "without their husbands was not done."[83] College, too, was a space gendered masculine. Upon hearing a teacher suggest the possibility of continuing education, Mary was aghast and excited: "College? I had never thought of that!" She admitted in retrospect "the only career thinkable for women was Husband, Home and Babies" after having spent the better part of her life in contradiction to that proscription.[84] The emerging ambiguity of space was mentioned without comment in her memoir when Mary noted how both her marriage and her brother's debut occurred six months apart in their father's house on Peachtree Street in Atlanta, though her linkage of these two rituals implied the space where they were conducted to be appropriate if unorthodox.[85]

---

[81] Margadant, *Biography*, stresses the "feminine presence in public life" as one way of demonstrating the changing nature of gendered behavior over the course of the nineteenth century, 1.
[82] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, letter from Mary to her mother, 20 May 1889, Box 11, Folder 7.
[83] Millis "Autobiography," 181.
[84] *ibid.*, 62.
[85] *ibid.*, 171.

The shame associated with transgressing traditional gendered spaces animated Mary's memory. Her interest and skill in drawing led her to contemplate becoming an architect—then unheard of for females. Upon broaching this subject with her father, Greene Raoul, Mary was crushed by his angry dismissal of so outrageous an idea with the remark that such a path would lead only to her death "in the gutter." This condemnation left scars "which endured the rest of [Mary's] life." Though her mother knew of this exchange, she never referred to it; for Mary's part, "silence buried it deep in my own soul"; after all, "gutters were dirty—and disgraceful."[86]

Greene's choice of vocabulary and his daughter's reaction to those words and the tone with which they were delivered recalled the relationship between shame and fear described by Norbert Elias.[87] Mary's notion of becoming an architect, however novel and innocent an idea, brought her "into contradiction" with her father and threatened "the loss of the love or respect of others." According to Elias's analysis of similar phenomena in pre-modern Europe, Greene's anger with Mary's tentative subversion of gender roles, may have "precipitated" a similar attitude within Mary toward herself as self-loathing allowed her to re-align herself within a paternalistic pattern with her trusted father.[88] Elias emphasized the power of bonds among people who look to each other for confirmation of proper behavior. Greene's disgust at Mary's plans threatened those familial bonds while reinforcing within the daughter the inclination to adhere to, rather than subvert, behavior properly gendered.

Shame, too, is associated with the transgression of taboo and resulting dishonor. Taboo, according to anthropologist Mary Douglas, functions to maintain "distinctive categories" and to

---

[86] Millis, "Autobiography," 137.
[87] Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations.* Translated by Edmund Jephcott and edited by Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom, and Stephen Marshall (Oxford, U. K.: Blackwell Publishers, 1994), 414-420.
[88] Elias, *Civilizing,* 415.

"protect the local consensus on how the world is organized."[89] Taboo "shores up wavering certainty" while reducing "intellectual and social disorder."[90] Mary Raoul's architectural dreams made ambiguous the dichotomy between women's presumed absence of public agency on the one hand with their proscribed presence in public spaces in pursuit of professions gendered masculine on the other. Greene's "gutter" was an "oblique warning" to his daughter not to undermine the values of a wider community—a community complicit in maintaining traditional gender roles by avoiding their subversion.[91] In this case, the promise of degradation promised by Greene's vocabulary was sufficient to deter Mary from following her youthful dreams. In this way, the daughter perpetuated the very taboo she had earlier approached.

This discussion may be broadened both geographically and chronologically by briefing looking at questions of honor/shame and profession in early modern Germany. Historian Kathy Stuart makes the point that certain occupations—"executioners, skinners, grave-diggers, shepherds, barber-surgeons, and bailiffs"—were all regarded as dishonorable.[92] For the Raouls, of course, it was not the profession itself that cast dishonor upon its practitioner—after all, Mary's brother (our Raoul) had flirted with becoming an architect—but the arbitrary gendering of a particular profession as either masculine or feminine. Proximity to the dishonored, according to Stuart, resulted in a contagion of the same. Seen in this context, it is worth wondering whether Greene worried for the reputation of the rest of his family should his eldest daughter pursue a professional path ambiguous at best and polluting at worst. Stuart's study makes the point that any study of dis/honor will be most profitable where the "social milieu"

---

[89] Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge, 1966), xi.
[90] Douglas, *Purity*, xi.
[91] *ibid.*, xii.
[92] Kathy Stuart, *Defiled Trades and Social Outcast: Honor and Ritual in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge, U. K.: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 2.

may be reconstructed to demonstrate how shame and honor are distributed.[93] To examine honor in its trans-Atlantic context proves, if nothing else, its social construction across time and through discrete societies.

Greene's harsh rebuke, and his daughter's memory of it, signaled a dangerous historical intersection where traditional spaces and hierarchies collided with increasing individualism and personal improvisation. Southern society was in flux in the 1890s. Greene, of course, knew better than his daughter of the changes taking shape in the South and elsewhere; his catbird seat at the helm of the Central of Georgia and Mexican National Railroads allowed long looks over the horizon. Mary's tentative foray toward the perimeter of professional spaces off-limits to women must have seemed to Greene yet further evidence of the decay of conventions long taken for granted.

Within his own profession, Greene had observed how railroads contributed to the demographic transitions by linking previously isolated places and people together; how newly constructed railroad stations often signaled the commencement of a settlement; how the iron tracks acted as magnets, drawing tenant farmers, adventurous young men and women, out-of-work artisans, black and white sharecroppers, and bankrupt former landowners to cities like Atlanta where the novelty of urban life offered possibilities (and ambiguities) unavailable in the countryside.[94] Greene complained about the regulatory practices of the railroad commission, yet their archives reveal no complaints about the 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision that mandated separate, and ostensibly equal, accommodations for Negroes on the Southern railways. The

---

[93] Stuart, *Defiled*, 17.

[94] Ayers, *Promise*, shows the power of the railroad industry in their decision "to divide the country into four time zones," thus becoming "the arbiter of time as of so much else in the nation and in the South," 12. It is worth mentioning that the allure of cities may have taken the place of the vanishing frontier as described by historian Frederick Jackson Turner's famous essay, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," from *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1953), 1-38. See also, Robert Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967), "The Distended Society."

cities themselves acted as agents of amalgamation by juxtaposing the rural with the urban, the devout with the dissolute, and the native with the immigrant.[95] The differences between urban and rural were made manifest in the 1890 census where, for the first time, a formal division was made between those own earned salaries and those who collected wages.[96] A southern society in flux made estimates of honor more problematic.

These transformations in Southern society from urbanization to railroad regulation, from Jim Crow to the Populists uprising, from women's contestation of public space to economic depression left the consensus on properly gendered behavior open to doubt,[97] both then (witness Greene's "gutter") and later in Raoul's memory. He, like his sister Mary, suffered shame; yet, his recollection of two particular events reveal how the autobiographer's present, through his memory, shapes his interpretation of the past, through his memoir.

In the 1890s, as a young adult in Atlanta, Raoul took advantage of his family's elite position and enjoyed what social life the burgeoning city had to offer.[98] He described various amusements: dances, bicycle parties, afternoon rides up and down Peachtree Street in "traps," an open-air carriage pulled by horses.[99] Girls were not allowed to take "buggy rides" because of the more confined interior, increased privacy, and chance of intimacy, though the larger, more open "traps" were deemed acceptable for men and women to share.[100] The Atlanta social scene, however lively, was somewhat arid, as young, rich Atlantans were not, according to Raoul, given

---

[95] Gunther Barth, *City People: The Rise of Modern City Culture in Nineteenth-Century America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 3.
[96] Robert H. Wiebe, *Self-Rule: A Cultural History of American Democracy* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), 121.
[97] Stansell, *American Moderns*, argues that "assaults on an older order emerged on the gender front as well, as working-class women increasingly entered paid employment and middle-class women began a campaign for women's rights that coalesced in the suffrage amendment of 1919," 5-6. Ironically, Greene Raoul's youngest daughter, Eleonore, was a leader in the Atlanta suffrage movement.
[98] The *Atlanta City Directory* of 1894 boast of the dramatic increase of population; as recently as 1890 Atlanta claimed 65,500; now, in 1894, it had nearly doubled to 106,881. Emory University, Microfilm 4335, Reel 7, 1894.
[99] "Traps" is short for "trappings," i.e., the accoutrement of the wealthy carriage traveler. The original meaning denotes an ornamental covering for the saddle of a horse to indicate both wealth and the likelihood of female riders.
[100] Raoul, 39.

to overindulgence to alcohol. He does not remember "even having seen an intoxicated man" during these frivolous few years. This restraint was occasionally forgotten and there would be, in Raoul's words, "a breaking over the lines."[101]

After one such evening of revelry, Raoul and his best friend at the time, Lowry Arnold, future attorney, were returning by street car to the Raoul's house when Lowry decided to make one final social call. Raoul recalled that, "we had a fool habit in the 1890s of asking each other to spend the night after some event."[102] As his friend departed the streetcar, Raoul said in a voice loud enough for all to hear, "now Lowry, you just go on, and come home when you get ready. I'm going home now, and when you come, you'll find me under the door mat, and the key tucked away in bed, tucked snug in the bed, Lowry."[103]

It is telling how Raoul framed this incident in his memory to accentuate the potential dishonor of drunkenness with sharing a bed with another man. It should be recalled, however, that Raoul and Lowry's male intimacy took place in the 1890s when it was not disgraceful for two male friends to share a bed, while Raoul wrote about the incident in the 1930s from his home in Navasink, Jew Jersey, a suburb of New York City, when public scrutiny and disapproval of homosexuality had become considerably more intense.[104] His inebriated speech to Lowry, said in a voice "loud enough for everyone to hear," served two purposes. First it persuaded Raoul's readership that nothing unusual was afoot and second, if his readers did not understand the varying constructions of gendered behavior from the late nineteenth century to the early

---

[101] Raoul, 38.
[102] *ibid.*
[103] *ibid.*, 39.
[104] Chauncey, *Gay New York*, argues gay culture thrived in the 1920s and early '30s when "a new anxiety about homosexuals and hostility toward them began to develop, which soon became part of the more general reaction to the cultural experimentation of the Prohibition era that developed in the anxious years of the Depression," 8. Chauncey believes the anti-gay backlash was due in part to the "disruption of gender arrangements [caused] by the Depression." In the economic chaos to follow, "gay men and lesbians began to seem less amusing than dangerous," 331.

1930s, then his drunken state could account for his feminine tone and a practice long since banished under discursive categories of perversity.

Historian Anthony Rotundo describes the late nineteenth-century relationship of James Blake and Wyck Vanderhoef, two young men trained as engineers, who shared an intimate friendship. James Blake's diary relates the final evening the two gentlemen spent together when "we laid our heads upon each other's bosom and wept, it may be unmanly to weep, but I care not, spirit was touched."[105] Here, James Blake explicitly apologized for "his unmanly conduct, but his apology is for weeping, not for laying his head on the bosom of his intimate friend in bed."[106] Raoul's apology was more implicit and relies upon readers with memories of different lengths: the first, his contemporaries, would presumably understand that his and Lowry's behavior, though now regarded skeptically, was common in the late eighteen hundreds; his younger readers would account for this gender transgression by attributing it to drink.[107]

Another incident ostensibly similar but altogether different in meaning occurred with Raoul in 1912, when he was forty years old, and a homesteader on the Montana prairie within walking distance of the Canadian border. He admitted to being "gregarious by nature, and I found the days alone, no matter how busy I kept myself, a trial to my nerves and appetite."[108] After his Saturday bath, and equipped with clean underwear, he walked north with an empty

---

[105] Rotundo, *American Manhood,* 81. John Benyon, *Masculinities and Culture* (Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2002), defines homosociality as comradeship or "close friendship and intimacy between men that is distinguished from homosexuality," 162.
[106] Rotundo, *American Manhood,* 81.
[107] Katz, *Love Stories*, argues, "the common custom of men casually bedding down together. . .became uncommon, even suspect, in the consciously eroticized twentieth century after the construction, naming, publicizing, and stringent tabooing of 'sexual perversion,' 'inversion,' and 'homosexuality,'" 9. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, "The Female World of Love and Ritual," from *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), makes the case for twentieth-century epistemology based upon "a dichotomized universe of deviance and normality, genitality and platonic love" that distorts the emotions and attitudes of nineteenth-century historical subjects, 58-59. In discussing the intimate male relationship between Abraham Lincoln and Joshua Fry Speed, Jonathan Katz comments on the changing nature of gender performance with the observation that one's "character was not thought to center upon sexuality—good women and men did not have erotic orientations or sexual identities," 9-10.
[108] Raoul, 294.

milk bottle to find a rumored claim with a herd of cows he had heard about located a few miles north. Upon arriving, Raoul "came upon a woman then engaged in milking. She was not the picture book milk maid, but was not bad to look at, and she welcomed me almost joyously." The isolation of the plains made its inhabitants "positively hungry for contacts."[109] Raoul happily filled his milk bottle, then his stomach with tea and homemade preserves, and finally he filled his mind with conversation. Presently he grew wary of threatening weather and made to leave. The milkmaid suggested that he stay the night. Raoul looked about and did not "see any space for a stranger to be put up with a lone woman, and assuming that her offer was merely politeness, took my departure." In this way, Raoul's honor continually vexed his sex drive as he refused her offer ("how dumb, how stupid")[110] and promptly got lost trying to find his way back to his cabin. Now the cold set in and he had nothing with which to build a fire.

Finally a flash of light signaled a cabin ahead and there he found a bachelor "just getting his supper of ham and eggs, and he, of course, welcomed me. He threw in a couple of extra eggs, I contributed the bottle of milk, and we had a feast of it." After dinner and directions home, Raoul got lost again and made his way back to the man's cabin where he "knocked him up at about two in the morning." His enthusiasm for company now dimmed, he and Raoul "made it as best we could, two in a single bed." Raoul remembered the event with remorse: "if I had to sleep in such close quarters, how much better had it been never to have left the proffered haven of the milk maid."[111] Thus his overweening sense of honor—years after his conversion to Socialism and its presumed corollary, "free love" created havoc with his gendered behavior: sleep (and sex?) with a lonely woman declined; consequently, an awkwardly shared single man's bed for one. Raoul told this story without any fear of being accused of homosexuality; rather, his

---

[109] Raoul, 296.
[110] *ibid.*, *297.*
[111] *ibid.*, 298.

fear emanated from its original source: his timidity with women and the consequent reflection upon his masculinity as a single man.

It was Raoul's reticence to fulfill masculine gender expectations that haunt his memoir like departed, and unconsummated, loves. His self-imposed celibacy after being expelled from the Lawrenceville School gave him "a feeling of assurance and equality with the chaste females of my own circle, which has often been misunderstood." Raoul provided no evidence for precisely how his behavior was "misunderstood." We may assume the circulation of rumors and insinuations among his elite peers that would have been undoubtedly damaging to his self-esteem and estimation of his own masculinity being judged as deficient. Raoul admitted to having "carried matters for a while with a high hand, concealing my timidity under a bold front, almost an imitation of a he-man; until, alas, I burst into tears, overcome with mortification."[112] Witnesses to such teary demonstrations added to the diminishment of Raoul's masculinity. He liked the girls of his circle. He played tennis, attended dances, and participated in driving parties, but he did not remember "ever even kissing but one" of his female friends.[113]

In Chicago for the 1893 Columbian Exhibition, Raoul's "sex instinct had been more or less sublimated."[114] After Chicago, Raoul went to Massachusetts to work in a series of cotton mills in pursuit of expertise to further his anticipated management career in textiles. While there, he kissed a company waitress, flirted with a company cook, painted a portrait of another girl who did not know of his "sublimation of sex."[115] Raoul rued the results of these friendships. The girls would "put their arms around me, and it didn't matter about having two, because I wasn't

---

[112] Raoul, 7.
[113] *ibid.*, 8.
[114] *ibid.*, 16.
[115] *ibid.*, 51.

going anywhere, anyhow. Damn."[116] Raoul reflected on his time at the Massachusetts' mills with regard to gender behavior: "My God, what a fool! Precious romantic years and opportunities gone by, which can never be retraced."[117]

Shortly afterward, Raoul returned to Georgia and took a management position at a cotton mill in Lindale, Georgia. There he met an attractive young married woman who was afraid of being left alone. Raoul proposed to give her "lessons in pistol practice." This was done during the daytime when the two of them would leave the mill and head to the nearby woods so that no innocent bystanders would be at risk of being shot. But village onlookers did not "understand [Raoul's] sex sublimation." The citizens of Lindale "knew of but one reason for a young man to walk out in the woods with another young man's wife. That reason called for talk, and sometimes, for action."[118] It was ironic that Raoul's subversion of expected gender behavior, that is of his presumed lust for and calculated seduction of this young wife, should have potentially placed him in the absurd position of defending his honor against accusations of improper behavior.

* * *

It is interesting that both Raoul's early celibacy and timidity with regard to sex caused as much confusion as his later predatory search for sexual partners after his conversion to Socialism and flirtation with Free Love. Both masculinities created doubt and suspicion in people's minds as being too extreme one way or the other. Raoul's remembrances of race render a more consistent pattern of patriarchal condescension from which he would rarely deviate.

---

[116] Raoul, 52.
[117] *ibid.*, 51.
[118] *ibid.*, 65.

CHAPTER FOUR

HONOR DENIED: RACE RECONSTRUCTED

A discourse of racial dishonor dominated the New South by its interminable and pervasive *alienation* and *subordination* of blacks from white society. The power of this discourse lay in its ubiquity. No strata of southern society were remote from it or unable to understand its meaning. In the words of Katherine Du Pre Lumkin, "Southern men were careful of their language; no doubt, also, careful of their thoughts. It behooved them to be careful, they would feel, in a land that had a bitter epithet, 'nigger lover,' for those whom it wished to cast sharp stones."[1] Language possessed the power to subordinate race either explicitly or implicitly.

When Georgia Governor, Hoke Smith, in 1907 declared "the honest student of history knows that the Negro. . .was improved by slavery, and that the majority of the Negroes in this state have ceased to improve since slavery"[2]; when Booker T. Washington, in September 1895 at the Cotton States and International Exposition in Atlanta, announced that "the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly"[3]; when William Raoul writes that "plantation Negroes are handled a good deal like a lot children"[4]; when Raoul's Aunt Sarah described a train car packed with Negroes, thus making her "situation more unpleasant than it would otherwise be"[5]; and when another southern lady compared eating with Negroes as "a most appalling

---

[1] Katherine Du Pre Lumpkin, *The Making of a Southerner* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1974), 179-80.
[2] Paul D. Escott, David R. Goldfield, Sally G. McMillen, and Elizabeth H. Turner, eds., *Major Problems in the History of the American South Volume II: The New South* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1999), 224.
[3] Booker T. Washington, *Up From Slavery* (New York: Penguin Books, 1986), 223.
[4] Raoul, 331.
[5] Wadley, *Diaries,* 16.

thought" second only to "intermarriage"[6], any ambiguity is extracted from their collective assumption of black subordination.

Implied inferiority derived from connotations. Raoul asserted that blacks preferred "an all wise chief. . .[without]any iron clad rules"[7] His inclination to reconstruct the past according to parallel memory paths, one as a Southern aristocrat glancing back, the other as an indignant socialist quick to condemn, make this characterization ambiguous: does "an all wise chief" refer to the futility of Native American efforts at maintaining their own rapidly diminishing societies? Does Katherine Du Pre Lumpkin's fatherly warning of Negroes' "insolence" and "uppitiness" imply a disordered hierarchy?[8] When the Socialist mayor of Butte, Montana, "was assailed for appointing a Negro policeman on the force, he replied that he thought that serving as a policeman was a pretty low down sort of job, and that he didn't see why the Negroes shouldn't do their part."[9] In this way the skillful politician elevated the oppressed while attacking the instrument of their capitalist oppressors. When W. J. Cash lamented the illiterate, unemployed, hook-wormed white trash of the piedmont he reiterated, "come what might, he would always be a white man."[10] Again, a hierarchy is assumed, but unstated.

The power of discourse to alienate blacks from whites took two primary paths: explicit separation, or unwanted association. The latter category took ironic turns. Writing in the early1940s (ten years after Raoul's autobiography), William Alexander Percy recognized the unlikely dilemma: "In our brave new world a man of honor is rather like the Negro—there's no place for him to go."[11] Similarly, the Atlanta diarist and Raoul peer, Arthur Inman, recorded his

---

[6] Lumpkin, 135.
[7] Raoul, 332.
[8] Lumpkin, 86.
[9] Raoul, 278.
[10] Cash, *Mind,*, 39.
[11] William Alexander Percy, *Lanterns on the Levee: Recollections of a Planter's Son* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1941), 72.

surprising association with an unscrupulous literary agent to whom he hoped would help him get his poems published while asserting that he was "without doubt part nigger . . . I would get down on my belly and go through the motions of making obeisance to a pink-eyed worm is by so doing I were sure I could further my work . . . Therefore I associate with a nigger."[12] Raoul continued the irony as he "refused the proffered hand" of a black "comrade" since he "did not yet see eye to eye with these new people."[13] The alienation made implicit by unwanted association is demonstrated by Raoul's aunt Sarah who, while in Jacksonville, Florida, in 1887 complained of loud music "and somebody (I suppose a Negro) is dancing very noisily."[14] Twenty-five years later, Sarah's nephew, William Raoul, while living in the South Georgia town of Millen with little to do but drink and flirt, took visitors to town to see the "picturesque crowds of Negroes on Saturday afternoon."[15] In this way, white gazes reduce black citizens to subjects. The idea of alienation by unwanted association was deftly captured by Ray S. Baker in 1908: "The color line is drawn, but neither race knows just where it is . . . it is constantly changing. This uncertainty is a fertile source of friction and bitterness."[16] The ambiguity of inter-racial proximity would be addressed by Southern governments through their respective Jim Crow laws.

The discourse of alienation's explicit separation settled more comfortably among the collective Southern conscious. The Supreme Court's 1896 ruling on Plessy v. Ferguson upheld a Louisiana law requiring segregated railroad facilities. Separate was deemed equal. Spokesman of the New South, Henry Grady, declared the Southern body politic must carry her two races "separately—for assimilation means debasement."[17] Novelist Thomas Dixon, in *The Leopard's*

---

[12] *Inman Diary,* 183.
[13] Raoul, 239.
[14] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, Box 5, Folder 5, letter of 15 February 1887 from Sarah Wadley to her sister Mary Raoul.
[15] Raoul, 375.
[16] Baker's *Following the Color Line* is quoted in Lankevich, *Atlanta*.
[17] Grady, *New South*, 46.

Spots, had a character say, "We don't allow a Negro to come inside the enclosure . . .[otherwise] labor trouble would end in anarchy or social revolution."[18] An editorial in the *Atlanta Constitution*, after noting how the blacks had recently refrained "from the reckless aggression of their race," praised their "respectful and unobtrusive [absence] upon the plane of life which were not their own."[19] Henry Grady's "New South creed" called for, among other things, "the exclusion of the Negro from political life."[20] Raoul discouraged Northern overseers in the South since they had a habit "of speaking to one in a sharp and abrupt manner with which a southern gentleman was not accustomed; and in the South, we were all gentlemen, if white."[21] Raoul's irony is perhaps unintentional: brusque speaking Yankees were welcome to harangue Southern blacks—Raoul was afraid they would not discriminate between the Southern races. Finally, Booker T. Washington managed to get on both sides of this metaphorical fence when he declared in his Exposition Address, "In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress."[22]

Memory is no longer merely a methodology for cultural historians in search of meaning; it has acquired genres that transcend the traditional dichotomy of social versus individual memory.[23] W. Fitzhugh Brundage urged scholars to consider the purposes served by memories by conducting "a social history of remembering in the South."[24] David Anderson has contributed to this endeavor with his examination of "nostalgia for the old south" in the last

---

[18] Quoted in Gavin F. Davenport, Jr., "Thomas Dixon's Mythology of Southern History," *Journal of Southern History* 36 (August 1970), 363.
[19] Garrett, *Environs*, 213.
[20] *ibid.,* 204.
[21] Raoul, 59-60.
[22] Escott, *Major Problems in the History of the New South*, 226.
[23] Matt K. Matsuda, *The Memory of the Modern* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 4-5. Matsuda argues that "memory is not merely a theme to search out in literary texts, nor a convenient trope to impose generically upon recollections, rituals, or remembrances: 'Classical' memory can be studied as an historical entity, perfectly distinct from 'Renaissance' memory. I argue that this thesis holds equally true for the late nineteenth century, where my reevaluation of historical evidence suggests a memory which I shall call distinctively that of 'modernity.'" French, "Social Memory?" 10, Scot A. French wrote that "history is a genre of memory, not just the detached arbiter of it."
[24] W. Fitzhugh Brundage, "Introduction: No Deed but Memory" in Brundage, *Where These Memories Grow*, 3.

decades of the nineteenth century when autobiographical writings "reveal a potent change in elite white southern consciousness after the Civil War."[25] William and Mary Raouls' respective reconstructions of the meaning of race complicate what Benedict Anderson called the "*attachment* (emphasis in original) that peoples feel for the inventions of their imaginations."[26] The Raouls present multiple imaginations, attachments to varied pasts.

The Raoul siblings' remembrances juxtapose two distinct types of recall: those of elite white southerners self-conscious of their social standing on the one hand, and on the other a parallel path of reminiscences redolent of insights gained from years of participation in progressive movements and as members of the Socialist party. Both these *Victorian* and *radical* reconstructions imply a multiplicity of personalities, or separate selves, within the presumed whole, natural, and essential correspondent. The Raouls present, not "the past," but a variety of pasts selectively chosen to redeem earlier mistakes and to confirm controversial paths taken. The autobiographical memories recorded by the Raouls make explicit or implicit the role of honor (and its absence) when discussing race in the New South. In addition, the Raouls' awareness of their society's state of flux accentuates their re-assemblage of remembrances on race—traditional white paternalism laced with barely concealed loathing exist alongside sympathetic comradeship that recognizes the difficulty of trumping racial antagonism with shared class interests. I follow Matt Matsuda's insight that "modernity" imposes upon memories conditions of instability, uncertainty, and contingency. Honor stands uneasily upon this shaky ground.

---

[25] David Anderson, "Down Memory Lane: Nostalgia for the Old South in Post-Civil War Plantation Reminiscences," *The Journal of Southern History* 1(February 2005), 108.
[26] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983), 141.

The democratization of honor that occurred after the Confederacy's defeat and the fall of the planter class made more ambiguous the very qualities of honor: who possessed it and why, under what circumstances was it assumed and recognized? The racial demarcation, though usually sturdy, allowed occasional seepage. Mary Raoul Millis admitted, "Negroes simply did not count as human beings"[27]; her brother recalled on those occasions that he invited a Negro to have a drink that he "did not drink with him. I poured the liquor, then sat down, while he stood and drank it and talked to me." Raoul drew the contrast between his two ways of remembering: the paternalistic supplier of alcohol ready to be entertained by the black man's thankful conversational improvisations, alongside a weak rationale inserted because of sophisticated and/or Socialist guilt: "these were the rules, laid down generations before, and one had as well undertake to start an insurrection or a revolution, as to violate them."[28] In Raoul's eyes, the result of the Civil War had little effect on the racial traditions "laid down generations before." Blacks remained without honor in the New South because of their slave heritage and their skin color. These two traits made manifest a third: thievery. Greene Raoul kept his tool-chest locked, "not so much on account of the children, as to guard against petty depredation by chance Negro laborers."[29] In this way skin color becomes epistemological: skin color equates with content of character to reinforce stereotypes too deep to bring to the surface.

Though without honor, blacks were not without usefulness. Mary Raoul Millis juxtaposed flattering and degrading traits when discussing black servants. One black nurse named Blanche possessed "a quieting, soothing personality capable of stilling the most fretful

---

[27] Millis, "Autobiography," (Appendix: "Reminiscence"), 4.
[28] Raoul, 338-39. Francis G. Davenport, in *The Myth of Southern History: Historical Consciousness in Twentieth-Century Southern Literature* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1970), 106, argued that "color became the badge of distinction, and every white man could be proud of his own racial distinction. Raoul reiterated this distinction with the observation that while lumbering in south Georgia, he was forced to spend time with the poor whites there: "the homes of some of these South Georgia woodsmen are even more squalid than those of the Negroes," 160.
[29] Millis, *Family,* 36.

crying infant." Blanche's absence of honor is made clear by Mary's addendum that her positive qualities were perhaps inherited "from voodoo ancestors in African jungles."[30] Black thievery appeared less important with regard to laundry. William and Mary's mother did not allow her daughters to do the washing since their carelessness caused loss; the clothes were "let out, at a fixed price, to a Negro laundress."[31] Racial nostalgia crept into Mary Raoul Millis's remembrances as she recalled with disappointment the formal and conventional manners of their Irish servant girls while in New York compared "to the easy and affectionate relations with our Negro servants" in the South.[32]

Race segregated by space indicated an absence of honor within the white elite of Georgia. At Great Hill Place, the permanent home of William Wadley, and his daughter, Aunt Sarah, there was "a two-room house for servants—without any running water or sanitary arrangement."[33] Raoul listed the outbuildings at Great Hill—stables, carriage and wagon houses, blacksmith shop—and "houses for the domestic servants. Across the pasture from these, nestled in a pine grove, were the 'quarters,' or houses where the 'wage hands' lived."[34] At the family's house in Macon, Georgia, where Raoul was born, the family kept a cow and "we had two Negro women servants. They lived in a small frame house in the rear of our lot; next to the cow."[35] Thus, a casual inventory of property included those no longer chattel but also not quiet citizens.

This spatial polarity carried with it particular characteristics. The Raouls' neighbor and younger peer, Arthur Inman, recalled "that musty smell which pervades any room in which a

---

[30] Millis, Family, 43.
[31] *ibid.*, 109-10.
[32] *ibid.*, 91.
[33] Wadley, *Diary,* 3.
[34] Raoul, 144. Twenty years later, at the Roger's Plantation where Raoul was summoned to oversee the both the books and the labor force, and confront his own personal estrangement from his family and region, he reported a similar arrangement. "Behind the house was the kitchen, a separate building, the shop, and then stables and barns. A plantation road ran out from the rear, and along the side of this several cabins, or small square houses used for the Negroes who served the house, or worked as wage hands," 325.
[35] Millis, *Family,* 36.

colored person had long lived." The young Inman enjoyed spying on his family's black servants in the kitchen and elsewhere and observed, "no white people ever put so much zest into the business of consuming food." The adolescent Inman discovered a servant quarters similar to the ones described by the Raouls: "The door of the Negro shack was open. Yellow light and the laughter of men and women came from it. I wished I were inside."[36] Mary Raoul Millis remembers the basement "as a huge Cave of the Winds, or other doleful place" where servants did the laundry "and were more than apt to spill water all over the floor."[37] As a manager at the Lindale Cotton Mill in Rome, Georgia, Raoul's perks included a house and an old black maid who lived in "half of a large wood shed."[38] Crossing racial spaces invited ambiguity as both William and Mary Raoul would discover.

Physical separation from servants is often contrasted with discreet affection. As a result, issues of honor—determined by class status, white skin color and hierarchical relationships—became immersed in a borderland of shifting sensibilities. Mary Raoul Millis contrived to bring two Japanese servants to the United States where they took up residence with her mother in Atlanta. Daughter received a letter from Mother "commenting on the difference between America where servants were few and very inefficient, and Japan, where apparently they grew on trees, and were the models of perfection."[39] When their term ended, and they returned to Japan, Aunt Sarah consoled her sister by writing how "one hates the breaking up of kindly feelings more than even the actual inconvenience."[40] Fifteen years later, Raoul, now jailed in Millen, Georgia, and involved in his divorce imbroglio with his younger cousin, Winifred

---

[36] *Inman Diary* 61-67.
[37] Millis, *Family,* 110.
[38] Raoul, 60.
[39] Millis, "Autobiography," 300-01.
[40] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, Box 5, Folder 11, letter of 4 May 1891 to Mary Raoul from her sister Sarah Wadley.

Wadley, wrote "to the proprietor of the Hotel Estelle at Millen and got him to send me John, my favorite dining room waiter, and installed him as temporary assistant workman and future cook." Raoul the aristocrat does not blush at the preceding memory, even as his radical self recalls shame when John the servant accompanied him to New York where a white sailor refused to share quarters with the black man. He explains: "we got through the night with rather bad feeling all around . . . I was bitten with yacht etiquette, a lapse into conventional snobbery. Where were my socialist principles and philosophy?"[41] "Yacht etiquette" allowed Raoul an easy reversion to attitudes alien to his socialist principles; his parallel memories of this incident—one presumably easy to delete from his autobiography—demonstrates the power of selective retrieval.

Raoul's sister Mary makes plain in her autobiography the parallel paths of memory with regard to race and ethnicity. Mary assimilated paternal and radical vocabularies into one narrative as she remembers herself as a youngster in Macon, Georgia, near the family plantation. On the one hand, blacks lived "in most inadequate cabins" (a progressive critique), their "settlement *teeming* with the primitive life of their vigorous *barbarian* (emphasis added) ancestors" (a paternalistic appraisal).[42] "Powerful black men" at work in the Wadley/Raoul fields near Macon were the object of "atonement made for terrible wrong inflicted." White peoples' pity and conscious, labor and money, went "to improve the lot of this unfortunate people."[43] Mary cannot pry apart two perspectives retrieved to make sense not of the lives of post-war black-share-croppers, but of her own separate memory steams, both ostensibly natural: paternalistic pity combined with half-hidden contempt on the one hand, and radical revision complete with self-criticism on the other.

---

[41] Raoul, 411-13.
[42] Millis, "Autobiography," 21.
[43] Millis, "Autobiography," 20-22B (Mary added three extra pages, 22-A, 22-B, and 22-C that follow page 22.)

Mary Raoul Millis asserted on the one hand how she was "unaware of the cataclysm which had blasted the thought-patterns and shattered the habits and attributes of one half of a nation"; on the other she confirms the triviality of emancipation: "The dingy quarters repelled me—fastidious and squeamish little person that I was . . .A wide impassable gulf separated the 'white folks' from those who served them."[44] Yet the "cataclysm" of war and the honor exacted and established by it was always near. Her mother beseeched her to "remember. . .whenever you see our *white* (emphasis added) soldiers standing on their pedestals, that they are built of the heart blood of the women of the South. . .because we wished that our soldiers might always be remembered and loved."[45] Aunt Sarah once corrected her niece, Mary Raoul Millis, for confusing the North's "Decoration Day" ("the day of the conquerors") with "Memorial Day."[46] Mary the Socialist imposed a different interpretation upon these events. Those "white" soldiers "forgot that they could not invoke Divine Justice to bless a cause which was fighting to keep the chains on the necks of their brothers."[47] Mary, the twentieth-century Socialist, dismissed the emotional arguments of her Mother and Aunt when recalling the Civil War as less a battle over slavery than "an economic crisis."[48] Mary piled one re-interpretive remembrance on another as her radical self concluded that the Confederacy's defeat "was inevitable—and was the best" [result].[49]

Mary Raoul Millis's marriage to army officer John Millis required her to journey about both the United States and the Pacific nations of Japan and the Philippines. While based near Washington, D.C., Mary objected to her husband renting a house close to "hordes of our colored

---

[44] Millis, "Autobiography," 25, 22A-22B.
[45] *ibid.*, 26.
[46] *ibid.*, 27-28.
[47] *ibid.*, 26.
[48] *ibid.*, 29.
[49] *ibid.,* 54.

brothers."[50] The juxtaposition of "hordes" and "brothers" confirmed the very confusion of selves/memories that lie at the heart of this project. When, three pages later, Mary refers again to "teeming Negro families" across the street from her army domicile, we may contemplate the ambiguity at play within the heart and mind of a Southern woman, raised partly in the North, and a sophisticated traveler to both Europe and Asia, whose memories, recorded decades after their occurrence, are constantly contested, internally, by not one Mary Raoul Millis, but by at least two: one sympathetic and supportive of her family's tradition view of racial hierarchy; and another one in opposition to the first, wherein the dignity of every individual, regardless of race or ethnicity, came before easy categories.[51]

Mary would experience similar ambiguities with regard to her Asian hosts and servants. In Kyoto, Japan, Marry missed the "raucous street cries" common to American cities; she found the urban Japanese strangely "muted." The progressive Mary attributed her difficulties to traveling alone in that "medieval country" without knowing that she was "losing face" each minute.[52] Mary's memories from the Far East are oddly juxtaposed between two traditions: American exceptionalism and United States imperialism. In the Philippines in 1905, Mary witnessed the aftermath of the Spanish-American War where U.S. advisors began "educating this semi-barbarous and largely illiterate people to govern themselves." Mary regarded American "tutelage" as "something new under the sun."[53] Her enthusiasm for American influence in the Philippines is contrasted with her disdain for English imperialism. In Shanghai, at a garden for foreigners only, Mary exclaimed, "it was like a blow in the face! So, this was Colonialism!" Mary's memories, even at the far remove of the early 1940s, cannot differentiate between her

---

[50] Millis, "Autobiography," 190.
[51] *ibid.*, 194.
[52] *ibid.*, 251.
[53] *ibid.,* 234-35.

own nation's imperial projects and those of the British who had no right "to invade this country and then to set themselves above the rightful owners."[54] American honorable tutelage and English imperial prerogatives were not synonymous in Mary's mind.

Neither, for that matter, were ideas of honesty and ethnicity regarding racial others whose honor could not be assumed. At their posting in Seattle, Washington, Mary's household was augmented by a valued Chinese servant, Chin. An issue of honor arose when Chin found a five-dollar piece under a cushion and returned it to Mary—who was not missing any money. "The memory of this incident has always troubled me" but she "said nothing to anyone about it." Should she have at least divided the money with her servant? Mary's "accusing conscience pointed out the lowly Chinaman was more honest than I had been."[55] Chin's death a year later mitigated Mary's shame. She somehow discovered that her trusted servant was an "opium eater" and that "before his death he had become violently insane."[56] Chin's "lowly" ethnic status, combined with cultural stereotypes of Asian drug abuse, made Mary's pecuniary choice more plausible—any reward to Chin would be wasted on opium. Yet the self-criticism, both explicit and implicit, is of traditional southern parochialism and sense of racial superiority—a critique born of Mary's socialist principles.

Raoul's life as a socialist led him to reevaluate his attitudes and actions within the South's racial sphere. As mayor of East Point, a suburb of Atlanta in 1900, Raoul sold some fence boards to a passing Negro who agreed to settle the next week. Raoul agreed to wait since "no Negro was ever expected to pay cash for anything." After waiting a couple of weeks for a

---

[54] Millis, "Autobiography," 237.
[55] *ibid.*, 224.
[56] *ibid.*, 228.

payment that never arrived, Raoul "decided to teach this man a lesson."[57] He arrived at his debtor's door and recognized his red boards incorporated into a shack otherwise "innocent of paint." Next, he lectured the Negro "on the inadvisability of not keeping contracts with me, [and then] ordered my men to tear off the lumber, and stack it in the roadway. There, I pored kerosene upon it, set it ablaze, then waited to see that it was not extinguished."[58] Raoul's paternal tone indicates that his position as mayor had nothing to do with this brazen act of will.

While thus entertaining himself with a cigar and ensuring the immolation of the Negro's quarters, Raoul was accosted by the shack's actual owner, a white man named Martin who exclaimed, "I'll show you that even colored people have rights under the law."[59] Raoul, the mayor, was shortly arraigned before the Justice of the Peace (the previous mayor) by his own constable who was summarily waved off with the assurance that he, Raoul, would show up shortly. The case then went to Atlanta before Judge Andrew Calhoun (who, a decade later, would marry Raoul and Winifred Wadley, his young cousin). Since Martin, the property-owner, was a "Yankee," Raoul and his lawyers "proposed to teach him a thing or two about just what rights a Negro did have under the law in the state of Georgia."[60] The case was dismissed, and the fifty-dollar fine William would have owed the county went to his attorneys.

In retrospect, Raoul the radical regarded this as "a pretty hard story, a brutal exhibition of domineering over a helpless Negro." Yet he clearly delighted in both demonstrating his mastery of the Negro, the white property owner, his constable, his lawyers, and judge; his pleasure stems, in part, from reflecting on how honor was dispersed among the participants in this little drama. Raoul, of course, emerged from this production with his honor unscathed. He took pleasure, too,

---

[57] Raoul, 98-99. Raoul ruefully comments that "all through life I have been teaching people lessons, at a good deal of expense to myself. This was no exception."
[58] *ibid.*, 99.
[59] *ibid.*
[60] *ibid.*, 100.

from his self-critique. "I was a very young man and filled with the tradition of the South . . . keeping the Negro in a subject position was part of that vast system."[61] This belated atonement does not diminish the autobiographer's joy of permitting one self to berate another self. It is this very shifting of voice and attitude that demonstrates the instability of memory as an epistemology.

In 1915, while Raoul attended to the problems of the family's Rogers plantation in Millen, Georgia, he provoked a similar racial encounter. His position as lieutenant to his attractive cousin, Florence Wadley, who owned and operated the property, may have influenced his behavior. Raoul recalled the incident as putting him "in the position of slave driver." This choice of vocabulary points in two directions: "slave driver" is either ironic paternalism or socialist invective. Pressed with the need to mobilize all the plantation's labor, Raoul ran across a young Negro headed for the river with his rod and reel for an afternoon of fishing. Infuriated, Raoul "took the rod away and broke it to pieces."[62] From the perspective of an aging socialist in 1933 (when Raoul began to write his autobiography), the shame he remembered, and the conduct he condemned was alloyed by creeping paternalism. Raoul's socialist principles have less to teach him than his experience as a Southern aristocrat. He recognized his error: "a good overseer would not have done this sort of thing. He would have lectured the boy, and succeeded in making him ashamed of himself, instead of exciting his animosity, and through him, probably the animosity of his family." The denouement is especially problematic for cultural historians reliant upon memory as methodology. Florence witnessed this incident and was pleased at Raoul's harshness; "but her words of praise only made it worse. This was one time when her

---

[61] Raoul, 101.
[62] *ibid.,* 330.

approval was not appreciated."[63] This is a dubious assertion in light of Raoul's jealous avoidance of Judge Hammond and his subsequent disastrous courtship and marriage of Florence's niece, Winifred Wadley. That Raoul on the one hand and Florence on the other, tore at each other in attempting to possess Winifred's young body (and future) indicates an unresolved rivalry that would soon dishonor all involved: Winifred's innocence, Florence's tutelage, Raoul's discretion, the family's public reputation—its collective honor put in jeopardy by Raoul's sexual frolic.

Raoul's memories of the year his spent on the family's Roger's plantation, dealing with labor troubles and encountering myriad racial circumstances, belie not only any notion of racial uniformity, but also of how honor manifested itself. Raoul's version of his past(s) accentuate Orlando Patterson's argument that "acting honorably is not the same thing as being honorable," that "two persons may perform the same act, yet the behavior of one is considered honorable while that of the other is not."[64] Raoul admired Green Rountree, "the patriarch of a large family [who] had lived in the same house and cultivated the same acres for many years." All were "impressed with the dignity of his character."[65] Dignity, of course, was not synonymous with honor. [66] For instance, should Raoul and Florence happen by Green's place at supper-time, they were "invariably asked to stop and have dinner with them, and we would be just as punctilious in giving some perfectly good reason why we could not." Had they accepted, Raoul and Florence would have had "the table to ourselves and all of our hosts would have waited on us with the

---

[63] Raoul, 331.
[64] Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), 80.
[65] Raoul, 338.
[66] Raoul illuminates this subtle point with his observations about Aunt Sarah's black servant, Israel, who stayed "in the family" until his death. Israel was, according to Raoul, "one of the heroes of my childhood." The plaudits accumulate: gentle, kind, "a resourceful mind, and a clever wit." Having constructed this sand hill of honor, Raoul wiped it out with the telling remark that Israel was also the "most childlike man I have ever known," from Raoul, 139.

greatest solicitude." Should the opposite situation occur and find Green Rountree at the Big House at dusk, he was always invited to "stay to dinner"; "this of course meant dinner in the kitchen with our servants."[67] In this way, reciprocal actions had opposite effects as the mutual generosity of both parties was interpreted differently. Green's invitation recognized the honor of his guests alongside his own dishonored status as unfit to share a table; Raoul's solicitude to Green made explicit the latter's degraded state as his place would be with other black servants.

While temporarily filling in as overseer on the Roger's plantation, Raoul had opportunities to observe evolving racial relationships within a rural society where honor was subtly asserted. Any semblance of autonomy on the part of black sharecroppers was constantly undercut by white prerogatives. Raoul remembered how his uncle Frank Wadley forbad a Negro sharecropper from cussing one of his mules. Uncle Frank was not sensitive to the mule, but, rather, to "the presumption of the Negro in cursing in his presence, and this was his tactful way of transmitting that information to him."[68] Similarly, Raoul recalled another incident of a white landowner asserting his honor, regardless of its merits, upon sharecroppers on a plantation near the Wadley's Great Hill place.[69] Sharecropper's survived the year with supplies from the/a landowner's store which in turn placed a lien on the poor farmer's crop. After harvest, everyone got paid. The sharecroppers paid off the lien and pocketed what was left. Only in this case "there never was any balance left over." Every cropper would get the same treatment: "Well Sam, its been a pretty good year, but a hard year. I see here now, by looking at the books, that I don't owe you nothing, and you don't owe me nothing." A shot of whiskey presumably

---

[67] Raoul, 338.
[68] *ibid.*, 333.
[69] Julian Pitt-Rivers, argues in "Honor," in the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* 2nd edition (New York: Macmillan Co., 1968), vol. 6, 505, how "the claim to honor depends always in the last resort, upon the ability of the claimant to impose himself. Might is the basis of right to precedence, which goes to the man who is bold enough to enforce his claim, regardless of what may be thought of his merits."

assuaged the disappointed Negro's feelings and then the next sharecropper came forth.[70] This annual ritual confirmed the implicit role of honor on New South plantations where the assertion of honor became "honor claimed, and honor claimed becomes honor paid."[71]

Raoul gradually, if incompletely, began to anticipate C. Vann Woodward's query to determine the "measure of the emancipated slave's freedom."[72] "Renters", though few in number, possessed the greatest autonomy. They bought their supplies on the open market—thus avoiding crop liens—"paid a fixed price for their land, and disposed of their entire crop as they pleased."[73] "Debt" laborers had less independence. The overseer prior to Raoul had hired two young Negroes, supplied them with a few provisions and assigned them a cabin only to discover that they had run off during the night. Since they were "in debt" they had broken what Raoul called an "illegal law."[74] Raoul described the process of "buying" debt labor as a delicate one where care should be taken so as not to offend.[75] One couple, thus bought, presented another problem for Raoul as he and a white neighbor watched the black woman unload their cart by herself. When he suggested that they should assist her, his companion made plain that "she wouldn't have any more respect for you if you did."[76] He implied that Raoul would dishonor himself in black laborers' eyes by elevating her troubles to a level a white man was bound to recognize. Another debt laborer created an entirely different set of problems for Raoul who described her as "an exceptionally good looking mulatto." Raoul went for food and provisions. When he returned, he was overcome: "just a child herself, but a woman, and beautiful to look

---

[70] Raoul, 336-37.
[71] Pitt-Rivers, "Honor," 79.
[72] Woodward, *Origins*, 205.
[73] Raoul, 337.
[74] *ibid.*, 333.
[75] *ibid.*, 334.
[76] *ibid.*

upon. I hurried away in confusion. My God! What was I about to get into?"[77] For Raoul, sex always trumped race, and his need for common laborers was superseded only by his craving for feminine companionship. Raoul's avoidance of trouble in this instance would not make him immune to unwise sexual temptations later on the plantation.

Raoul's socialist indignation is evident is in description of convict labor: "this outrageous custom of going bond for a prisoner awaiting trial, and then putting him to work, was, I think, in pretty general use."[78] According to Raoul, a plantation like Rogers "required two posts to be filled by white men": an overseer and a clerk/bookkeeper.[79] A third position, the "lot man" might be filled by a black man. He was responsible for "the feeding of the stock used by the wages hands, and of the care of all of the gear and other property around the lot."[80] Raoul worried that no Negro would take this position because of its "solitary work. Negroes, even more than our race, like to work in gangs."[81] When Raoul at last found his "lot man," a black prisoner named Bob Anderson, he had already relinquished the post of overseer to a certain Joe Duberry.

The Wadleys and the Duberry's went back to Great Hill place where Joe's brother had been the overseer before being killed with an axe wielded by "some irate Negro, whom he was doubtless abusing."[82] This decidedly socialist memory is mixed with others more paternalistic in nature. Duberry "was talkative and shrewd, and had a winning way with the Negroes, half

---

[77] Raoul, 335.
[78] Raoul, 329. Ayers, *Promise,*154, argued that "planters, railroads, or other employers facing labor shortages were all too happy to purchase, merely by paying a small fine and court costs, the labor of black men convicted of petty crimes. County officials were eager to arrest black men moving through a county, whether for vagrancy or some other trumped up charge, when they knew they could make money for the county and themselves by farming the prisoners out."
[79] Raoul, 327.
[80] *ibid.*, 329.
[81] *ibid.*
[82] *ibid.,* 327-28.

cajoling, half ordering and bullying."[83] Raoul, anxious that his convict lot man would not take to Duberry's blandishments, demanded the overseer take his place on the bond in the event Bob Anderson fled. Raoul left the denouement in doubt, reporting only that he observed Duberry and Anderson on a wagon headed for Millen, Georgia, where the jail was located. What was not in doubt was Raoul's honor within a hierarchy where Duberry was required to address Florence and William as "Miss Florence and . . . Mr. Willie. This was in recollection of our childhood, and a compromise with our first names, which his class position did not permit him to use."[84] The skewer of superiority that gathered whites together in an honorable assemblage in opposition to blacks' degradation discriminated by class; the inability to recognize one's proper place could easily escalate events towards violence.

The class divide separating elite from poor whites could be forded far easier than the chasm that maintained racial distinctions. In the spring of 1915, a white neighbor named Ben Franklin was shot by one of his black share-croppers, Tom Campbell. Raoul received two stories then and later imposed his interpretation upon both narratives in the 1930s when he wrote his memoir. He heard the black version of the incident from the Campbell's fellow sharecroppers, and then two days later he listened to the white narrative from his cousin Frank Wadley who had talked with Franklin's brother. The interpretation Raoul imposed on his memories combined elements of both his aristocratic and radical selves to manipulate these two narratives. His rendition demonstrated how masculine honor had grown too complex to be easily categorized by race.

According to the plantation blacks, Franklin had gone to the Campbell home and became irate after finding the wife readying a shotgun for fishing. He complained about her laziness and

---

[83] Raoul, 328.
[84] *ibid.*, 329.

of the work that needed attention. Furious, Franklin snatched the shotgun from Mrs. Campbell and aimed it at her while unsuccessfully trying to load a shell into the chamber. Leaving the yard in frustration, Franklin was accosted by Tom Campbell who "protested against this treatment, seized another gun, a single barreled shotgun . . . and emptied its contents into Franklin's back."[85] This version of the episode exemplified the conundrum posed by W.E.B. Du Bois twelve years earlier on his tour of southern Georgia when he wrote of the black sharecropper's "careless ignorance and laziness here, fierce hate and vindictiveness there."[86]

Franklin was severely wounded, but lived; Campbell fled into the nearby swamps of Duck Pond to hide from inevitable retribution in the form of a lynch mob that began to gather "within an incredibly short time" from the "neighboring plantations and towns, and from other parts of the state." Vigilantes "came in automobiles, in buggies, and on horseback" while the local sheriff "brought the dogs from his convict camp for use in trailing Campbell to his hiding place."[87] Georgia Governor John Slaton (who had paid $7.50 for Raoul's dismal train trip home from Chicago in 1893) posted a reward for Campbell's capture.[88] Thus an inter-racial affair over two men's honor had mobilized "all the forces of law and lawlessness" that now "joined hands to take part in the man hunt."[89]

The second version of the story, the one related to Raoul by Frank Wadley, came second-hand from the victim's brother. It differed significantly and contained elements incompatible with Raoul's (aristocratic) estimate of Franklin's masculinity or his (radical) calculation of Campbell's honor. According to Wadley, Franklin informed the Campbells that they had better

---

[85] Raoul, 359-60.
[86] W.E.B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993) (originally published in 1903), 104.
[87] Raoul, 360. See Du Bois, 103.
[88] Raoul, 360. "Governor's Office-Rewards," 1-4-20, unit 12, Georgia Archives. An entry for April 30, 1915 noted Thomas Campbell's assault "with intent to murder" Ben Franklin in Jenkins County. Governor Slaton offered a reward of $150.00 for aid in Campbell's capture.
[89] Raoul, 360.

get to work plowing instead of shooting fish. While crossing the yard to get his mule, Campbell said loud enough for Franklin to hear, "I b'lieve I'll jus' kill de son of a bitch now."[90] Alarmed at this threat, Franklin began to run from the yard until he was cut down by Campbell's shotgun blast to the back. Campbell's wife rushed at him with an axe as he lay prostate and his death was only prevented by the couples' excited children. According to Wadley, Franklin claimed to have never abused or touched the Campbell woman.

Raoul was incredulous and asked his cousin if he believed this tale. Wadley replied, "I have no reason not to believe it. I would take a white man's word before a Negro's every time." Truth, explicitly racialized, was now also implicitly gendered between distinct masculinities divided not only by race and class but also by implied essential differences between two types of men, a white landlord and a black sharecropper. Raoul, acutely aware of bot the nuances of white honor and masculine shame, critiqued Wadley's version of events. He pointed out that Franklin was not only a courageous man, but a "high tempered one, and that it was not at all like him, or any other [white] man, to run in the face of a threat from a Negro . . . that the natural course of any man in such a situation, would have been to go to the Negro to prevent his carrying out the threat."[91] Raoul dismissed his cousin's version of the story, in part, because it posited a white man fleeing a black man. Raoul's interpretation troubled Frank Wadley because of it implications: Franklin had lied about his aggression to mitigate his share of the blame for the shooting that followed. Raoul was less interested in Franklin's defense than what he believed to be the honorable response of any white man confronted with black violence.

Frank Wadley became angry and ended the conversation by stating his preference for a white man's word over a "nigger," and that anyone who would not "would do himself no good in

---

[90] Raoul, 360.
[91] *ibid.*

this part of the country."[92] Wadley did what Raoul refused to do: he willingly subordinated white honor to black guilt, a conclusion repugnant to Raoul's aristocratic calculations of white southern manliness.

Raoul believed that had Campbell been "captured in the next twenty-four hours he would have been lynched." He was captured five days later, however, after the excitement had died down and Franklin appeared well on his way to recovery. Both Campbell and his wife were charged with "assault with intent to murder" and jailed in Millen. Raoul visited the jail and spoke with a Sheriff Johnson. A mutual friend asked the sheriff what he would do if men appeared at his jail with shotguns. The sheriff answered that he would "be somewhere else" thus signaling his acquiescence in vigilante justice administered without benefit of trial.[93]

Raoul's interpretation of the Franklin-Campbell dispute made explicit what the rest of the white community seemingly ignored. He recognized that this incident inverted the usual southern narrative about racial violence. Here, a white man apparently assaulted a black woman instead of the traditional trope of black men attacking white women. In this case, instead of a white man defending the honor of his alabaster spouse, a black man came to the rescue of his threatened wife. Raoul argued "that *any man* would have shot Franklin under like circumstances," thus collapsing racial distinctions about masculine honor. (emphasis added) Raoul's arguments denied racial stereotypes about black men's violent nature and affirmed that the dignity and motives of an African-American man, in defense of his wife and home, were no different than that of a white man—that, indeed, black and white masculinities mirrored one another.[94]

---

[92] Raoul, 361.
[93] *ibid.*
[94] *ibid.,* 362.

Previous to this conversation, Raoul had "expressed [his] intention to be present in case of a lynching, and to put the mob on notice that [he] would stand as a reputable witness in prosecuting them." Alarmed for his safety, Raoul's family was also angry and confused at his ambiguous attitude. A younger cousin, Richard Wadley, told him that he had heard that Raoul would be shot and strung up "alongside the nigger" if he interfered with the lynching party. Raoul expressed "contempt of such mobs."[95] Franklin's recovery forestalled the lynching party. Raoul admitted that "these events made me feel somewhat alien to my environment, and to my life with my cousins."[96] In the end, Raoul's calculations of white and black masculinities were too complex for a community that confined manliness to a narrow gamut dependent primarily on race. Raoul was a symptom of the New South's tentative steps into the twentieth-century's often bewildering array of choices. His choice of socialism exemplified the proliferating, though only grudgingly recognized, masculinities in the New South.

* * *

This chapter has demonstrated the complexity of gender in the hands of a skillful manipulator like Raoul who sought to impose his will, either brazenly or subtly, on those he encountered in his intimate life. The next chapter charts Raoul's socialist sojourn as he associates clusters of memories with specific sites and particular masculine performances. His power to impose representations on events long past is demonstrated as he traveled through the "New World" of the working class.

---

[95] Raoul, 362.
[96] *ibid.*

CHAPTER FIVE

ALTERNATIVE HONOR: SOCIALISM AND THE NEW WORLD

When in 1908 William Greene Raoul, Jr. (1872-1956) decided he would "travel about, hobo if necessary, and find out what was being done in the socialist and working class world," he committed not only political and social apostasy but also announced his voluntary descent down the ladder of the American social hierarchy his father and grandfather had struggled to climb.[1] He lived at his father's elaborate mansion on Peachtree Street in Atlanta while reading Marx and giving lectures on the virility of the working class and the virtues of socialism at local theaters.[2] Raoul remembered, "what was I going to do? I certainly couldn't live off my father and work for the Socialist Party."[3] He had been "brought up in the tradition of the self-made captain of industry. I must make a living, and a good one."[4] For Raoul, dependence and reliance were feminizing attributes, qualities incompatible with both his class and gendered expectations. And expectations were great for Raoul as both his father and maternal grandfather had reached the apex of their professions. His family had settled in Atlanta, after all, because his father believed it the ideal city where his sons could cultivate the manly arts of commerce. Repeated failures in the business world would push Raoul down a different path.

Raoul would finally reject the bourgeois values and masculine roles of his southern conservative upbringing for a life lived on the radical fringe as a member of the Socialist party

---

[1] Raoul, 242. The reader will recall that Raoul's maternal grandfather, William M. Wadley (1813-1882), served as president of the Central of Georgia Railroad both before and after the American Civil War. During the war, he served briefly as Commander of the Confederate Railroads. Greene Raoul (1843-1913), followed his father-in-law as president of the Central before devoting most of his career to the Mexican National Railroad as president.
[2] Located at 848 Peachtree Street, William Greene Raoul's residence was designed by New York architect Bradford L. Gilbert with whom Raoul, Jr., the subject of this essay, served as an apprentice for a year after leaving preparatory school.
[3] Raoul, 240.
[4] *ibid.*, 2.

and advocate of Free Love—ideals simultaneously subversive *and* emancipating for the failed businessman and frustrated lover. Raoul, driven to this alienation by an unsatisfying sexual life and financial dependence upon his father, fashioned another sort of Southern manhood that rejected the masculine model of the "captain of industry" for that of an elite condescending to join an oppressed working class. Raoul crafted a version of masculinity that in some ways predicts that of the "modern man" who anticipates (and encourages) women's sexual expression. Raoul's failure to achieve the sort of masculinity valued by his father made him an improviser of masculinities, shaping and crafting his life and gendered behavior along two distinct paths.

Raoul's recollections on gender are important because they make explicit the role of honor and its link to various masculinities in the New South, a connection already made by Bertram Wyatt-Brown for the antebellum South.[5] Furthermore, Raoul's recollections demonstrate the complexity of memory as a scholarly tool. As mere methodology, memory is revealed as a dubious source since its parallel constructions permit alternative realities; yet, this ostensibly intellectual cul-de-sac widens into infinite epistemological avenues as scholars investigate the *meaning* of memories—their interpretation being more important than the events they ostensibly represent. Autobiographies, after all, may tell us more about their author's present than their past: it is at the moment of composition that the decision is made as to *which* memories are recorded and *how* they are interpreted. This dichotomy creates tension between memory and history.[6] And, of course, the memory of an unknown historical actor like Raoul cannot always be verified. The historian will profit from interpreting Raoul's memory in

---

[5] Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*.
[6] Daniel L. Schacter, *Searching for Memory: The Brain, the Mind, and the Past* (New York: Basic Books, 1996), 308, argued "memory is a central part of the brain's attempt to make sense of experience and to tell coherent stories about it. These tales are all we have of our pasts, and so they are potent determinants of how we view ourselves and what we do."

historical context rather than running down elusive leads that do not alter the patterns of memory—both aristocratic and radical—imposed by Raoul upon both the page and his past.

This chapter will examine four sites of Raoul's memories and the stories he associated with those places in his reconstitution of masculinities in Chicago, Birmingham, "on the road," and Millen. In Chicago, Raoul created an alternative working-class persona while visiting the Columbian Exposition and World's Fair in 1893, fifteen years before his Socialist epiphany. In Birmingham in 1910, soon after his Socialist conversion, Raoul undertook a variety of masculine roles where gender and class collided. After Birmingham, in 1911-12, Raoul undertook what I have deemed his "anti-vacation" as the new Socialist proselytizer takes his secular faith "on the road" to encounter his idealized working-class man and other assorted radical characters. In Millen, in 1914-15, he subverted the community's gender expectations by marrying his eighteen-year-old cousin before speaking out against a prospective lynching. These events led to his alienation from the land of his birth, but together they allow us to understand better the complex ways that memory and masculinity functioned together in the New South.

To place Raoul's memories of Chicago, Birmingham, "on the road," and Millen in better historical context, I will preface my discussion of them by briefly examining the anthropological impulse that animated researchers' investigations into the differences in men at the turn of the twentieth century. Raoul's "performance" of various masculine roles does much to explain how gender operated in the New South. His own peripatetism offered many occasions for observations and a running commentary on how gender worked in larger geographical contexts.

The Aristocrat as Anthropologist

William Raoul depicts his deliberate descent into the working-class world not just as something undertaken with the spirit of an adventurous *bon vivant* on an anti-vacation, but also as an apprentice anthropologist observing the underclass. Raoul's experiment among "this new world of the working class" hints of Columbian daring and was anticipated by other amateur ethnologists with alternative agendas.[7] Their collective audacity created an unwitting partnership among early twentieth-century social investigators who chose to descend the class ladder to assume the guise of the working man for purposes of adventure, observation, and identity. Historian Frank Higbie argued that "the participant-observer investigation, in which writers donned working-class clothes and lived a double life," presented problems for historians. On the one hand, they convey authenticity while on the other the resulting "texts are as much about defining differences between investigator and subject as they are about working-class life itself." Raoul would never escape this paradox. His descent into the working class was a quest for manliness more authentic (and accessible) than the privileged masculinity of his upbringing; yet, the porousness of class boundaries brought into question Raoul's masculine character among both his elite and working-class audiences. Higbie asserted "the middle- and upper-class social investigators who took on working-class identities were in a sense expressing uneasiness about their own and working men's manliness."[8] Certainly Raoul's sojourn among his working-class

---

[7] Raoul, 238.
[8] Frank T. Higbie, *Indispensable Outcasts: Hobo Workers and Community in the American Midwest, 1880-1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 68.

comrades would often reveal the proletarian aristocrat as a stranger searching for alternative masculinities in an alien land.[9]

Raoul's contemporary, Walter Wyckoff, left Princeton University in 1891 to begin "an experiment of earning my living as a day laborer" and managed to cross the country from Connecticut to California as a not-too-eager member of the working class.[10] Wyckoff "hoped to gain some personal acquaintances with the conditions of life of unskilled forms of labor."[11] Wyckoff's ruse of a working-class persona was designed to convince his (reading) audience that even the most unskilled laborers could survive by muscle and sweat. Wyckoff's *appearance* as a worker suggests the permeability of class and status and at the easy betrayal of both by outward signs, clothes, mode of transportation, vocabulary, and attitude.

Wyckoff, like Raoul, was "sustained by the knowledge that at any moment you may leave it" and return to the comfortable confines of Princeton—or Greene Raoul's house on Peachtree Street in Atlanta.[12] Leaving the single-tax colony of Fairhope, Alabama, on his working-class peregrination, Raoul reflected "that it was a delightful and wholesome atmosphere

---

[9] Anthropologist (and Raoul's contemporary) Franz Boas described how the assumed superiority of the investigating (or colonizing) group was often based on the "difference between its social status" with that of the subject people. Franz Boas, *The Mind of Primitive Man* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911), 21. Boas's protégé, Claude Levi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, translated from the French by Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest (New York: Basic Books, 1963), 378, asserted that the anthropological method was marked by "distantiation" whereby the investigator and his subjects were "representatives of very different cultures."

[10] Walter Wyckoff, *A Day with a Tramp* (New York: Benjamin Blom, Inc., 1901), Preface. Clearly an inspiration for Wyckoff, Josiah Flynt had illuminated "the habits of life and of thought of the fraternity, and its common speech and symbols . . . and how it occupies a world midway between lawlessness and honest toil, lacking the criminal wit for the one and the willpower for the other," 5.

[11] Wyckoff, *Tramp*, 3-4. Daniel T. Rodgers, "The Tramp and the Policy Doctor," *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 58: 1 (1996): 67-71, described Wyckoff's work as following Franz Boas's admonition for anthropologists to cease "arranging the peoples of the world in ascending order," and, instead, to immerse themselves by rite of passage into the society of the other.

[12] Wyckoff, *Tramps,* 45. While Flynt, Wyckoff, and Raoul climbed down the social ladder to undertake their respective experiments, Nels Anderson, *The Hobo: The Sociology of the Homeless Man* (University of Chicago Press, 1923), xiii, "did not descend into the pit, assume a role there, and later ascend to brush off the dust." Indeed, Anderson ascended from the working class to the University of Chicago where he achieved his Master's degree in sociology based on his keen observations of the working class. The only instruction he received from his committee chair was to "write down only what you see, hear, and know, like a newspaper reporter," xii.

to *vacation* in."[13] (emphasis added) At work as a carpenter in Birmingham, Raoul maintained "one connection with the old world," spending pleasant Sunday afternoons at his friends' "comparatively luxurious home," a "haven" from his working-class digs in the city.[14] Raoul, preparing to disembark from Birmingham for points out west, wrote his mother that he did not "expect to stop to work until I reach Denver."[15] His casualness about stepping into the class chasm was exemplified by his "squaring" with the conductor of a freight train for his transportation, while sending one of his chests ahead "by express," thus making plain the game of negotiating a switch in class: Raoul would ride free like the hoboes whose autonomy he admired; his luggage would go first class to Denver.[16] Pressed into service as a speaker at a Socialist party gathering when the headliner did not show, Raoul admitted to a rowdy crowd that he held valuable railroad bonds in addition to real estate but that he did not "approve of this system at all." He thought it was "pure robbery, and that every man ought to have to work for his living. But I don't have to work for mine."[17] Raoul, unlike Wyckoff, was not troubled by his ability to vacate his working-class life for his aristocratic one. Whereas Wyckoff worried that his academic life undercut the authenticity of his observances of the working class, Raoul's parallel pattern of memories validated the authenticity of both sets of recollections, radical and aristocratic.[18]

---

[13] Raoul, 261.
[14] *ibid.*, 247.
[15] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, box 19, folder 4, letter from Raoul to his mother, 30 April 1911.
[16] Raoul, 264.
[17] *ibid.*, 365.
[18] Higbie, *Outcast*, 67, argued that all of these "would-be reformers" shared a common self-identity as "outsiders, looking in on a class world separate from their own." This pattern was reiterated across the west as men and women transgressed class and gender boundaries in pursuit of myriad quests. For Diego Rivera's murals of Mexican farmers and urban proletariat depicted the idealization of the working class by the elite for aesthetic and political purposes, see Andrea Kettenmann, *Rivera, 1886-1957: A Revolutionary Spirit in Modern Art* (London: Taschen, 2005). Anne McClintock's *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995), tracks the astonishing story of Arthur Munby and Hannah Cullwick's subversion of traditional class and gender expectations while making plain the power of the proletariat (and its accumulated dirt) as a fetish. Hal Foster, *Prosthetic Gods* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2004), discussed artists' attraction to the "primitive" as,

Americans were introduced to anthropology as a scientific buttress to racial hierarchy during the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893 where Raoul's memories of his failure to find work would foretell his radical epiphany fifteen years later. Greene Raoul gathered his three oldest sons, (our) William, Gaston, and Tom and told them that he was sending them to the Fair. Supplied with railroad passes and one hundred dollars apiece, Greene informed his young men that they "were to see the fair thoroughly. That on our return he would expect each of us to describe everything to him."[19] In this way, the late nineteenth-century's predilection for classification and accumulation of knowledge was extended to Greene Raoul's sons whose visit to the Fair was framed as work instead of leisure.[20] Told by his father to "observe" things during his time in Chicago, Raoul was already attuned to the question of appearance, the differences between surface and undergirding, the range between the authentic and the artificial.

An Epiphany Foretold: Chicago, Where the Clothes Make the Man

Raoul's sartorial surface often undermined his working-class intentions. He had promised his family and peers that he would remain in Chicago to seek employment there if he did not receive a summons for work in Atlanta. This vow led to a futile job search in depression-ridden Chicago in the summer of 1893 and provoked him to assume an alternative masculine

---

alternatively, "an erotic object" on the one hand and as sharing intimacy "with the sacred" on the other, thus bringing into sharp focus the allure of the under-classed other as being genuine and without artifice, qualities sufficient to compensate for their being left in modernity's wake.

[19] Raoul, 15.

[20] Erik Larson, *The Devil in the White City: Murder, Magic, and Madness at the Fair that Changed America* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003), 121, discussed how the Exposition's Executive Committee dispatched an army officer to Zanzibar to find and bring back a "tribe of Pygmies only recently revealed to exist by explorer Henry Stanly." The Committee wanted "a family of twelve or fourteen of the fierce little midgets" to demonstrate not only humanity's variety but also its ostensible hierarchy.

personality. He complained that "people seemed to differentiate me from the usual workman."[21] Fifteen years later, in his initial foray into radical politics in Atlanta, Raoul went to his first meeting of the Socialist party and was received with "rather hostile looks." Of course, Raoul "was very well dressed. That was a part of my job, and in considerable contrast with the membership."[22] Raoul's fashionable dress prompted a member to make "a somewhat fiery speech about how, since the Socialists were becoming such a threatening force in society, the capitalists would soon be trying to break in so as to capture their organization, and he warned that great care should be exercised in taking in new members."[23] Raoul was astounded by this potentially hostile declaration, though very impressed with the local's "excellent and systematic methods of organization."[24]

Raoul's astonishment arose from the heretofore unimagined hostility of the working class to his sympathetic presence when, after all, he should have been greeted with gratitude for his thinly disguised paternalism on the one hand, and authentic interests in their socialist ideas on the other. The confusion attendant to both sides, Raoul and his working-class audience for which he was essentially auditioning, was borne of shifting masculinities. Raoul came to this radical congregation as a novice, though possessed of the bearing and dress of a class enemy. To the Socialist club he desired to join, his surface betrayed class antagonism by its easy confidence and its authentic upper-class bearing. The irony, of course, lay in Raoul's search for masculine

---

[21] Raoul, 20.
[22] *ibid.*, 238.
[23] *ibid.* 238. John K. Turner, "Labor Union and Socialist Local Infested with Corporation Spies," in the July 25, 1914 issue of *The Appeal to Reason*, argued that "ever since the smoke began to rise from the tall chimneys at Akron the Corporation Auxiliary Company has had scores of 'operatives' (pretended workingmen) in the factories 'inspecting,' reporting upon and discharging the rubber workers." John Graham, ed., *"Yours for the Revolution": The Appeal to Reason, 1895-1922* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990), 122. In the same collection is a confidential letter from the Corporations Auxiliary Company, in Cleveland, Ohio, that promised to "eliminate the agitator and organizer quietly and with little or no friction, and further, through the employment of our system, you will now at all times know who among your employees are loyal and to be depended upon," 126.
[24] Raoul, 238.

authenticity among the blue collars combined with his rejection of the predatory manliness of his peers. At play in Raoul's mind were (at least) three possible masculinities: the steely captain of industry (Raoul's father and grandfather), the rich dandy ne'er-do-well (Raoul himself), and the rough-and-tumble working-class proletarian (Raoul's alter-ego).

Back in Chicago, where the amateur anthropological spirit was everywhere afire with the interpretation of symbols (and where Frederick Jackson Turner had just declared the end of the American frontier), Raoul would experience the same problems of class identification previously tackled by Walter Wyckoff. Once, while trying to find work as a laborer, Wyckoff's unphysical background as a missionary's son was discerned by an Irish maid who told him that his "hands did not look as though . . . [he] was used to work."[25] Like Raoul, Wyckoff did all he could "to keep a respectable appearance," though his eastern accent and polished manners made him appear alien to working-class types in Chicago and places further west.[26] Wyckoff was "without the smallest gift of mimicry" and imagined that western workers credited his otherness with being "an immigrant of a new and hitherto unknown sort" from "an island in distant seas, where any manner of strange artisan might be bred."[27] Raoul, like Wyckoff, little realized the "indelible marks of class, the speech, the manners, the habit of thought" that, according to a friend familiar with his elite background, made obvious the "ruling class written all over you."[28]

---

[25] Walter A. Wyckoff, *The Workers: An Experiment in Reality, The East* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), 21. McClintock argued in *Imperial Leather* that "hands expressed one's class by expressing one's relation to labor. Dainty hands were hands that were unstained by work. The language of gloves spoke of 'good breeding,' leisure and money, while smooth white hands revealed that one could afford to buy the labor of others." She quotes Eric Hobsbawn: "The safest way of distinguishing oneself from the laborers was to employ labor oneself." McClintock noted the metonymic power of hands in classifying artisans as "dockhands," or "farmhands," 99.
[26] Wyckoff, *The Workers: An Experiment in Reality, The West* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), 303.
[27] Wyckoff, *Tramp*, 51.
[28] Raoul, 248.

Wyckoff and Raoul would discover while mingling among the working class that each possessed "inescapable, insulating cultural blubber."[29]

Having been caught in the wrong cultural clothing before, Raoul resolved to try a new masculine wardrobe in his forlorn search for work in Chicago during the Columbian Exposition even as the depression of 1893 began. He had determined to not "waste any time on good jobs; I'll just go out and tie into the sure thing. After all, this was merely a demonstration, not the great career of captain of industry I would yet embark on." This high-sounding language of travel and exploration revealed the transitory state of desperation Raoul found himself trapped in as an unemployed worker in a Chicago bursting with out-of-work men. Various construction foremen told Raoul "in forcible and unmistakable language just how little they needed any men at all, particularly one such as I."[30] Raoul distinguished himself from other men, other masculinities. His daily deportment made his applications for work absurd in the eyes of men who had never done anything other than labor with their hands. Raoul's estimation of himself, fashioned in opposition to the blue-collar men he now sought to join, underwent seismic shifts as his liminal status rendered him useless to his class peers and ridiculous to the working class he sought to join.

Raoul imposed a pattern of radical remembrances upon his difficult stay in Chicago. His decision to apply for work at every storefront along a prosperous looking street meant, in retrospect, that Raoul "was going to scab it with a vengeance."[31] Raoul sold life insurance door-to-door to poor people who viewed such products cynically as unattainable luxuries. His honor was called into question by a maid servant who turned on him for trying to sell her an insurance policy she could not afford. Raoul "flushed again at the memory" of how "mortification struck

---

[29] Rodgers, "Doctor," 61.
[30] Raoul, 18
[31] *ibid.*

deep at my heart" upon being "set right on a point of common honesty and plain figures by a maid servant at a back door."[32] In Raoul's memory, his contempt of capitalism coincided with the irony of being instructed by a member of the lower class to condemn the exploitive system he would later abandon.

Raoul tried to salvage his diminished honor by creating an unlikely alchemy of masculinities by re-inventing himself as a member of the working class. His "brilliant idea" resulted in a public resume of sorts, a "postal card" displayed outside his rooming-house and elsewhere. This advertisement made reference to his work with Bradford Gilbert, the architect with whom he had apprenticed the year before in New York, and it was signed "in a feigned hand" by a working-class persona created in Raoul's imagination, one "Tom Davis." He had never known "a man named Tom Davis, but that name brings to my mind a real personality, the man I was to be." Thus Raoul sought to create out of his own raw material what he fancied a working-class man might look like. Should anyone call on this fictitious "Tom Davis," Raoul informed his land-lady that "I was he."[33]

Raoul's new masculinity grew tiresome after a day and he stopped "impersonating Tom Davis" and re-assumed his "own personality."[34] He shed his working-class shirt and "dressed carefully in a cutaway coat and short fawn colored top box coat." Authenticity and artifice collided when after retrieving his "fashionable derby hat" and gloves, Raoul's progress to some social event was interrupted. His "enigmatic landlady" flung open his door and declared in an irritated tone: "Davis: someone to see you." "Paralyzed," Raoul hurriedly began to dismantle his elite masculine appearance by dropping the gloves and discarding the coat as "if I was going into action," thus linking physicality to a manliness he believed would be required in this

---

[32] Raoul, 20.
[33] *ibid.*, 21. Seigel, "Self," from Bonnell and Hunt, *Linguistic Turn*, 281-314.
[34] Raoul, 20-21.

surprise interview.[35] For Raoul, the transition between upper-class and working-class masculinities lay in his façade. He may have told his sister, Mary Raoul Millis, a different memory of this event. In her *Family of Raoul*, Millis described the dramatic scene absent the landlady as her brother descended "the dingy stairs" only to be confronted by "a burly Contractor" who announced that he was looking for Tom Davis, "the man who sent me this letter." Raoul, dressed as if on the way to a cotillion instead of a construction site, confirmed his false identity. The foreman's "glance wandered from top hat to patent leather shoes, in slow, inexpressible scorn . . . and without another word, he turned and left."[36] Implied in Millis's version of this incident was her brother's failure to convincingly portray a masculinity known only to him by observation.

Raoul's own version of the interview differed. He confessed the "crime" of impersonation in his memory while assuring the foreman of his qualifications. The foreman's questions were asked "sternly"; Raoul answered "feebly."[37] He had been emasculated by a member of the working class and embarrassed by his dandified dress in the presence of a man bewildered by Tom Davis, the laborer, now inappropriately dressed as another type of man—an elite without need of work and, indeed, probably a part of the exploitive capitalist class. When asked if he understood framing, Raoul, who "had never heard the word . . . rose to the occasion" and said yes. When informed by the foreman that he should be ready to leave on the morning's five o'clock train, Raoul lost what was left of his composure. He did not have any money, tools, or skills. By this confession, he avoided the job while garnering further shame as being unemployable. While writing his memoirs, Raoul reflected that he "should have plunged . . .

---

[35] Raoul, 21.
[36] Millis, *Family*.
[37] Raoul, 21.

[because] once out in the sticks he would have had to give me a fair trial."[38] The implication was that Raoul could represent a framer until he actually became one. Clearly particular masculinities corresponded to particular skills. With myriad masculinities available, Raoul had only to determine what unique qualities were required.

Raoul as a working man in disguise would re-emerge in his adventures as a hobo and Socialist proselytizer. Like Anne McClintock's Arthur Munby, who was transfixed not so much by actual labor as by the "representation of labor . . . [of] labor as spectacle," Raoul paid attention to his appearance as an aristocrat on the one hand and as a member of the working class on the other.[39] When he arrived in Birmingham, on the first leg of his radical journey, Raoul chose "a working shirt . . . instead of the white collar mark," making clear for all to see what sort of man was he. When offered an opportunity to return to Atlanta to look after his father's interest in the Associated Charities, he took a "recess" from his "working-class life," thus diminishing the authenticity of his life as a laborer. Looking for, and getting, work in Kansas, Raoul believed he was "well disguised as an amiable and capable farm hand." By the time he reached Butte, Montana, Raoul deliberately "dressed in corduroys and blue shirt, and a western hat, something on the cowboy order."[40] Raoul's attentiveness to dress and comportment revealed his bourgeois status. Genuine working class would not know nor care about appearing in appropriate attire. Raoul remained self-conscious about his numerous metamorphoses of masculinities.

Raoul's inability to find work convinced him to end his Chicago experiment and return to Atlanta. He sought financial help from two prominent Georgians staying in the city, future

---

[38] Raoul, 21.
[39] McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 144-47.
[40] Raoul, 244, 256, 270, 279.

governor, Jack Slaton and Will Black, later a federal judge in New York.[41] Both were ensconced in a Chicago hotel. The first time Raoul called upon them, he had to wait. This added to his humiliation as he imagined the "bell hops had begun to be suspicious of me," a perverse inversion of honor as his social inferiors questioned his status as he loitered about the lobby. He returned the following morning and said to Slaton, "I hardly know you well enough to ask such a favor, but I would be most obliged if you would help me." Delighted, as most men are to have another in their debt, Slaton was "most happy to accommodate" Raoul's financial needs which amounted to $7.50 for train fare home to Atlanta.[42]

Raoul arrived back in Atlanta from Chicago before dawn and walked to his father's house at 708 Peachtree Street, just one door north of the city limit. It was early September 1893, and Raoul went to sleep in the hammock strung up in the back yard. At dawn, he entered the house with the servants through the back door and went upstairs to the "boy's floor" where he bathed and made himself presentable at the family's breakfast table. After exchanging greetings, Raoul remembered "no prying questions were asked, and I volunteered no information." He had "a feeling that I had been whipped, but hadn't had a fair deal, and that nobody would understand this."[43] His sister Mary remembered Raoul's homecoming. She wrote that he was received at breakfast "without enthusiasm. He was disgraced; but, again, *was* it his fault?" Though "crushed with shame and discouragement," why should he "be thus humiliated? Was it *his* fault that men lay idle and hungry [in Chicago] . . . and could find no work to do?"[44]

---

[41] *Atlanta City Directory*, 1894, lists John M. Slaton (who as one of his final acts as governor would commute Leo Frank's death sentence to life in prison) as a lawyer whose residence on Courtland Street was only one block east of Raoul's Peachtree Street address. William Black was also listed as an Atlanta lawyer, 456.
[42] Raoul, 24-25.
[43] *ibid.,* 26.
[44] Millis, *Family*, 117 (emphasis in original).

Raoul's parallel memories were often constructed with a caveat whereby his radical voice anachronistically imposed itself on events that occurred years before his conversion to socialism. This justified and made sense of his failures before his radical enlightenment. He employed one when recalling this painful first morning home from Chicago. His personal bitterness became blame broadcast on "this very family of mine" who "were part of that world which had gone all wrong," and that they were not "capable of understanding the spiritual revolution" that gripped him after this apparent defeat. He remembered a "misconception, disproved by my experience in Chicago, that all men who were willing to work could always find work . . . but I did not then realize" how false was the capitalist explanation of economic life.[45] After breakfast, Raoul went to the Southern Iron Car Line and spoke to the owners Eugene and Will Spalding, who were neighbors.[46] He pleaded with Will Spalding. "I want work. I wanted work before I left [for Chicago three months ago], but now I just must have it. I will do anything, Mr. Will, at any price, or no price, but I just must have work."[47] Raoul, of course, was not begging for a living wage, but rather for a respectable masculinity. Supplication so remembered would make Raoul's later political apostasy especially ironic.

Birmingham: Masculinities Abound

In 1910, Raoul decided upon Birmingham to begin "earning my living as [a] journeyman." To do so in Atlanta "would savor too much of publicity seeking." Also, Raoul wanted "to make a more complete severance with my inherited associations than would have

---

[45] Raoul, 48.
[46] *Atlanta City Directory*, 1899, list Eugene Spalding as President and General Manager of the Southern Iron Car Line. His address at 477 Peachtree Street put him one block away from the Raoul home, 1213.
[47] Raoul, 26-27.

been possible" in Atlanta. As if auditioning for a workingman's job, Raoul built an elaborate tool chest within which his new masculinity might be both demonstrated and contained. He arrived in Birmingham with the newly constructed chest and a "working shirt . . . instead of the white collar mark." Raoul remembered his earlier fashion imbroglios in Chicago. The chest, too, would soon be discarded for a "suit case" less heavy and more practical for a man on the move.[48] Raoul improvised his new masculinity.

In February 1910, only a month since his departure from Atlanta, Raoul wrote to his mother, "there is a movement on fire here to start a socialist paper."[49] In March he wrote that he had taken leave from work to arrange the first issue of the "People's Voice." He would edit the paper without compensation and would like for his mother "to send us $1.00 for your subscription." Raoul believed that his mother would come to "understand" [him] by reading his paper.[50] Judging from Raoul's next letter home, his mother apparently took the same dim view of socialist literature as his aunt Hennie had back in Waycross. In a supplicating tone, Raoul wrote his mother that Socialism seemed "so reasonable and noble and good to me and so free from all communism or servility, that it is hard for me to believe it can seem totally otherwise to those I honor and love." The vocabulary of class struggle and working-class exploitation, of utopian societies and brotherhood among men sounded to Raoul "like those of a great patriarch or statesman."[51] Raoul obviously received a rude reply to his request for subscription money as his next letter declared in an incredulous tone that, "I had no idea that I could go to editing a paper and you not wish to see it." For Raoul, editing a paper (any paper!) marked a success; for his mother the achievement was tainted by its subject matter. The pathetic tone of a disappointed

---

[48] Raoul, 243-44. *Birmingham City Directory, 1911* (Birmingham: R. L. Polk and Company, 1911), 963.
[49] Raoul Family Papers, Mss 548, box 19, folder 2, letter from William Raoul to Mary Wadley Raoul, 22 February 1910.
[50] *ibid.*, letter of March 1910 (no exact date).
[51] *ibid.*, letter of 24 March 1910.

school-boy was rapidly replaced by an indignant voice that did "not wish to change your views *one whit*. I only wish that you could become acquainted with mine."[52] The happy tone of his next letter was no doubt due to a check from his mother that was "certainly greatly appreciated" since it allowed him to "square" his debts and give more time to the "Voice."[53] The shame of financial dependence disappeared when the cause shifted from Raoul's personal failures to his noble quest to uplift the working class.

The "People's Voice" ran for less than a year, but before it closed its doors, Raoul ran a story that forced him to revert to the role of patriarch, imposing his will on all. An explosion at a nearby mine prompted Raoul to visit the site, mingle with the miners, spend the night "around the pit head," and to write an article published the following day. This piece did not "spare either owners or local managers or foremen." To make certain it was read by the miners, Raoul sent a bundle of papers with a miner to distribute them at the site. Receiving no reply to this provocation, Raoul went himself the next day to the camp and delivered his presumably incendiary story "from house to house."[54]

The results of Raoul's story, now widely disseminated with the mining camp, yielded quick consequences which tested its author's wits. Two men entered Raoul's Birmingham office the next day, "and as they seated themselves, the older man picked up the long shears lying on the desk, and kept possession of them. The younger man was a burly, grimy customer, and heavily under the influence of liquor." The latter informed Raoul that he was a mine foreman, that he did not appreciate the invective aimed at him in the story, that he was armed, and "had come to town to have it out with me." To ratchet up the tension, the foreman, whose honor had been insulted, suggested that he and Raoul "shoot it out right then and there." Raoul portrayed

---

[52] Raoul Family Papers, letter of 4 March 1910; emphasis in original.
[53] *ibid.,* box 19, folder 3, letter from William Raoul to Mary Wadley Raoul, 2 May 1910.
[54] Raoul, 249.

his opponent in memory as "overwrought" with both "liquor and his grievance," while admitting that "things looked rather dangerous for me." His defense rested upon drawing the drunk foreman "into an argument" about the circumstances of the explosion while not "retracting" anything he had written. (Years before, as a cotton-mill manager, Raoul had made it plain that he would not accept threats of violence from the underclass, and that his code then was to shoot down any worker who transgressed and laid a hand upon hand.) The give and take of argument only inflamed the mine foreman whose "voice became so loud, and his language so lurid, that two plain clothes men passing on the street came up, and threatened to run him in for swearing in public."[55] Now three competing masculinities converged: Raoul the aristocratic editor of a working-class paper, the working-class mine foreman representing the capitalist's interests, and two Birmingham plain-clothes policemen whose backgrounds are unknown but whose authority trumped all.

The policemen's intervention in this potentially violent affair provided Raoul an opportunity he would not miss. Instead of welcoming the authorities as a *dues ex machine* ready to snatch away the belligerent mine boss, Raoul said something so offensive to them that they now threatened to arrest him as well. At this juncture, Raoul "became . . . more judicial." He explained the contretemps "was merely a friendly difference of opinion" in which his friend, the mine foreman, "had forgotten himself." Raoul guaranteed "that he would not transgress again." His mastery of the scene impressed both the police and the foreman: the former left satisfied that things were well in hand and the latter "was so impressed with my apparent magnanimity . . . that he proposed that we go to the nearest speakeasy and have a drink." Over shots of whiskey, Raoul promised the foreman he would return to the mining camp and if he discovered any editorial mistakes, he would correct them in the next edition of the "People's Voice." No

[55] Raoul, 249-50.

retractions were made. The foreman never returned. New editions of the "People's Voice' were met by "company guards on arrival and marched off the mining reservation without further ceremony."[56]

This incident demonstrated the variety of masculine roles at play and available to Raoul. As an ostensible member of the working class and a committed Socialist, he instigated the drama on behalf of what he considered the most progressive—and exploited—segment of society, the working-class miners. His reading of Marx and others had made plain the inexorable triumph of the proletariat, while his position at the vanguard of that movement allowed him to assume another—though not necessarily stable—masculine self. By provoking the mine foreman into an argument, Raoul was able to temporarily forestall violence through question and rebuttal. When immediate gunplay was threatened, Raoul then came to the defense of his class enemy against authorities of the law. He reconciled all parties to a solution of his construction, thus making plain his mastery of all the masculinities he surveyed.[57]

After the "People's Voice" shut down, Raoul had an opportunity to practice the intemperate, two-fisted type of masculinity favored by his mine-foreman foe. As a "general handy man" and common laborer for the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company, Raoul despised the "grimy hard work" far from the front lines of the revolutionary struggle. After work one evening, Raoul, with many other workers, walked down the street that divided the works in half when an automobile "came tooting its way through the hundreds of overalled (sic) men who thronged the street." Men began to scatter to both shoulders as the "driver signaled me in a

---

[56] Raoul, 250. Ayers, *Promise*, 122. Ayers set the stage for a potential disaster: The miners "began their work by 'undercutting,' digging out a cavity beneath the 'face' of coal at the end of the shaft with pick and shovel. This job took two or three hours. When they finished undercutting, the miners drilled a hole, loaded it with powder, and detonated the charge."

[57] Drew Gilpin Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), and Greenberg, *Honor and Slavery*, discuss ideals of masculine mastery in the antebellum South.

preemptory series of toots to get out of the way." Raoul finally relinquished the road and shouted to the driver, "get out of the way yourself you son-of-a-bitch." The car pulled to the curb and stopped. Raoul went over and "thrust a black and grimy face over his door," making plain his identity as a laborer. When asked by one of the men in the car to repeat what he had said, Raoul did so and added, "if you don't like, and will get out of that machine, I will beat the hell out of you." Thinking back on the incident, Raoul confessed he probably would not have been "so courageous if it had not been for the hundreds of my fellows swarming through the street." The boss replied, "that's a pretty hard name to call a white man." Raoul agreed but admonished them to "be damned careful in the future how you blow that horn when you come through here."[58]

In this scene, variations on the theme of masculinities manifested themselves in various ways. Raoul described his fellow proletarians as "swarming," a verb reminiscent of both he and his sister's description of their entrance into the Socialist world as dirty and taboo. Next was the racial distinction agreed upon by both the boss in the car and Raoul on the street. Raoul's anger was mitigated by the boss's use of racial categories that elevated Raoul's status even in his demeaning class state. For these two men, as would be true throughout the history of the South, race would nearly always trump class. Finally, Raoul's warning about the intemperate use of the car horn goes to representations of power and the capacity to flout dominance by a device so trivial. Yet the car horn was still novel in 1910, and its use in these circumstances made plain the class differences between those men riding and doing the tooting, and those black-faced men rushing to the road's shoulders.

[58] Raoul, 254-55.

Anti-vacation: On the Road in the "New World"[59]

The idea of an anti-vacation is fitting for Raoul since it encapsulates the confusion attendant to his sense of self and his role out on the road among those hoboes and migrant workers he idealized. Here, the aristocrat embarked on an adventure within the working-class and radical world disguised, alternately, as a man of means here and as a laborer there. That nothing is as it appears rendered Raoul's travels both ironic and subversive as his gift of manipulating appearances allowed him access to myriad sites of what he assumed to be centers of political activity from box-cars to utopian societies. He associated with harvesters in the endless fields of the Kansas, with miners in Montana, with western radical reformers, and socialist stump speakers; yet, the committed radical retained, when convenient, the attitude of the dilettante. For instance, while immersed in construction of houses in Birmingham, Raoul received a summons from his father in Atlanta to return home to help with the books of the Associated Charities, a new-found interest of Greene Raoul, now retired as President of the Mexican National Railroad. We have already noted that this transition from carpenter to accountant was represented as "a recess in my working-class life."[60] Raoul's exploration of the "New World" was, in one sense, an immense shopping excursion as he sought out masculinities that afforded access to honor.

Raoul departed Birmingham in 1911 for reasons he did not explain and headed south to Fairhope, Alabama, near Mobile on the gulf, where a "single-tax colony" had been founded based on the theory of Henry George.[61] He hitched a ride with officials of "the Farmer's Grange

---

[59] Raoul's chapter 17 is entitled, "Adventuring in the New World."
[60] Raoul, 256. *Atlanta City Directory, 1912*.
[61] Paul M. Gaston, *Women of Fair Hope* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984), describes both the founding of the utopian colony and the theories of Henry George who argued for a single tax on the increased value of land as it

of the Birmingham district," described by Raoul as "horny handed practical dirt farmers" who warned him that he would encounter "some curious people" there.[62] Upon arriving in Fairhope, Raoul sought out Armistead Collier with whom he had been corresponding.[63] From his letters, Raoul was attracted to Collier because of his aristocratic upbringing and his devotion to anarchy, traits reflective of his own paradoxical character. Raoul, on his first morning in Fairhope, was "startled" by a man wearing "a blue working shirt, kaki breeches, rolled nearly to the knees, and bare footed." Raoul was of course always attuned to masculine façades and this one became more interesting as the gentleman so attired "strolled into the post office as though he owned it, and came out with a huge bundle of mail."[64] Raoul remembered the warning given by the Grange officials.

The following day, Raoul inquired if anyone knew Collier and apparently everyone did. Naturally he lived behind the public library in a cottage with a sign proclaiming, "Eden." Raoul found Collier "standing in a round tub in the middle of the floor, entirely nude . . . [with] a towel in one hand" while extending the other in greeting. Collier dried himself as he walked about the room offering Raoul refreshments of nuts and raisons. He invited his guest to stay with as his dialogue continued: "we'll talk over every thing, and settle everything. Hungry? Had any

---

was a result of the whole community and, thus, unearned income, x-xi. For Henry George, see Louis Filler, *A Dictionary of American Social Reform* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1963), 311-12. Brad Paul, "Rebels of the New South: The Socialist Party in Dixie, 1897-1920" (masters thesis, Georgia State University, 1994), describes the trend when "in the early 1900s, socialist-sponsored publications, co-operative stores, libraries, debates, and socials gave many workers an ideological, social, and economic stake in communities that increasingly lost their autonomy and character in the wake of regional industrialization," 29.

[62] Raoul, 257. William was not the only Raoul engaged with socialism at this time. His youngest sister, Eleanore, visited Chicago the following year and wrote of her visit to "a meeting of the garment makers union" and her disappointment to discover all the speakers were German. She anticipated seeing Big Bill Haywood "address a lot of Socialists out in one of the parks." Eleonore complained that the socialists "can't give any body credit for an honest difference of opinion," and was incredulous that intelligent people could "follow them blindly like sister [Mary Raoul Millis] does." She closed with the observation that these radicals "seem to think they have a monopoly on all virtue in the world." From the Raoul Family Papers, box 30, folder 12, letter of 13 July 1912 from Eleanore Raoul to her mother, Mary Wadley Raoul.

[63] *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography,* Volume 49, (Clifton, NJ: J.T. White, 1926), 189-90.

[64] Raoul, 258.

breakfast?" We may imagine Raoul's surprise as Collier described meals as "an abomination" foisted on people as a mere convention: "get rid of the conventions, and we will have the free society of the future." Within a day, Raoul had shed his "hat and shoes" and decided "to share Eden with him."[65]

Raoul remembered "interminable discussions, often frivolous, sometimes serious." Raoul's infatuation with the working class clashed with Collier's argument that "the working class may be the shot that does the work, but the intelligentsia is the powder that will fire the shot." Collier sealed his argument: "Look at Marx, Engels, Lasalle, Owen, William Morris, and yourself even; did any of these come from the working class? And where would the movement be today, tell me, if it were not for these men." Raoul straddled the divided socialist body—workers here and intelligentsia there—moving nimbly from one side to the other as did Collier who railed against "exploitation" while preferring books and bicycles to hard labor since "everyone should do what he likes best to do."[66]

This was Raoul's only encounter with an "experimental colony" and he believed "that they are all harmful" as examples of "social theory." To compensate for the lack of a class struggle, they did at least provide "a pleasing environment." He visited Marietta Johnson's "Experimental school" where students were free to come and go as they pleased.[67] He remembered a debating club and believed the community had a "free water system," but remained unimpressed with Fairhope except for a young lady, a satellite of Collier, who did not appreciate Raoul entering her orbit. Upon leaving, Raoul remarked that his stay constituted "a

---

[65] Raoul, 259.
[66] *ibid.,* 260. Raoul wrote that Collier was "cousin to the Baron G. Collier of advertising fame in New York, and never could understand why his cousin didn't make him his right hand man at a princely salary."
[67] Sinclair, *Outpost,* 226. In their occasional and oddly parallel lives, Raoul and Sinclair visited Fairhope within a year of one another. Sinclair discussed Marietta Johnson's "organic school," and the colony in general, 226-28

happy vacation."[68] The working class called, however, and he headed west for the general destination of Butte, Montana where Louis Duncan, a socialist, had recently been elected mayor of that western mining town.[69]

Raoul may have learned as much about the working-class world on his journey west than he did once he arrived at his destination. He intended to stop over in Memphis, Tennessee to see an old roommate named Kenneth Duffield from the Lawrenceville School of more than twenty years before, and he wanted to stop in Denver, Colorado. First he had to secure transportation which meant making contacts with a freight train conductor as "this traveling about the country without paying . . . interested me immensely." Of course, Raoul had gone most of his life aboard trains without paying due to his grandfather and father's positions at the head of the Central line. Raoul "squared" with the train official and "proceeded to make myself at home." He rode in the caboose's "lookout" and regarded this as "hoboing deluxe."[70]

In Memphis, he discovered his old roommate, "Duff," "was the partner of a *scab* building contractor, and naturally he had the opposite viewpoint of all my theories." (emphasis added) Raoul's radical memories worked overtime to create his alternative masculine identity during this journey. He remembered an argument with "Duff" that turned ugly as they fought over the merits of union labor versus non-union workers. "Duff" pointed out a building his firm was putting up and told Raoul that across the street was another building going up with union labor. One hot day, one of "Duff's" non-union men approached the union workers and asked for some water only to be refused. Raoul's friend was incredulous at his inhumane behavior. Raoul, himself, said the non-union workers did not "deserve to be treated like human being. They are scabs, traitors . . . working men . . . must be made to feel that so long as they stay out of the

---

[68] Raoul,
[69] *Butte City Directory, 1911-16,* Louis Duncan is listed as mayor for the years, 1911-15.
[70] Raoul, 264-65.

union they are enemies of their class." Raoul remembered taking leave of "Duff" as their relationship degenerated into an interminable "quarrel."[71] For Raoul, the working class remained an abstraction and his admiration for them had less to do with actual human beings as it did with the Marxist theory that justified his personal failures while elevating the proletariat, another abstraction.

Raoul remembered his next stop in Coffeeville, Kansas as will the reader who will recall our working-class hero entering a hotel room there with naked white women sound asleep and how this vision made his mind race with images of an angry mob and his feigned working-class status. After this unsuccessful attempt to find lodging, Raoul went to the lobby and sleep on a divan. He was run off by the proprietor the next morning with the words, "Hell I'm carrying enough men now who are broke and can't pay their board." At a "working-class hotel," Raoul "assumed a much less modest demeanor" as genuine working-class anger began to invade the aristocratic conscience. The owner "had a free and easy way of calling people sons-of-bitches" while serving his guests. Raoul wanted a room, admitted that he had no money, but assured the proprietor that his trunk and tools would be sufficient security until he could find work. Soon he was transporting building materials atop a wagon pulled by horses. The wagon became stuck and Raoul was unable to coax his team to pull it free. His boss, "the fat, heavy jowled contractor . . . said in an offensive tone of voice," that Raoul, in spite of his previous assurance, did not "know much about how to handle a team." Raoul, "in a militant frame of mind toward bosses," replied insolently, "well, if you know so damn much about it, why don't you pull 'em out?" The fat man promptly did just that. Raoul admitted he "didn't have the good grace to thank him."[72] Raoul's impersonation of his ideal, the working man, was not always successful, as this episode

---

[71] Raoul, 265-66.
[72] *ibid.,* 267-69.

attests. His contempt for authority other than his own, however, remained consistent whether he wore a white or a blue collar.

Leaving Coffeeville for points further west, Raoul sought work as a field hand during the Kansas harvest. Upon arrival, he discovered the source of his constant itching were his box-car companions and their body lice from which Raoul now suffered. His next disappointment was mitigated because it confirmed his view of capitalism: "the papers had tricked thousands of men to the harvest fields in order to have a surplus of labor." Raoul got work in spite of the abundance of laborers because he was "well disguised as an amiable and capable farm hand." He remembered that a couple of days in the fields were enough. Indeed, "the most satisfactory angle to see the harvest fields is from a Pullman car window . . . [and that] if you don't want to be disillusioned, don't go any nearer than that." The barbed end of the wheat, the "beards . . . worked themselves into your clothes and finally to every crotch and crevice of the skin." The only happy moment remembered from those couple of days under the sun was dinner time when a bottle of whiskey and "a little measuring glass" was passed round to each man. The next day, Raoul, tormented by the beards that "augmented . . . [his already] militant humor," rebuffed the boss's offer of tobacco. He was laid off that evening either as a result of his "militant" language or his poor work habits. Raoul was refused a place in the bunk house and wanted "to whip" his boss, "but the other men were also irritated with me and took his side, so I had to pocket my ire, and leave."[73] This episode demonstrated that Raoul, even when not in a position of authority, managed to alienate those about him, both fellow workers and their bosses. Raoul did not spell out the source of this trouble, though we may suspect that his "militant" socialist attitude may have proven both irrelevant and irritating to his fellow field hands. Raoul would usually find himself surrounded by both workers and bosses in his exploration of the "New World"—two

[73] Raoul, 270-71.

groups indigenous to that place though alien to Raoul. Bosses angered him because of their authority, and the workers annoyed him because of their lack of working-class consciousness.

In route to Denver, Raoul stopped to look up local socialists. For one he crossed the prairie fourteen miles only to discover that "he wasn't worth walking one mile for." Another ideological brother ran a "bee ranch." Raoul's contempt dripped through his memory: "every sort of a farming endeavor is called a ranch out in the West." His working-class disguise failed him as the bee-rancher's wife asked, "What is it you are doing anyhow? Are you going to write a book, or something?" The rancher arranged for Raoul to make a fourth of July speech. Raoul did not remark on the incongruity of a socialist delivering an oration on the nation's most celebrated secular holiday. The speech did not go well as Raoul's style "was cramped by the sting of a bee who was accidentally taken into my mouth with the honey."[74]

Raoul's anti-vacation continued in Denver where he remained a week without working. Further west, Raoul found himself working at "common labor" (Raoul's quotes) with a gang that wheeled concrete "over a long line of planks to keep the wheelbarrows from sinking into the earth." When it was announced that work would continue overtime, Raoul took action. He had advocated industrial sabotage in the past and practiced it now as his barrow full of "cracked rock" tipped over, "quite by accident of course. The whole line had to stop until my load could be cleared, and while I was shoveling it back, I whispered to the next man that it was his turn on the next trip." After another barrow load went over, "the contractor capitulated, and stopped the work for the day." Raoul, in his memory, did not want to make too much of this episode as he remarked that it wasn't "the big time stuff like a strike, but it lent romance and possibilities of excitement to each job." Raoul would always believe "that this spirit of quick and involuntary resistance, right on the job, is what makes good militant class conscious workers in the great

[74] Raoul, 272.

war."[75] Raoul, by his vocabulary, managed to both trivialize and aggrandize the struggle between labor and capital. Those he fancied his working-class brethren had no Peachtree mansion to retreat to, nor did they evaluate what work they could get on the basis of "romance" and "excitement," but upon its duration and pay. When Raoul wrote his memoirs in the early to mid 1930s, the expression, "the great war" referred, of course, to the First World War, the greatest conflagration in human history up to that time. Of course, by the mid-1930s, when Raoul wrote his memoir, the Great Depression encouraged the class struggle in the United States.

In Cheyenne, Wyoming Raoul witnessed a painter plunge thirty feet from his scaffold and, although he survived, "he was badly broken up." Raoul and a group of fellow workers went to the man's place, used the lumber already gathered, and put up his house in nearly a day. They made a picnic of the occasion and the injured man's wife prepared plenty of food. The men amused themselves by discussing socialism and, after making a count, discovered that more than half of the volunteer workers were "hoboes," or, in Raoul's characterization, "traveling workmen." This, according to Raoul, was "significant." His earlier experience in the cotton mills had taught him "that the cleverest loom fixers were the hobo fixers." Likewise in the West, "it was generally accepted . . . that the most militant and socially intelligent men were the hoboes."[76] Thus did Raoul come to the implicit conclusion that since he, too, was a traveling worker, he belonged to society's more progressive and "militant" group.

When Raoul arrived in Butte, he went to city hall and introduced himself as a socialist from Georgia who had traveled all this way "to see what this outfit looked like." This introduction warranted attention and he "soon had the confidence of the clique who were running things." Raoul described Mayor Duncan as "the outstanding personality . . . full of nervous

---

[75] Raoul, 274.
[76] *ibid.,* 275-76.

energy, and animated in movement and conversation." Duncan had been "an Episcopal minister." Now he carried "a long wicked looking revolver . . . which time proved that he needed." Duncan was clever at manipulating race and class. Criticized for placing a Negro on the police force, the mayor replied that "he thought that serving as a policeman was a pretty low down sort of job, and that he didn't see why the Negroes shouldn't to their part."[77]

Raoul described the Butte Socialist Local as "a large and live one." The local's meeting were "always interesting and sometimes stormy" as the members debating issues such as worker sabotage. Duncan's administration was comprised of an executive committee that met with Socialists councilmen. Raoul showed up to attend one such meeting on the assumption "that all deliberations of the party were open to all members. The committee was apparently amused at Raoul's naivete and he was allowed to remain.[78]

It is not surprising that Raoul would recall in detail his masculine façade upon reaching Butte. He was dressed "in corduroys and blue shirt, and a western hat, something on the cowboy order." He had only ten dollars and was "ready to rustle for a job without putting up anywhere." Raoul was especially interested in working in the mines as he sought to further his education but a surplus of laborers stymied demand for more workers. He went back to city hall and became acquainted with a "comrade" from Chicago who spoke with "a slight Italian accent." Raoul remembered his name as "Sagali" and his exotic new friend said "that it was all foolishness for me to go to work in the mines." Sagali suggested that Raoul travel with him further west to see the country "and talk to people." Raoul protested that he was nearly broke and needed to find work. Sagali said that Raoul could work his "way on the box like I'm doing." Raoul believed he

---

[77] Raoul, 278. Lewis (not Louis) Duncan was described as a reverend and an idealist, "who abandoned the practice of law in Wisconsin, to become a Unitarian minister of the Gospel." He won re-election as Butte's Socialist Mayor in 1913, from M. G. O'Malley, "Echoes from the Distant Past," *Montana Standard*, 25 May 1941.
[78] Raoul, 279.

was "crazy" as he knew nothing soap-box oratory. Sagali finally prevailed and the two of them departed the following day for the next town, Anaconda.[79]

Raoul's career as a stump-speaker, however brief, is enlightening because of the ideological paradox posed by his radical rant on the one hand with his desire to make money, and to achieve autonomy by this activity, on the other. In Anaconda, Raoul was preoccupied with his empty stomach while Sagali was keen on scouting out the best place to draw attention. When he did finally suggest that it was time to eat, Sagali brought forth "Quaker oats . . . and a paper of raison[s]." Similar to Armistead Collier, of Fairhope, Sagali lectured on the dangers of convention with regard to food telling an unconvinced Raoul that "It's all a lot of foolishness to go loading yourself up with heavy food like ham and eggs to break the fast. One of those ideas the working class must get over." Raoul ate the stuff while pondering Collier's remark, not made in self-deprecation, "that there were a lot of cranks in our movement."[80]

The business at hand began by tacking up handbills about the small town announcing a socialist speech that evening at a promising intersection. Raoul was rueful that "the populace had evidently not been aroused by our posters." Sagali borrowed a chair from a nearby saloon and had Raoul mount the soapbox as a sort of opening act after which the headliner would begin. Raoul felt ridiculous but did as instructed and, sure enough, "the spectacle of a man on a chair, out in the street, shouting to nobody, and gesticulating to the air, soon had people coming in from nowhere to see what was going on." Raoul remembered his partner talked for an hour and "held his crowd as it increased." This was preface to the selling of socialist literature, described by Sagali to the crowd as Raoul passed round the hat for a collection.[81]

---

[79] Raoul, 280-81. Anaconda, Montana is a small town in the southwestern part of the state named for the Anaconda Company that began mining there in 1884.
[80] *ibid.,* 282.
[81] *ibid.,* 284.

The spotlight grew warmer and cozier to Raoul who very soon decided to call an end to his "apprenticeship" and strike out on his own.[82] Raoul attributed his success, in part, to his rather humorous finish which he remembered went something like this: "Now all of those who like the doctrine I have been preaching I know will be glad to help me on my way to the next town to keep the good work going; and it would be a good idea for all those who don't like it to help too, because if I don't take up enough to pay my fare to the next town, I will have to stay here in this one, talking the same sort of stuff." Raoul imagined this line of work as possessing the benefits of two ideologies, socialism and capitalism. He could spread the socialist word on the one hand while making money and gaining independence on the other. His adventures, however, were undercut by the monotony of the work. Often he had nothing to do while awaiting that evening's performance and he began "to tire of talking the same old story over and over again."[83]

Back in Butte, Raoul described the mining town as a "hideous example of the impact of man's unrestrained assault upon nature."[84] The city appears to have been belched forth from one of the nearby mines that sustained its economic life. A crazy-quilt of power lines and "skeleton structures which carry the refuse from the operations" intersected with streets descending the hill-sides. Raoul remembered that Butte was "a twenty-four hour town," as its rhythm ran with the three shifts that were employed round the clock so that the "bars and restaurants" were open all hours of the day and night. Raoul did visit one of Butte's "cribs," the local vernacular for a

---

[82] Raoul, 284, Raoul remembered that his soap-box speaking tour attracted the attention of fellow radicals and led to him "being made State Organizer for the Socialist Party."
[83] *ibid.*, 285-86.
[84] For Butte, see Jerry W. Calvert, *The Gibraltar: Socialism and Labor in Butte, Montana, 1895-1920* (Montana Historical Society Press, 1993), and Michael P. Malone, *The Battle for Butte: Mining and Politics on the Northern Frontier, 1864-1906* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1981).

house of prostitution though he found the whole experience "too business like" and not conforming to his "idea of southern hospitality."[85]

From his base in Butte, Raoul ventured the open plains north of there and after becoming "familiar with the life of the homesteaders [he] conceived the idea of taking up a claim [him]self."[86] The solitary existence, though rewarding in many ways, ran counter to his gregarious nature and he found himself craving company. Shortly after he settled in to this most un-socialist-like existence he received a telegram from Atlanta asking him to come home as his father, Greene Raoul, was dying. Raoul would inherit a substantial amount of money on Greene's death but found his sudden financial independence more vexing than satisfying. While in Cleveland, Ohio to visit his sibling and fellow socialist, Mary Raoul Millis, he received another telegram, this one from the Wadley side of the family asked Raoul to come to Millen, Georgia where his services were needed to help organize one of the family's plantations.

Millen, Georgia: Gender Manipulated

Raoul spent his final years (1914-15) in the South as an accountant, occasional overseer, and general trouble-shooter at the family's plantation at the small, southeastern Georgia town of Millen, equidistant between Savannah and August. In 1914, immersed in self-doubt and depression after receiving his inheritance following his father's death, Raoul received a letter from his cousin Frank Wadley requesting his presence at the family's plantation in Millen where his accounting skills might help "in straightening out the books." This letter arrived "like a

[85] Raoul, 291-92.
[86] *ibid.,* 293.

godsend." Raoul was "galvanized into action" and left for Millen.[87] He met with his cousins (and the estate's two principles and siblings) Frank Wadley and Florence Wadley Coleman to discuss his duties. Raoul was untroubled by impending gender subversion. Florence made plain that she would run the estate and that her brother, Frank, would be excluded from decision-making as he was "a child in arms compared to Florence, in business and executive ability, and in shrewdness and singleness of purpose." Thus traditional masculine traits were assumed by Florence as Frank was assigned feminine subordination and naiveté. Raoul would act as Florence's "ally in the undertaking."[88]

Raoul served briefly as plantation overseer and encountered myriad gender surprises in his management of labor, black and white, male and female. In his attempts to secure needed farmhands, Raoul had to reconcile paradoxical masculine impulses: to exploit labor as was expected from an elite southerner, or to empathize with his various charges and underlings as a radical reformer. His experience as a manager of men had convinced Raoul that "sustained work cannot be gotten without a reasonable degree of contentment." For Raoul, "the plantation Negroes [were] handled a good deal like a lot of children . . . cajoled and flattered and pushed into carrying on their long and monotonous tasks." Similar to the feminization of Frank Wadley, African American labor was infantilized and their masculinity diminished. Yet, Raoul the radical remembered how "the plantation Negro is an entirely different breed of animal from the up-country white who worked in the cotton mills." He contrasted pliable white mill workers with recalcitrant African Americans who on the farm or in the field "can sabotage more effectively than any workman that I know of." Thus the radical track of Raoul's memories mitigated his traditional contempt for African Americans with his admiration of black labor's

---

[87] Raoul, 317-18.
[88] *ibid.*, 323.

capacity to disrupt, via sabotage or other means of resistance, a capitalistic system based, in his view, on exploitation.[89]

Raoul's aristocratic and radical memory paths intersected when he remembered how one of the family's long-term associates and one-time overseer, Joe Duberry, always referred to him as "Mr. Willie. This was in recollection of our childhood, and a compromise with our first names, which his class position did not permit him to use." Here indigenous paternalism (Raoul's easy acceptance of this hierarchy as natural) and acquired radical critique ("class position") combined to reinforce one another. In contrast, Raoul's radical memory recalled how Duberry's brother, another overseer, "had died from a wound inflicted with an axe by some irate Negro, whom he was doubtless abusing."[90] Raoul's adopted antipathy toward southern labor traditions made possible the juxtaposition of the African-American murderer as victim and the white (and dead) overseer as aggressor. This line of reasoning was discussed in chapter four when Raoul used both race and gender to defend another black sharecropper accused of an assault against a white landowner.

Raoul imposed parallel memories on both the masculinity and the management of African-American labor. An earlier overseer had hired two "stalwart young Negroes as wage hands." These two settled into their sharecropper cabin with supplied provisions, worked a day or two, and then disappeared "up the railroad tracks." Raoul the aristocrat admired the overseer's ability to capture and return his truant labor to the field with the aid of the local sheriff. Raoul the radical deplored the tradition of placing these men "in debt" and the "illegal law" that required their labor in exchange for room and board.[91] Southern mastery of labor

---

[89] Raoul,, 331-32.
[90] *ibid.*, 328-29.
[91] *ibid.,* 333.

exemplified white supremacy, a notion not unpleasing to Raoul; yet, in his socialist memory the dignity of labor clashed with traditional southern exploitation of African-American labor.

Raoul remembered another method by which white masculinity asserted its dominance over African American manliness. He heard his cousin Frank Wadley once tell an African-American sharecropper, who he had heard swearing oaths at one of his mules, that he, Wadley, "did not allow anybody to curse any of my mules. It don't do any good, and besides, I just don't allow it on this plantation." Frank Wadley objected to a black man cursing in his presence since such language implied an equality that did not exist. Wadley's qualification, "on this plantation," substituted spatial parameters for racial injunctions in this instance. Raoul admired Wadley's "tactful" method.[92] For Raoul, race would usually, but not always, trump class.

Feminine labor proved especially vexatious for Raoul the overseer. Once he had to settle the "debt" of a family who worked for a neighboring farmer to bring them to the Wadley plantation.[93] The husband remained behind while the wife proceeded to unload all their worldly possessions in view of Raoul and another farmer who happened by. Raoul felt "guilty at sitting there in a buggy and watching that poor woman struggling with her household goods." In response to his suggestion that the two of them lend a hand, Raoul's neighbor "replied with condescending authority, knowing that I was a comparative stranger to the life," that he "couldn't think of doing anything like that." Should Raoul deign to help, warned his companion, "she wouldn't have any more respect for you."[94] Thus Raoul's paternalistic inclination to assist

---

[92] Raoul, 333

[93] *ibid.,* 335. He explained that "you could not hire or contract with hands from another place, unless you first settled their debt. This was referred to as 'buying' the man. It was a rather delicate business, as it must be done without giving offence to your neighbor. Usually therefore you did not get an opportunity to buy anybody unless for some reason, not always plain upon the surface, your neighbor wanted to get rid of his man, and was glad to have you pay up his debt."

[94] *ibid.,* 334-35.

the weaker sex was shot down by his neighbor's insight that any help would diminish his masculine dominance asserted across gender and class lines.

Crossing racial lines were as treacherous for Raoul as transgressing class lines in his quest for labor. He "scraped up . . . an exceptionally good looking mulatto" with a baby but without a man. After settling the two into their sharecropper cabin, Raoul brought supplies for the week and food for the evening. As he made to leave, "she looked up at me with a pathetic appeal." Raoul remembered her as two people in one, "just a child herself, but a woman, and beautiful to look upon." Perhaps this woman's racial ambiguity made easier Raoul's escape as he "hurried away in confusion. My God! What was I about to get into?" The young woman, both vulnerable and perhaps sexually available, complicated Raoul's masculine calculations forcing him to waver between paternal restraint on the one hand and pent-up sexual desire on the other.[95]

Indeed, the confusion attendant to sexual choices made Raoul's stay in Millen especially problematic because his inclination to transgress traditional gender behavior alienated his family and community. Having turned forty-three while at the plantation, Raoul initiated a troubling relationship with eighteen-year-old Winifred Wadley, Raoul's cousin and the younger sister of Florence Wadley Coleman, his putative boss. Like the mulatto woman just mentioned, Raoul had a dual memory of Winifred as a "combination of baby, child, and voluptuous woman. She was small, and plump, with beautifully full and firm breasts . . . and a romping manner."[96] Raoul enjoyed watching Winifred "break over foolish conventions" and the subsequent consternation on the faces of family and friends.[97] Raoul's encouragement of Winifred's exaggerated feminine behavior, however ossified he believed traditional gender roles to be, angered both family and

[95] Raoul, 335.
[96] *ibid.,* 341-42.
[97] *ibid.*, 359.

community. Now, with young Winifred, pliable, rebellious and alluring, Raoul would propose marriage "as a more satisfactory relationship than the one we had then entered into."[98] In Raoul's mind, "more satisfactory" meant sexual access without necessarily committing to a permanent union as he coupled his proposal with the comment "that if, in the future, it became undesirable, it could be easily dissolved."[99]

Raoul's first marriage was characterized by dangerous pregnancies, fear of intimacy, abortions, miscarriages, ignorance of contraceptives, and the death of his wife Ruth Cunningham Raoul during childbirth, in 1905 after only four years of marriage. Raoul understandably complained that marriage did not guarantee a happy sexual union. Here on the plantation, he created his own version of the "New Woman" by supporting Winifred's unorthodox behavior and dress.[100] In this way he gained her confidence as prelude to possessing her body.

Though bitterly contested by family members, Raoul and Winifred were married in January 1915 by Judge Calhoun in Atlanta (who had married Raoul and Ruth fifteen years before). Raoul, however, inevitably grew weary of married life and his increasingly hostile community. The Ben Franklin/Tom Campbell crisis (discussed in chapter four) followed a miscarriage by Winifred that spring. Raoul's intellectual interests began to atrophy in the intellectual bog of Millen. Having already planted his flag in the formerly unexplored terrain of Winifred's sexuality, he longed for new conquests. Their honeymoon in Mexico and Cuba had opened Winifred's eyes, not only to the possibilities the world had to offer, but also to the vast

---

[98] Raoul, 345.
[99] *ibid.*, 345-46.
[100] *ibid.,* 349. On their honeymoon in Atlanta, the Raouls stayed at the Georgian Terrace Hotel where Winifred lit a cigarette. Raoul quoted from a column called "Chatter by Polly Peachtree": "Imagine the thrill that swept over the assemblage when, breakfast being over, the groom took out his cigarette case and passed it over to his young wife, who promptly selected a nice little 'Philip Morris' and used it for what it was intended. Protestations, exclamations, defamations, declamations and ultimatums were hurled upon the manager, who Bryanized the situation by showing the ladies that he was not prepared for defense or offense—only to sit on the fence . . . the bride went on smoking whenever she wanted to, while the bridegroom looked on with pride—I almost said with fatherly interest, for he really was old enough to have known better and to have taught his very young wife more discretion."

quantities of young men who found her irresistible. She and her husband fought over magazines. She delighted in offended society by smoking in public. Raoul may have believed that he had created a New Woman he could not control. Perhaps he simply lost interest.

Raoul left Millen in the late spring of 1915 for a long trip to Chicago to attend a Socialist convention. Afterwards, he went to New York where he met Meta Fuller Sinclair, the recently divorced wife of Upton Sinclair. Armistead Collier, Raoul's old friend in Fairhope, had talked about her. Meta and Raoul "were at once attracted to each other." Meta's beauty was surpassed by her "captivating power of expressing a vivid . . . interest in everything a man says." Raoul may have had the urge to activate that clause of his marriage proposal to Winifred that if, in the future, their arrangement did not "seem best," then it could be easily "dissolved." Meta's curiosity about the details of plantation life prompted an invitation from Raoul to visit Millen as his and Winifred's guest.[101]

Raoul had in common with Upton Sinclair more than an interest in Meta Fuller. Both were drawn to diet fads and medical quackery and both spent time in utopian colonies. Sinclair knew Samuel Clemons while the "magic pamphlet" that had effected Raoul's conversion to Socialism had by written by Clemon's brother. Winifred went skinny-dipping to please Raoul while Sinclair did the same to make Meta happy.[102] Both were accused of advocating "free love," though Sinclair was described by his by father-in-law as "an unripe persimmon . . . too much the novelist . . . and not enough the man."[103]

---

[101] Raoul, 366.
[102] Sinclair, *Outpost,* goes on about various diets: "milk," "raw food," "squirrel," "meat," 222, 218, 214, 227. See Leon Harris, *Upton Sinclair: American Rebel* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1975), 115, and 193-95 for Sinclair's embarrassments over miracle medical and dietary recommendations. Indiana University's Lilly Library has a brief and amusing correspondence between Sinclair and Raoul during the late 1930s concerning matters of health. Upton and Meta Sinclair visited Fair Hope in 1909, two years before Raoul. Sinclair had also lived at the Arden single-tax colony at Edge Moor, Delaware, and at Helicon Hall in New Jersey, *Rebel*, 94-95, 98, 120 and for Sinclair's skinny dipping, 111.
[103] Harris, *Rebel*, 133.

Raoul could not have known, when he invited Meta to the plantation in June 1915, that her father had called her "sexually insane" and that it was Meta, not Upton, who practiced free love and kept him advised of her carnal progress.[104] Winifred was warned of Meta's propensity to flirt, yet she agreed, at her husband's behest, to extend an invitation. Raoul assured his wife that their visitor intended to research the South's "negro question" while at the plantation. After Meta arrived, Winifred feigned friendship while Raoul pretended to be busy with some indispensable project in the hope that the two women would hit it off.

At the divorce trial that summer, the plantation's bookkeeper testified that he could see through Meta's dress "in almost any light" and thought her "careless in her demeanor and conduct."[105] Meta disturbed her hosts' sleep the first night by complaining of bed bugs. Raoul gallantly switched places with her. The next night he was awakened by Winifred and Meta, giggling and jiggling, in their nightgowns. Apparently, Meta walked in her sleep. Frank Wadley had never seen a woman parading about the house and farm, day and night, in a "kimono" until Meta's visit.[106] She and Raoul spent hours with each other during the twilight hours in the grove near the house. Less than a week's worth of this reckless behavior was enough for Winifred. She demanded that Raoul tell their guest that she was no longer welcome. Raoul abandoned his advocacy of free love long enough to protest this blow against their reputation as hospitable hosts. More to the point, he told Winifred that "she might as well acquiesce . . . to his intimacy with" Meta "as he had fully made up his mind to consort with her" and had, in fact, brought her south to "compare the two [of them] and to make his choice.[107] This brutal admission was quickly followed by Frank Wadley's eviction of Raoul and Meta from the plantation. Raoul later

---

[104] Harris, *Rebel*, 133.
[105] Trial transcripts, Raoul v. Raoul, 31.
[106] *ibid.,* 28.
[107] *ibid.,* 15 February 1916 and 23 June 1915.

remarked that his cousin Frank's anger was really jealousy of the "sparkling and sophisticated Mrs. Sinclair in contrast to his provincial family."[108]

Humiliations now swarmed like horseflies around Raoul's head: eviction was followed by arrest and jail, then trial, and exile. Winifred fled to her family, and Meta to hers. Raoul's blatant disregard of community standards, his open advocacy of free love and socialism, his flaunting of Meta Sinclair, all added up to reckless masculine behavior. After losing the divorce proceedings, Raoul would leave the South for good and relocate, initially, to Greenwich Village where limits on masculine behavior were not nearly so circumspect.

* * *

These episodes in the life of William Raoul demonstrate the ways that race, class, and gender were deeply conflicted issues at the time the New South was undergoing tremendous change. Raoul's anthropological assessments of class and gender, his class transvestitism and interests in socialism, his (self-serving) reformulations of gender and sexuality, even his attempts to envision a form of Southern laboring-class masculinity that was able to transcend racial divisions are remarkable in their own right. But they are important for other reasons too: with Raoul we have a lens through which we can glimpse how these categories of identity that seem so rigid and unchanging were in fact easily manipulated. As the aristocrat shifted into the socialist proletarian, Raoul did not abandon his patrician heritage; rather it remained, encoded in his behaviors and thoughts about race and class. As gender identities mutated and were "classed" and "raced," we see the twinning images, the parallel tracks that continued to inform Raoul's relations with those in his family and community. While Raoul seems aberrant in his

[108] Raoul, 376.

path from aristocrat to worker, he in fact demonstrates that deep conflicts about class status were intertwined with serious reservations about how to construct and maintain a viable "Southern" masculinity, a problem that transcends the narrow bounds of William Raoul's life and speaks to the broader historical transformations being felt across and through the New South.

CONCLUSION

William Greene Raoul, Jr., left Millen, Georgia for New York City at the conclusion of his divorce trial with the one regret that he had not made his own "plea" to the jury. Instead of his attorneys' "conventional court room oratory, with quotations from Shakespeare and the Latin," he believed that "a simple talk as man to man with the jury" would have assured a better outcome.[1] Raoul was confident that he could concoct a convincing masculine personae to a Millen jury aware of his reckless behavior both in marriage and in his advocacy of Tom Campbell, the African-American sharecropper jailed for attempted murder. Appropriately, Raoul would leave the South pondering the consequences of various masculinities and their respective messages.

Raoul settled in Greenwich Village where he remained consistent in his appreciation of masculine façades in addition to encountering not only the luminaries of the Liberal Club, but also his third and final wife.[2] On his first visit to the Liberal Club, he encountered Floyd Dell "dressed in white flannels, a soft white shirt and a flowing black tie," and remembered that he "seemed entirely at home, and acted as though his costume was quite the usual one for winter evening dress" when, of course, black, not white, was appropriate for dinner hour.[3] As a general factotum, Raoul found himself taking tickets for some function at the Club and felt obliged, in a place where "there were no limits to how scant the costume should be," to refuse a couple who

---

[1] Raoul, 395. "Mrs. Winnifred Raoul Wins Total Divorce," *Atlanta Constitution,* 16 March 1916, p. 1.
[2] Raoul, 397-98. Contemporary descriptions of Greenwich Village include Albert Parry, *Garrets and Pretenders: A History of Bohemianism in America.* Revised edition with a new chapter, "Enter Beatniks," by Harry T. Moore (New York: Dover Publications, Incorporated, 1933), chapter 23. Floyd Dell, *Love in Greenwich Village* (Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1926), 13-44, and *Homecoming: An Autobiography by Floyd Dell* (Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1933), chapter 24. Recent scholarship includes Stansell, *American Moderns*.
[3] Raoul, 397-98. Floyd Dell, among other things, was a biographer of Upton Sinclair, from Sinclair's *Outpost*, 48.

"believed that they were properly dressed."[4] Raoul does not hint at the reason for his disdain, though it probably had nothing to do with the risqué. At the nearby Rand School, Raoul worked as a stage carpenter helping to ready their theater for the evening's play. Once, while "dressed in corduroys and working shirt," Raoul remained with the invited guests, dancing and enjoying the festivities when "a group of upper-class people" arrived who "were in sympathy with working class but not too familiar with it." One of these elite tourists remarked how "picturesque" the scene would be if all the partiers wore their working-class clothes as "that man in the corduroy trousers and the blue shirt, and no coat." This spectator was informed that "that man is about the only one in the room who does not belong to the working class."[5] Raoul would have undoubtedly appreciated this misunderstanding as his ostensible appearance often belied the man upon which the apparel hung.

Raoul happily remembered his "several years of intimate and affectionate association with the Liberal Club." Here he discovered—to his surprise—that he "could talk and act as [he] pleased without fear of giving offence." He described the Liberal Club as "a playground for the artistic and literary members of the radical and revolutionary movement." Also welcomed were those, like Raoul, "who had no artistic or literary ability, but who thrived in such an atmosphere." The absence of "taboos" made the ambience attractive as one "could advocate any sort of social conduct . . . without fear of giving offence."[6] This was in contrast to the South where his radical politics and advocacy of Free Love stamped him a dangerous deviant.

Raoul brought to this eclectic crowd his skill as a carpenter, the juxtaposition of elite radicalism, and an exotic southernness. In this enticing atmosphere, Raoul had resolved to "never marry again and it seemed quite possible in this society of the village to mate honorably

---

[4] Raoul, 408.
[5] *ibid.*, 405-06.
[6] *ibid.*, 398-99.

and openly without undertaking the legal contract of life-long obligation."[7] A variation on this strategy, of course, had already been tried without success in 1915 in Millen when Raoul assured his eighteen-year-old cousin, Winifred Wadley, that marriage would be "a more satisfactory relationship than the one we had then entered into." By this Raoul meant that marriage meant his access to her sex instead of their current frustrating relationship of flirting and petting. He assured Winifred that such a union, if "it became undesirable," might "be easily dissolved."[8] A year later, on the occasion of his first visit to the Liberal Club, Raoul spotted a dancer that caught his attention. Curiously, his description of his future wife ("a young woman dressed as a child') was reminiscent of his earlier remembrance of Winifred Wadley—"a combination of baby, child, and voluptuous woman."[9] Shortly after this initial visit to the Liberal Club, Raoul returned and was approached by the dancer dressed as a child. She introduced herself as Margaret White and Raoul detected one source of her interest in him was "because [he] came from the romantic South."[10] Smitten, Raoul hoped to join Margaret in play at the Rand School where she would portray a nymph and he a "shepherd or faun who played with the nymphs." The director would not hear of it: "No, Mr. Raoul . . . your dignity and bearing, and ahem, age, would better fit you for the part of a Roman Senator," thus assuaging Raoul's honor while tempering his lust.[11]

This final section of "The Proletarian Aristocrat" (that is, after he leaves the South) is comprised of six chapters and 99 pages of text out of 486. The events of Raoul's life following his divorce and abandonment of the New South are treated as a coda. Much is mentioned and then omitted: two trips to Europe, one leisurely and educational with his new wife, the other a failed attempt to enter the new Soviet Union for the purposes of finding "some place in the

---

[7] Raoul, 402.
[8] *ibid.*, 346.
[9] *ibid.*, 398, 341.
[10] *ibid.*, 401.
[11] *ibid.*, 406-07.

conduct of industry there . . . especially . . . in the production of wooden freight cars."[12] Also given short shrift are the details of his frenzied speculation on the stock market and the consequences of the Great Crash on his marriage and his masculine identity. The bulk of these final pages are concerned with Raoul's attempts to become a legitimate "master" of a sea-going vessel; the lesser portion is devoted to radical politics. In both arenas, his keen nose for masculine behavior and appearance are evident.

Having failed to become a "Captain of Industry" as a young man, Raoul now sought to become a "Master" of a boat and to conquer the open sea as a middle-aged man. His ambivalence about this project was present from the beginning. Aware of his propensity to spend beyond his means, he admitted having caught the "fever of enthusiasm" and "went ahead with [his] usual recklessness" in purchasing a small schooner. He lingered about the dock-yard admiring the boats and reflecting on all the men busy with their repairs and preparations, while he did the same duties as "a great pleasure and privilege." Raoul acknowledged explicitly what he had long known implicitly: "It was all a matter of point of view."[13]

Raoul's purchase of the "Hermes" obliged him to assemble a crew—a task that revived vexatious questions of masculine authority and the problem of race. Now associated with the New York Canoe Club, Raoul remembered it from when he had lived with his family on Long Island in the late 1880s. The Club, much to his satisfaction, retained the criteria of "judging a man" by his sailing talents "rather than the position he held in society, or his cash balance"—an ironic stance to take from one who had so handsomely benefited over the years from those very factors now viewed with some disdain. These noble sentiments he immediately contradicted by denying a series of candidates, "those who had the requisite knowledge," the position of

---

[12] Raoul, 480.
[13] *ibid.,* 411.

"captain." Raoul, without experience but bucked up by ownership and honor, would not "consent" to allow another authority over his vessel no matter his inexperience.[14]

Raoul believed it essential that he be registered as "Master" of his ship so that he would have "legal power at sea to give the orders," thus recalling the cause of so many contretemps in the past whether in the cotton mills, the Saw Works, or as a builder of box-cars. In furtherance of this goal, he resolved to "take on an all Negro crew" so that questions of authority would become mute.[15] He had earlier, upon first purchasing his boat, sent word to the Hotel Estelle in Millen, to send John, his "favorite dining-room waiter," to New York where he would become Raoul's "temporary assistant workman and cook." His maiden voyage ran aground on racial shoals. Having invited members of the Liberal Club for a cruise about the big waters, Raoul was "ashamed" to find out that one of his "white sailors objected to sleeping . . . with the Negro John . . . [leaving all] at an impasse for a time." This imbroglio, resolved only by the white sailor's bunking at the opposite end of the deck from the servant John, left both crew and guests "with rather bad feeling all around." In his memoir, Raoul confessed to "blush" at this recollection. His authority had apparently been undermined by "yacht etiquette" and "a lapse into conventional snobbery." Raoul's rhetorical question, "Where were my socialist principles and philosophy?" had been answered by his acquiescence in behavior counter to his wishes instead of exerting proper authority aboard his own ship.[16]

Raoul kept his eyes open for masculine façades on his adventures along the Atlantic coast from Sandy Hook to Cuba. He finally found a reliable mate, "George James . . . a thin, wiry English West Indies Negro" who "wore small gold rings in his ears" coupled with eye-glasses when in port. The latter, according to Raoul's calculations, were "purely for effect" as they were

---

[14] Raoul, 412.
[15] *ibid.,* 435-36.
[16] *ibid.,* 411-13.

always discarded once under sail.[17] The string of adjectives describing George James attested to his exotic nature, though Raoul must have appreciated the effort on the part of his "mate" to appear to be more than merely a man of high seas. Likewise, while stranded in Nassau in the Bahamas, Raoul and his wife, after a harrowing voyage through a violent storm and dangerous seas, were awakened from their first sound sleep in days when they were "aroused by a peremptory telephone message from the American consular agent" demanding their presence in his office. It was 1918 and the United States was at war. German submarines lurked about. Raoul noted how he often forgot this pertinent fact. He and Margaret prepared for this meeting by rescuing dry clothes—"a good looking gray crash suit . . . and Margaret's big hat"—along with his "walking cane." Entering the consular agent's office, thus attired, Raoul believed himself "a rather unusual looking master for a little American freighter." The diplomat, a Mr. Doty, became rather "less peremptory than [he had been] over the telephone." Raoul's elite masculine appearance had altered the atmosphere in his favor; now his past presence as a young man at the Lawrenceville Preparatory School in New Jersey—also attended by Mr. Doty—would resolve the issue as it was determined that "Billie Raoul" had played football there in the class just ahead of the consular official. Raoul remembered how "smoothly" things went after this discovery. Raoul and Margaret were introduced to the best people and he "entertained on board the schooner with tea and high balls as though [he] was a visiting man of war."[18] This last phrase indicated Raoul's mastery over all and, indeed, hints of a sort of autonomy usually only employed by a sovereign power.

Less grandiose, though no less telling, was Raoul's fascination with an adventurer, actor and all-round bon vivant, one Louis Wolheim, "Wally" to his intimates, with whom he struck up

---

[17] Raoul, 437.
[18] *Ibid.,* 459-60.

a friendship while his boat was being used for a movie shot in Charleston, South Carolina.[19] Raoul remembered the film's name, "Peg O' the Pirates," the crew and director, but most of all he recalled "Wally's" capacity to slip from one masculine façade to another. A raconteur of many tales, he had been employed "by one of the revolutionary groups in Mexico to transport gold from one part of the country to another." To aid in his mission, "Wally" had "always went as a working-class American." The gold, according to this actor/adventurer, was always kept in the pocket of "an old dilapidated sweater." "Wally" treated this garment carelessly, leaving it behind before remembering to retrieve it, slumping over the back of a chair aboard a train and then reclining upon it. He mixed easily with whomever he was with, "laughing, joking and drinking with them, so that no particular attention was ever paid to him."[20] Raoul, of course, was less interested in the intrigue of carrying revolutionary gold about his person than he was in "Wally's" ability to assume a variety of masculine guises while trespassing across class lines.

Raoul concluded his memoir by discussing his political choices and their consequences after relocating to New York City and, later, Atlantic Highlands, Jew Jersey. Raoul explained that he declined to assume a position as an organizer for the "revolutionary or labor movement" because he did not care "to make a business of what to [him] was a religion." This high-sounding rationale may have merely covered his more genuine reasons: his enjoyment of the Liberal Club and courtship of Margaret White, an avoidance of the "monotony" of the Socialist spiel, and "a disinclination to obligate [himself] to steady and laborious work."[21]

The First World War complicated ideological commitment for American Socialists, including Raoul. Though more interested in sailing than in United States intervention in Europe,

---

[19] Sinclair, *Outpost*, 268. Sinclair and his second wife, Mary Craig Kimbrough, helped to finance Russian film director Sergei Eisenstein's many miles of footage shot throughout Mexico for a film, tentatively called "Que Viva Mexico," that was eventually edited, absent Eisenstein, into three unsuccessful short films.
[20] Raoul, 470.
[21] *ibid.,* 403.

Raoul remembered how he "had been only lukewarm about the activities of the Socialist Party, and [he] now decided to resign from it." Raoul's claim that he did not buy the Wilson administration's "silly propaganda about making the world safe for democracy" was belied by his support and vote for President Wilson "because he kept us out of the war," thus substituting one campaign slogan for another. These admissions aside, Raoul wrote that he "did not loose [his] head or desert [his] socialist position. To him, it was obvious that the war was fought among "rival capitalists, and that the working class was not concerned with which side won." And then, in a startling statement reminiscent of Thomas Jefferson at his most provocative, Raoul declared that he "had had enough of democracy, and now [he] wanted working-class domination."[22] Raoul did not put to paper his reflections on the unintended outcome of a class revolution: his sailing, his crystal decanters, his stock market speculation, his freedom from manual labor or, for that matter, any kind of work. It is in moments like this that Raoul's bitterness towards his family's class and its values is made manifest by animosity fueled by failure to achieve a respectable manhood in their realm and to assume another that might slay the former.

Raoul had originally joined the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America during his stay in Birmingham in 1909 after his conversion to Socialism because he wanted to ally himself "with the most virile force in society." Now, in 1934, two years prior to writing "The Proletarian Aristocrat," Raoul decided to resign from the union. He declared that his "faith in the destiny of the working class is unshaken," but he believed the brotherhood had abandoned its

---

[22] Raoul, 404. Thomas Jefferson, *Writings*, The Library of America edition (New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1984, 911. In a letter from Paris in 1787, Jefferson asked, "What country before ever existed a century and a half without rebellion? And what country can preserve its liberties if their rulers are not warned from time to time that their people preserve the spirit of resistance?" In the same letter, Jefferson made the famous statement that "The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants." In another letter of 1793, Jefferson asserted that he would have rather "seen half the earth desolated" than to witness the failure of the French Revolution, 1104. Such sentiments provided political ammunition to rivals like Alexander Hamilton and John Adams.

"feeling of social responsibility," its "espirit de corps," and its "militant class interest." Raoul's association with the union had, therefore, "ceased to be an honor." For Raoul, honor resided in opposition to capitalism and he joined the Communist Party to make plain his "position." The Communists, in Raoul's view, offered "the clearest challenge to the existing order." Raoul's bitterness now veered toward abstractions as he nonchalantly accepted violence "as a necessity" for a work-class revolution.[23] The 1930s were ripe with the reduction of political problems to dangerous abstractions (Hitler's anti-Semitism, Stalin's paranoia, and Herbert Hoover's devotion to laissez faire). Raoul chose communism because of its more virulent opposition to capitalism than that offered by socialism, and because he constructed his own masculine identity by his association with capitalism's greatest foe.

Raoul's high-minded talk of political virility and his extremist stance against the political and economic system that had failed him took a pathetic turn when juxtaposed with contemporary letters by Raoul written in 1932. Having "lost all of [his] capital in the stock market," Raoul wrote a "Mr. Rice," he would "have to raise some more to get into the pigeon business." He had put together an estimate of the costs and needed funding and inquired if the gentleman would examine it. Raoul laid out his plan: he "would begin selling squabs within a few months . . . [to] bring in some income" until "the flock would be self-supporting."[24] That same day, Raoul wrote to his mother in Atlanta his "estimated cost of going into the pigeon business." He could not ask her to back his project "to a finish"; in fact, "it doesn't seem fair to ask you to back any of it at all." Nevertheless, he had to "do something or [he] will have to mortgage the place to keep from starving." Finally, "if you, or you and Sister can see your way

[23] Raoul, 482-83.
[24] Raoul Family Papers, Mss. 548, box 19, folder 5, letter of 13 January 1932 from William Raoul to a Mr. Rice.

to lending me that five hundred I am ready to go ahead and put my best into it."[25] Thus the middle-aged radical was reduced to begging so he might raise and sell pigeons in an economic system so despised that the second half of his life would be spent in ostensible opposition to it.

Though glaring in contrast to the theoretical discussions Raoul remembered as important to finishing his story, this episode sustained perfectly the pattern of failure and dependence that had tracked Raoul throughout much of his professional life. He opined that "it cannot be given to all men that they shall be great, or famous, or powerful," then declared the triviality of these attributes. He declared on his final page that three decades had passed "since [he] accepted the socialist philosophy, and at the same time gave up the idea of ever becoming a captain of industry," then wondered if the former led to the latter after spending a few hundred pages demonstrating precisely how failure in traditional masculine roles provoked the assumption of an alternative masculinity. In a final attempt of rhetorical flourish, Raoul revealed more than he realized by dividing the individual man into three when he wrote "that *man*, that *being*, that *personality*," that confronts the world had "to some extent" elements of "greatness . . . integrity . . . [and] nobility."[26]

William Raoul's memories of multiple masculinities resemble an unresolved Hegelian dialectic. Contradictions of character, instead of capitalism, precluded synthesis for Raoul who contained contrary identities vying for predominance without success. Raoul's speculative fever in the 1920's led to the accumulation of a fortune independent of his family or inheritance. This achievement, however, was dismissed in one sentence in his memoirs because it reflected poorly on both his aristocratic and radical selves. For the aristocrat, speculation was mere gambling and, though acceptable for the antebellum planter, was viewed as behavior characteristic of the

---

[25] Raoul Family Papers, letter of 13 January 1932 from William Raoul to Mary Wadley Raoul.
[26] Raoul, 485-86.

lower classes by Raoul, his family, and elite peers. For the radical, speculation on the stock market amounted to political apostasy which Raoul had committed once in earnest but could not commit twice without provoking contempt for mere opportunism.

* * *

It is hazardous to generalize from one man's life, and in the case of William Raoul, it would be foolhardy to do so. Raoul's career represents the exception to the rule: the conservative turned radical, the prude become wanton, the Southern Socialist—an oxymoron by most scholars' accounts.[27] Raoul's life—and especially the remembrances of that life—complicate Southern historiography by both confirming and contradicting the traditional themes of Southern history: (dis)continuity, race and/or class, agriculture or industry, paternalism or profit. His trek through the Southern business world revealed, not consistency but variety: accountant, cotton-mill manager, saw manufacturer, box-car builder, timber contractor, railroad agent, business-supply store proprietor, promoter of collegiate sporting events, and plantation overseer. It was undoubtedly his chronic failure to bring these pursuits to a successful conclusion that prompted the aged radical to pen his memoirs in the midst of the Great Depression when his past political apostasy suddenly looked prescient.

"The Proletarian Aristocrat" is nearly all that scholars have of this obscure man's career. It is both a personal memoir and an artifact of history requiring not mere reading but textual analysis and interpretation. If the memoirist seeks to locate the self in history, we may imagine either the difficulty or the delight Raoul must have experienced in rendering his parallel memory

---

[27] Brad Paul, "*Rebels of the New South: The Socialist Party in Dixie, 1897-1920*" (master's thesis, Georgia State University, 1994), 6.

tracks to the page. His writing appears spontaneous and without deliberate deceit. It is this paradox at the heart of his recollections that put in opposition Raoul and the world created by his memory. Should we concern ourselves with distinctions between fact and fiction in such a work? Does this memoir also qualify as history? As literature? As Laura Marcus suggests, autobiography should be viewed as "transcending" rather than "transgressing categories."[28]

William Raoul's memories allow us a glimpse into the possibilities and limitations of a Southern man born and reared to grasp the future while overcoming any and all impediments. It was to everyone's surprise—including his own—that the future he grasped was unexpected and iconoclastic. His capacity to locate alternative gender norms amidst a society that assumed normative masculine roles marked him as an improviser among others stymied and/or satisfied by traditional assumptions and gender behavior. Raoul's recognition of class and racial categories and his ability to transform himself according to his surroundings make him conspicuous among his peers either satisfied or stuck in masculine roles never questioned. Raoul recognized modernity as it crept forward in all aspects of life and he welcomed its drip, drip, drip upon the conventions—economic, sexual, and otherwise—that he believed were evanescent. He identified his adoption of a radical masculinity as conforming to the changes heralded by modernity. Raoul sought, and found, honor in alternative forms on the edge of a society that condemned his politics even as his critique of capitalism in the mid-1930s made him appear, at least to himself, as a prophet.

---

[28] Laura Marcus, *Auto/biographical Discourses: Theory, Criticism, Practice* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1994), 8.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources:

Arthur C. Inman Collection, 1895-1927, Mss 281. Atlanta History Center.

Bradley, Frances Sage, 1866-1949, Mss 413. Unpublished manuscript, Special Collections, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University.

City Directories of the United States, Emory University, Microfilm 4335.

Executive Minutes, State of Georgia, June 29 and July 19, 1915. Governor's Reward Fund, Reel 1217, Georgia Archives.

Governor's Office – Rewards, State of Georgia, 1-4-20 (Record Group Number), unit number 12, 1915.

Inman, Grant, and Slaton Family Papers, Mss 579. Atlanta History Center.

John Marshall Slaton Collection, 1860-1955, Georgia Archives.

Meta Fuller Stone Papers, Lilly Library, Indiana University.

Millis, Mary Raoul. "Autobiography." 1941. Unpublished manuscript, Atlanta History Center.

Millis, Mary Raoul. "The Family of Raoul: A Memoir." 1943 . Special Collections, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University.

Rainey, Glenn W., 1907-1989, Mss 471, Special Collections, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University.

Raoul, Jr., William Greene. "The Proletarian Aristocrat." 1933 . Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Raoul Family Collection, Mss 171, Kenan Research Center, Atlanta History Center Library/Archives.

Raoul Family Papers, 1865-1982, Mss 548. Special Collections, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University.

Sarah Lois Wadley Papers, Mss 461. Special Collections, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University.

Upton Sinclair Collection, Manuscripts Department, Lilly Library, Indiana University.

William Greene Raoul Papers, 1843-1913, 1869, 1878-1897, Mss 162. Special Collections, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University.

William M. Wadley Papers, 1869-1882, Mss 727. Special Collections, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University.

Primary Sources

Aleckson, Sam. *Before the War, and After the Union, An Autobiography.* Boston: Gold Mind, 1929.

Ames, Mary. *From a New England Woman's Diary in Dixie in 1865.* Springfield, Mass.: [s. n.], 1906.

Anderson, Nels. *The Hobo: The Sociology of the Homeless Man.* The University of Chicago Press, 1923.

Arp, Bill. *From the Uncivil War to Date, 1861-1903.* Atlanta, Ga.: The Hudgins Publishing Company, 1903.

Autobiography of Joseph Leconte. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1903.

Avirett, James B. *The Old Plantation: How We Lived in Great House and Cabin Before the War.* New York: F. Tennyson Neely Company, 1901.

Bartlett, Napier. *Clarimonde: A Tale of New Orleans Life, and of the Present Civil War, By a Member of the New Orleans' Washington Artillery.* Richmond, Va.: M. A. Malsby, 1863.

Bebel, August. *Women and Socialism.* Translation by Meta L. Stern. New York: Socialist Literature Co., 1910.

Boas, Franz. *The Mind of Primitive Man*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911.

Branch, Mary Jones Polk. *Memoirs of a Southern Woman "Within the Lines."* Chicago: The Joseph G. Branch Publishing Company, 1912.

Cable, George. *John March, Southerner.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

Carnegie, Andrew. *The Gospel of Wealth and Other Timely Essays.* Edward C. Kirkland, ed. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1965.

_____. *Miscellaneous Writings.* Volumes One and Two. Edited by Burton J. Hendrick. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1933.

Chesnut, Mary Boykin. *A Diary From Dixie.* Ben A. Williams, ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Davis, Benjamin J. *Communist Councilman from Harlem: Autobiographical Notes Written in a Federal Penitentiary.* New York: International Publishers, 1969.

_____. "Why I Am A Communist." *Phylon* 2 (Second Quarter, 1947): 105-115.

Dawson, Sarah Morgan. *A Confederate Girl's Diary.* New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1913.

Dell, Floyd. *Homecoming: An Autobiography.* Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1933.

_____. *Love in Greenwich Village.* Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1926.

_____. *Intellectual Vagabondage: An Apology for the Intelligentsia.* New York: George H. Doran Company, 1926.

Depew, Chauncey M. *My Memories of Eighty Years.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922.

Diaries of Sarah Lois Wadley, 1856-1920. Huntsville, Ala.: Clark Associates, 1995.

Divorce Proceedings and Trial Transcript, Raoul vs. Raoul, Jenkins County Courthouse, Millen, Georgia, 1915-17.

Dixon, Thomas. *The Leopard's Spots: A Romance of the White Man's Burden, 1865-1900.* New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1902.

Dowdy, Clifford, ed. *The Wartime Papers of Robert E. Lee.* Boston: Da Capo Press, 1961.

Du Bois, W. E. B. *The Souls of Black Folk*. With an Introduction by Arnold Rampersad. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993 (Originally published in 1903.)

Ellis, Havelock. *My Life.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1939.

_____. *My Confessional: Questions of Our Day.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934.

Ellis, John B. *Free Love and its Votaries; or, American Socialism Unmasked.* San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft and Company, 1870.

Enstam, Elizabeth York, "They Called it 'Motherhood': Dallas Women and Public Life, 1895-1918," in *Hidden Histories of Women in the New South.* Edited by Virginia Bernhard, et. al. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1994.

Felton, Rebecca Latimer. *Country Life in Georgia in the Days of My Youth.* Atlanta, Ga.: Index Printing Company, 1919.

Fish, Carl Russell. *The Restoration of the Southern Railroads.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1919.

Flynt, Josiah. *Tramping with Tramps: Studies and Sketches of Vagabond Life.* College Park, Maryland: McGrath Publishing Company, 1969.

Forty-Fifth and Forty-Seventh Report of the President and Directors of the Central Railroad and Banking Company of Georgia to the Stockholders. Savannah, Ga.: Press of George N. Nichols, 1882.

Garrett, Franklin. "Necrology, 1822-1933." Georgia Department of Archives and History. Atlanta, Georgia.

_____. "Obituary Abstracts, 1892-1896." Georgia Department of Archives and History. Atlanta, Ga.

Goulka, Jeremiah E., ed. *The Grand Old Man of Maine: Selected Letters of Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain, 1865-1914.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Grady, Henry W. *The New South and Other Addresses.* New York: Haskell House, 1969.

_____. *Life and Labors of Henry W. Grady, His Speeches, Writings, etc.* Atlanta, Georgia: H. C. Hudgins and Company, 1890.

Graham, John, ed. *"Yours for the Revolution: The Appeal to Reason, 1895-1922.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990.

Hammett, Dashiell. *Red Harvest.* New York: Vintage Books, 1929.

Harland Marion. *Autobiography: The Story of a Long Life.* New York: Harper Brothers Publishers, 1910.

Haywood, William D. *Bill Haywood's Book.* New York: International Publishers, 1929.

Herndon, Angelo. *Let Me Live.* New York: Arno Press, 1969.

_____. *The Scottsboro Boys: Four Freed! Five To Go!* New York: Workers Library Publishers, 1937.

Hine, Lewis W. et. al., *Child Labor in the Carolinas: Account of Investigation Made in the Cotton Mills.* [N. Y.]: [National Child Labor Committee], [1919].

Hundley, Daniel R. *Social Relations in Our Southern States.* New York: Henry B. Price, 1860.

I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition. Twelve Southerners. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962 (originally published in 1930).

The Inman Diary: A Public and Private Confession, Vol. 1. Edited by Daniel Aaron. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.

Jefferson, Thomas. *Writings.* The Library of America edition. New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1984.

Kemp, Harry. *Tramping on Life: An Autobiographical Narrative.* New York: Boni and Liveright Publishers, 1922.

Knight, Lucian Lamar, *A Standard History of Georgia and Georgians* Vol. 4 (Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1917).

Leigh, Frances Butler. *Ten Years on a Georgia Plantation since the War.* London: Richard Bently and Son, 1883.

London, Jack. *American Rebel*. Edited by Philip S. Foner. New York: The Citadel Press, 1947.

Longstreet, Augustus B. *Georgia Scenes.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1850.

Martin, Thomas H. *Atlanta and Its Builders: A Comprehensive History of the Gate City of the South, Volume 2.* Century Memorial Publishing Company, 1902.

Mitchell, Broadus. *The Rise of Cotton Mills in the South*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1921.

National Cyclopedia of American Biography, Volume 49. Clifton, New Jersey: J. T. White, 1926.

Newman, Frances. *The Hard-Boiled Virgin.* New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926.

O'Connor, T. P. *My Beloved South.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914.

Office of Roswell Manufacturing Company, "Annual Report," 28 October 1896.

Parry, Albert. *Garrets and Pretenders: A History of Bohemianism in America.* New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1933.

Percy, William Alexander. *Lanterns on the Levy: Recollections of a Planter's Son.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973. (Originally published, 1941.)

Pollard, Edward A. *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates.* E. B. Treat and Company, Publishers, 1866.

Prostitution in America: Three Investigations, 1902-1914. New York: Arno Press, 1976.

Pryor, Sara Agnes Rice. *My Day: Reminiscences of a Long Life.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909.

Raper, Arthur F. *The Tragedy of Lynching.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1933.

Russell, Charles Edward. *Why I Am A Socialist.* New York: George H. Doran Company, 1910.

Scott, Sir Walter. *Ivanhoe*. Edited by Graham Tulloch. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.

Sinclair, Upton. *American Outpost: A Book of Reminiscences*. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1932.

Small, Sasha. *Hell in Georgia: What Angelo Herndon Faces!* New York: International Labor Defense, 1935.

Steffens, Lincoln. *The Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens, Volume Two.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1931.

Thirty-Ninth Report of the President and Directors of the Central Railroad and Banking Company of Georgia to the Stockholders. Savannah, Georgia: Press of George N. Nichols, 1874.

Thomas, Edward J. *Memoirs of a Southerner, 1840-1923.* Savannah, Georgia: [n. s.], 1923.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America.* Edited by J. P. Mayer. Translated by George Lawrence. New York: HarperPerennial, 1969.

Tolstoi, Leo. *The Kreutzer Sonata and Other Stories.* Translated by Benjamin R. Tucker. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1890.

United States War Department, *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records.* Washington, D. C., 1880-1891.

Veblen, Thorstein. *The Theory of the Leisure Class.* New York: Dover Publications, 1994.

Wadley, Sarah L. *A Brief Record of the Life of William M. Wadley.* New York: J.C. and W.E. Powers Press, 1906.

Washington, Booker T. *Up From Slavery.* New York: Penguin Books, 1986.

Watterson, Henry. *Marse Henry: An Autobiography, Vols. 1 and II.* New York: George H. Doran Company, 1919.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* Translated by Talcott Parsons, With an Introduction by Anthony Giddens. London: Routledge Classics, 1930.

Whitlock, Brand. *Forty Years of It.* New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1914.

Wyckoff, Walter A. *The Workers: An Experiment in Reality, The East.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897.

_____. *The Workers: An Experiment in Reality, The West.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

_____. *A Day with a Tramp: And Other Days.* New York: Benjamin Blom, Inc., 1901.

Newspapers

Alpharetta Review

The Jeffersonian

The Augusta Chronicle

The Macon Telegraph

The Atlanta Journal and Constitution

The Peoples' Voice

Secondary Sources

Adams, Henry. *The Education of Henry Adams.* New York: The Modern Library, 1931.

Allen, Frederick Lewis. *The Great Pierpont Morgan.* New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1949.

Alyea, Paul E. and Blanche R. *Fairhope, 1894-1954: The Story of a Single Tax Colony.* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1956.

Andelson, Robert V., ed. *Critics of Henry George: A Centenary Appraisal of Their Strictures on Progress and Poverty.* London: Associated University Presses, 1979.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso Editions, 1983.

Anderson, David. "Down Memory Lane: Nostalgia for the Old South in Post-Civil War Plantation Reminiscences." *The Journal of Southern History* 1 (February 2005): 105-136.

Ayers, Edward L. and Bradley C. Mittendorf, eds. *The Oxford Book of the American South: Testimony, Memory, and Fiction.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Ayers, Edward L. *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction.* London: Oxford University Press, 1992.

_____. *Vengeance and Justice: Crime and Punishment in the 19th Century American South.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

_____. "Narrating the New South." *Journal of Southern History* 61 (Aug. 1995): 555-566.

_____. "Memory and the South." *Southern Cultures* no. 1, 5-8.

_____. "Narrative Form in *Origins of the New South,"* in John H. Roper, ed., *C. Vann Woodward: A Southern Historian and His Critics.* Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1997.

Bailey, Nancy Perrin, "In Their Own Voices: A Study of Birmingham's Press in the Progressive Era, 1900-1917." M. A. Thesis, University of Alabama at Birmingham, 1983.

Bartley, Numan V., ed. *The Evolution of Southern Culture.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988.

Bass, Jack and Thomas E. Terrill. *The American South Comes of Age.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1986.

Battan, Jesse F. "The World Made Flesh: Language, Authority, and Sexual Desire in Late Nineteenth-Century America," in *Major Problems in the History of American Sexuality*, Kathy Peiss, ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2002: 252-263.

Baudelaire, Charles. *The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays.* Translated and edited by Jonathan Mayne. New York: Phaedon Press, 1964.

Bederman, Gail. *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Bell, Catherine. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project*. Translated by Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999.

Bensel, Richard Franklin. *The Political Economy of American Industrialization, 1877-1900.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Benyon, John. *Masculinities and Culture.* Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2002.

Billington, Monroe L., ed. *The South: A Central Theme?* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

_____. *Southern Politics Since the Civil War.* Malabar, Fla.: Robert E. Krieger, 1984.

Black, Robert C. III. *The Railroads of the Confederacy.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1952.

Blanchard, Mary W. "Boundaries and the Victorian Body: Aesthetic Fashion in Gilded Age America." *The American Historical Review* 100 (Feb. 1995): 21-50.

Blasing, Mutlu Konuk. *The Art of Life: Studies in American Autobiographical Literature.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1977.

Blatt, Martin Henry. *Free Love and Anarchism: The Biography of Ezra Heywood.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989.

Blinderman, Abraham, ed. *Critics on Upton Sinclair.* Coral Cables, Fla.: University of Miami Press, 1975.

Boas, Franz, ed. *General Anthropology.* New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1938.

Bonnell, Victoria E. and Lynn Hunt, eds. *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Brattain, Michelle. *The Politics of Whiteness: Race, Workers, and Culture in the Modern South.* Princeton University Press, 2001.

Briggs, Laura. "The Race of Hysteria: 'Overcivilization' and the 'Savage' Woman in Late Nineteenth-Century Obstetrics and Gynecology." *American Quarterly* 52 (June 2000): 246-273.

Brod, Harry and Michael Kaufman, eds. *Theorizing Masculinities.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 1994.

Brodie, Janet Farrell. *Contraception and Abortion in Nineteenth-Century America.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Brownell, Blaine A. and David R. Goldfield, eds. *The City in Southern History: The Growth of Urban Civilization in the South.* Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1977.

Brundage, W. Fritzhugh. *Lynching in the New South: Georgia and Virginia, 1880-1930.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.

_____. Ed. *Where These Memories Grow: History, Memory, and Southern Identity.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Bryan, Ferald J. *Henry Grady or Tom Watson? The Rhetorical Struggle for the New South, 1880-1890* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1994.

Bryant, James C. *Capital City Club: The First One Hundred Years, 1883-1983.* New York: Capital City Club, 1991.

Buchbinder, David. *Masculinities and Identities.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1994.

Buhle, Mari Jo, Paul Buhle, and Dan Georgakas, eds. *Encyclopedia of the American Left.* New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1990.

Buhle, Mari Jo. *Women and American Socialism, 1870-1920.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981.

Burton, Orville V. "The Modern 'New' South in a Postmodern Academy: A Review Essay." *Journal of Southern History* 62 (Nov. 1996): 767-786.

Burton, Orville V. and Robert C. McMath, Jr., eds. *Toward a New South? Studies in Post-Civil War Southern Communities.* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1982.

Burwood, Stephen. "Debsian Socialism Through a Transnational Lens." *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 2, 3 (July 2003): 253-282.

Bush, M. L. *What is Love? Richard Carlile's Philosophy of Sex.* New York: Verso, 1998.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York: Routledge, 1990.

_____. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Cairns, Huntington, ed. *H.L. Mencken: The American Scene, A Reader.* New York: Vintage Books, 1982.

Calder-Marshall, Arthur. *The Sage of Sex: A Life of Havelock Ellis.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959.

Calhoun, Charles W., ed. *The Gilded Age: Essays on the Origins of Modern America.* Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, 1996.

Calvert, Jerry W. *The Gibraltar: Socialism and Labor in Butte, Montana, 1895-1920.* Montana Historical Society Press, 1993.

Canby, Henry Seidel. *American Memoir.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947.

Canning, Kathleen. "Feminist History after the Linguistic Turn: Historicizing Discourse and Experience." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Vol. 19 (Winter 1994): 368-404.

Carnes, Mark C. *Secret Ritual and Manhood in Victorian America.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Carnes, Mark C. and Clyde Griffen, eds. *Meanings for Manhood: Constructions of Masculinity in Victorian America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Carroll, Bret E., ed. *American Masculinities: A Historical Encyclopedia.* New York: Sage Publications, 2003.

Carter, Dan T. *Scottsboro: A Tragedy of the American South.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979.

Cash, W. J. *The Mind of the South.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941.

Cashman, Sean Dennis. *America in the Gilded Age: From the Death of Lincoln to the Rise of Theodore Roosevelt.* New York: New York University Press, 1984.

Charney, Leo and Vanessa R. Schwartz, eds. *Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Chauncey, George. *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the making of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940.* New York: Basic Books, 1994.

Chernow, Ron. *Titan: The Life of John D. Rockefeller, Sr.* New York: Random House, 1998.

Clanton, Gene. *Populism: The Humane Preference in America, 1890-1900.* Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991.

Clark, John E. Jr. *Railroads in the Civil War: The Impact of Management on Victory and Defeat.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001.

Clarke, Adele, E. *Disciplining Reproduction: Modernity, American Life Sciences, and "the Problems of Sex."* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Clayton, Bruce. *The Savage Idea: Intolerance and Intellectual Leadership in the South, 1890-1911.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972.

Clinton, Catherine and Michele Gillispie, eds. *The Devil's Lane: Sex and Race in the Early South.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Coben, Stanley. *Rebellion Against Victorianism: The Impetus for Cultural Change in 1920s America.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Cocks, Catherine. "Rethinking Sexuality in the Progressive Era." *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 5:2 (April 2006): 93-118.

Coddington, Edwin B. *The Gettysburg Campaign: A Study in Command.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968.

Cohen, Ralph, ed. *New Directions in Literary History.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Coleman, Richard G. "A Short History of the Roswell Manufacturing Company of Roswell, Georgia: Home of 'Roswell Grey,'" 1 March 1982.

Coppet, Daniel de, ed. *Understanding Rituals.* London: Routledge, 1992.

Confino, Alon. "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method." *American Historical Review* (Dec. 1997): 1387-1403.

Cooper, William J., and Thomas E. Terrill. *The American South: A History.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990.

Cott, Nancy R. *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Cotterill, Robert S. "The Old South to the New." *Journal of Southern History* 15 (Feb. 1949): 3-8.

Current, Richard N. "Fiction as History: A Review Essay." *Journal of Southern History* 52 (Feb. 1986): 77-90.

Cutler, James E. *Lynch-Law: An Investigation into the History of Lynching in the United States.* Montclair, N. J.: Patterson Smith, 1969.

Davenport, F. Gavin, Jr. "Thomas Dixon's Mythology of Southern History." *Journal of Southern History* 36 (Aug. 1970): 350-67.

_____. *The Myth of Southern History: Historical Consciousness in Twentieth-Century Southern Literature*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1970.

Davidoff, Leonore and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850.* The University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Society and Culture in Early Modern France.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1987.

Davis, Natalie Zemon and Randolph Starn. "Introduction: Memory and Counter-Memory." *Representations* no. 26 (Spring 1989): 1-6.

Davis, Allen F. *Spearheads of Reform: The Social Settlement and the Progressive Movement, 1890-1914.* New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1984.

Davis, Harold E. *Henry Grady's New South: Atlanta a Brave and Beautiful City*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1990.

Deaton, Thomas M. *Atlanta During the Progressive Era.* Dissertation. Athens: The University of Georgia, 1969.

Degler, Carl N. *Place over Time: The Continuity of Southern Distinctiveness.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* Trans. From the French by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. New York: The Viking Press, 1977.

Dellamora, Richard. *Masculine Desire: The Sexual Politics of Victorian Aestheticism.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

D'Emilio, John and Estelle B. Freedman. *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988.

De Grazia, Victoria, ed. *The Sex of Things: Gender and Consumption in Historical Perspective.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Denmark, Lisa. "But what a pretty thing a Rail Road is!—We must have one of our own—positively!": The Central Railroad and the Ambivalent Rhetoric of Internal Improvement." Paper presented at the Georgia Association of Historians' Conference, Clayton State University, April 2006.

Depastino, Todd. *Citizen Hobo: How a Century of Homelessness Shaped America.* The University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Derrida, Jacques. *Memoires for Paul de Man.* Trans. By Cecile Lindsay, Jonathan Culler, and Eduardo Cadava. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Dickey, Ouida and Doyle Mathis. *Berry College: A History*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2005.

Dodd, Rebecca Foltz. "East Point, Georgia: A History, 1821-1930." Masters thesis, Georgia State University, 1971.

Dorr, Lisa L. *White Women, Rape, and the Power of Race in Virginia, 1900-1960.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo.* London: Routledge Classics, 1966.

_____. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology.* London: Rutledge, 1970.

_____. *Implicit Meanings: Essays in Anthropology.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Douglas, Ann. *Terrible Honesty: Mongrrel Manhattan in the 1920s.* New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1995.

_____. *The Feminization of American Culture.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.

Doyle, Don H. *New Men, New Cities, New South: Atlanta, Nashville, Charleston, Mobile, 1860-1910.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Du Pre Lumpkin, Katherine. *The Making of Southerner.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1981.

Dumenil, Lynn. *Modern Temper: American Culture and Society in the 1920s.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1995.

Eagles, Charles W., ed. *The Mind of the South: Fifty Years Later.* Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1992.

Eakin, Paul John. *How Our Lives Become Stories: Making Selves.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999.

East Point Historical Society. "Early History of East Point, Georgia, or 'A Historical Sketch of Pioneer Days,'" 1984.

Easton, Laird McLeod. *The Red Count: The Life and Times of Harry Kessler.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Edwards, Rebecca. *New Spirits: Americans in the Gilded Age, 1865-1905.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Elias, Norbert. *Power and Civility: The Civilizing Process: Volume II.* Trans. By Edmund Jephcott. New York: Pantheon Books: 1982.

_____. *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations.* Translated by Edmund Jephcott and edited by Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom and Stephen Mennell. Malden Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 1994.

Ellis, Havelock. *Essays in War-Time: Further Studies in the Task of Social Hygiene.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917.

_____. *My Confessional: Questions of Our Day.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934.

_____. *My Life: Autobiography of Havelock Ellis.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1939.

Ellis, John B. *Free Love and its Votaries; or, American Socialism Unmasked.* San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft and Company, 1870.

Enyeart, John P. "Revolution or Evolution: The Socialist Party, Western Workers, and Law in the Progressive Era." *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* Vol. 2, 4(October 2003): 377-402.

Escott, Paul D., David R. Goldfield, Sally G. McMillen, and Elizabeth H. Turner, eds. *Major Problems in the History of the American South Volume II: The New South.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1999.

Falk, Candace. *Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1984.

Fanning, Philip Ashley. *Mark Twain and Orion Clemens: Brothers, Partners, Strangers.* Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2003.

Fasce, Ferdinando. *An American Family: The Great War and Corporate Culture in America.* Translated by Ian Harvey. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1993.

Faulkner, Peter, ed. *William Morris: The Critical Heritage.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

Faust, Drew Gilpin. *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.

Filler, Louis. *A Dictionary of American Social Reform.* New York: Philosophical Library, 1963.

Fivush, Robyn and Catherine A. Haden. *Autobiographical Memory and the Construction of a Narrative Self.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 2003.

Flaming, Douglas. *Creating the Modern South: Millhands and Managers in Dalton, Georgia, 1884-1984.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Foner, Eric and Olivia Mahoney. *America's Reconstruction: People and Politics after the Civil War.* New York: Harper Perennial, 1995.

Foster, Hal. *Prosthetic Gods.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2004.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, An Introduction:* Volume 1. Trans. By Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.

_____. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences.* New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

_____. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews.* Edited by Donald F. Bouchard. Trans. by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977.

_____. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Translated from the French by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

Franklin, John H. "The Great Confrontation: The South and the Problem of Change." *Journal of Southern History* 38 (Feb. 1972): 3-20.

_____. *The Militant South, 1800-1861.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1956.

Franklin, Clyde W. *The Changing Definition of Masculinity.* New York: Plenum Press, 1984.

Fraser, Steve and Gary Gerstle, eds. *Ruling America: A History of Wealth and Power in a Democracy.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Fredrickson, George M. *White Supremacy: A Comparative Study in American and South African History.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Freedman, Diane P., Olivia Frey, and Frances Murphy Zauhar, eds. *The Intimate Critique: Autobiographical Literary Criticism.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.

Freeman, Mark. *Rewriting the Self: History, Memory, Narrative.* London: Routledge, 1993.

French, Scot A. "What is Social Memory?" *Southern Cultures* Vol. 2: 9-18.

Freud, Sigmund. *Totem and Taboo.* New York: Vintage Books, 1918.

Fried, Albert. *Socialism in America: From the Shakers to the Third International, A Documentary History.* New York: Anchor Books, 1970.

Fried, Martha N. and Morton H. Fried. *Transitions: Four Rituals in Eight Cultures.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1980.

Friend, Craig Thompson and Lorri Glover, eds. *Southern Manhood: Perspectives on Masculinity in the Old South.* Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2004.

Fuller, Constance Wadley, "Joseph Wadleigh of Brentwood, New Hampshire and Some of His Descendants," *The New England Historical and Genealogical Register* (July 1978): 218-221.

Gale, Robert L. *The Gay Nineties in America: A Cultural Dictionary of the 1890s.* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1992.

Gallagher, Catherine and Thomas Laqueur, eds. *The Making of the Modern Body: Sexuality and Society in the Nineteenth Century.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Galloway, Tammy Harden. *The Inman Family: An Atlanta Family from Reconstruction to World War I.* Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2002.

Gannon, Martin J. *Cultural Metaphors: Readings, Research Translations, and Commentary.* Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 2001.

Garraty, John A., ed. *The Transformation of American Society, 1870-1890.* New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Garrett, Franklin M. *Atlanta and Environs: A Chronicle of Its People and Events,* Volume II. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1954.

_____. Necrology 1822-1933, Obituary Abstracts, 1892-1896. Georgia Department of Archives and History. Atlanta, Georgia.

Gaston, Paul M. *Women of Fair Hope.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984.

_____. *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.

Gay, Peter. *Schnitzler's Century: The Making of Middle-Class Culture, 1815-1914.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2002.

_____. *The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books, 1973.

_____. *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology.* New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Gennep, Arnold van. *The Rites of Passage.* Trans. by Monika B. Vizedomm and Gabrielle L. Caffee. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Georgia Atlas and Gazetteer. Yarmouth, Me.: Delorme, 1998.

Gerster, Patrick and Nicholas Cords, eds. *Myth and Southern History, Volume II: The New South.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989.

Gidlund, Leonora A. "Southern Suffrage and Beyond: Eleonore Raoul and the Atlanta League of Women Voters, 1920-1935." *Atlanta History* 304 (Fall-Winter 1996-97): 30-43.

Gilfoyle, Timothy J. *City of Eros: New York City, Prostitution, and the Commercialization of Sex, 1790-1920.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1992.

Gilmore, David D. *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Glickman, Lawrence B., ed. *Consumer Society in American History.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Glover, Lorri. "An Education in Southern Masculinity: The Ball Family of South Carolina in the New Republic." *The Journal of Southern History* 59 (Feb. 2003): 39-70.

Goldman, Wendy Z. *Women, the State and Revolution: Soviet Family Policy and Social Life, 1917-1936.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Grantham, Dewey W. Jr., ed. *The South and the Sectional Image.* New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Greenberg, Kenneth S. *Honor and Slavery.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

_____. *Masters and Statesmen: The Political Culture of American Slavery.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Griffin, Larry J. and Don H. Doyle, eds. *The South as an American Problem.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995.

Hackney, Sheldon. "Origins of the New South in Retrospect." *Journal of Southern History* 38 (May 1972): 191-216.

Hale, Grace Elizabeth. *Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890-1940.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1998.

Hall, Jacquelyn, James Leloudis, Robert Korstad, Mary Murphy, Lu Ann Jones, and Christopher B. Daly. *Like a Family: The Making of a Southern Cotton Mill World.* New York: W. W. Norton, 1987.

Haller, John S. Jr. and Robin M. Haller. *The Physician and Sexuality in Victorian America.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1974.

Hammond, Douglas. *Creating the Modern South: Millhands and Managers in Dalton, Georgia, 1881-1981.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Harris, Leon. *Upton Sinclair: American Rebel.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1975.

Harris, Marvin. *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968.

Hartog, Hendrik. *Man and Wife in America: A History.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Hartz, Louis. *The Liberal Tradition in America.* New York: A Harvest Book, 1955.

Hata, Donald Teruo, Jr. *"Undesirables": Early Immigrants and the Anti-Japanese Movement in San Francisco, 1892-1893: Prelude to Exclusion.* New York: Arno Press, 1978.

Higbie, Frank Tobias. *Indispensable Outcasts: Hobo Workers and Community in the American Midwest, 1880-1930.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003.

Higham, John. *Writing American History: Essays on Modern Scholarship.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970.

Hilkey, Judy. *Character is Capital: Success Manuals and Manhood in Gilded Age America.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Hillquit, Morris. *History of Socialism in the United States.* New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1906.

Hobson, Barbara Meil. *Uneasy Virtue: The Politics of Prostitution and the American Reform Tradition.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1987.

Hodes, Martha. *White Women, Black Men: Illicit Sex in the Nineteenth-Century South.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Hoffert, Sylvia D. *A History of Gender in America: Essays, Documents, and Articles.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2003.

Hofman, Walter. *The Contraceptive Revolution: Bearings on Social Reality.* New York: Sylvania Publications, 1969.

Hofstadter, Richard. *The Age of Reform.* New York: Vintage Books, 1955.

_____. *Social Darwinism in American Thought, 1860-1915.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1945.

Horowitz, Helen Lefkowitz. *Rereading Sex: Battles over Sexual Knowledge and Suppression in Nineteenth-Century America.* New York: Alfred A. Knofp, 2002.

Howe, Daniel Walker, ed. *Victorian America.* University of Pennsylvania Press, 1976.

Hunter, Tera W. *To 'Joy My Freedom: Southern Black Women's Lives and Labors After the Civil War.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Hutton, Patrick H. *History as an Art of Memory.* Hanover, N. H.: University Press of New England, 1993.

Isaac, Rhys. *Landon Carter's Uneasy Kingdom: Revolution and Rebellion on a Virginia Plantation.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Izenberg, Gerald N. *Modernism and Masculinity: Mann, Wedekind, Kandinsky through World War I.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Jackson, David. *Unmasking Masculinity: A Critical Autobiography.* London: Unwin Hyman, 1990.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad.* New York: Hill and Wang, 2000.

Jay, Mike and Michael Neve, eds. *1900: A Fin-de-siecle Reader.* London: Penguin Books, 1999.

Jelinek, Estelle C. *The Tradition of Women's Autobiography: From Antiquity to the Present*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986.

Johnpoll, Bernard K. *Pacifist's Progress: Norman Thomas and the Decline of American Socialism.* Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970.

Jones, Gareth Stedman. *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History, 1832-1982.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: Correspondence, 1846-1895, A Selection with Commentary and Notes. New York: International Publishers, n.d.

Kasson, John F. *Houdini, Tarzan, and the Perfect Man: The White Male Body and the Challenge of Modernity in America.* New York: Hill and Wang, 2001.

Katz, Jonathan Ned. *Love Stories: Sex Between Men Before Homosexuality.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Kenway, Jane, Anna Kraack, Anna Hickey-Moody. *Masculinity Beyond the Metropolis.* New York: Palgrave, 2006.

Kern, Stephen. *The Culture of Love: Victorians to Moderns.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Kelley, Robin D. G. *Hammer and Hoe: Alabama Communists During the Great Depression.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Kent, Susan Kingsley. *Gender and Power in Britain, 1640-1990.* London: Routledge 1999.

Key, V. O., Jr. *Southern Politics in State and Nation.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950.

Kimmel, Michael. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History.* New York: The Free Press, 1996.

Kimmel, Michael S. and Michael A. Messner, eds. *Men's Lives.* New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1992.

Kimmel, Michael S. with Amy Aronson, eds. *The Gendered Society Reader.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

King, Nicola. *Memory, Narrative, Identity: Remembering the Self.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000.

King, Richard H. "Victorian to Modernist Thought." *The Southern Literary Journal* 15 (Spring 1983): 122-127.

Klein, Kerwin Lee. "On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse." *Representations* 69 (Winter 2000): 127-145.

Klein, Maury. *The Great Richmond Terminal.* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1970.

_____. *History of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad.* New York: MacMillan, 1972.

Klotter, James C. *Kentucky Justice, Southern Honor, and American Manhood: Understanding the Life and Death of Richard Reid.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003.

Kollmann, Nancy Shields. "Women's Honor in Early Modern Russia." Barbara E. Clements, Barbara A. Engel, and Christine D. Worobec, eds. *Russia's Women: Accommodation, Resistance, Transformation.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Kotre, John. *White Gloves: How We Create Ourselves Through Memory.* New York: The Free Press, 1995.

Kramer, Laura, ed. *The Sociology of Gender: A Text-Reader.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.

Kuhn, Clifford M. *Contesting the New South Order: The 1914-1915 Strike at Atlanta's Fulton Mills.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Kuhn, Clifford M., Harlon E. Joye, and E. Bernard West. *Living Atlanta: An Oral History of the City, 1914-1948.* Foreword by Michael L. Lomax. Athens: The University of Georgia Press in association with the Atlanta Historical Society, 1990.

LaCapra, Dominick. *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language.* Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983).

Lancaster, Roger N. and Micaela di Leonardo, eds. *The Gender/Sexuality Reader: Culture, History, Political Economy.* New York: Routledge, 1997.

Landes, John B. *Women and the Public Sphere: In the Age of the French Revolution.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Lankevich, George J., ed. *Atlanta: A Chronological and Documentary History.* Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.: Oceana Publications, 1978.

Laqueur, Thomas. *Solitary Sex: A Cultural History of Masturbation.* New York: Zone Books, 2003.

_____. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

_____. "Introduction: Grounds for Remembering." *Representations* 69 (Winter 2000): 1-8.

Larcom, Anne S. "Centennial Chronology of East Point History, 1887-1987." A paper prepared in partial fulfillment of a degree in the Master of Heritage Preservation Program, Georgia State University, 1985-1987.

Larson, Erik. *The Devil in the White City: Murder, Magic, and Madness at the Fair that Changed America.* New York: Vintage Books, 2003.

Laslett, John H. M. *Failure of a Dream? Essays in the History of American Socialism.* Garden City, New York: Anchor Press, 1974.

Lawson, Sherron D. *A Guide to the Historic Textile Mill Town of Roswell, Georgia.* Roswell, Georgia: Roswell Historical Society, 1996.

Lears, T. J. Jackson. *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.

Leaska, Mitchell, ed. *The Virginia Woolf Reader.* New York: A Harvest Book, 1984.

Lebsock, Suzanne. *The Free Women of Petersburg: Status and Culture in a Southern Town, 1784-1860.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1984.

_____. *A Murder in Virginia: Southern Justice on Trial.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2003.

LeMaster, J. R. and James D. Wilson, eds. *The Mark Twain Encyclopedia.* New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1993.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. *Structural Anthropology.* Translated from the French by Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Lipset, Seymour M. and Gary Marks. *It Didn't Happen Here: Why Socialism Failed in the United States.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2000.

Lipsitz, George. *A Life in the Struggle: Ivory Perry and the Culture of Opposition.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988.

Lively, Penelope. *Oleaner, Jacaranda, A Childhood Perceived: A Memoir.* New York: Harper Collins, 1994.

Long, Alecia P. *The Great Babylon: Sex, Race, and Respectability in New Orleans, 1865-1920.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004.

Lorber, Judith and Susan A. Farrell, eds. *The Social Construction of Gender.* Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1991.

Lutz, Tom. *American Nervousness, 1903: An Anecdotal History.* Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Lynd, Robert S. and Helen M. Lynd. *Middletown: A Study in Contemporary American Culture.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1928.

MacKell, Jan. *Brothels, Bordellos, and Bad Girls: Prostitution in Colorado, 1860-1930.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004.

Madison, James H. *A Lynching in the Heartland: Race and Memory in America.* New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Malone, Dumas, ed. *Dictionary of American Biography.* Volume 20. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

Malone, Michael P. *The Battle for Butte: Mining and Politics on the Northern Frontier, 1864-1906.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1981.

Marcus, Laura. *Auto/biographical Discourses: Theory, Criticism, Practice*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1994.

Margadant, Jo Burr. *The New Biography: Performing Femininity in Nineteenth-Century France.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Martin, Charles H. *The Angelo Herndon Case and Southern Justice.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1976.

McMath, Robert C., Jr. "From Captain of Industry to Sergeant of Socialism: William Greene Raoul and the Management of Southern Labor." In *Looking South: Chapters in the Story of an American Region.* Edited by Winifred B. Moore, Jr. and Joseph F. Tripp, New York: Greenwood Press, 1989, 171-189.

McQuillan, Martin. *Paul de Man*. London: Routledge, 2001.

McWhiney, Grady. *Cracker Culture: Celtic Ways in the Old South.* Tuscaloosa, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1988.

Meier, August, Elliot Rudwick, and Francis L. Broderick, eds. *Black Protest Thought in the Twentieth Century*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1971.

Melosh, Barbara, ed. *Gender and American History Since 1890.* London: Routledge, 1993.

Menand, Louis. *The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2001.

Miller, Sally M. "For White Men Only: The Socialist Party of America and Issues of Gender, Ethnicity and Race." *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* Vol. 2, 3(July 2003): 283-302.

_____, ed. *Race, Ethnicity, and Gender in early Twentieth-Century American Socialism.* New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1996.

Moore, A. B. "Railroad Building in Alabama During the Reconstruction Period." *Journal of Southern History* 1 (Nov. 1935): 421-441.

Morris, William. *News from Nowhere.* Edited by Stephen Arata. Toronto: Broadview Literary Texts, 2003.

_____. *News from Nowhere and Other Writings.* Edited with an Introduction and Notes by Clive Wilmer. London: Penguin Books, 1993.

Morris, May. *William Morris, Artist, Writer, Socialist: Volume II, Morris as a Socialist.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1936.

Munslow, Alun. *Discourse and Culture: The Creation of America, 1870-1920.* New York: Routledge, 1992.

Murdock, Eugene C. *Tom Johnson of Cleveland.* Dayton, Ohio: Wright State University Press, 1994.

Morillo, John and Wade Newhouse. "History, Romance, and the Sublime Sound of Truth in Ivanhoe." *Studies in the Novel* Vol. 32, issue 3 (September 1, 2000): 1-19.

Murray, Jacqueline, ed. *Conflicted Identities and Multiple Masculinities: Men in the Medieval West.* New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999.

Myerhoff, Barbara. "Rites of Passage: Process and Paradox," in *Celebration: Studies in Festivities and Ritual.* Edited by Victor Turner. Washington, D. C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1982.

Myers, Gustavus. *History of the Great American Fortunes.* New York: The Modern Library, 1907.

Nelson, Dana. *National Manhood: Capitalist Citizenship and the Imagined Fraternity of White Men.* Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1998.

Nisbett, Richard E. and Dov Cohen. *Culture of Honor: The Psychology of Violence in the South.* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1996.

Nora, Pierre, ed. *Rethinking the French Past: Of Memory.* Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Nye, Robert A. *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Oakes, James. *Slavery and Freedom: An Interpretation of the Old South.* New York: Vintage Books, 1990.

_____. *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders.* New York: Vintage Books, 1983.

O'Brien, Michael. "W. J. Cash, Hegel, and the New South." *Journal of Southern History* 44 (Aug. 1978): 379-398.

_____. *The Idea of the American South, 1920-1941.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

_____. *Rethinking the South: Essays in Intellectual History.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Olney, James. *Memory and Narrative: The Weave of Life-Writing.* The University of Chicago Press, 1998.

_____. *Metaphors of Self: The Meaning of Autobiography.* Princeton University Press, 1998.

_____. *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical.* Princeton University Press, 1980.

Oney, Steve. *And the Dead Shall Rise: The Murder of Mary Phagan and the Lynching of Leo Frank.* New York: Pantheon Books, 2003.

Ownby, Ted. *Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, and Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Parr, Joy. *The Gender of Breadwinners: Women, Men, and Change in Two Industrial Towns, 1880-1950.* University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Pascal, Roy. *Design and Truth in Autobiography.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Patterson, Orlando. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Paul, Brad. "Rebels of the New South: The Socialist Party in Dixie, 1897-1920." Master's thesis, Georgia State University, 1994.

Peiss, Kathy. *Hope in a Jar: The Making of America's Beauty Culture.* New York: Metropolitan Books, 1998.

Pendergast, Tom. *Creating the Modern Man: American Magazines and Consumer Culture.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000.

Peristiany, J. G. and Julian Pitt-Rivers, eds. *Honor and Grace in Anthropology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Peristiany, J. G. ed. *Honor and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society.* The University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Pessen, Edward. "Social Mobility in American History: Some Brief Reflections." *Journal of Southern History* 45 (May 1979): 165-184.

Petersen, Alan. *Unmasking the Masculine: 'Men' and 'Identity' in a Skeptical Age.* London: SAGE Publications, 1998.

Phillips, Ulrich Bonnell. *Life and Labor in the Old South.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963.

_____. *American Negro Slavery.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1966.

Pick, Daniel. *Faces of Degeneration: A European Disorder, 1848-1918.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Pierpont, Claudia Roth, "The Measure of America: Annals of Cultures," *The New Yorker* 80, issue 3 (8 March 2004), 48-63.

Pijl, Kees van der. *The Making of an Atlantic Ruling Class.* London: Verso, 1984.

Pitt-Rivers, Julian. "Honor" in the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 2nd edition. New York: Macmillan, 1968, vol. 6, 503-511.

Pleck, Elizabeth H. and Joseph H. Pleck, eds. *The American Man.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

Pleck, Joseph H. *The Myth of Masculinity.* Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1981.

Plummer, Ken. *Documents of Life: An Introduction to the Problems and Literature of a Humanistic Method.* London: George Allen and Unwin, 1983.

Pomerantz, Gary M. *Where Peachtree Meets Sweet Auburn: The Saga of Two Families and the Making of Atlanta.* New York: Scribner, 1996.

Poovey, Mary. "Feminism and Deconstruction." *Feminist Studies* 14 (Spring 1988): 51-65.

Popkin, Jeremy D. *History, Historians, and Autobiography.* The University of Chicago Press, 2005.

_____. *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Potter, David M. "The Emergence of the New South: An Essay Review." *Journal of Southern History* 34 (Aug. 1968): 420-424.

Raine, Barry. *Where the River Bends: A Memoir.* Princeton: Ontario Review Press, 2002.

Rakow, Lana F. and Cheris Kramarae, eds. *Women's Source Library: The Revolution in Words, Righting Women, 1868-1871.* London: Routledge, 2001.

Reddy, William M. *The Invisible Code: Honor and Sentiment in Postrevolutionary France, 1814-1848.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Reed, John Shelton. *Southerners: The Social Psychology of Sectionalism.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1983.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Memory, History, Forgetting.* Translated by Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Riley, Denise. *"Am I That Name?" Feminism and the Category of "Women" in History.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1988.

Rodgers, Daniel T. "The Tramp and the Policy Doctor," *Princeton University Library Chronicle* vol. 58, issue 1, 1996, 57-90.

Roediger, David R. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class.* London: Verso, 1991.

Rosen, Harold. *Speaking from Memory: A Guide to Autobiographical Acts and Practices.* London: Trentham Books, 1998.

Ross, Bruce M. *Remembering the Personal Past: Description of Autobiographical Memory.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Rotundo, E. Anthony. *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era.* New York: Basic Books, 1993.

Roper, John Herbert, ed. *C. Vann Woodward: A Southern Historian and His Critics.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1997.

_____. *C. Vann Woodward: Southerner.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987.

Rosen, Ruth. *The Lost Sisterhood: Prostitution in America, 1900-1918.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.

Rubin, David C., ed. *Remembering our Past: Studies in Autobiographical Memory.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Russell, James M. *Atlanta, 1817-1890: City Building in the Old South and the New.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988.

_____. *Atlanta, Gate City of the South, 1847-1885* (Princeton University, dissertation, 1972).

Ryan, Mary P. *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Sahlins, Marshall. *Culture and Practical Reason.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Sandage, Scott A. *Born Losers: A History of Failure in America.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Sawyer, Elizabeth M. and Jane Foster Matthews. *The Old in New Atlanta.* Atlanta: JEMS Publications, 1976.

Schivelbusch, Wolfgang. *The Railway Journey: The Industrialization of Time & Space in the 19th Century.* Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1977.

_____. *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery.* Trans. by Jefferson Chase. New York: Picador, 2003.

Schlereth, Thomas J. *Victorian American: Transformation in Everyday Life.* New York: Harper Perennial, 1991.

Schacter, Daniel L. *Searching for Memory: The Brain, the Mind, and the Past.* New York: BasicBooks, 1996.

Schmidt, Peter. "Walter Scott, Postcolonial Theory, and New South Literature." *Mississippi Quarterly*: The Journal of Southern Cultures (2003 Fall; 56 (4): 545-554.

Schwartz, Vanessa R. *Spectacular Realities: Early Mass Culture in Fin-de-Siecle Paris.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Scott, Joan Wallach. *Gender and the Politics of History.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

_____. *Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and the Rights of Man.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

_____. "Women's History," in *American Feminist Thought at Century's End: A Reader.* Edited by Linda S. Kauffman. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1993.

_____. "The Evidence of Experience," *Critical Inquiry* 17 (Summer 1991): 773-797.

Scott, Thomas A., ed. *Cornerstones of Georgia: Documents That Formed the State.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995.

Sears, Hal D. *The Sex Radicals: Free Love in High Victorian America.* Lawrence: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1977.

Simpkins, Francis B. "Tolerating the South's Past." *Journal of Southern History* 21 (Feb. 1955): 3-16.

Sinclair, Upton. *The Autobiography of Upton Sinclair.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Singal, Daniel Joseph. *The War Within: From Victorian to Modernist Thought in the South, 1919-1945.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

_____. "Broadus Mitchell and the Persistence of the New South Thought." *Journal of Southern History* 45 (Aug. 1979): 353-380.

Smith, Bonnie G. *Confessions of a Concierge: Madame Lucie's History of Twentieth-Century France.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Sombart, Werner. *Why is there no Socialism in the United States.* Translated by Patricia M. Hocking and C. T. Husband. London: The MacMillan Press, 1976.

Sommerville, Diane M. "Rape, Race and Castration in Slave Law in the Colonial and Early South," in *The Devil's Lane: Sex and Race in the Early South.* Catherine Clinton and Michele Gillespie, eds. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Spurlock, John C. *Free Love: Marriage and Middle-Class Radicalism in America, 1825-1860.* New York: New York University Press, 1988.

Stallybrass, Peter and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression.* Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1986.

Stansell, Christine. *American Moderns: Bohemian New York and the Creation of a New Century.* New York: An Owl Book, 2000.

Stead, Christina and William Blake, eds. *Modern Women in Love: Sixty Twentieth-Century Masterpieces of Fiction.* Garden City, N. Y.: Garden City Publishing Company, 1945.

Stoehr, Taylor. *Free Love in America: A Documentary History.* New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1979.

Stoler, Ann Laura. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.

Stone, Albert E. *Autobiographical Occasions and Original Acts: Versions of American Identity from Henry Adams to Nate Shaw.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982.

_____ ed. *The American Autobiography: A Collection of Critical Essays.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981.

Stover, John F. *The Railroads of the South, 1865-1900: A Study in Finance and Control.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1955.

Stowe, Steven M. *Intimacy and Power in the Old South: Ritual in the Lives of the Planters.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

Stuart, Kathy. *Defiled Trades and Social Outcasts: Honor and Ritual Pollution in Early Modern Germany.* Cambridge, U. K.: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Surkis, Judith. *Sexing the Citizen: Morality and Masculinity in France, 1870-1920.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Swiencicki, Mark A. "Consuming Brotherhood: Men's Culture, Style and Recreation as Consumer Culture, 1880-1930," from Glickman, ed., *Consumer Society in American History,* 207-240.

Thelen, David. "Memory and American History." *Journal of American History* 75 (March 1989): 1117-1129.

Theweleit, Klaus. *Male Fantasies, Volume 1: Women, Floods, Bodies, History.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Thompson, Charles P., Douglas J. Herrman, Darryl Bruce, J. Don Read, David G. Payne, and Michael P. Toglia, eds. *Autobiographical Memory: Theoretical and Applied Perspectives.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998.

Thompson, E. P. *William Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary.* London: Lawrence and Wishart LTD, 1955.

_____. *The Making of the English Working Class.* New York: Vintage Books, 1966.

Tindall, George Brown, ed. *The Pursuit of Southern History.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964.

_____. *The Emergence of the New South, 1913-1945.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967.

Tone, Andrea. *Devices and Desires: A History of Contraceptives in America.* New York: Hill and Wang, 2001.

Traister, Bryce. "Academic Viagra: The Rise of American Masculinity Studies." *American Quarterly* 52 (June 2000): 274-304.

Tullos, Allen. *Habits of Industry: White Culture and the Transformation of the Carolina Piedmont.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989.

Turner, Victor W. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.

Turner, Frederick Jackson. *The Frontier in American History.* New York: Dover Publishing, 1996.

Veblen, Thorstein. *Essays in Our Changing Order.* Edited by Leon Ardzrooni. New York: The Viking Press, 1954.

Vicinus, Martha, ed. *Suffer and Be Still: Women in the Victorian Age.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972.

Wahrman, Dror. *Imagining the Middle Class: The Political Representation of Class in Britain, c. 1780-1840.*

Walkowitz, Judith R. *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class, and the State.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Wall, Bennett H. "Breaking Out: What is Not in Southern History, 1918-1988." *Journal of Southern History* 55 (Feb. 1989): 3-20.

Wall, Joseph Frazier. *Andrew Carnegie.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Ward, James A. "Notes and Documents: A New Look at Antebellum Southern Railroad Development." *Journal of Southern History* 39 (Aug. 19 **??):** 409-420.

Washburn, Charles. *Come Into My Parlor: A Biography of the Aristocratic Everleigh Sisters of Chicago.* New York: Knickerbocker Publishing Company 1934.

Watson, Harry and John Shelton Reed. "The Front Porch." *Southern Cultures* Vol. 2: 1-4.

Way, Peter. *Common Labor: Workers and the Digging of North American Canals, 1780-1860.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Weinstein, James. *The Decline of Socialism in America, 1912-1925.* New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967.

Wells, Jonathan Daniel. *The Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 1800-1861.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

_____. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

White, Kevin. *The First Sexual Revolution: The Emergence of Male Homosexuality in Modern America.* New York: New York University Press, 1993.

White, Sarah L. "Liberty, Honor, Order: Gender and Political Discourse in Nineteenth-Century Spain." Victoria L. Enders and Pamela B. Radcliff, eds. *Constructing Spanish Womanhood: Female Identity in Modern Spain.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

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

Wilson, Edmund. *Patriotic Gore: Studies in the Literature of the American Civil War.* London: The Hogarth Press, 1987.

Winn, Les R. *Ghost Trains and Depots of Georgia, 1833-1933.* Chamblee, Ga.: Big Shanty Publishing Company, 1995.

Woodman, Harold D. *King Cotton and His Retainers: Financing and Marketing the Cotton Crop of the South, 1800-1925.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1968.

_____. "Sequel to Slavery: The New History Views the Postbellum South," *Journal of Southern History* 43 (Nov. 1977): 523-44.

Woodward, C. Vann. *The Burden of Southern History.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1960.

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

_____. *The Strange Career of Jim Crow.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.

_____. *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

_____. "The Search for Southern Identity," in Dewey Grantham, ed., *The South and the Sectional Image: The Sectional Theme Since Reconstruction.* New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1967.

Wotton, Grigsby Hart, Jr. *New City of the South: Atlanta, 1843-1873* (The Johns Hopkins University, diss., 1974).

Wright, Gavin. *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy Since the Civil War.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1986.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *Honor and Violence in the Old South.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

_____. *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

_____. *The Shaping of Southern Culture: Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1880s.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

_____. *The House of Percy: Honor, Melancholy, & Imagination in a Southern Family.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Wyllie, Irvin G. *The Self-Made Man in America: The Myth of Rags to Riches.* New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1954.

Yung, Judy. *Unbound Voices: A Documentary History of Chinese Women in San Francisco.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.