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ABSTRACT

White Women’s Heritage Organizations in Texas, 1870-1970

By

Mercy Harper

This study offers an analysis of three white women’s heritage organizations—the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC), the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), and the Daughters of the Republic of Texas (DAR)—from 1870 through 1970. These three organizations each paid tribute to a different nation (the Confederacy, the United States, and the Republic of Texas). Yet their members shared an ethos of traditionalism and nationalism encapsulated in their focus on celebrating a blood- and lineage-based understanding of national belonging. Historians and laymen alike have long viewed white women’s heritage organizations as conservative; however, the role of white women’s heritage organizations in the various and shifting manifestations of twentieth-century American conservatism have not been fully explored.

This study finds that white women’s heritage organizations—and the discourse of “heritage” they employed—played a critical role in the development of grassroots conservatism in the United States. The DRT, UDC, and DAR in Texas were part of both the interwar era conservative women’s bloc and the post-WWII conservative women’s movement. White women’s heritage organizations in Texas built connections to right-wing organizations such as the
American Legion and the Minute Women of the USA. White women’s heritage organizations possessed a larger and more stable membership than extremist right-wing women’s organizations, though, and were careful to work within rather than against local, state, and national political structures. As a result of their political nimbleness, their influence on conservative politics has been broader than that of more openly extreme organizations, and more enduring.

However, there was nothing pre-determined about white women’s heritage organizations’ enduring conservatism. Before 1920, the UDC, DAR, and DRT were not always out of step with progressive women’s organizations in their goals and ideas. Cross-membership and collaboration were key to the spread of conservative ideals and political strategies among the three organizations. Through outreach efforts focused primarily on education, white women’s heritage organizations contributed to anti-communist and anti-integration sentiment in the state of Texas.
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INTRODUCTION

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, women across the United States joined together to form clubs for self-betterment, civic improvement, and camaraderie. Women of different races, ages, and religions joined a variety of clubs whose activities could range from studying Shakespeare to speaking before the legislature. Few women’s clubs that formed at the turn of the twentieth century have endured into the twenty-first. Among those still standing today are the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC), Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), and Daughters of the Republic of Texas (DRT).

To join one of these organizations, a woman has to provide documented proof that her bloodlines could be traced to a soldier or loyal citizen who supported the Confederacy in the Civil War (to join the UDC), the Patriots in the American Revolution (to join the DAR), or the Texans in the Texas Revolution (to join the DRT). Members of the UDC, DAR, and DRT—whom I generally refer to as “Daughters”—found in their organizations an opportunity to learn more about their own ancestry and the history of their state, region, and country. The UDC, DAR, and DRT also provided an avenue for its members to step into the public sphere. The Daughters built monuments, preserved historic sites, and intervened in public education to build public recognition of and respect for the history their ancestors’ lived.

While the UDC, DAR, and DRT are variously termed “genealogical,” “lineage,” or “patriotic” clubs, I refer to these groups as “white women’s heritage
organizations.” I utilize this term to differentiate these organizations from ethnicity- or nationality-based organizations with genealogical or lineage requirements. I employ “heritage” to connote the way that the past—via genealogical ties—provided not only a ticket for membership, but also informed the political ideology and rhetoric of members. For the Daughters, heritage was a sense of national belonging (Confederate, American, or Texan) rooted in blood and race. The DRT, UDC, and DAR have received varying degrees of attention from historians but share a depiction as wealthy women with conservative conceptions of gender, race, and nation.¹

The DRT has not been the subject of much scholarship; the organization is occasionally placed alongside other Progressive Era clubwomen and has received some notice from historians for its role in preserving Texas historic sites. Elizabeth Hayes Turner’s work on women in the New South era locates the DRT (as well as the UDC and DAR) as an elite enclave for upper-class women within

¹ Political positions that have defined American conservatism have shifted over the twentieth century. This study is attentive to the ways in which time, as well as region, has shaped the composition of conservatism; yet, when possible, I have aimed to trace beliefs and rhetorical strategies that have remained key to both the pre-1930 Old Right and the New Right, which came into prominence in the Cold War era. Some core ideas that generally remained constant for twentieth century conservatives were: that the primary role of government is to ensure order, protect private property (which is intimately linked to protecting individual freedom), and ensure the operation of the free market; a belief that human nature is not naturally good and must be disciplined; and a belief in the idea of a transcendent moral order rooted in religious and historical truths. Brian Farmer, American Conservatism: History, Theory, and Practice (Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2005), 6-11; Kim Phillips-Fein, “Conservatism: A State of the Field,” Journal of American History 98, 3 (December, 2011), 737-739.
the Texas clubwoman movement. Organizations such as the DRT, she argues, were more concerned with preserving the supremacy of their own racial and class standing than engaging in the civic reform and benevolent activities. Most other scholarship on the DRT in and outside the discipline of history focuses on the organization’s preservation and custodianship of the Alamo historic site in San Antonio. Many of these scholars argue through their preservation of the Alamo, the DRT also preserved a romantic and Anglo-centric version of Texas history.

Of the three organizations, only the UDC has been the sole subject of a published scholarly book, *Dixie’s Daughters* by Karen Cox. Cox examines the UDC at the national level from the organization’s formation in 1894 through 1919 to uncover the ways in which women played a central role in perpetuating the

---


“Lost Cause” version of southern history. Lost Cause histories presented Old
South slavery as benevolent and the Confederate States of America’s cause,
“states’ rights,” as more virtuous in spite of southern defeat. The role of the Lost
Cause narrative in perpetuating white supremacy is a central theme in the
historiography on Civil War memory and the Jim Crow Era. Cox and other
historians have underscored the UDC’s centrality in creating and maintaining the
Lost Cause version of history by building stone monuments to the Confederacy
and working to ensure the Lost Cause was dominant in southern schools and
libraries. Most research on the UDC focuses on the organization’s Confederate
monuments and focuses on the years before 1920.¹ The Texas Division of the

¹ Karen L. Cox, *Dixie’s Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and
the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida,
2003). Other historians whose works examine the UDC before 1920 and focus on
their role as monument builders include Gaines Foster, *Ghosts of the
Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South*
Women and the Politics of Historical Memory of the New South, 1880-1920” in
Jane Dailey, ed., *Jumpin’ Jim Crow: Southern Politics from Civil War to Civil
Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, MA;
Belknap Press, 2001); William A. Blair, *Cities of the Dead: Contesting the
Memory of the Civil War in the South 1865-1914.* (Chapel Hill: University of North
Carolina Press, 2004); George C. Rable, *Civil Wars: Women and the Crisis of
Southern Nationalism* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1989), David
Goldfield, *Still Fighting the Civil War: The American South and Southern History*
(Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002); Grace Elizabeth Hale,
*Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890—1940* (New
York, NY: Vintage Books, 1999); Lee Ann Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in
Gender* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995); Jane Turner Censer, *The
Reconstruction of White Southern Womanhood, 1895-1895* (Baton Rouge:
Louisiana State University Press), 2003; Cecilia Elizabeth O’Leary, *To Die For:
1999); Kelly McMichael, “‘Memories are Short but Monuments Lengthen
UDC has been the sole subject of a dissertation by Kelly McMichael Stott titled, “From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment: The Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1896-1966.” While Stott and I both researched the post-1920 UDC, her findings differ from my own.⁵

The DAR received little attention from historians before the emergence of scholarship on conservative women’s organizations in the US. Research in this subfield finds that the interwar period marked the beginning of a movement of conservative and anti-radical women united in opposition to real or perceived communists on the home front. Conservative white women viewed New Deal liberalism as the domestic equivalent of communism and socialism and began to organize in the 1930s.⁶ After WWII, conservative women—often portrayed by the

---

⁵ Stott’s work focuses primarily on monuments, and presents the UDC’s educational mission as superfluous as well as an overall failure. Most of her analysis of the UDC’s educational campaign is derived from material before 1910—a period when, I found, the UDC’s educational campaign was not yet in full swing. I argue that while the UDC remained focused on “education” for decades, the content and purpose of their educational strategy changed over time. I further argue that the Lost Cause could not have maintained hegemony in the Texas educational system and cultural milieu without the concerted and continued efforts of historical actors such as members of the UDC. Kelly McMichael Stott, “From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment: The Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1896-1966” (PhD diss., University of North Texas, 2001).

⁶ Catherine E. Rymph, Republican Women: Feminism and Conservatism from Suffrage through the Rise of the New Right (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); June Melby Benowitz, Days of Discontent: American
mainstream media as housewives or “little old ladies”—became a recognizable force in American politics. Like conservative women of the interwar era, postwar conservative women believed their gender legitimated their authority over issues of the home and family. In the 1950s and 1960s, conservative women built connections to each other and to the conservative media as they engaged in grassroots political activism against federal power, “experts” and bureaucrats, and of course, communists. Female activists helped weave the rhetoric of family values into conservative anti-statist ideology. Most of these works do not focus on the DAR but note that the organization and its members were part of the coalition of organizations involved in women’s conservative movements before and after World War II.7

Two scholars have brought closer attention to the DAR as a conservative women’s organization. Francesca Morgan’s *Women and Patriotism in Jim Crow America* usefully examines both the UDC and DAR alongside two other women’s organizations, the Women’s Relief Corp and the National Association of Colored

---

Women, in her analysis of women’s deployment of “patriotic” rhetoric. She follows
the DAR from the turn of the twentieth century until after WWI to show the growth
of right-wing sentiment among DAR leaders. Morgan argues while the
nationalisms of the UDC and DAR were different, for both organizations national
belonging was entangled with conceptions of white supremacy. Kirsten
Delegard’s recent work, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki*, presents the DAR and
American Legion Auxiliary as the leaders of women’s anti-communist sentiment
and activism in the interwar era. Delegard further suggests that the DAR helped
awaken other white women’s heritage organizations such as the UDC to the
dangers of communism, foreign and domestic radicalism, and federal welfare
programs.8

Historians have depicted the DRT, UDC, and DAR as conservative
women’s clubs, but how and why these organizations became comprised of
conservative-minded women has not been fully examined. That these
organizations have existed for over one hundred years (and counting) begs
further inquiry. How did these organizations endure while other conservative and
right wing women’s organizations fizzled? How did the Daughters’ conservatism
change over time, and in what ways did it differ from mainstream American
conservatism? What role did the Daughters play in the conservative women’s
movement, and in American conservatism? Scholarship frequently links white

---

women’s heritage organizations such as the UDC and DAR together, due to their shared membership base of well-to-do conservative women as well as their focus on history, heritage, and nationalism. Deeper analysis of the ways in which these organizations cooperated and of their ideological similarities and differences is underexplored and can reveal much about conservative women’s changing political strategies and beliefs. Answering the questions raised by the longstanding conservatism of white women’s heritage organizations will shed light on the place of conservative women in women’s history, and on the relationship between women and twentieth-century American conservatism.

Through the examination of the DRT, UDC, and DAR in Texas from 1870 through 1970, this dissertation examines the ways in which the Daughters grew together as members of white women’s heritage organizations and as conservative women from 1870 through 1970. Texas is a useful site to examine white women’s heritage organizations because the state has long been home to thriving UDC and DAR divisions as well as its own white women’s heritage organization, the DRT. A state-based study can more closely examine the connections between white women’s heritage organizations that is hinted at in scholarship by Morgan and Delegard. The membership of the DRT, UDC, and DAR often overlapped. The Daughters were invited guests at each other’s annual and chapter meetings. Ideas, strategies, and rhetoric were shared among members as the UDC, DAR, and DRT held joint programs and collaborated on projects. My approach to white women’s heritage organizations combines my
interests in the fields of women’s history, southern history, and critical theory. I examine the entanglement of gender, race, and nation in Daughters’ identities and rhetoric through analysis of organizational records, Texas newspapers, members’ collected papers, and fictional works authored or read by members.

I argue that an identifiably conservative perspective can be found in Texas white women’s heritage organizations, especially in the years between 1920 and 1970. From their formation, heritage organizations shared a traditionalist and nationalist ethos that dovetailed with discourses prevalent in upholding Jim Crow, interwar xenophobia, and Cold War anti-communist witch hunts. However, there was nothing pre-determined about the organizations’ enduring conservatism. Personal and ideological connections between members were key to bringing white women’s heritage organizations into the conservative women’s movement. Through shared members, shared goals, and shared strategies, the UDC, DAR, and DRT pulled each other into conservative political awareness in the interwar period and in the following decades.

The chapters reveal that in their early years, the UDC, DAR, and DRT were not always out of step with progressive women’s organizations in their goals and ideas. Chapter one examines how leaders and prevalent cross-membership helped to forge personal and ideological connections between the three organizations almost as soon as they formed. Through these connections the UDC, DAR, and DRT grew in cooperation with—rather than in competition with—each other. In chapter two I show how the activities of white women’s heritage
organizations in the Progressive Era often aligned with the mainstream clubwomen movement’s goals of social uplift and beautification. In this period the Daughters’ discourses of heritage could be and were used to underpin the idea that the United States, the South, and Texas rightly belonged to the white race; however, progressive perspectives on race, gender, and nation were not yet entirely absent from the organizations.

Chapter three explores the interwar era, when the Daughters (led by the DAR) awakened to the dangers of radicalism and communism. In so doing, they built key alliances with conservative organizations, particularly the American Legion. These allies were critical to the Daughters, as the interwar period also marked a weakening of their Progressive Era alliances with other clubwomen’s organizations (such as the YMCA). While I believe the Daughters can be usefully considered as part of the interwar “conservative women’s bloc” identified by Kirsten Delegard, the Daughters’ perspectives on race, gender, and nation could be complex. For example with regard to race, the Daughters evinced their opposition to racial liberalism and “so-called social equality” for black Americans but sometimes embraced the concept of Chicanos as American citizens. Chapter four examines the Daughters in the midst of World War II. The war brought about new questions about the role of the US in a globalizing world and new fears of foreign enemies, but it also introduced the Daughters to a new figure of female patriotism: the WWII servicewoman, whom the Daughters embraced. The postwar era is the subject of chapter five, which locates the Daughters as
proponents of conservative perspectives on race, gender, and the communist “threat.” The Daughters fit the stereotype of the “housewife” ascribed to female conservative activists of this period; however, unlike many other conservative women’s organizations, the Daughters had well-established political connections, strategies, and authority over matters of “patriotism.” In the conclusion, I explore the complex ways the Daughters navigated the tumultuous 1960s and how the Daughters operate today.

I hope that this study can contribute to a more complex understanding of how and why average women adopted conservative beliefs. Too often, conservative women are portrayed as dupes of their husbands, or as simpleminded reactionaries. Financial, ideological, and political connections to men were important to developing the Daughters’ conservative awareness. Reactions to contemporary manifestations of liberalism and radicalism also played a role in developing Daughters’ beliefs. However, the Daughters’ conservative perspective was not a carbon copy of the conservatism espoused by men. The Daughters infused ideas of family, motherhood, and heritage into their political beliefs. The Daughters’ fearful and angry responses to liberalism, radicalism, and communism were, I suggest, not entirely unwarranted; Daughters recognized many of the ways these philosophies threatened their social position.

In writing this dissertation, I rarely agreed with the Daughters’ political perspectives. However, I believe analysis of conservative (and moderate) women in history deepens our understanding not only of women’s history but also of past
and current American politics. In our polarized moment, it is useful to investigate how the legacies of left and right intertwined with discourses of gendered, raced, cultural, and national belonging in ways that continue to shape our identities as “liberals” or “conservatives.”
CHAPTER 1: ORIGINS, 1870—1905

In Texas we are well provided with patriotic societies—with the Daughters of the American Revolution, Daughters of the Republic of Texas, and Daughters of the Confederacy—to teach the rising generation about the heroic deeds of George Washington, Stephen F. Austin, and Robert E. Lee, and to teach them to sing Yankee Doodle, Come to the Bower, and Dixie. We will ply the children so full of patriotism and love of country, that every boy will wish he was a drummer boy in a brass band to give expression to his feelings, and every girl will bring her richest gifts of intellect to glorify our Republic; and all will join in one grand chorus—“My country ‘tis of thee.”

– Mrs. Seabrook W. Sydnor, State Regent of the Texas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution

The state of Texas provided fertile ground for the development of white women’s heritage organizations. Inspired by the example of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas (DRT), Texas chapters of the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) and Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) grew rapidly around the turn of the twentieth century. Texans did not suffer the degree of devastation from the Civil War that propelled other “un-reconstructed” southern women to join the UDC, and the battles of the American Revolution had been waged many hundreds of miles away from the state. Yet the UDC and DAR blossomed alongside the DRT in Texas for two reasons. The political, economic,

9 PDAR, 1905, 10. Each year the DRT, Texas DAR, and Texas UDC printed a record of the proceedings of their annual meeting, along with chapter and committee reports. The precise titles of these annual proceedings vary slightly over the years, as do the publishers, so henceforth all annual proceedings will listed uniformly as PDAR (or PDRT, or PUDC), with the year and page number following, as in PDAR, 1905, 10.
and demographic development of Texas from 1870 through the 1900s created conditions favorable to the development of women’s heritage organizations and other white women’s clubs. Personal and ideological connections between members of the DRT, UDC, and DAR then helped each organization grow. This chapter examines how these two factors created a vibrant and interconnected culture of white women’s heritage organizations in Texas.

Reconstruction, Redemption, and Reform in Texas

When Texas joined the United States of America in 1845, it was already southern in many ways. Texas’ white population was largely comprised of immigrants from other southern states who brought the South’s agricultural slaveholding way of life to the new state. Texas’ Tejano and Native American populations in the south and west, along with the sheer size of undeveloped frontier within the state’s borders, made life in Texas different from other southern states. But Texas’ political core was in the east, where the interests of slaveholders dominated. Motivated by a desire to keep the system of slavery intact, Texas aligned with the Confederacy during the Civil War. Texans did not face the degree of material destruction experienced by Old South states in the war. Union forces did not invade the state’s interior, and Texans did not, generally, have to endure food shortages. Lacking access to the North and the aid of Union soldiers, the enslaved population of Texas largely stayed put during the war.10

Like other white southerners, Texans proved highly resistant to even moderate reconstruction at the war’s end. The state’s postwar elected leaders, largely former secessionists, refused to ratify the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments and tried to restore Texas to its pre-war political, social, and economic status. Republicans in the US Congress, frustrated by southerners’ reluctance, seized control of the process of reconstructing the southern states.

As former Confederate leaders in Texas were disenfranchised and federal forces worked to ensure black men’s access to the ballot, Republicans rose to power in late 1860’s Texas. The appointment of Republican E.J. Davis to the governor’s seat in 1870 inaugurated a short-lived but hectic period of “radical” reconstruction in Texas. Under Davis the size and scope of state government grew exponentially. The Republican-controlled Texas legislature granted Davis control of voter registration and appointing state and local officeholders. Davis inaugurated a centralized public school system to serve both white and black children.\(^{11}\)

What disturbed former Confederates most was Davis’s creation of the Texas state police. Not only did this police force actively work to prevent crimes against the state’s black population, but 40 percent of its officers were black men. Whites complained that the state police, and Davis’s occasional impositions of martial law, were unjust and tyrannical. Historians generally agree that these

criticisms of the state police were largely undeserved. But for former
Confederates, the figure of the black police officer was the very symbol of a world
turned upside down. The memory of Davis’s administration—which lasted only
from 1870 through 1873—remained useful political fodder for fiscally and racially
conservative Democrats through the end of the century.\textsuperscript{12}

Democrats and moderate Republicans in Texas began plotting to
overthrow Davis almost immediately. Aided by the US Congress’ easing of
restrictions on former Confederates in 1871, Democrats swept Texas’
congressional seats and the state legislature by 1872. Texas Democrats ran
Richard Coke—an ardent secessionist and Confederate captain—against Davis
in the 1873 gubernatorial election. Davis contested the election results on a
technicality, but Coke proved victorious. The first of a series of former
Confederate conservative Democrat Texas governors, Coke appointed
Democrats to serve as district and state Supreme Court judges and replaced the
state police with the all-white Texas Rangers to ensure his party’s control of all
branches of government. Coke was reelected in 1876 and approved a new state
Constitution that reflected redeemer Democrats’ opposition to taxes, public
spending, and activist government. Under the 1876 Constitution counties
retained control of most government functions, so at the local level Republicans
(white and black) were not entirely ousted by the Democratic Party’s redemption
of Texas. In the 1870s and 1880s white citizens groups used a variety of mostly

\textsuperscript{12} Campbell, \textit{Gone to Texas}, 281, 289; James M. Smallwood, “Black Texans During
Reconstruction, 1865-1874” (PhD diss., Texas Tech University, 1974), 392-394.
extralegal tactics to intimidate blacks and Republicans out of politics and out of the state. From the Texas Rangers to the governor, Democrats stood idly by or even approved extra-legal violence against the black population, believing as did Richard Coke that it was “high time for an enraged and outraged people to take the law into their own hands as a means of seeking redress for the manner in which they have been outraged, robbed, threatened, murdered, abused, and vilified for the past ten years.” Black Texans began to move out of the state in increasing numbers and faced increasing lack of representation in local and state politics.¹³

Texas was primarily rural and agricultural when Richard Coke took office in 1873, but this would change over the next two decades. Beginning in the 1870s, Texas experienced waves of immigration (largely whites from other southern states) that spurred urban growth. The population of Texas’ major towns grew by over 75 per cent through the 1870s. The development of Texas’ railway system in the 1880s further encouraged urbanization as well as the commercialization of agriculture and ranching, the production of lumber, and the

establishment of manufacturing enterprises. The growth of Texas’ market economy carved out space for leisurely pursuits among those of means. In the 1880s and especially 1890s, upper- and middle-class white women evinced an interest in using their leisure time for self-betterment. Sporadically, women’s study and literary clubs emerged, primarily in larger cities like Dallas and Galveston. The development of women’s clubs in Texas was slow at first. But as Texas newspapers gained more subscribers and moved from weekly to daily publication, news of the nascent movement spread across the state.\(^\text{14}\)

In the 1890s and early 1900s, Populism, Progressivism, and prohibition diversified the political scene in Texas. While Democrats held firmly onto power, many became more sympathetic to reform and spending on public services. Women played a role in this new matrix of political power through the Women’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU). The WCTU, which first appeared in Texas in 1883 but grew particularly after 1900, argued that alcohol destroyed the family, and thus its prohibition fell within the sphere of woman’s proper concerns. While not very successful in prohibition efforts at the state level, Texas WCTU leaders like Jenny Bland Beauchamp secured several other reform-oriented achievements, such as the establishment of state orphanages, from the state legislature. The election of governor James S. Hogg in 1891, and a nationwide depression in 1896, helped move Texans away from earlier attitudes toward public spending. Hogg was a Democrat, but he supported civic improvement

efforts such as the establishment of a state library, a pension for aging Confederate veterans, and aid for public schools and infrastructure. Early women’s clubs in Texas—which were beginning to turn from self-betterment and study toward the improvement of society—were supporters of these modest reform efforts.\textsuperscript{15}

Texas clubwomen joined together to form the Texas Federation of Women’s Clubs (TFWC) in 1897. Like the national General Federation of Women’s Clubs, the TFWC helped women’s clubs move beyond self-betterment toward public reform efforts. The TFWC refused to lobby directly in order to achieve its goals. TFWC-affiliated clubs worked with rather than against local authorities to improve schools and other public facilities. Instead of complaining about or “exposing” government failings, clubwomen raised money to donate services and equipment where needed. While primarily focused on the needs of children, the TFWC was also interested in cleaning up society through legislation against gambling, divorce, and election fraud. The TFWC issued petitions to politicians, often using gendered rhetoric to justify their authority on moral issues. One seemingly unlikely TFWC moral imperative was the adoption of a poll tax in 1902. Remembered by current historians for its effective disenfranchisement of poor and non-white voters in Texas, the establishment of the poll tax was a double-win for the TFWC. Pro-poll tax politicians promised it would “clean up” political corruption, and the money used from the poll tax went to an education fund. The TFWC helped Texas clubwomen direct their influence outside the

\textsuperscript{15}Haley, \textit{Passionate Nation}, 431-434; Campbell, \textit{Gone to Texas}, 325, 333-342.
home and outside the study group through reform efforts that were generally non-threatening to the Democrat politicians in power.¹⁶

The origins of the UDC, DAR, and DRT are part of this story of the emergence and growth of Texas women’s clubs. Like Texas clubwomen, the Daughters were leisured women in urban environments who joined together locally and then across the state for self-betterment, recognition of their achievements, and the improvement of their communities. The Daughters also followed the TFWC’s “non-political” approach to politics, using petitions and fundraising to affect change without stepping outside the boundaries of proper womanly behavior. But UDC, DAR, and DRT chapters did not, typically, officially join the TFWC.¹⁷

In many ways, the Daughters were different from other clubwomen in the early twentieth century—the UDC, DAR, and DRT retained more of the study group and social aspect of early women’s clubs, and nearly any social betterment campaign they took up had the effect of bettering their own social position. The Daughters’ campaigns to preserve historic sites and promote history in the classroom usually had the effect of raising public awareness of the value of their heritage more than helping needy children. The Daughters’ membership requirements and focus on genealogy made them more elite and less accessible than most women’s clubs. Daughters worked more with other Daughters, rather

¹⁷ One exception is the “Literary Society” of the Dallas chapter of the UDC, which joined the GFWC in 1901. Stella L. Christian, ed., The History of the Texas Federation of Women’s Clubs (Houston, TX: Dealy-Adley-Elgin Co, 1919), 70.
than the TFWC, to achieve their own goals. But a number of TFWC leaders—such as Betty Ballinger, Katie Cabell Currie, Cornelia Branch Stone, Adele Briscoe Looscan, Adina De Zavala, and Katie Daffan—were also leaders of the DRT, UDC, and DAR of Texas. These leaders helped bring established TFWC political strategies, connections, and sometimes members to the emergent DRT, UDC, and DAR.¹⁸

**The Daughters of the Republic of Texas**

The idea to establish the Daughters of the Republic of Texas began in the hearts of two cousins, Hally Bryan and Betty Ballinger of Galveston, who hoped to assure proper burial and remembrance for their military ancestors. Bryan and Ballinger were women of culture, wealth, and status who shared a love of literature, history, and travel as well as genealogical ties to the Republic of Texas. With the encouragement and accompaniment of Hally’s father Colonel Guy M. Bryan of the Texas Veterans Association (TVA)—an organization comprised of veterans of Texas’ war for independence—the cousins traveled to Houston to meet two more wealthy female descendants of Texas Revolution patriots, Mrs. Andrew Briscoe and Mrs. Anson Jones. These four women agreed to establish an organization for women who shared their heritage, and on November 6, 1891, they called together thirteen more women from Houston, Galveston, and Brazoria County to join them in founding an organization that

would first be called the Daughters of the Lone Star Republic. Mrs. Anson Jones, being the widow of the last president of the Republic of Texas, was unanimously chosen as the first president.¹⁹

The fledgling Daughters of the Lone Star Republic applied to the much larger TVA to solicit more members among the wives and daughters of Texas Veterans. The TVA was happy to oblige. Since that organization’s founding in 1873, members of the TVA recognized the importance of the fairer sex, announcing, “Resolved—that the surviving pioneer women of the period we commemorate who were sharers in the trials and privations of that period, and whose patriotism was equal to the occasion, we tender our kindest regards and remembrances.”²⁰ The formation of the Daughters of the Lone Star Republic (renamed the Daughters of the Republic of Texas in 1892) could not have come at a better time for the TVA, whose ranks of aged veterans were beginning to thin. TVA President Guy M. Bryan called to his audience at the 1892 Texas Veterans Association Annual Reunion, “Will our influence die with us? No, thank God, no. Woman, devoted, patriotic, self-sacrificing woman, will continue our good work.” Brimming with pride as he looked toward his daughter Hally and other DRT members sitting in the audience, he added, “It will be your pleasing duty to soften the rugged lines of history by woman’s delicate touch, and your patriotic duty to commemorate the heroic deeds of your ancestry.” Young Miss

¹⁹ Fifty Years of Achievement: History of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas Together with the Charter, By-Laws, Constitution and List of Members (Dallas, TX: Banks Upshaw and Company, 1942), 11-17, 50-52.
²⁰ Fifty Years of Achievement, 3, 52.
Willie Ashe then rose to speak for her grandmother, DRT President Mrs. Anson Jones. To great applause she announced, “To-day it is my special pleasure to present to you the legitimate offspring of the Texas Veterans Association.”\(^{21}\)

The DRT’s close relationship with the TVA marked the founding objectives and early projects of the organization. The stated aims of the DRT were the perpetuation of “the memory and spirit of the men and women who achieved and maintained the independence of Texas,” to “encourage historical research into the earliest records of Texas,” to celebrate Texas’ Independence Day and San Jacinto Day, to build monuments, and to preserve the unity of Texas “as achieved and established by the fathers and mothers of the Texas Revolution.”\(^{22}\) Together these objectives aimed to honor living veterans (and the wishes of living veterans) while also ensuring that their legacy would endure. DRT members attended TVA Annual Reunions each year, offering help and filling in the audience as veterans passed away. In 1907 the few remaining members of the TVA voted to dissolve their organization but demonstrated that they accepted the DRT as their rightful heirs. The TVA passed a resolution that affirmed, “the holy memories clinging around it [the TVA] should be merged into that patriotic association, The Daughters of the Republic of Texas.”\(^{23}\)

The DRT’s relationship with the TVA was reflected in one of the organization’s earliest achievements, the preservation of the San Jacinto

\(^{21}\) Proceedings of the Texas Veteran Association at the Annual Reunion held at Lampasas, Texas, April 20 and 21, 1892 (Austin, TX: Eugene Von Boeckmann, Printer, 1892) 9, 11.

\(^{22}\) Fifty Years of Achievement, 52.

\(^{23}\) Ibid., 9.
Battlefield. Texas Veterans began the effort to secure this historic site in 1883 but were only able to persuade the state to purchase ten acres of the massive property, which had fallen into disrepair. In 1894 Daughters and Veterans joined together to map the correct boundaries of the battlefield, and by 1897 the combined efforts of the two secured a legislative appropriation to buy the entire grounds. DRT and TVA members then returned to the battlefield to decide which historic spots should be officially marked with stone memorials. Either because the Veterans were growing old, or because the Daughters were growing stronger and more independent, the DRT alone submitted a request to the state legislature for memorial funds in 1903.24

Members of the DRT entered the realm of politics in pursuit of organizational goals but were careful not to step outside the boundaries of proper womanly behavior. In an address at the 1894 meeting of the DRT, founder Betty Ballinger boasted that “we women are growing cleverer and cleverer every day,” but she warned that Daughters must ensure that “the means which we may use [to achieve DRT aims] are such as may be fitly employed by the Daughters—not the Sons—of the Republic of Texas.” “We have no shadow of cause for complaint that our sphere is not large enough nor of the vastest importance,”

24 The state granted the DRT some funds, but the San Jacinto chapter DRT largely paid for the memorial markers through its own fundraising events. Sally Anne S. Gutting, “Honoring Texas Heroes: The San Jacinto Monument and its Cornerstone,” Houston History 4 (Spring 2007), 21; House Journal, April 1, 1897, 871-3; Entertainment given by the San Jacinto Chapter, Daughters of the Republic of Texas, at the Armory of the Houston Light Guard, Friday Evening March 2, 1900, n.p., and Mrs. J. J. McKeever, Jr., “A Memorial to the Honorable Members of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature (1903), Adele Briscoe Looscan Papers, Albert and Ethel Herzstein Library, San Jacinto Museum of History.
Ballinger continued, “for it is only in the soil of the home and the heart that can be sown the seed that will take root and bear fruit a hundred-fold of loyal, loving patriotism.” Ballinger’s praise of woman’s sphere of home and family resonated with many DRT members. In addition to historic preservation, another early aim of the DRT was to preserve the memory of the Republic of Texas through work with the future generation. DRT members placed pictures of historic heroes in schools, established historic essay contests for children, and facilitated programs for schools to celebrate Texas holidays. In order to achieve these goals the DRT sometimes had to network with politicians and other powerful men, but they understood their goal of teaching children Texas history as well within the confines of woman’s sphere.

Many DRT members understood woman’s role—and thus, the DRT’s role—through a Christian lens. Protestant theologians of the nineteenth century argued that men and women were spiritual equals. Like other American women, DRT members used religion to argue that woman’s role was as important, albeit different from man’s. Rebecca J. Fischer explored the meaning of “woman’s mission” in an 1898 address before the DRT. She noted that, in biblical times, “Woman was first at the cross, and then at the sepulcher.” Fischer understood the traditional caring role of women, and the DRT’s mission to nurture the legacy

25 PDRT, 1894, 13-14.
of the Republic of Texas, as the duty of “intelligent Christian women.”\textsuperscript{28} Despite many members’ use of Christian rhetoric, the early DRT did not institutionalize Christianity as did the Texas UDC or Texas DAR. At UDC and DAR meetings, Daughters would hear lengthy memorial addresses, crafted in Christian rhetoric and sometimes delivered by an appointed member acting as “chaplain.” At state-level DRT meetings, the death of a member was usually marked only by a brief mention of her name.\textsuperscript{29} However, at some local chapter meetings, more elaborate and clearly Christian memorial ceremonies took place when a fellow Daughter was “called to her Heavenly home.”\textsuperscript{30}

The DRT was the most elite women’s heritage organization in Texas for several reasons. Many more women could claim an ancestor from the Confederacy and even from the American Revolution than could claim to be a descendant of the Republic of Texas. By 1905 the DRT had only eleven chapters—less than half the number established by the DAR by that time.\textsuperscript{31} Between the organization’s founding and 1920, fewer than fifty members total joined.\textsuperscript{32} But the DRT did not need a large membership to be influential. Ties to TVA members and other well-respected men helped the DRT navigate Texas politics. Equally important as the DRT’s social ties was a provision in the DRT’s founding charter that allowed the organization to “have and hold by purchase,

\textsuperscript{28} PDRT, 1898, 6-7.
\textsuperscript{29} The DRT did not hold more extensive memorial ceremonies until 1920, and first appointed a member as “chaplain” in 1930. PDRT, 1920, 8; PDRT, 1931, 3.
\textsuperscript{30} PDRT, 1904, 27.  
\textsuperscript{31} PDRT, 1904, 31.
grant, gifts or otherwise, real estate on which battles for the independence of Texas were fought."\textsuperscript{33} The organization’s ability to own real estate made the DRT distinct among other women’s organizations and allowed the DRT to make its most lasting legacy as the savior and custodian of the Alamo. DRT members were well aware of their organization’s elite status. At the 1905 TVA meeting (at which the DRT as well as the Texas UDC was present), DRT leader Rebecca J. Fisher exclaimed, “I can not understand how any Daughter of the Republic of Texas can be indifferent and withhold her influence from this, the grandest and most highly-honored of all other Associations.”\textsuperscript{34} UDC members in the audience perhaps glanced over at one another in mutual embarrassment as Fisher proclaimed the DRT to be the most important association of all. DAR and UDC members were also wont to boast about the supremacy of their organizations, but DRT members were particularly confident that they were uniquely elite.

**The United Daughters of the Confederacy, Texas Division**

The United Daughters of the Confederacy formed as a national unification of the state-based women’s organizations that began memorializing the Confederacy in 1865 called Ladies Memorial Associations (LMAs). LMAs formed across the South after the Civil War to move Confederate soldiers’ bodies from mass graves on battlefields and in hospital yards to individual graves in designated Confederate cemeteries. The federal government took charge of

\textsuperscript{33} Fifty Years of Achievement, 65.

\textsuperscript{34} Proceedings of the Texas Veteran Association at their Thirty-Second Annual Reunion held at La Grange, Texas, Casino Hall, April 20, 21, 1905 (Austin, TX: Von Boeckmann-Jones Company, Printers, 1905), 14.
identifying and reburying the Union dead but not the Confederate dead, so these women filled an important void. LMA members shared a belief in the “Lost Cause” conception of southern history. The mythology of the Lost Cause aimed to ameliorate southerners’ pride and identity after losing the Civil War. According to the myth, the South possessed the greater cause and its men were braver and more skilled than Union soldiers. The North won due to superior numbers of men and resources, but the South’s cause—state’s rights—was more noble. LMA members helped establish the culture of the Lost Cause in the South as well as women’s role in that culture. The formation of the UDC provided an avenue for southern women to expand on the LMA mission in a more modern, centralized, and vocal organization.\textsuperscript{35}

Correspondence between LMA leaders Caroline Meriwether Goodlett of Tennessee and Anna Davenport Raines of Georgia germinated the idea of uniting like-minded women across the nation under “one name and one badge.” Through their efforts newspapers across the South advertised a call for women “interested in perpetuating the memories of the South” to meet in Nashville on September 10, 1894, to form the National Association of the Daughters of the

Confederacy. Nearly all attendees at the first meeting were from Nashville, with the exception of Raines and—importantly—Mrs. J. C. Myers of Dallas. The Daughters quickly approved a constitution based on that of the United Confederate Veterans (UCV), which helped lay the structure for an ambitious and national organization. Provisions were made for a representative system of state divisions, a slate of officers, and standing committees. The UCV offered the Daughters further assistance by providing the new organization free advertising space in the UCV magazine, the *Confederate Veteran*. As with the TVA and the DRT, the UCV relied on UDC assistance in the completion of memorial and preservation projects and eventually passed on its mission to the Daughters when its membership grew older and less able. But relationships between the early UDC and the UCV were not always harmonious. The UDC refused the UCV's request to hold its annual meetings in conjunction with the UCV and sometimes disagreed with the UCV on how best to memorialize the Confederacy. Daughters did consider caring for Confederate veterans an important duty of their newly formed organization. But as Elizabeth Turner

---

36 The organization was renamed the Daughters of the Confederacy in 1895. Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 23.
asserts, many of these women “quietly resented the fact that southern men had been unable to protect them and their privileged position as ladies.”

The UDC expanded on the agendas of the UCV and LMAs in its official objectives—defined as social, historical, benevolent, memorial, and educational. Like the UCV, the UDC offered its members a social outlet and a space to connect personal narratives to a broader history. Like LMAs, the UDC was dedicated to the benevolent mission of caring for needy Confederate veterans and widows and to the construction of memorials to the Confederate cause. The UDC’s educational agenda distinguished it from other Confederate memorial organizations. UDC members understood the education of children to be woman’s “sacred duty” and believed the responsibility for teaching the future generation the values and history of the Lost Cause rightly fell to women of Confederate heritage. Early years of the UDC found the Daughters focused on growing—and policing—the social aspect of their organization as they debated membership requirements and developed a more complex system of state and local representation within the organization. The UDC educational mission, as well as the memorial mission to which it was closely linked, moved to the forefront as the organization stabilized in the early twentieth century. The UDC’s efforts to teach children the Lost Cause—by monitoring textbooks and libraries, placing Confederate flags and mementos in schools, and offering prizes and

---

scholarships to students who demonstrated their devotion to the UDC’s understanding of history—became its most lasting legacy.\textsuperscript{40}

Texan women played critical roles in shaping the UDC’s mission and in helping the organization grow. Mrs. J. C. Myers’s attendance at the founding of the UDC first secured the state a voice in an organization that, in its early years, derived the bulk of its membership from Virginia and Tennessee.\textsuperscript{41} Myers was selected as a founding vice president of the UDC, but she was quickly replaced by a fellow Dallas Daughter, Katie Cabell Currie. According to Mary Poppenheim’s official history of the UDC, the replacement of Currie for Myers was simply an “irregularity of procedure” in the developing organization. Karen Cox asserts that Myers was replaced because she was married to a Union veteran. Whatever the motivations behind her appointment, Currie proved to be more than capable. As a UDC vice president, Currie’s charge was to help Texas’ chapters grow. By 1898 the far-flung state was exceeded only by Virginia in numbers of registered UDC members.\textsuperscript{42} Currie was boastful of her accomplishments. Speaking before the convention of the national UDC, Currie asserted that the Texas chapters were “the greatest” and had accomplished more than any other state. Perhaps Daughters from other states resented Currie’s comments, but they must have recognized her leadership ability. Currie

\textsuperscript{40} Cox, \textit{Dixie’s Daughters}, 20-22, 122; Poppenheim, \textit{History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy}, 26-38.
\textsuperscript{41} Poppenheim, \textit{History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy}, 21-25.
\textsuperscript{42} Texas exceeded Virginia, however, in numbers of new chapters organized within the year, and had the largest delegation at the convention (held in Arkansas this year). PUDC, 1898, 6.
was elected to serve as UDC president from 1898 through 1900. Under her presidency the UDC experienced its most dramatic membership growth yet, adding an additional 195 chapters to its ranks.\textsuperscript{43}

Texan women were pivotal in developing the UDC’s educational agenda. While education was an early UDC goal, the national organization did not take steps to act until 1908 when president Cornelia Branch Stone—hailing from Galveston, TX—appointed the first UDC committee on education. As Stone knew well, her state division began its own “educational movement” nearly ten years earlier. In 1899 Texas Division Historian Adelia Dunovant proposed a two-tiered educational movement. She called for the creation of children’s auxiliaries to teach members’ children about the Lost Cause (and to ensure future generations of UDC members). To reach a broader audience, Dunovant recommended chapters hold public lectures on the “correct” history of the South and Civil War, and she further advised chapters to maintain a library of UDC-approved books that the general public could read for free.\textsuperscript{44}

Dunovant steadily continued building the Texas Division’s educational movement through the early twentieth century. She compiled a “historical catechism”—a synthesis of Lost Cause ideology, presented in question-and-answer format to encourage rote memorization—for children’s auxiliaries to use, and called members to encourage the formation of UDC chapters in the Texas

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Cox, \textit{Dixie’s Daughters}, 19; Poppenheim, \textit{History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy}, 13; PUDC, 1898, 5-6, 45.
\item Poppenheim, \textit{History of the United Daughters of the Confederacy}, 95; PUDC, 1899, 31-33.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
colleges. When she assumed presidency of the Texas Division in 1902, four of the six new standing committees she created concerned education; she established committees on libraries, inspection of textbooks, chapters in colleges, and children’s auxiliaries. Through the Texas Division’s educational movement, Daughters entered public schools and libraries in search of “un-true histories,” made connections to politicians and public education authorities, and even found themselves appointed to Texas’ State Text Book Review Board.\textsuperscript{45} The Texas Division’s enthusiastic educational campaigns provided a model for Galvestonian Cornelia Branch Stone when she inaugurated the national UDC educational movement in 1908.\textsuperscript{46}

The racial implications of the UDC’s Lost Cause message have garnered the organization more attention from historians than those of the DRT or DAR. According to the Lost Cause, the Old South was the epitome of racial harmony; when enslaved, black Americans recognized their “place” in society and gladly served benevolent white masters. UDC members, recognized by their peers as authorities on “mammies,” asserted that, back in slavery times, whites had no need to hate or fear blacks.\textsuperscript{47} At the turn of the twentieth century many white Americans agreed with the UDC’s narrative of history and believed in the natural

\textsuperscript{45} PUDC, 1900, 39; PUDC, 1902, 18; PUDC, 1904, 42, 47; Stott, “From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment,” 205-206.
\textsuperscript{46} Texas was not the only UDC state division to have a nascent educational program in place before 1908. The Texas Division maintained, however, that its program was the most complete and uniform across chapters, and reported that other state divisions solicited advice from Texas in the establishment of their own educational programs. PUDC, 1905, 55.
\textsuperscript{47} PUDC, 1905, 5-6.
superiority of the white or “Anglo-Saxon” race. But especially at the local level, the UDC took the lead in securing the acceptance of the Lost Cause in public schools and in public culture. The racial dimension of the UDC’s understanding of history was made clear in a speech given by member Mrs. D. A. Nunn. Nunn, who led the Texas Division’s committee to secure legislation making Jefferson Davis’s birthday a legal holiday, delivered a lengthy meditation on the “Cause of the South.” She argued that the South stood up to the North in defense of “constitutional liberty and the rights of States” but also in defense of “the integrity of the Anglo-Saxon race.” Nunn’s choice of words—racial “integrity” rather than racial superiority—emerged again in the 1950s, when DAR and UDC members used “racial integrity” as a code word for racial segregation. For Nunn, racial “integrity” meant not that the South fought for slavery but for the preservation of a racial system that ensured the ultimate purity and dignity of whiteness.

The UDC entreated white women across the South, and even across the nation, to join together to perpetuate the Lost Cause narrative and the ideals it embodied. Although the organization had not been founded in Texas, Texan women quickly became rising stars in the organization and established the Texas Division UDC as one of the fastest-growing and most active state divisions. A number of Texan women rose to leadership in the national UDC, like Katie Daffan, who served as national UDC president twice. By 1900 Texan women

48 Ibid., 38.
comprised 14 percent of the UDC’s national membership.\textsuperscript{49} In ensuing decades, Texas consistently registered more members and chapters than any other state.\textsuperscript{50} While the UDC was perhaps less elite than the DAR or DRT because Confederate lineage was less rare, Texan UDC members took great pride in representing one of the strongest states in their national organization.

\textbf{The Texas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution}

Like the DRT, the origins of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution were bound up with the founding of a male heritage organization. The Sons of the American Revolution formed in 1889, and it was comprised of men who could trace their ancestry to soldiers and supporters of the American Revolution. At the SAR’s first meeting in 1890, the organization voted to exclude women with the same heritage from membership. Mary Smith Lockwood, a widow who balanced work as a journalist and boarding house keeper, responded to the decision with a furious letter to the \textit{Washington Post}. To bolster her argument that the exclusion of women was inherently unfair, she underscored the critical if unheralded role that women played in the American Revolution. William McDowell, who founded the SAR but quickly lost control of that organization, used Lockwood’s letter to recruit Washingtonian women for the formation of a new and independent organization. Meetings in August and


\textsuperscript{50} Stott, “From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment,” 3, 50.
October of 1890 led to the formation of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D.C.

The founding membership of the DAR contained working women and suffragettes whose views would clash with those of later members. Founders Eugenia Washington and Mary Desha were known for their deep-seated antipathy toward the SAR, which was interpreted by later DAR members as a form of gender deviance. Member Florence Darling sneered that Washington and Desha “had no use for mankind” and wanted the DAR to be an “Adamless Eden.” Although the formation of the DAR was in part a reaction to women’s exclusion from both the history of the American Revolution and the SAR, most subsequent members adhered to a more conservative view of women’s role and welcomed cooperation with men from the SAR. The DAR positioned itself against immigration and banned black women from membership within the first four years of its founding. Men’s wealth and status proved important to DAR members, as the organization was exclusively headed by married (and some widowed) women from its founding until World War II.51

Women joined the DAR for some of the same reasons that they joined the UDC and DRT. Becoming a member of the DAR was a route for a woman to learn more about her own genealogy and to explore how her genealogy

connected to a broader historical narrative. Joining the DAR also offered a
member social prestige. First Lady Caroline Harrison lent her celebrity to the
organization, serving as the first DAR President General. Before 1905 DAR
Presidents General—all wives of prominent statesmen, diplomats, and
politicians—were chosen for their social prominence rather than their abilities.
Lavish parties and famous leaders accorded the organization much press
attention. The DAR was a social outlet, but it also offered women a space to
impact society though the organization’s three primary aims: historic
preservation, promotion of patriotism, and supporting popular education. As DAR
members, women could practice political behavior—while remaining well within
the confines of proper gendered behavior—as they voted and campaigned within
the organization’s leadership structure.\textsuperscript{52}

The early years of the DAR found the organization focused on social
events and membership growth. The DAR became a well-known presence at
national fairs and exhibitions. In this period the DAR’s historic preservation of
Revolutionary Era gravesites and buildings was largely carried out at the local
level by chapters in the northeast. The DAR’s children’s auxiliary, the Children of
the American Revolution (CAR), was established in 1895. Through the CAR,
children of chapter members learned about the history of the American
Revolution and the place of their heritage in that narrative. The early DAR did not,
however, make an effort to bring its message to the public schools. Educational
work among the foreign born, which became a major effort in later decades, was

\textsuperscript{52} Gibbs, \textit{The DAR}, 58-60
also very limited before the 1910s. The major non-social project of the pre-1906 DAR was the screening of U.S. Army nurses during the Spanish-American War. George M. Sternberg, surgeon general of the Army, needed an organization to process applications for nurses but harbored a personal prejudice against the Red Cross. His wife, a DAR vice-president, convinced him that her organization could handle the job. The DAR’s role as official screening agency for army nurses brought the organization much acclaim and more members as well.\(^53\)

The DAR’s entanglement with government and political power made it unique among women’s heritage organizations. The DAR’s founding and enduring presence in Washington, DC, lent the organization a degree of official status. In 1896 the US Congress, in chartering the DAR, required the organization to make an annual report (printed at government expense) that would be read into the *Congressional Record* before being delivered to the Smithsonian Institute. Only the American Historical Association had the same obligation to the Smithsonian and Congress. In 1891 the DAR began fundraising to build its national headquarters in Washington, DC, Memorial Constitution Hall. The plot they purchased in 1902 was undeveloped swampland, but it was only three blocks from the White House, and DAR receptions at the president’s abode soon became standard practice. In the early twentieth century, Memorial Constitution Hall became a DC landmark in its own right.\(^54\) The DAR’s headquarters in Washington helped cultivate a more national worldview among

\(^{53}\) The national DAR’s membership increased by nearly 10,000 in 1898. Gibbs, *The DAR*, 57-58, 68-69, 72-75.
\(^{54}\) Ibid., 62-66.
its members. Francesca Morgan argues the DAR’s membership base of “propertied women” led the organization to support capitalism and the state. Even in the earliest years of the DAR, some Daughters derided “populists and anarchists.”\textsuperscript{55} However, by and large the organization did not become a space for women to become acquainted with current events until the establishment of the DAR’s legislation committee in 1906.\textsuperscript{56}

In early years the DAR focused on membership growth, and by 1894, the organization reached Texas. While Aurelia Hadley Mohl of Houston was present at one of the founding meetings of the DAR in DC, it was not until the DAR appointed a Texas state regent that chapters began to form. The first Texas DAR chapter formed in Galveston in 1895, followed by chapters in Dallas, Fort Worth, Austin, and Houston. Members of these five founding chapters came together at the Texas State Fair in 1900 to form the Texas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.\textsuperscript{57} Although the Texas DAR did not publish records of its annual meetings until 1905, it is clear that the organization focused on membership growth and chapter development. By 1905 there were twenty-five Texas chapters of the DAR from cities as far as El Paso and Amarillo, although members from the five founding chapters maintained a firm hold on state level leadership positions.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{55} Morgan, \textit{Women and Patriotism in Jim Crow America}, 51.
\textsuperscript{56} Gibbs, \textit{The DAR}, 58.
\textsuperscript{57} History of the Texas Society, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution (n.p., 1975), 1.
\textsuperscript{58} PDAR, 1905, 1-2, 70-117.
The projects of the Texas DAR were necessarily different from those of the national DAR. Being far from Revolutionary Era historic sites, the Texas chapters could only contribute financially to historic preservation efforts on the east coast. The projects of the Texas DAR were necessarily different from those of the national DAR. Being far from Revolutionary Era historic sites, the Texas chapters could only contribute financially to historic preservation efforts on the east coast.\(^{59}\) Texas chapters focused more on education—primarily the self-education of members through study groups and genealogical research. Texas state regent Mrs. Seabrook W. Sydnor recommended that members bring their knowledge of history to more public spaces by placing approved books in city libraries. She did not establish a state-wide public-focused educational program (as the Texas UDC did), but some chapters did enter public schools and public spaces. Houston’s Lady Washington chapter DAR placed books in the Houston library, while chapters in San Antonio and Gainesville held essay contests for school children.\(^{60}\)

Among the Texas DAR’s state officers was Kate Daffan, a founding member and enduring leader of the Texas UDC, as well Cornelia Branch Stone, the first president of the Texas UDC. Daffan and Stone exerted a powerful influence in the Texas DAR; both served on a number of committees, and Stone—who was also a pivotal leader in the DRT—drafted the Texas DAR’s

\(^{59}\) The only major Texas-based historic preservation effort of the Texas DAR was the marking of King’s Highway (Camino Real), also known as Old San Antonio Road. The Texas DAR began this effort in 1912 and completed it in 1918. Through fundraising and petitions made to Governor William P. Hobby, the DAR and the State of Texas placed 123 stone markers along the historic trail. Mrs. Lipscomb Norvell, “King’s Highway and History: the National Old Trails road” (Beaumont, TX: American Printing Co., 1918), Mrs. Lipscomb Norvell Papers, 1918, Dolph Briscoe Center.

\(^{60}\) Ibid., 10-11, 19, 23, 25.
bylaws. The two brought their experience as well as their regional identities to
the Texas DAR. At the national level, the DAR emphasized reconciliation of the
North and South. But at the state and local level, regional identities sometimes
remained strong. Buttressed by the involvement of Stone, Daffan, and other
UDC and DRT members, this was certainly true of the Texas DAR. Welcoming
addresses at the 1905 meeting praised Texas as “a region vibrant with the
fragrance and enchantment of the South.” Although the state could claim no
“shrines” from the American Revolution, Mrs. Thomas M. Bosson argued that the
spirit of the American Revolution was perfected in the Texas Revolution of 1836.
Descending from “Revolutionary sires from the East and from the South,” the
Texas pioneer’s wife was, she argued, an unmatched figure of patriotism and
bravery in American history. DAR members’ Texan and southern ties helped
the DAR grow in concert, rather than in competition, with the DRT and Texas
UDC.

Leaders and Bridge Builders

Women who chose to join multiple white women’s heritage organizations
were critical to the development of the DRT, UDC, and DAR in Texas. Daughters
like Katie Daffan and Cornelia Branch Stone actively sought out leadership
positions in all three organizations, and in so doing, helped build bridges between
members, organizations, aims, and strategies. Bridge builders like Stone and
Daffan typically resided in urban areas, had well-connected fathers or husbands,

61 Ibid., 1-2, 14.
62 Morgan, Women and Patriotism in Jim Crow America, 44.
63 PDAR, 1905, 6-7.
and actively sought out public recognition of their talents. Cornelia Branch Stone, Katie Daffan, Lena Dancy Ledbetter, and Emma Kyle Burleson were four women who claimed membership in the DRT, UDC, and DAR for decades. They all came from prosperous and notable families, and as Daughters they shared many beliefs and memories. Yet they were also women of different ages, lifestyles, and attitudes.

Cornelia Branch Stone, born in 1840, was the daughter of Edward Thomas Branch, who served in the battle of San Jacinto and later became a congressman and supreme judge of the Republic of Texas. Stone did not have much formal education but was a voracious reader. She married at sixteen years of age and had one son. When her son went away to college, Stone became involved with women’s clubs and quickly distinguished herself as a leader not only in the UDC, DAR, and DRT, but also in the Colonial Dames and TFWC. It was Stone who served as chairman of the TFWC’s committee to secure the passage of a poll tax law in 1902, and fellow clubwomen believed that the passage of the poll tax was secured wholly through her efforts. In 1905 Stone was a stately sixty-five year old widow who dedicated herself entirely to work in women’s clubs.64

64 Stone was composed and motherly, but not above having a little fun at the right moment. At the 1923 DAR national convention, Stone reportedly broke out into an “old fashioned dance” when the band played “Dixie.” The entire crowd “applauded madly,” while southern delegates responded with rebel yells. “Don’t Tell Any One I Told You—For Women Only,” newspaper clipping, May 6, 1923, Rebecca J. Fisher Papers, 1827, 1860-1927, 1936, 1944, 1964, Dolph Briscoe Center, Mary Simmerson Logan, Part Taken by Women in American History (Wilmington, DL: Perry-Nalle
In 1905 Katie Daffan was thirty-one years old and was well known by her contemporaries for her publications, public activism, and eccentric behavior. Her father was a Confederate veteran, Klansman, and high-ranking railroad official. Katie was briefly married to Texas assistant attorney general Mann Trice in 1897, but did not take his last name or bear any children with him. Katie Daffan was highly educated. She was a graduate of the Hollins Institute, a private woman’s college in Virginia, but also attended courses at the University of Texas and the University of Chicago. She worked as an elementary school teacher, high school teacher, and principal. Daffan first stepped into the spotlight in 1900 when an article she wrote about a trip to Mexico received international syndication. In 1905 she moved to Houston where in addition to teaching, she cultivated her career as an author of history books (eight total before she passed away in 1951) and a journalist for numerous newspapers including the *Houston Chronicle*. Daffan was an advocate of woman’s rights and even ran for office herself in 1922 and 1930. She was equally dedicated to the Democratic Party and to state’s rights, however, and bowed out of the 1930 Texas gubernatorial race when her candidacy threatened to split the party. Despite her activism and her career, Daffan found time to help the DRT, DAR, and especially UDC grow and achieve organizational goals. She never married again, and some rumored that she was a lesbian. Her frequent and flowery letters to other Daughters perhaps suggested

---

that she was; but more certifiably, her correspondence evinced her dedication to the DRT, UDC, and DAR.65

Lena Dancy Ledbetter was another woman who built bridges as a member of the DRT, UDC, and DAR. Born in 1850, she had fond memories of life on her family’s vast plantation in La Grange. In her memory, the plantation was “full of Happy Slaves singing their spirituals while at work in the field.” She fondly recalled sitting on the knees of her “black daddy” as he read the Bible aloud, and cuddling up to “mammy” to hear her “thrilling, mysterious stories.” Lena Dancy firmly maintained that her family’s enslaved population was intelligent, dedicated, and even “proud of their slave ancestry.” Lena was especially close to her father John Winfield Scott Dancy, who was an attorney, politician, and Confederate colonel. John privately called Lena his “son,” and publicly introduced her to eminent figures like Sam Houston and Robert E. Lee. He died of a “broken heart” when his beloved Confederate States of America lost the Civil War. As a mere teenager, Lena took charge of the family and the property at war’s end, since she was the only one besides her father who knew how shoot a gun. She remained eternally dedicated to honoring the memory of her father, the Confederacy, and

---

slavery. Even at the age of eighty-five, she maintained, “We will never be able to teach the free-negro to love us, like our black mammies, or other slaves who were well provided for did, and defended us with pride!”

After being educated at a New Orleans women’s college, Lena Dancy married attorney James Peacock Ledbetter in 1870. She had seven children, but her homemaking duties did not prevent her from joining the Texas clubwoman movement. She founded a Literary and Music Club in Coleman and soon joined the UDC, DAR, and DRT. She was also an amateur composer and conducted a “ladies orchestra” in her home. She read articles on woman suffrage and proudly pasted articles on women’s achievements into her diary but did not join a woman suffrage organization or speak publicly on behalf of woman’s rights. As a member of the DAR, DRT, and UDC, she did not have as strong a leadership presence as Stone or Daffan. Nor was she as active in politics or reform. Yet, members of white women’s heritage organizations were her “dearest friends,” and she corresponded with them frequently.

Emma Kyle Burleson, born in 1869 near San Marcos to a loving and prosperous family, did not experience the days of slavery and Civil War as did Lena Dancy Ledbetter. But she did have a “negro servant,” Hester, who dressed her, combed her hair, and attended to her every need. Emma’s life changed

67 Scrapbook of Lena Dancy Ledbetter, Lena Dancy Ledbetter Papers, 1830-1950, Dolph Briscoe Center.
dramatically when her mother passed away from illness and her father—a Confederate major and descendant of a vice president of the Republic of Texas—died soon after. A relative took control of her father’s estate and sent Emma to a boarding school in Austin. At school, Emma acted like a spoiled brat. Rather than comb her own hair and tie her own shoelaces, she cut off her braids and threw her shoes away. She was a constant disciplinary problem for the nuns at St. Mary’s Academy. When she turned twenty-one she claimed her inheritance (the family silver), continued her education at a women’s college in Virginia, and traveled Europe before returning to Austin.⁶⁸

Emma Kyle Burleson never married. Instead, stubborn and independent Emma dedicated her life to historic preservation through the DRT, DAR, UDC, and other organizations like the Texas Historical Commission. Along with Lena Dancy Ledbetter, she was a member of the William Barret Travis chapter of the DRT. The William Barret Travis chapter was particularly prestigious; its members were granted use of a room in the state Senate building for their meetings. Yet Burleson weaved herself into the DRT inner circle even before she was officially a member of the organization. Burleson made friends with DRT executive committee member Cornelia Branch Stone and first vice president Rebecca Fisher. Although her membership application was not processed, Stone and Fisher allowed her to vote and participate in the organization’s deliberations over the preservation of the Alamo property in 1905. To the astonishment of many,

---

Burleson was quickly appointed to the executive board of the DRT. Some DRT members saw her as a charlatan, a “self-constituted” leader, and a “sower of discord” who whispered in the ears of established DRT leaders to empower herself. But those who opposed Burleson and her friends were, eventually, effectively dismissed from the DRT.\(^69\)

Whether or not Burleson truly was a power-hungry “sower of discord,” that she was perceived as such showed the ugly side of leadership struggles within white women’s heritage organizations. Ladylike Daughters did not usually air their grievances as did Burleson’s opponents, so Burleson’s example provided a rare glimpse into the feelings of jealousy and anger that Daughters sometimes felt about their leaders. Daughters who were leaders and bridge builders between the three organizations tended to be women of means, status, and ambition who were (at least publicly) revered by the rank-and-file. Some, like Daffan and Burleson, fit the stereotype of the eccentric spinster clubwoman. Yet others, like Stone and Ledbetter, appeared motherly and dignified. All of them found in white women’s heritage organizations a place to have their talents and abilities recognized.

**“One Grand Chorus”: Cooperation and Similarities among Texas Daughters**

---

\(^69\) More on this division within the DRT appears in chapter two. Mrs. Starkey Duncan, “Lest We Forget: Annals of the William Barret Travis Chapter No. 3, Daughters of the Republic of Texas, 1892-1962,” (undated), Daughters of the Republic of Texas, William Barret Travis Chapter, Records, 1892-1994, Dolph Briscoe Center; Mary Briscoe, secretary pro tem, Minutes of DRT meeting April 19, 1907, Adina Emilia De Zavala Papers, 1766 (1831-1955), Dolph Briscoe Center.
In 1902 the Old Stone Fort at Nacogdoches—a historic landmark from the 1770s—was demolished so that a modern building could be erected on the choice location. As soon as news reached Houston, members of local DAR, DRT, and DAR chapters came together under the leadership of Mrs. J. J. McKeever of the DRT to strategize means of preserving the original materials of the Old Stone Fort. Through the spring and summer of 1902, the Daughters corresponded with the purchasers of the site, William and Charles Perkins, as well as “prominent ladies of Nacogdoches” in an effort to have the Old Stone Fort re-built and restored at another location. Adele Looscan—a member of the UDC, DAR, and DRT—wrote several articles for the *Houston Post* to publicize the importance of preserving the building. Despite their efforts, the Old Stone Fort did not have a stable home until the Cum Concilio Club of Nacogdoches, a local women’s study club that took charge of the building materials, secured a site on public school property in 1907.70

The Houston Daughters were unable to preserve the Old Stone Fort as quickly or as thoroughly as they wished, but this project showed that the Daughters had common interests and could work together. For some, the Old Stone Fort was also a lesson in the importance of working with other Daughters, rather than with other clubwomen. In 1902 DRT member Adina de Zavala predicted that the Cum Concilio Club—“those Nacogdoches women [who] were fast asleep, never raised voice or finger”—would “never raise the money.” The

---

Daughters had started the project and had done all the work. It was ill-advised, de Zavala believed, to hand off control of the project to the Nacogdoches women’s study club. In a letter to Adele Looscan, Adina de Zavala argued, “when Daughters agitate and Daughters do the work people who are indifferent and lukewarm should not control...I am beginning to see that we must be more selfish.” De Zavala even proposed that the DRT form a chapter in Nacogdoches to wrest control back from the Cum Concilio club. De Zavala knew that her words were controversial in the interconnected and conciliatory world of women’s clubs. She maintained that the letter was “sub rosa” and begged Looscan, “please do not tell anyone of this.” Yet her words echoed a sentiment other Daughters may have shared. Many Daughters understood their organizations as distinct from, and superior to, other women’s clubs.

The Daughters were united by a shared interest in genealogy and history. Other clubwomen in Texas studied history for self-betterment and showed occasional interest in historic preservation, but the Daughters’ focus on genealogy made them unique. Lineage tracing was a growing national phenomenon among the well-to-do around the turn of the twentieth century. Rapid social changes, particularly an influx of immigration, compelled old-stock natives to find and cherish their roots. Genealogy was stereotyped as a pursuit for elderly gentlemen and spinsters, and it held little attraction for the broader American population. It may have dwindled along with other 1900s fads if it were

---

71 Adina de Zavala to Adele Briscoe Looscan, June 3, 1902, Adina Emilia De Zavala Papers, 1766 (1831-1955), Dolph Briscoe Center.
not for the formation of heritage-based associations—such as the DRT, DAR, and UDC—that used genealogy as a ticket to membership. The genealogy-based membership requirements of the DRT, DAR, and UDC necessarily restricted eligibility and crafted a sense of elite status for the organizations. Furthermore, these membership requirements meant that members shared more than a common interest; they shared a common heritage. Daughters who met as strangers could find they shared a common ancestor, or that their ancestors served together in battle or lived in the same town. Genealogical research offered avenues for Daughters to find deeper and lasting ties to their organization, and to each other. The strength of these heritage-based ties perhaps explains why the DRT, DAR, and UDC endure today while most other women’s clubs that formed in the late nineteenth century are long forgotten.

The DRT, DAR, and UDC paid tribute to distinct heritages and historical memories, but they had more in common with each other than with other clubwomen. The different foci of the DAR and UDC—which, respectively, celebrated the coming together of the United States and South’s secession from the United States—could have created tension between members of the two organizations. The DRT’s frequent assertions of supremacy over other organizations could have made the DAR and UDC resentful. In ensuing decades, occasional spats between Daughters emerged. But far more often, the Daughters worked together. DAR, DRT, and UDC members invited each other to their local

---

and state-level meetings and collaborated on various projects. Cross-
membership was common, especially among ambitious women in pursuit of
leadership roles. Leaders such as Cornelia Branch Stone helped members,
ideas, and strategies flow across the three organizations in ways that helped
each grow stronger.
CHAPTER 2: THE DAUGHTERS IN THE PROGRESSIVE ERA

The Progressive Era was, in many ways, the heyday of white women’s heritage organizations. In these years the majority of the United Daughters of the Confederacy’s (UDC’s) memorial projects came to fruition, and the organization’s membership grew steadily throughout the era before experiencing a gradual decline beginning in 1924.73 The Daughters of the Republic of Texas (DRT) secured their best known project, the restoration of the Alamo, in the Progressive Era. For the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), the Americanization of immigrants was the exclusive province of their organization, not the federal government, before World War I.74 Perhaps it appears strange that these organizations, largely recognized by historians as politically conservative, would reach their zenith in the so-called “Progressive Era.”

Yet political conservatism as we understand it today was not necessarily incompatible with early twentieth-century progressivism. Americans who called themselves “progressives” in this era shared a belief that society must be reformed, but did not always agree on how. Sometimes, progressive impulses toward moral and social reform cohered with conservative nationalist, raced, and gendered discourses that marked these years as the dawn of Jim Crow. The unsteady ideological alignments of the Progressive Era provided the Daughters a unique opportunity to grow. Beliefs that appear progressive and liberal by today’s

74 Morgan, Women and Patriotism in Jim Crow America, 7.
standards could surface in organizations that mainly espoused reactionary and conservative ideas about race, gender, and nation—and vice versa. This chapter examines the Daughters’ beliefs and strategies to evaluate the ways in which they were, and were not, conservative women.

The Daughters as Clubwomen

The Daughters’ approach and foci aligned with many of those found among white mainstream Progressive Era clubwomen. The same demographic of white, urban upper- and middle-class women formed the membership base of both the Daughters and the majority of clubwomen’s organizations. These women had the leisure time and financial stability to make study and civic improvement a part of their everyday lives.⁷⁵ Members of the Daughters and southern suffragists alike found in their organizations a place to enjoy the camaraderie of other women and mirror one another’s social status and femininity.⁷⁶ Although scholars debate the centrality of outright white supremacist arguments in the southern suffrage movement, it cannot be denied that southern woman suffragists did, like the Daughters, occasionally utilize racial appeals.⁷⁷ Historian Elizabeth Hayes Turner has argued, “Southern women were complicated, did not fit into neat categories of progressive and conservative…Yet

⁷⁷ Wheeler, New Women of the New South, 21; Green, Southern Strategies, 11, 131.
they shared with women all over the nation the idea that they, as women, were culture carriers and transmitters.” The Daughters’ conservative conceptions of race, national belonging, and gender roles were in many ways mainstream among white clubwomen and the broader white southern populace.

Although more focused on historic preservation, the Daughters also engaged in social welfare efforts typical of progressive clubwomen’s organizations. As was the trend in the rest of the South, the Texas clubwomen movement began in the 1880s and took hold by the 1890s. Initially, many women’s clubs’ focused on the self-betterment of members through study and socialization. But clubwomen soon began to look outward to improve their communities. Between the end of the nineteenth century and 1920, clubwomen became interested in civic work such as the establishment of free libraries; city beautification; laws on child labor, food, and drugs; and services for tuberculosis patients, among other benevolent activities. In and outside of Texas, clubwomen formed an important wing of Progressive reform and social justice movements in the early twentieth century.

As members and as organizations, the Daughters worked with groups like the Texas Federation of Women’s Clubs and the Young Women’s Christian

---

78 Turner, Women, Culture, and Community, 173-174.
79 The clubwomen movement in the South developed about ten years later than that in the North. This may be attributed to the relative dearth of antebellum era female organizational activity in the South as well as the slower pace of urbanization in the region. Meagan Seaholm, “Earnest Women: The White Woman’s Club Movement in Progressive Era Texas, 1880-1920” (PhD diss., Rice University, 1988), 193, 203.
80 Ibid., 151; Turner, Women, Culture, and Community, 160; Stella L. Christian, History of the Texas Federation of Women’s Clubs (Dealy-Adey-Elgin co. printers, 1919), 37.
Association in typical Progressive reform efforts like prohibition, increasing the accessibility to and quality of public education, and combating corruption in elections. The DAR was particularly involved in reforms that aligned more with typical progressive clubwomen’s efforts than those of their own heritage-based agenda. In 1912 the Texas DAR’s Committee on Welfare of Women and Children claimed as their greatest accomplishment the establishment of the Federal Children’s Bureau, a federal agency that intervened in issues of infant mortality, orphanage, disease, and labor among children from “all classes of our people.” In the years after World War I the Texas DAR reversed positions and opposed federal intervention in child labor, but in the Progressive Era the DAR joined in chorus with progressive clubwomen on behalf of this maternal cause.81

The Texas UDC pursued Progressive-style social welfare in the form of their Confederate Woman’s Home, which opened in 1908. After years of work fundraising and writing letters to legislators for state aid, the UDC established this facility to serve indigent and poor wives and widows of honorably discharged Confederate veterans, and those women who themselves aided the Confederate effort. The Daughters funded, operated, and governed the Woman’s Home until it became state-supported in 1911. Even though the state of Texas put the home under an all-male board of managers, the day-to-day operations were left to prominent UDC member Katie Daffan, whose appointment by Governor O. B.

81 Turner, Women, Culture, and Community, 169; PDAR, 1917, 40, 56; PDAR, 1912, 65.
Colquitt as Superintendent of the Confederate Woman’s Home made her the first woman to serve on the board of a state institution in Texas.\textsuperscript{82}

The Texas UDC’s Confederate Woman’s Home was in many ways a typical creation of Progressive Era women’s activism; it sought to bring relief to the poor, sick, and elderly (albeit, only the Confederate poor, sick, and elderly). For decades it remained “one of the only options in the state available for destitute white women.”\textsuperscript{83} However, the admission requirements of the Home reflected the UDC’s elitism and exclusivity. Having the same heritage as a UDC was apparently not, in and of itself, a guarantee of support. In addition to proving her connection to the Confederate effort, an applicant had to be recommended by “two citizens of good standing” from her hometown. In the majority of cases, these recommendations came from UDC members and were the determinant of admission decisions.\textsuperscript{84}

That UDC members maintained ultimate control over which particular individuals would be admitted into the Home and who would not was a manifestation of the exclusivity and sense of social superiority found in all three organizations. Historian Elizabeth Turner has called women’s heritage organizations “elite enclaves” that used their lineage to distance themselves from immigrants and the nouveau riche.\textsuperscript{85} The Texas UDC, Texas DAR, and DRT did

\begin{flushleft}\textsuperscript{82} Kelly McMichael Stott, “From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment: The Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy” (PhD diss., University of North Texas, 2001), 145-147, 150. \\
\textsuperscript{83} Ibid., 157 \\
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid., 153. \\
\textsuperscript{85} Turner, \textit{Women, Culture, and Community}, 166.\end{flushleft}
frequently and openly proclaim their superiority though the language of aristocracy and exclusivity. The president of the Texas UDC announced that her organization was the “queen of patriotic organizations” and that serving as its president was the “highest honor” she ever hoped to receive. The president of the DRT bragged, “This [the DRT] is a very exclusive organization of which you should be proud.”

Perhaps most clearly reactionary, though, was one member’s description of why she and her friends started a new DAR chapter in their town. In a well-received address before the entire state convention, Mrs. W. S. Tilton explained that for years, she and other future members had lived quite contentedly, “deeply interested in our husbands and babies” and little else. However, the construction of a new railroad brought in an “invasion” of newcomers from the “effete East” whose “manners were so bad…it made the blue blood in our veins commence to boil.” Tilton continued, “When it reached the boiling point we made up our minds that there was enough blue blood to start a Chapter of the D.A.R.’s.” Tilton reveled in the success of her efforts as she concluded, “The railroad brought in another trainload yesterday and people are now asking who those aristocratic, fine-looking people are, and we are only too proud to say, ‘They are the Texas D.A.R.’s.’” For Tilton and many others, joining a heritage organization was sometimes a way of distancing oneself from newcomers and foreigners.

---

86 PUDC, 1914, 26; PDRT, 1910, 14.
87 PDAR, 1913, 32-33.
However, Turner’s term “elite enclave,” and the historiographical focus on these organizations’ exclusivity, is somewhat misleading. For the Daughters’ heritage to be recognized as important, the organizations would need to assure that the versions of history that gave that heritage value were hegemonic among the general public. To accomplish this aim, the Daughters would need to engage in educational efforts that required members to step out of their elite enclaves and into the public school system.

Educational Campaigns

It was in their focus on education that the Daughters were most clearly aligned with the aims and activities of other and more “progressive” clubwomen in Texas. From the late nineteenth through the early twentieth century, the Texas public school system was the subject of progressive reform activism. Teachers, philanthropists, denominational organizations, and clubwomen worked toward the centralization and modernization of Texas public schools through the development of a textbook board, increased funding, and the enlargement of normal schools (teacher training schools).88 Not all Texas women’s clubs had educational reform as an explicit organizational aim, but nearly all actively supported efforts such as the Texas State Teachers’ Association’s “Better

---

Schools Campaign,” which successfully advocated for a state constitutional amendment to allow local districts to raise taxes to fund education.\(^8^9\)

Women’s clubs with a wide variety of organizational aims could be counted on to support education because the care and teaching of children fell well within woman’s domestic domain. But for the Daughters in the early twentieth century, education was a primary goal. This was especially true for the UDC. In 1908 the national UDC’s president—Cornelia Branch Stone, former Texas Division president—recommended that the organization redirect its efforts from memorial building to education. Since the Texas Division UDC began its first “educational movement” in 1899 under Stone’s tenure, Texans often led the way in UDC educational efforts.

For the UDC, “untrue” books were those that failed to sufficiently glorify the Confederate effort and its legacy. Offering analysis of these “pro-northern” books in lurid detail, UDC textbook and library committee reports called local chapters to search for and remove such books from their hometowns. Textbook committee chairman Faith Harrison Ledford’s report at the 1909 annual convention vividly described the book *A Youth’s History of the Rebellion* as “an atrocious vilification of the South and her soldiers and her people.” Quoting from the reputedly slanderous book, she recounted its assaults on the honor of Confederate leaders, soldiers, and even the women of the South, who the author

claimed were “more bitter, malignant, and revengeful than the other sex.”

Library committee chairman Mary E. Bryan recounted how Nicholas Worth, author of *The Southerner*, not only “willfully” misrepresented the character of a southern officer and denied the intellectual merits of southern women but also “says there is no negro social problem. He does not find objectionable the marriage of a mulatto girl to a white man. He meets the negro woman on terms of equality.” *The Southerner* was not only an assault on the history of the South, but also an assault on the racial ideology underlying a purely valorizing account of the Old South and Confederate mission.

The Texas Division’s textbook and library committees also recommended the use of particular books to those UDC members with positions of educational power, such as teachers or members of state educational boards. Division members Katie Daffan, Emma Burleson, Ella Dancy Dibrell, and Mary Hunt

---


92 White supremacist authors may have known UDC members could be strong allies. Racial theorist Alfred Holt Stone of Mississippi consulted Texas Division members for help with his analysis of “the economic history of the negro.” Letter from Alfred Holt Stone to Mrs. M.M. Birge, October 11, 1907, United Daughters of the Confederacy Papers, 1904-1978, Dolph Briscoe Center. For more on Alfred Holt Stone, see James G. Hollandsworth, Jr., *Portrait of a Scientific Racist: Alfred Holt Stone of Mississippi* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008).
Affleck all served on the Texas Textbook Review Board.\(^\text{93}\) As the Division’s educational campaign grew through the years, so did the Daughters’ connections to the state’s public education system. At the 1915 annual convention, the textbook and library committees made a joint report. Following an extensive investigation of readers from first through seventh grade, as well as higher-level English and history courses, the two committees reported:

Nothing objectionable reported on our School History, owing to the fact that the school books in Texas are selected by the State Board, on a five-year contract, and are highly censored by the Confederate veterans and the Daughters of the Confederacy. We recommend that this censorship be strictly continued.\(^\text{94}\)

As the nineteen-teens progressed, the Texas UDC successfully broadened its educational campaign. This shift toward education was key to the continuation of the organization into the twentieth century. The Confederate veterans, whose care formed the core of the Daughters’ organizational impetus at the organization’s formation, were beginning to pass away. While building monuments in their honor remained a beloved aim for many members, from 1906 through 1916 the UDC leadership continually asked members to forego erecting monuments and instead educate the children who would carry the memory of the Confederacy into the twentieth century.\(^\text{95}\)

The Daughters of the Republic of Texas also embraced education as a goal, although their efforts were perhaps less fervent than that of the UDC or DAR. The DRT first formed a children’s auxiliary, dubbed the “Little Patriots,” in

\(^{93}\) Stott, “From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment,” 205-206.
\(^{94}\) PUDC, 1915, 42.
\(^{95}\) PUDC, 1914, 74-75.
In contrast to the UDC’s Children of the Confederacy, the Little Patriots were highly affiliated with local schools and supported by principals and superintendents. However, the DRT’s children’s auxiliaries were never as widespread or as independent as the UDC’s were. News about the Little Patriots largely disappeared from DRT annual reports soon after its emergence, and another DRT children’s auxiliary did not emerge to replace them until 1934. Similarly, textbook monitoring and scholarships for students of Texas history did not emerge as DRT goals until 1927.

The DRT could afford to be less interventionist and direct in its educational program, though, because its preferred narrative of Texas history was largely hegemonic in the state. Nearly all Texas schools had maintained courses in Texas history since at least 1898. There was no particular course of instruction on southern history in Texas elementary schools, but there was a mandatory course on the Texas Constitution. Accordingly, the DRT’s legislative committee’s educational campaigns in the Progressive Era largely affirmed an already existent culture of historical celebration in the state. In 1915 the DRT secured the passage of Concurrent Resolution No. 6 by the Texas Legislature, which provided for the “Texas Flag Day” state holiday, on which the flag would fly
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96 The idea likely came from the William Barret Travis chapter in Austin, who formed a children’s auxiliary called “Little Patriots” in 1906. Minutes of the William Barret Travis Chapter, DRT, March 9, 1906, Daughters of the Republic of Texas, William Barret Travis Chapter, Records, 1892-1994, Dolph Briscoe Center.
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99 W. A. Stigler, “Textbooks in Texas” (Austin, TX: October 1935 [publisher not noted]), 14.
above all public buildings and schools.\textsuperscript{100} In a cooperative effort with the Texas UDC two years later, the DRT successfully pressured the state legislature to make the study of Texas history mandatory in public schools. While DRT state organizer Mrs. Kreisle bragged that the measure was evidence that “When we prove to the sons of Texas we are serious we always get what we ask for,” the resolution simply affirmed the current Texas school curriculum rather than made an intervention in it.\textsuperscript{101} Still, local DRT members helped ensure that the directives to fly Texas flags and teach Texas history were carried out by donating flags to public schools and giving presentations and programs at schools on Texas holidays.\textsuperscript{102}

Education was a key tactic in the DAR’s mission to promote America and Americanism. Like the UDC, the DAR educated their own children through a hereditary auxiliary, the Children of the American Revolution, beginning in 1895.\textsuperscript{103} But the DAR also formed an organization named the Children of the Republic that was for “foreign boys and foreign girls and American boys of no Revolutionary ancestry.”\textsuperscript{104} DAR members feared that the organization’s mission to Americanize all youth could not be entrusted to employed teachers alone, especially in classrooms of non-white and non-native born children. According to the state regent, teaching “the unparalleled progress of our nation” to American children was easy. “But,” she continued:

\textsuperscript{100} PDRT, 1916, 16-19.
\textsuperscript{101} PDRT, 1917, 44-45.
\textsuperscript{102} Ibid., 36-41.
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…we encounter hordes of alien born children, Italian, German, Czech, Slav and whatnot that are flooding our land... How may we by organized effort meet these stolid, imaginative foreigners and plant ideas in their muddled brains that shall bring forth flowers of sentiment for order, beauty, and well doing? How train them to be good citizens of the future? This is the problem that confronts us, to the solution of which our heartiest efforts should be directed.  

Following this and a more direct call for the formation of an educational committee made by the state regent the following year, the Texas DAR formed a Patriotic Education Committee in 1909. The activities of the Patriotic Education Committee were similar to educational efforts of the UDC and DRT: granting flags and other patriotic gifts to schools, holding flag-raising ceremonies, and offering prizes for historical essays. Unlike the other two organizations, though, the DAR made non-white children the object of their educational mission as well, as they made similar interventions in Texas’ segregated black and Mexican schools.

Although the DAR worked with foreigners and non-whites to instill “citizenship” and a reverence for the country, their message was one of social control. Scholar Lee Edelman has argued that as a symbolic object, “the child” has served as a means to regulate political discourse. The child, he explains, “embodies the citizen as an ideal, entitled to claim full rights to its future share in the nation’s good, though always at the cost of limiting the rights ‘real’ citizens

105 PDAR, 1907, 8.
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are allowed.” Mrs. L. A. Scott eerily echoed this logic in 1909 in her speech before a flag-raising ceremony in McKinney, Texas. She said:

The one law that governs our life is the law of obedience. In the home the child must be obedient to the parent. The first step that the child-citizen takes into the world is the school room. Here the law of obedience must be observed. The child-citizen who respects this law and voluntarily obeys it is entitled to the highest respect and gives promise of becoming the most loyal citizen when he steps out into the world where he must obey the laws of his country or pay the penalty. The citizen who renders perfect obedience to the law is the man who is entitled to the greatest respect among his fellow men.109

The “child-citizenship” that Mrs. L. A. Scott extolled was one of limited rights and an idealized “voluntary” and “perfect” obedience to the law.

The educational missions of the UDC, DRT, and DAR, which focused exclusively on history and citizenship, supported the supremacy of the organizations and the race and heritage of members. Members of the DAR worked with non-white and immigrant others, but as a symbol they saw “the child” as white and native-born. Patriotic Education Committee chairwoman Mrs. Leavering Moore described immigrant children as “a long list of meaningless names.”110 This stood in stark contrast to the DAR’s hereditary auxiliary, the Children of the American Revolution, wherein ancestors’ names were the key qualification for membership. The aim of the DAR, as well as the UDC and DRT, was to have “their” children (those who could claim Revolutionary, Confederate, or Republic of Texas heritage) as well as “other” children (those who could not)

109 PDAR, 1909, 9-10.
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imbibe their preferred vision of history, and by proxy, the supremacy of their heritage as descendants of those historical heroes.

“The Women of Texas Guard Racial Purity”

The model of heritage-based belonging offered by the Daughters tended to align with xenophobia and conceptions of “Anglo-Saxon” supremacy that pervaded the Progressive Era. In the DRT’s historical memory, the battle between Texas and Mexico was described as a race war, as “that conflict which for all time decided the momentous question, which shall rule Texas, Latin or Saxon?”¹¹¹ Like other white women’s heritage organizations, for the DRT, white or “Anglo-Saxon” identity was a key element of the heritage of which they were so proud. In the words of Mrs. J. E. Webb, the DRT mission would not only honor Texan identity but would also “forever crown the Anglo-Saxon race with glory.”¹¹²

The DAR’s efforts to reach out to immigrants were infused with xenophobic fears and a belief in the superiority of white native-born citizens. Like the DRT, their patriotic mission “bred into the bones of our children” both “love of country and pride of race.”¹¹³ Racial pride would be critical to maintain in the face of new waves of immigrants arriving on American shores, the Daughters believed. In an addressed titled, “America—The Melting Pot,” Mrs. A. R. Howard remarked, “The melting-pot has been converted into a sort of public dump for the world’s sedition.” These new immigrants, she continued, posed a real risk to “pro-American spirit.” Accordingly, she admonished members, “We must not permit

¹¹¹ PDRT, 1910, 19.
¹¹² PDRT, 1914, 12.
¹¹³ PDAR, 1908, 17.
ourselves to become so obsessed with the idea of helping outsiders that we will unconsciously allow the foundations of this Republic to be pulled down.”

Becoming too progressive or equitable in their work posed a real risk to the DAR, who jealously guarded the social superiority accorded to their heritage.

The UDC’s historical memory of the Old South and Confederate effort was particularly salient in the Progressive Era, as these years also marked the establishment of Jim Crow. Racial inequality pervaded educational systems in Texas for many years, but the establishment of segregation laws governing railroads, residences, and public facilities began around 1910. Racial segregation, however, was not primarily enforced by law but by actions and local unwritten codes that had the force of law. Many of the infamous “whites only” signs were erected without legal requirement by white citizens and business owners. The UDC took part in this policing of racial purity, even as they also “played in the dark” by engaging in escapist fantasies of idealized Old South race relations.

“Racial Purity or Death!” shouted Miss Adelia Dunovant at the Fourteenth Annual Convention of the Texas Division, UDC. She was infuriated by the existence of a national UDC scholarship for “Teacher’s College, New York City, a

---
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school of the North, in which negroes [sic] are on a perfect equality, and the professors of which publicly and officially advocate intermarriage of the races.” In a unanimously passed resolution, Dunovant argued that the Texas Division must break with the national UDC and renounce this scholarship, which would be a “fatal blow to racial purity.” She expounded, “We will never let it be said that the women of Texas guard racial integrity and purity with less jealous care than do the men of our State.”

Here the UDC demanded racial segregation with scare tactics about intermarriage, but at other moments, UDC members reminisced about the race relations of an idealized antebellum past. In another unanimous resolution, Mrs. E. O. Spenser condemned the criticism of southern civilization found in early twentieth century productions of Uncle Tom’s Cabin. The Old South she remembered was instead an “atmosphere of cultured happiness in which the people of the South reached the pinnacle of fair fame and in which the Southern negro found his place and era of whole-hearted delight.” At the 1913 convention, members condemned those in the media who denied the existence of a “negro social problem” but later showered applause on Mamie Wynne Cox’s retelling of “dialect stories of the negro race.” Other white women’s heritage organizations embraced the UDC’s memory of the Old South and Confederate effort. The Texas DAR incorporated the UDC’s terminology of “War between the

---
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States” and identified with the Confederate side in the conflict.\textsuperscript{120} The DRT also sided firmly with the Confederacy, although (with a touch of characteristic DRT elitism) a member remarked that it was in “emulation of the dauntless Texans” that the Confederates fought.\textsuperscript{121}

Yet, a racist and xenophobic outlook may have not been entirely pervasive among all members of white women’s heritage organizations. At the 1909 annual meeting DRT historian Nettie Houston Bringhurst used her position of power to speak out against racial discrimination. She argued that the popular textbook \textit{Texas History} contained “entirely too much matter derogatory to the Mexicans in this volume for its acceptable use,” and that as a result “it engendered ill feeling among the boys against Mexican students.” Bringhurst’s stand was indeed a brave one, as the author of \textit{Texas History} was prominent author and clubwoman Anna J. H. Pennybacker. Pennybacker was a former president of the Texas Federation of Women’s Clubs, who had previously collaborated with DRT members in finding evidence for her publications.\textsuperscript{122} Despite the high social position of its author, Bringhurst was compelled to speak out against the book.

Bringhurst’s remarks were part of a diatribe on the “confusion and absurdity of much so-called Texas history.” Bringhurst took her position as
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historian seriously, and she believed that errors in fact and interpretation must be corrected. Far from a romantic, she praised General Sam Houston’s unfulfilled recommendation that the Alamo—a most treasured historical site in the eyes of nearly all Daughters and the foremost subject of DRT historical preservation efforts—be destroyed. Not only would such a measure have saved lives, she explained, “if the men had only blown it up, the women wouldn’t have been blowing it up ever since.” Bringhurst’s report was cynical and tongue-in-cheek at moments. But in her recommendations against Pennybacker’s *Texas History*, she showed that her belief in righting the wrongs of Texas history was about more than facts and figures. She wanted Mexican children to be “treated with proper respect,” and further explained, “I value my list of Mexican friends as highly as any that I have, and have given the hand of fellowship to our Latin cousins, without mental reservation.” Bringhurst’s remarks stood in stark contrast to those made by fellow DRT members, who referred to “Latins” and “Mexicans” as a historic enemy and inferior race. Yet, Bringhurst was not condemned for her comments. Instead, she received a “rising vote of thanks” and was appointed to serve a second term as division historian.123

**Woman’s Duty and Woman’s Place**

The Daughters’ understandings of their role as women were shaped by racial understandings. In the Progressive Era, conceptions of race were often entangled with ideas about gender, and vice versa. This was true for the category of “men” as well as “women,” as Gail Bederman reveals in *Manliness and*  
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Civilization. Gender was a crucial component of the racial discourse of “civilization” that pervaded the Progressive Era. Blurred gender distinctions were viewed as the hallmark of savagery; the pronounced distinction between white womanhood and white manhood, thereby, was the hallmark of the superiority of white/"Anglo-Saxon" civilization. For white women, the cult of domesticity that pervaded the antebellum era appeared, in many ways, to be ascendant yet again in the early twentieth century. Stepping into the public sphere—or worse, neglecting the all-important duty of motherhood—was viewed as a threat to racial purity and supremacy.

In the U.S. South, the purity of white womanhood (and the domestic sphere over which woman presided) was especially central to conceptions of southern “civilization.” White southerners combined memories of the Old South plantation mistress with the white womanhood of their own era to link the southern civilization of the past with that of the present. Accordingly, Grace Elizabeth Hale argues, southern white women became “key creators of the new racial order, segregation as culture.” In a context where southerners (and indeed many white Americans) feared “race suicide,” white women were important not just as symbols but also as breeders of the future generation of

---

native-born whites. For organizations based on bloodlines, these discourses would be especially resonant.

Maternal duty and pure womanhood were popular tropes in the speeches made at the Daughters’ annual meetings, and these tropes were often explicitly connected to discourses of race, nation, and civilization. In a poem delivered before the 1906 DRT convention, Miss Myrtle Lott described the DRT mission as an ultimately maternal one in which “Her children be proof of her progress/And with her their fortunes be cast.”¹²⁷ UDC members agreed that a woman’s patriotic duty centered on the home and work of motherhood. Those who stepped out of the domestic sphere sacrificed their dignity, according to member Mrs. Aflect. She recommended that the Daughters instead emulate “that lily of purity,” the Old South plantation mistress. Her remarks received a standing ovation.¹²⁸

Mrs. Hattie Raguet similarly praised the “Southern mother” whose “passive courage” in the domestic sphere bequeathed to the UDC a mission of patriotism and blood. Mrs. Raguet proclaimed:

Let other sections feel, when they come in contact with the Daughters of the Confederacy, thro’ whose veins flow the blood of cavaliers, and whose ancestors have made a nation, that the Southern woman was, and is representative and exponent of the highest civilization the world has known!¹²⁹

Like the UDC and DRT, the DAR saw their patriotic mission as a part of feminine duty. The DAR state historian explained, “To woman is given the keeping of the hearthstone—the rearing of the children—should it not also be her sacred task to

¹²⁷ PDRT, 1906, 16.
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instill in every young heart lessons of the sacrifices and struggles and heroism of their fathers.” Quoting Ralph Waldo Emerson, she asserted, “A sufficient measure of civilization is the influence of a good woman.” Through their patriotic duty to raise children to honor the male heroes of the past, the Daughters could “make the measure of our civilization fill the cup of life to overflowing.”

The gendered form of patriotism offered by the DAR, DRT, and UDC in Texas largely accords with what Francesca Morgan calls “woman-centered nationalism.” Morgan explains that woman-centered nationalism is defined by “celebrating men’s sacrifices on the battlefields as the highest form of patriotism.” She identifies the national-level UDC and DAR as exponents of an especially conservative form of woman-centered nationalism that deferred to men in politics while “imparting considerable cultural and moral influence to women and to female institutions.”

Elizabeth Turner has similarly argued that the constricted conception of woman’s duty in the UDC and DRT offered only “vicarious” pride because the importance of members’ bloodlines was based on male achievement.

While the Daughters would sometimes remark that woman’s sphere had widened, most still saw woman’s role as distinct from and subordinate to that of men, especially in the arena of politics. In 1910 the Texas UDC passed a resolution declaring the organization would not, by virtue of its foundational principles, enter into “political questions that may come up of whatsoever
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nature.”\footnote{PUDC, 1910, 84-85.} At the 1914 annual DRT meeting, prominent leader Cornelia Branch Stone instructed her fellow members to eschew political engagement and respect men’s proper authority in the political sphere. “Women,” she said, “We need not suffrage to back us in our work. We can get the support of men, and I know they will help us.”\footnote{PDRT, 1914, 15.}

But a few advocates for a broader, non-domestic, and political role could be found among the Daughters. In her address, “Woman, Teacher of Patriotism,” DAR member Mrs. Helen Knox identified work with the National Woman’s Suffrage Association as a legitimate (although subordinate to the DAR) realm of activism for Daughters.\footnote{PDAR, 1914, 34.} At the 1915 annual DRT meeting, newly elected Governor James E. Ferguson spoke before the Daughters and said that while he had never “expressed himself on suffrage” before, “if these women who founded Texas would express themselves in favor of suffrage, he would be glad to express himself as they do.” He concluded with a compliment to the DRT’s heritage by adding that “the women whose fathers and grandfathers builded [sic] this great State ought to have a say in the affairs of the State.” Ferguson’s remarks on suffrage were met with “unbounded applause” from the Daughters.\footnote{PDRT, 1915, 10.}

At the 1919 UDC convention, members endured a lengthy presidential address from veteran member Mrs. Oscar Barthold. Mrs. Barthold pressed her audience to remember that “the UDC do not take part in politics” although

\footnote{133 PUDC, 1910, 84-85.} \footnote{134 PDRT, 1914, 15.} \footnote{135 PDAR, 1914, 34.} \footnote{136 PDRT, 1915, 10.}
suffrage threatened to place the “full burden of citizenship” on women. She offered herself as a model of womanhood to members as she bragged that, “having no inclination in that direction myself,” she had declined all political invitations. “I trust through the years to come that the UDC will steer clear of politics and all its alluring bypaths,” she continued, “and will ever remain true to the objectives of our organization.” But on the next day of the convention, a committee meeting had to be cancelled because all of its members were attending a suffrage luncheon at a hotel nearby. In the rhetoric of leading members especially, it appears many of the Daughters largely accepted and even reveled in their subordination to men. But changes to woman’s role were less frightening than changes to the racial order of Texas. This may explain why more variance can be found in members’ conceptions of gender than in their conceptions of race.

Nationalism(s) and the Great War

The DRT, UDC, and DAR shared an identity as white, as women, and as the inheritors of a precious heritage. Each organization paid tribute to a different nation, but many Daughters understood Texan, Confederate, and American heritage as interconnected. Daughters exchanged gifts of American, Texas, and Confederate flags at each other’s meetings and often paid tribute to these different heritages. For example, in her remarks at the seventeenth annual Texas DAR convention the honorary state regent praised “this great Lone Star
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State” as well as the memory of when “Texas took her stand, staunchly, loyal, and true beside her other sister southern states, and became one of the Confederate States of America.\textsuperscript{140} The Daughters tended to see Texan, Confederate, and American heritage as coterminous (if not necessarily equal).

For the UDC, however, the interconnection of heritage was more complex. More than the DRT or DAR, the UDC’s historical memory appeared to be under attack. While the DRT and DAR’s narratives were ones of triumph, the story of the Confederacy was ultimately a “Lost Cause.” The story of the American Revolution and the Texas Revolution both conclude with a merging into the United States. The Confederate effort was marked by its break with the U.S., and some UDC members still harbored distrust of the federal government. At a UDC meeting in San Antonio, Mrs. John Van Wert contemplated the interconnections of Texan, Southern, and American history:

\begin{quote}
We are standing today on ground hallowed by the blood of those martyred heroes...who died that liberty might live. The brave pioneers of Texas threw off the yoke of Santa Anna, and in order to give greater protection to the people and their property upon an exposed frontier, sought and gained admission into the United State of America, but when the Federal government was made a weapon to strike down the interests and property of the people of Texas...the liberty-loving Texans withdrew from the Union and fought to preserve the rights of the State so dearly purchased.\textsuperscript{141}
\end{quote}

This conception of the federal government as a weapon threatened UDC members’ ability to see their ideals as aligned with those of the United States, and thus perhaps, with those of the DAR.

\textsuperscript{140} PDAR, 48-49.
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However, the merging of Confederate and American identities was facilitated by the DAR’s open embrace of the Lost Cause narrative. DAR members agreed that Texas should have seceded, believed the Confederate cause was just, and understood themselves as southern women.\(^\text{142}\) The Lost Cause version of the Civil War, more than the narrative of the Texas Revolution or American Revolution, was attacked by oppositional historical viewpoints in the Progressive Era. By sharing Confederate identity with the UDC, members of the DAR and DRT helped stabilize the supremacy of the Lost Cause and the alignment of southern womanhood with Texan and American womanhood.

But World War I led the Daughters to consider the relationship of their nation(s) to the world. Before the war and before the U.S. entered the conflict, the UDC and DAR took clear positions in support of peace and arbitration between nations, while the DRT quietly ignored international concerns.\(^\text{143}\) However, as the years progressed, all three organizations began to see the war as “the first concerted attack upon hereditary privilege.”\(^\text{144}\) The Daughters pledged their work and the power of their superior heritage to the Allied effort when the U.S. entered the war.

The DAR was the first to break their pledge to peace. Even before the notorious Zimmerman telegram moved President Woodrow Wilson and most Americans (especially Texans) toward intervention in the international conflict, Miss Anne E. Yoakum highlighted the changing attitudes of DAR members at the
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annual meeting in 1916. She spoke of “advocates of Universal Peace” as critics and opponents of the DAR, whose members now came to embrace military “preparedness” for a more active role in the conflict.¹⁴⁵ When the U.S. entered the war, the DAR stood behind their country and assumed their own wartime mission: to promote Americanism and to prevent foreign influences from infiltrating the country. Expecting a wave of European immigrants, Mrs. Henry A. Cline explained that it was the DAR’s “duty” to “help them to become useful citizens.” Mrs. D. A. Potts affirmed the DAR’s commitment to this mission, adding, “Many of us have servants who have come from the lowly homes of Europe. Are we willing to accept their plans and methods, or are we to teach them our ways and methods?”¹⁴⁶ For many members of the DAR, promoting “citizenship” among immigrants was a means of social control. Members maintained a view of most foreigners as “anarchists, malcontents, [and] undesirables.”¹⁴⁷ Mrs. Henry Cline made her anti-immigrant position especially clear when she asserted that America’s strength did not and would not come from assimilated immigrants but from the “original stock” who could claim Revolutionary heritage.¹⁴⁸

In the midst of the Great War, the DAR’s mission to promote America exceeded national boundaries. The Daughters recognized the wisdom of their

¹⁴⁵ PDAR, 1916, 48, 55. The national DAR also retreated from previous support of peace and arbitration as the organization assumed an “increasingly fervent” antiradical orientation before and during WWI. Morgan, Women and Patriotism in Jim Crow America, 106, 108.
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forefathers’ admonition against “entangling alliances” and abhorred “irresponsible Bolshevik internationalism.”\textsuperscript{149} But they supported the country’s alliance with other nations because they believed the U.S. always assumed superiority. A member explained, “The mission of America—the nation reserved for the time of the world’s greatest need—is that she has become a living spirit to uphold civilization and make the world safe for democracy…God make us worthy of the flag that floats as a beacon of light above Europe.”\textsuperscript{150} DAR members envisioned the war as an opportunity to showcase the superiority of their heritage on a global stage.

In 1917 the UDC moved to support President Woodrow Wilson, the United States, and the allied mission with nearly as much fervor as the DAR. The Division president announced that while the country was at war, the mission of the UDC would be a “double task—interpreting the history of the South aright—and helping to make the world safe for Christian democracy.” The Daughters declared that their mission was now “worldwide” and embraced work caring for soldiers, working with the Red Cross of America, fundraising for hospital beds, and raising money for needy women and children in France and Belgium. Many members agreed it was time to put sectionalism aside. As one member explained, “In 1861—65 it was a fight for States’ Rights. Today the Allied world is fighting for Democracy’s rights and the freedom of the world from autocracy.”\textsuperscript{151}

\textsuperscript{149} Ibid., 65.
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Fusing southern identity with a larger American mission, however, could be tricky for Daughters of the Confederacy. One member’s wartime poem, “Causes that Led to the War between the States,” mediated between the Daughters’ desire to preserve their southern distinctiveness and the need to be American in a time of war. Author Mrs. P. S. Summers described colonial American settlers of the North and South as “two mighty steams” of “Anglo Saxons” that united in the American Revolution, when they “obeyed the strongest characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race” by abolishing monarchical control. The poem continued by identifying northern aggression as the cause of the Civil War. Summers used the logic of race to unite southern and American identities, while still maintaining southern righteousness. Francesca Morgan describes how national UDC leaders made World War I Americanism palatable by “syncretizing it with neo-Confederate beliefs” and locating (or inventing) the white southern roots of American patriotism. In no other area was this clearer than in the support of the UDC and UCV—both nationally and in Texas—for Woodrow Wilson.

The Texas UDC, like other neo-Confederate organizations, found it easier to embrace the war effort and Americanism because the president was a white
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southerner. In a plea to members to take up war work, the president of the Texas Division noted that the Confederacy was “founded on the same broad principles upon which Woodrow Wilson and the Entente powers [allies] are now seeking to establish the League of Nations.”

Through WWI the UDC did not assume a broader vision of their mission as newly including Americanism and the support of democracy worldwide. Rather, members saw their southern ideals as the best and purest form of Americanism. The Division president asserted that southern principles were indeed key to ending the war. The Confederacy, she explained, “rose and fell without a stain, writing in blood its principles upon the heart of the nation to be moulded [sic] by the master Statesman, Woodrow Wilson, the son of a Confederate Veteran, into the fourteen points of peace, and the League of Nations to enforce a permanent peace.”

For the Daughters, Wilson’s actions at the end of the conflict flowed naturally from his Confederate heritage.

The UDC and DAR both supported the League of Nations but also became increasingly wary of international entanglements and dangers as the war came to a close. Past UDC president Mrs. J. C. Muse warned members about new immigrants who would bring “Bolshevism” and whose newspapers spread “socialist doctrines.” She advocated joining alongside other organizations in promoting Americanism (which was, at heart, based on southern principles) after
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the war. The Texas DAR annual meeting in 1919 was pervaded by calls to members to continue their Americanization efforts after the war. “America—Americanism—Americanization. These are to be our watchwords for the future,” warned Mrs. James Lowry Smith, lest the “European ideal” brought in by immigrants overwhelm American principles. Although other members claimed a “new international sympathy” after the war’s end, many more Daughters worried about the danger foreign people and ideas presented.\footnote{Ibid., 46.} 

The DRT was perhaps less marked by their experience in the Great War. After ignoring the early years of the conflict, the DRT moved to support President Wilson and U.S. entrance into the war in 1917. The DRT pledged “active support” and to “not make [a] special effort” to raise funds for monuments during the war.\footnote{PDAR, 1919, 51, 63.} Some DRT chapters took up volunteer work with the Red Cross, and a Houston chapter even sent a “telegram of loyalty” to President Wilson. But the DRT did not engage in any fundraising for the war effort as an organization. Still, like members of the DAR and UDC, some DRT members saw this moment as one in which their heritage was especially valuable. For Mrs. Hal Sevier, the legacy of her heritage—both Texan and American—became clearer on a world stage. She compared “Alamo heroes” with “the situation in the Russian revolution, when women had to go out and fight because their men hung back.” She continued, “The American man stands up and fights, not for his selfish interest, but for the greater cause of right.” While seeing their heritage reflected in

\footnote{PDRT, 1917, 13-23, 35.}
the American role in the conflict, the DRT did not work to aid the war effort as directly as the UDC or DAR did. In 1919, the DRT (like the UDC) passed a resolution praising Wilson and the League of Nations. Yet most of that year’s meeting—like the years before and the years after—was spent discussing the Alamo.  

**Conclusion: Defending the Alamo**

At the 1919 Annual Meeting of the DRT in Austin, a heated argument broke out over whether or not memorials to Bexar County’s World War I dead could be placed in the Alamo. Buoyed by a newspaper story, the “movement” to have memorials to the fallen WWI soldiers was supported by most members of the San Antonio chapter and the city public at large. But member Mrs. Pickerell objected to the inclusion of this war’s dead in the Alamo “shrine.” She prefaced her argument, “I would not disparage America’s part in that struggle [World War I] nor any brave youth, white or black, bond or free, who gave his life as part of that dear price we have paid for the world’s freedom.” But, Pickerell explained, the inclusion of the World War I memorials in the Alamo would “rob Texas of her individuality.” Other members joined in chorus, arguing that the only artifacts that rightfully belonged in the Alamo were those from the days of the Republic of Texas. Mrs. Kincaid, of the San Antonio chapter that backed the World War I memorials, requested that a public vote on the matter be taken, “so that all may know who refuses our boys this honor.” The debate continued, raising questions
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of power within the organization and whether the chain of command was followed. In the end, a motion was passed to allow the already-made memorials to remain in the Alamo only temporarily.\textsuperscript{161} The Daughters’ anxiety over allowing these memorials into the Alamo may seem petty in a time of war. However, they were working to maintain the Alamo’s strict alignment with their specific heritage. This alignment had been hard won in the years before the war, and the Daughters would not let their control of the Alamo slip out of their hands.

The DRT’s fight to preserve the Alamo began in the early twentieth century with the actions of two members, Adina De Zavala and Clara Driscoll. By the 1880s the Alamo chapel had been purchased by the state, but a grocery firm privately owned the large area around the original mission. De Zavala first proposed that the DRT work to preserve the mission in 1902.\textsuperscript{162} De Zavala diverged from average DRT members in her gender behavior, her sense of national belonging, and her conception of history. Granddaughter of Lorenzo De Zavala, a Mexican politician and vice president of the Republic of Texas, Adina De Zavala was also a scholar of Texas and Mexican history. She hoped to preserve the Alamo as it was in its mission days, while other Daughters—led by Clara Driscoll—wanted to demolish the covenant walls to make room for a park and monument (which would encourage commercial enterprise at and around the Alamo). Although Driscoll and De Zavala worked on the preservation of the Alamo together at first, tensions over the preservation of the walls grew, and

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., 63-69.
Driscoll used her wealth to assume control of the project by buying the property. De Zavala publicly protested and barricaded herself in the Alamo for several days, while increasingly negative publicity swirled around the Daughters. By court order in 1906, De Zavala and her chapter were removed from the DRT, and the walls were torn down.

The victory of wealthy Clara Driscoll was a victory for a conservative and business-oriented conception of the historic site. De Zavala was, according to anthropologist Richard Flores, “much more likely to define the Alamo in terms of all those who tread through its historical doors,” whereas Driscoll “was intent on interpreting it as a place that legitimated the ensuing social transformation and economic development” of the site.163 After the difficult and public battle over preserving a certain version of history at the Alamo, it is perhaps little wonder that the DRT guarded it so jealously—even from memorials to Texas World War I soldiers.

The preservation of the Alamo was the major achievement of the Texas Daughters in the early twentieth century, and it still stands—in some ways, as a symbol of their conservatism, but also as a symbol of the alternative and more progressive currents that found voice in all three organizations in this era. De Zavala envisioned an Alamo that was molded by the presence of Indians, Spaniards, and Mexicans as well as Anglo-Americans, rather the bifurcated narrative of Anglo vs. Mexican that the DRT came to offer in their historical

narrative of the Alamo. De Zavala was eventually silenced, but she was not alone. DRT historian Nettie Houston Bringhamurst advocated for a less divisive and racially discriminatory version of Texas history years after De Zavala’s ousting. Along with those in the DRT, UDC, and DAR who showed subtle support for suffrage, De Zavala and Bringhamurst indicated that progressive voices had not been entirely silenced among the Daughters in the Progressive Era.

---
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CHAPTER 3: THE DAUGHTERS IN THE INTERWAR ERA: DEVELOPING CONSERVATIVE ALLIANCES

The interwar period is sometimes labeled as the beginning of the “doldrums” of women’s political action in the United States. While women had united victorious to gain the ballot in the early twentieth century, a solid women’s voting bloc failed to emerge afterwards. Efforts to put the ideals behind the suffrage movement into action (such as the campaign for the Equal Rights Amendment) and liberal women’s political coalitions met with harsh criticism.165 Historians also depict the end of World War I as the beginning of an era of declining influence and authority for white women’s heritage organizations. Karen Cox sees the mission of the UDC as essentially accomplished by 1920, as national acceptance of the Lost Cause narrative marked “sectional reconciliation on the Daughters’ terms.” After the Great War, Cox explains, the UDC did not return to its signature campaign—the construction of memorials to honor the Confederacy—with the same enthusiasm and determination shown by members at the turn of the twentieth century.166 Francesca Morgan argues that the interwar period marked the DAR’s political shift to the right as well as the “masculinization” of the organization’s work. As the DAR’s mission centered more on celebrating

and aiding men’s achievements than women’s, she argues, the ideals of the DAR became increasingly derivative of male political and club leaders.\footnote{Morgan generally presents the movement of the DAR, UDC, and other women’s heritage and patriotic organizations toward “men centered nationalism” as a loss, because it marked the end of ideals of unique female cultural authority and more unified concepts of “woman.” Francesca Morgan, \textit{Women and Patriotism in Jim Crow America} (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 140.}

However, emergent scholarship on the history of conservative white women suggests that the interwar period was not one of decline for all women’s political action and organization. The interwar period may mark the beginning of a gradual and unsteady development of a sense of belonging among conservative white women in the U.S.\footnote{Catherine E. Rymph, \textit{Republican Women: Feminism and Conservatism from Suffrage through the Rise of the New Right} (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 62; June Melby Benowitz, \textit{Days of Discontent: American Women and Right-Wing Politics, 1933-1945} (De Kalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2002), 75.} Many white women in the interwar period held a range of political beliefs that could not be categorized as uniformly conservative or liberal.\footnote{Pamela Tyler’s work on New Orleans women reveals that the 1930s marked a clear departure of middle- and upper-class white women away from purely private club work and into politics. Most of the women Tyler studies were moderates rather than conservatives, but the political activity of these women who “carried no feminist banner” is suggestive of the under-studied importance of women’s political action outside the scope of feminism and liberalism. Pamela Tyler, \textit{Silk Stockings and Ballot Boxes: Women and Politics in New Orleans, 1920-1963} (Athens: The University Press of Georgia, 1996), 238-252.} However, what distinguishes this period in terms of conservative and right-wing politics is that women played an active role in both independent hard right and conservative party-aligned organizations, independently as women and alongside men.\footnote{Chip Bertlet and Matthew N. Lyons, \textit{Right-Wing Populism in America: Too Close for Comfort} (New York: The Guilford Press, 2000), 135.} Kirsten Delegard’s exciting new work, \textit{Battling Miss...}
Bolsheviki: The Origins of Female Conservatism in the United States, provides compelling evidence that the anti-communist efforts of the national DAR and American Legion Auxiliary led to the emergence of the first distinct and multi-issue conservative women’s coalition in the US. Delegard’s work suggests that the cooperation of national-level DAR and American Legion Auxiliary leaders facilitated the mobilization of larger groups of anti-radical women. She focuses primarily on how the Bolshevik Revolution and the imagined domestic communist menace united conservative women. I argue that the Texas DAR, UDC, and DRT were part of the phenomenon described by Delegard but also hope to show a more multi-faceted view of how the Daughters came to an understanding of themselves as conservative. Texas Daughters seized on the vote after women’s suffrage passed, and through collaboration with one another and with the right-wing American Legion, became interested in a wider variety of political, social, and economic issues. The Daughters leaned to the right in most of their beliefs, but in ways that could be complex. For example, Daughters opposed “so-called social equality” for black Americans, who they saw as racially inferior. Daughters also understood Americans of Mexican descent as belonging to a different race, but unlike many white Texans, many did not see Chicanos as inferior or threatening. In fact, in the interwar era some Daughters took an active role in helping Chicanos claim the rights and privileges of US citizenship.
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This chapter also introduces another subject of analysis alongside the DAR, UDC, and DRT. Ida Mercedes Darden of Fort Worth was not a member of any of these organizations, but as later chapters will show, she maintained key connections to them. More importantly, Darden was a prominent and outspoken white woman conservative author and activist whose work served as an inspiration to far right conservatives in and outside the state. In the interwar era, Darden had not yet built her connections to white women’s heritage organizations and had only begun her career as a writer. However, her hard right perspectives on suffrage and communism provide useful comparative points to those of the Daughters as Texan conservative white women negotiated a new era of political involvement and international awareness.

**A New Kind of Citizenship: The Daughters become Voters**

The fight for woman’s suffrage in Texas was, unlike that in most southern states, a story of victory. Decades before the National American Women Suffrage Association’s introduction of its regionally targeted strategy in the 1890s, male and female supporters of woman suffrage brought discussion of the “woman question” into the public sphere. Texas suffragists also maintained a positive and reciprocal relationship with national women’s suffrage organizations. National leaders viewed the state as one of strategic importance and unique promise among southern settings. By 1915 suffragists and anti-suffragists (both men and women) became increasingly vocal, and woman’s suffrage was almost passed by the Texas House of Representatives. Public support for woman suffrage grew,
and Texas women won the right to vote in primary elections in 1918. On June 28, 1919, Texas became the first southern state—one of only a handful—to ratify the Nineteenth Amendment.¹⁷³

This legacy left Texas Daughters in a unique position relative to other conservative-leaning women in the South. Many Daughters shared the ideal of domestic womanhood and fear of black empowerment espoused by the state’s anti-suffragists.¹⁷⁴ But while other southern states could (and did) deem the Nineteenth Amendment to be yet another federal assault on state sovereignty, Texas had irrefutably proven its commitment to woman suffrage. In Texas, the DRT, UDC, and DAR responded to the enfranchisement of women enthusiastically.

Discussion at the 1920 meeting of the Texas UDC revealed how the specific state experience of these Daughters allowed them to claim their newfound political authority without fear. Governor William P. Hobby, a fervent supporter of woman suffrage whose election to office was largely attributed to the

¹⁷³ Jessica S. Brannon-Wranosky, “Southern Promise and Necessity: Texas, Regional Identity, and the National Woman Suffrage Movement, 1868-1920” (PhD diss., University of North Texas, August 2010), 10, 12, 14, 189, 211, 216-226. At the local level in Texas, some white suffragists worked with black and Mexican women. The former Confederate states that passed woman suffrage were Texas, Arkansas, and Tennessee. Brannon-Wranosky embraces a more expansive definition of “southern” states in her dissertation, and she identifies Oklahoma, Missouri, Kentucky, and West Virginia as other southern states that ratified the Nineteenth amendment. See footnote 12, page 13 of Brannon-Wranosky, “Southern Promise and Necessity.”
¹⁷⁴ In Texas, pre-suffrage discourse was often connected to pro-nativist opposition to political machines. The Texas Democratic Party bundled its support of woman suffrage with its endorsement of a citizenship clause to restrict immigrants’ ability to vote. However, in the main it was anti-suffragists rather than suffragists that brought discussion of race and ethnicity into the debate.
passage of primary suffrage for women, appeared before the convention. At the opening of the convention, he and UDC leader Mrs. J. C. Muse escorted a Confederate veteran to the stage who remarked, “Ladies, now that the Nineteenth Amendment is adopted I feel like calling you comrades.” Division president Mrs. Oscar Barthold added to the convention’s “delightful celebration” with her narrative of how Texas women gained the right to vote. She exclaimed:

Lo! We find the spirit of celebration for tomorrow’s golden opportunities with unlimited power at our command—the ballot. So courteous and gallant were the members of the thirty-sixth legislature that only a few slight skirmishes on the part of the devotees of Woman Suffrage were necessary ‘ere they surrendered, and handed the ballot on a silver waiter to the old fashioned women of the State whether they care for it or not.  

Barthold’s retelling seized without trepidation on the “unlimited power” offered to Texas white women through the ballot. But she also assured members that the fight for suffrage did not alter gender norms, particularly those of “old fashioned” women in the UDC and gentlemen politicians who had aided the Daughter’s pet projects for years before woman suffrage.  

Barthold and the Texas Division acted immediately on the fact of woman’s enfranchisement by passing resolutions encouraging members to endorse, work for, and vote in support of a proposed educational amendment to the state constitution. The convention also passed a resolution brought by the Confederate veterans in support of a bill that would return federal funds collected from the Civil War and Reconstruction-era cotton tax to the southern states from which
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they were collected. Those funds would then be used to support Confederate veterans and their widows.\textsuperscript{177}

In the later 1920s and 1930s, the UDC’s attention to voting and specific items of legislation emerged primarily in relation to issues that, like the return of the cotton tax, clearly intersected with the concerns of Confederate veterans and widows, and the memory of the Confederacy.\textsuperscript{178} UDC leaders encouraged members to write their elected officials and make them aware of the “UDC program,” especially its imperative to honor southern heroes. “We should let the politicians know that the time has passed when they shall be too cowardly to speak the name of Jefferson Davis,” one member noted.\textsuperscript{179} While the Lost Cause narrative appeared securely hegemonic in Texas schools in the Progressive Era, Daughters saw their message as under attack in the 1930s. In 1936 the president of the Texas UDC issued a warning to members that “[t]here is in our land an unseen, insidious force” working to force “pictures, books and statues of the heroes of another section of our country into our own public schools, buildings and parks.” She acknowledged that true southerners who protested such actions were often perceived as bitter and narrow minded. But, she asserted, members must “force the issue and demand that all this

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{177} Ibid., 116, 118.
  \item \textsuperscript{178} For example, the Texas UDC supported a federal bill to term the Civil War the “War Between the States” and state legislation to support the Confederate home and other UDC projects. PUDC, 1922, 115; PUDC, 1928, 15; PUDC, 1933, 64, 65.
  \item \textsuperscript{179} PUDC, 1923, 154; PUDC, 1925, 57; PUDC, 1930, 105.
\end{itemize}
propaganda be uprooted” and to further insist that “our tax money” be used to honor southern heroes and ideals.  

The DRT was more cautious in its embrace of politics and the ballot; its leaders preferred to continue to employ their personal connections and social standing to convince legislators to pass DRT aims. At the 1920 DRT meeting, a male speaker endorsed equal suffrage (alongside prohibition) as a method of protecting the domestic sphere, but mention of suffrage or women’s political voice was otherwise largely absent from discussion. Later during the meeting, executive committee member Cornelia Stone asked the convention to endorse Clara Driscoll Sevier, a fellow DRT executive committee member, as a Texas delegate to that year’s national Democratic Convention. Sevier quickly responded that she could not accept such an endorsement; she explained, “I could not allow this organization, being a patriotic organization, to enter into politics.” Others agreed that Sevier’s actions were in good taste, and members moved to another topic.  

While the idea of acting politically as individuals remained largely unheard of in interwar era DRT meetings, the organization did engage with (mostly state-level) politics. Organizational leaders and the DRT legislation committee communicated directly with men in politics to gain appropriations for DRT projects and enact legislation promoting Texas history and the Texas flag.  

DRT members even praised the 1928 state Democratic Convention platform for
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maintaining fidelity to “the wishes and suggestions of the DRT” with regard to the future of the Alamo property.”

More than the DAR and even the UDC, DRT objectives—whether they necessitated entry into politics or not—rarely expanded beyond issues directly related to the DRT and its properties. That the DRT was the oldest of the three organizations, and the lineage it celebrated perhaps the most rare, led DRT members to consider themselves particularly elite. The elite standing of the organization, supported by the array of properties it owned and the upper-class position of most of its members, perhaps encouraged the DRT to remain especially conservative in its representation of gendered citizenship and to employ the same political strategies and conception of the organizations’ role in politics as before 1920.

However, individual DRT members may have been as politically engaged as DAR and UDC members. The DRT maintained connections to organizations, such as the DAR and American Legion, that focused on broader national and international issues. Many DRT members also shared UDC and/or DAR lineage, and sometimes membership. A speech made by a DRT member visiting the 1930 Texas DAR convention revealed how in different settings, individual DRT members assumed more politically engaged positions. DRT president Mrs. T. A. Armstrong began her address to the DAR by delineating the “strong band of fellowship” between the two organizations. The DRT and DAR shared more than
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appreciation for history and tradition, Armstrong explained. “We have a unity of purpose in protecting our country from the insidious propaganda which undermines governments and in upholding the high principles upon which our Nation was founded.” While “insidious propaganda,” “lurking communism,” “negro-ism,” and other right-wing lingo remained absent from DRT meetings in the interwar era, individual members—especially those who cultivated relationships with the DAR—may have aligned with the more activist conservative tenets of the DAR and American Legion.

The interwar era marked the beginning of the DAR’s turn to the right and toward a more expansive political awareness. While at least some members were reluctant to campaign for woman’s right to vote, once suffrage was achieved DAR leaders seized on the ballot as a way to achieve organizational aims. In turn, DAR objectives became more entangled with contemporary political issues. By the 1930s, the DAR aligned itself with the “intelligent, conservative majority” that maintained good government in the US, and it saw the vote as a critical way to assert its agenda.

The 1920 DAR convention opened with a call to members to “take their rightful place in the public affairs of the country, seeing to it that proper persons are elected to office.” Mrs. James Lowry Smith acknowledged that, due to the “long years the nation has neglected to use its woman power,” all American women were “more or less ignorant of the weighty matters of government.” Yet,
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she argued, DAR members must dedicate time to the study of “the principles on which our government is founded” so that they may “play a noble part in the future administration of public affairs.” Other members echoed Smith’s enthusiasm for “our newly gained citizenship,” as well as her understanding that this privilege required a new dedication to political education and awareness.\textsuperscript{187}

Each chapter maintained a legislative chairman to brief the chapter on current national and state legislation, particularly that which related to issues of the home. In the 1920s male politicians, frequent guest speakers at DAR meetings for many years, began to focus more on specific items of legislation and a wider variety of foreign and international issues.\textsuperscript{188}

In some ways, DAR members understood their exercise of the ballot as shaped by—although perhaps not restricted by—gender. Members were instructed to vote “for the sake of our children,” and the organization maintained particular focus on issues regarding education and youth through the 1920s and 1930s. Leaders’ rhetoric deployed the symbol of the child to build support for an increasingly right-wing anti-communist agenda.\textsuperscript{189} Speaking in 1938 against a bill that would restrict child labor, state regent Mrs. Maurice Clark Turner asserted, “we do not care for our youth to be controlled through federal legislation directed and outlined by un-American liberals.” After railing against communists and liberals and the vast array of problems they were creating, Turner added, “We are women—yes—but we are voters; we are striving to emulate the standards

\textsuperscript{187} PDAR ,1920, 26, 38, 44.
\textsuperscript{188} PDAR, 1928, 70-71, 77, 169; DAR 1929, 19.
\textsuperscript{189} PDAR, 1935, 71.
expected of us by the men—and we are encouraged when men of ability and eminence express approval of us.”¹⁹⁰ This statement appears to confirm Francesca Morgan’s argument that as the DAR turned to the right, it became increasingly “men-centered.”

But state regent Turner’s praise of “men of ability and eminence” was more reflective of the DAR’s new alliances with conservative men and men’s organizations than of a desire to surrender political authority to men generally. Throughout the interwar period, DAR members were encouraged to vote but were not instructed to consult with husbands or other male authority figures before doing so. Indeed, in 1930 state chairman Mary Prescott Duff explained that many chapter members not only “used their ears and telephones and did their part in getting out the voters” in the recent primary election, but they also told fellow Daughters, neighbors, friends, and perhaps even husbands how to vote.¹⁹¹

While Duff also proudly noted, “it is said the women elected the new Governor,” DAR members began to distance themselves from progressive women, especially in the 1930s.¹⁹² National Defense committee chairman Sarah Weaver noted with indignation that it was a woman legislator who blocked a DAR-supported state bill requiring public school teachers to sign an oath of

¹⁹⁰ PDAR, 1938, 73. The DAR’s opposition to “federal control” of youth in 1938 revealed just how far to the right the organization moved by the end of the interwar era. Less than ten years earlier, the Texas DAR made a resolution advocating the adoption of a Department of Home and Child in the presidential cabinet. PDAR, 1930, 196.
¹⁹¹ PDAR, 1930, 162.
¹⁹² Ibid., 201.
allegiance.\textsuperscript{193} DAR leaders began to suspect liberal-leaning women’s organizations, particularly the Young Women’s Christian Association and League of Women Voters, of being infiltrated by “pacifist, socialist, and even inter-racialist propaganda.” Such female propagandists were portrayed as “well-meaning” and merely “dupes and tools of an international conspiracy” rather than full-blooded un-American agitators.\textsuperscript{194} But the perceived susceptibility of these less-conservative women’s organizations to radical “isms” led the DAR to align less with women’s club and benevolent organizations and more with conservative organizations such as the National Association for Constitutional Government and the American Legion.

Ida Darden’s interwar political work suggested that, for conservative white women, an apparent belief in gender inequality could be reflective of political connections rather than a dedicated adherence to a restricted conception of (conservative) women’s political engagement. After her husband’s death in 1908 left her to support herself and her newborn daughter, Ida Darden took work as a secretary and lobbyist for the Texas Businessmen’s Association, which opposed woman suffrage (as well as protective labor bills). As a lobbyist Darden gained connections to a number of important conservative Texas politicians, and through these connections she was appointed publicity director for the Texas Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage. Darden did express the view that women were

\textsuperscript{193} She resolved that the organization should make this demand part of “our election campaign” for the future, and indeed, by 1936 a teacher’s oath bill passed largely due to the persistent efforts of the Texas DAR and American Legion rather than aid from other women’s organizations. PDAR, 1932, 183; PDAR, 1936, 131.

\textsuperscript{194} PDAR, 1934, 153.
biologically incapable of making political decisions. But like the DAR, she also connected women (and woman suffrage) to the spread of an insidious communist and socialist conspiracy.\(^{195}\)

Darden did not retreat from politics after 1920 but instead dedicated the rest of her life to conservative causes. For over a decade she worked behind the scenes as a lobbyist, but in 1932 she ran for Congress with the support of the founder of the Texas Businessmen’s Association, John Henry Kirby. Kirby was also a former opponent of woman suffrage, and he continued to oppose women in politics generally. Yet he made an exception for Darden, “one of the most outstanding leaders of the Democratic party,” whose “knowledge of the Constitution and her devotion to its cardinal principles was not surpassed by that of any man.” Darden believed in the “original purity” of the Constitution and dedicated herself to strictly uphold its principles if elected. Despite Kirby’s backing, Darden lost the Democratic Party primary. Darden did not run for office again but moved deeper into Texas politics in other ways. She relocated to Houston, where she built new connections to wealthy New Deal opponents and began work on her first book, a political satire drenched in right-wing rhetoric titled *Gentleman of the House*.\(^{196}\)

As a lobbyist, political candidate, and author, Darden did not allow her apparent belief in most women’s mental inferiority and susceptibility to radicalism to interfere with her expression of her own


conservative ideals. Neither did the members of the DAR, with whom Darden shared an opposition to welfare programs, government spending, and liberal “tampering” with the Constitution.

**A New Alliance: The Daughters and the American Legion**

As the Daughters became more politically active and aware, organizations began to build alliances with conservative organizations and politicians in the state. Members of equivalent male lineage organizations such as the Sons of the American Revolution (SAR) and the Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV) were clear potential allies for the Daughters. Many of these men shared political ideals as well as heritage with the Daughters. Yet as DAR state regent Mae Wynne McFarland noted in 1921, while the DAR had become “the largest Woman’s Organization in the world,” its male equivalent the SAR had all but disappeared. “[A]nd the Sons of the American Revolution, Where O, Where are they?” she asked Daughters, “Will they ever advance? Methinks I hear the answer when Poe’s Raven cries, ‘Never More, Nevermore.’”

McFarland overstated the irrelevance of the SAR, but her thoughts reflected an important development in the DAR as well as the UDC and DRT. The Daughters did seek out male allies in this period, but not primarily among the SAR, SCV, or Sons of the Republic of Texas. Instead, the Daughters developed a particularly cozy relationship with the newly formed American Legion. This association of World War I veterans boasted a much larger membership than other male veteran and veteran heritage organizations, as well as a broader
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mission. Veterans’ issues such as pensions and disability services were part of the Legion’s program, but the organization’s core purpose was to promote “100 per cent Americanism” and combat all “anti-American tendencies, activities, and propaganda.” Like the DAR, the Legion was officially non-political, but its members followed legislation closely and with pens at the ready to fire off angry letters to opponents of the Legion’s conservative ideals. The Legion maintained a powerful lobby in Washington, D. C., which they claimed seldom lost a legislative battle. Membership numbers and political influence made the Legion a much more useful ally than other male veteran and heritage organizations.

The DAR, UDC, and DRT collaborated with the American Legion, and its female American Legion Auxiliary, on a number of projects. The celebration of patriotic holidays and the memorializing of historical and recent military heroes were part of the Legion’s pro-Americanism strategy. Legionnaires were also dedicated to celebrating and protecting the American flag. As active and longtime proponents of these patriotic aims, the Daughters were natural allies with the Legion, especially at the local level. Daughters joined with the American Legion and its Auxiliary when they attended their meetings (and vice versa), collaborated with them on relief projects, and made floats for their parades.


200 PDAR, 1920, 29; PUDC, 1920, 98; PDRT, 1921, 51; PUDC, 1922, 28; PDAR, 1923, 29, PDRT, 1929, 31; PDAR, 1930, 19; PDRT, 1930, 27; PDAR, 1933, 91, 151; PUDC,
1931 the Texas American Legion even successfully requested that the Texas UDC make a resolution “That [the] Rebel yell be learned authentically, and taught correctly, so as to be handed down to posterity.”

But the Legion did not only dictate orders to the Daughters. The Daughters aided in the creation of the American Legion’s textbook, *The Story of Our American People*. The Legion hoped to create a “thoroughly American and patriotic United States textbook” but relied heavily on other organizations including the UDC and DAR to develop its content. First published in 1925, the book offered a celebratory account of the past that not only aligned with the DAR and UDC’s understanding of the Revolution and Civil War but also sewed those historical memories to the Legion’s explicitly conservative political ideology.

According to *The Story of Our American People*, liberalism was “risky,” and those who urged radical change drew their support from the dregs of society.

Conservatism, by contrast, proceeded cautiously because “it sees clearly the good in present things and knows the dangers of change.”
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The president of the Texas UDC considered the American Legion Auxiliary to be a “sister patriotic organization” alongside the UDC, DAR, and DRT. PUDC, 1935, 61.

201 Oran M. Roberts Chapter, UDC, “Introductory to Report on Texas Division UDC Convention,” Chapter Minutes, meeting of October 20, 1931.

202 Gellerman, *American Legion as Educator*, 219-220; Charles F. Horne, *The Story of Our American People Volume Two—The United States* (New York: National Alumni, 1926), 42-43. While the UDC may have been alarmed by the book’s use of the term “War of Secession” to describe what they called “The War between the States,” the book’s reconciliatory stance situated the North and South as moral equals, agreed
Members of the DAR particularly connected with the Legion’s conservative message and its ideal of “100 per cent Americanism.” DAR members and Legionnaires collaborated on charity projects such as a hospital for WWI veterans in Kerrville and public events aimed at promoting Americanism, such as flag-raising ceremonies on patriotic holidays. Members of the Legion and its female Auxiliary were frequent guests at Texas DAR National Defense meetings, where they would have found much to approve.\(^{203}\) The DAR’s National Defense committee’s two-fold objective was to “support adequate national defense and to counteract subversive influences.” Subversive influences included all forms of “modern radicalism” but specifically bolshevism, communism, and socialism.\(^{204}\)

The National Defense committee encouraged members to read work on immigration by Senator David A. Reed, the co-author of the 1924 Immigration Act. This act, which the Legion counted as one of its successful lobbying efforts, restricted immigration from southern and eastern Europe (supposed communist hotbeds).\(^{205}\) The DAR joined the Legion in opposing communism internationally through opposition to US recognition of Soviet Russia (both the DAR and the Legion were greatly disheartened by Roosevelt’s recognition of Russia in
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\(^{203}\) First created in 1926, the National Defense committee soon emerged as one of the most vigorously-supported DAR ventures, eventually requiring a separate “National Defense” meeting day at the DAR annual conventions. PDAR, 1921, 47; PDAR, 1924, 97; PDAR 1932, 183.

\(^{204}\) PDAR, 1928, 176.
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1933). The DAR also joined the Legion’s hunt for communists supposedly lurking on the home front through their shared support of Representative Martin Dies, Jr., a Texas Democrat and staunch anti-communist. The DAR worked with particular diligence toward securing a state-wide measure requiring all public school teachers to swear an oath of loyalty to the United States. Texas DAR members began campaigning for a teacher’s oath in 1930, writing hundreds of letters to their representatives, and did not cease their efforts until it became state law in 1936. Their actions were in accordance with those of the Legion, who spearheaded efforts to secure teachers’ loyalty oaths across the country.

The alliance between the Daughters (particularly the DAR) and the American Legion was significant because of the Legion’s prominence in the right-wing politics of the interwar and Cold War period. The Legion’s officially non-political stance may have actually boosted the organization’s influence. By WWII many of the nation’s governors and legislators were members of the American Legion, as were many local politicians. Although the Legion did not endorse
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candidates, its lobbying efforts won it recognition from the American Civil Liberties Union as “the most active agency in intolerance and repression in the United States.” The Daughters’ work with the American Legion reveals their exposure to, and frequently alignment with, the Legion’s right wing agenda.

Richard Seeyle Jones’s *A History of the American Legion*, written with the support and cooperation of the Legion in 1946, argued that the organization’s efforts to combat un-Americanism formed only ten per cent of its Americanism program but received ninety per cent of the public’s attention. While Jones’s statement is part of a work that aimed to exonerate the Legion from categorization as a witch-hunting organization, there was an important element of truth to his argument. While the percentage breakdown may not be correct, what Jones calls the “other ninety per cent” of the Legion’s Americanism program—its “educational enterprise” encouraging study of the nation’s history, celebration of historical heroes and special days, and honoring of the American flag—is historically significant as well. Local Legionnaires’ parades and holiday celebrations both boosted the organization’s standing in communities and its authority as the voice of patriotism. These less-well-known Legion activities were frequently carried out with the assistance of the Daughters.

**A New Threat: Communism**

The activities of the Legion and the DAR were an important part of an evolving anti-communist sentiment in interwar Texas and the U.S. The first Red
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Scare in the U.S. emerged in reaction to the 1917 Russian Revolution and domestic labor activism. Bomb attacks made by (or attributed to) communists and anarchists in the U.S. alongside the emergence of the Soviet state brewed fears of an international communist conspiracy. These fears led to the justification of the Palmer Raids, wherein thousands of suspected radical immigrants were rounded up and arrested or held. A second Red Scare did not emerge until the end of WWII. But fervent anti-communist activists kept fear of communists, socialists, and other radicals in public discourse between the wars.

At the helm of anti-communist activism was a coalition of self-proclaimed patriotic organizations. The American Legion and its Auxiliary united with a host of older veterans’ and heritage organizations such as the DAR, SAR, and UDC to root out so-called communists at home and prevent the entrance of foreign radicals to the U.S. Conservative-minded women’s organizations particularly rallied behind the anti-communist effort. Kirsten Delegard identifies the coalition of the DAR and American Legion Auxiliary, solidified on the national level by the mid-1920s, as the first identifiably conservative women’s bloc in the U.S.

In Texas, the UDC and DRT responded to this atmosphere of simmering anti-communism and attendant conservative women’s activism in different ways. The UDC interpreted the communist threat and its patriotic antidote through a
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214 Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki*, 93, 143.
Confederate lens. At annual conventions in the early 1920s, UDC leaders connected the recent war and its aftermath to a God-given right to secession and compared contemporary anarchists and communists to antebellum abolitionists.\textsuperscript{215} For the UDC, Confederate heritage was not only synonymous with Americanism, it was the apex of Americanism. In 1920 President Mrs. Oscar Barthold claimed, “the world is looking to America for leadership and America is looking to the South for leadership—and the South is looking to the loyal sons and daughters of Confederate lineage for leadership.” She pressed the Daughters to weave southern principles into “every phase of Americanization.”\textsuperscript{216}

Americanism did not receive much attention from Texas UDC leaders after the first Red Scare. However, local and state-level collaborations with the American Legion, American Legion Auxiliary, and DAR provided the UDC occasional opportunities to hitch its Lost Cause message to the Americanism bandwagon. Meanwhile, the DRT remained largely outside of the discourse. Annie Webb Blanton made a pro-Americanism speech at the 1921 annual DRT meeting; but she was a guest speaker, not a member.\textsuperscript{217} The DRT’s lack of a nation-wide membership likely contributed to the organization’s more insular focus. However, DRT members looking to be more involved in fighting the communist menace would not have to wander far from their own meetings.

\textsuperscript{215} PUDC, 1923, 75-77; PUDC, 1920, 42-43.
\textsuperscript{216} PUDC, 1920, 45.
Members of the American Legion, American Legion Auxiliary, and DAR were invited guests and local collaborators for the DRT as well as the UDC in Texas.

The Texas DAR was in lockstep with the national organization’s anti-communist agenda. Immediately moved by a feared communist threat after the war, the Texas DAR’s anti-communist activism ramped up in the mid-1920s and became a multi-tiered assault by the 1930s. DAR leaders in the newly formed National Defense committee took the lead in awakening members to the dangers. Texas National Defense committee chairwoman Mrs. James Lowry Smith explained that Bolshevism, communism, and socialism were “all a form of modern radicalism” and as such were bound by the same six principles. Other members referred to these principles as the “six abolitions”: the abolition of government, religion, family relations, patriotism, private property, and rights of inheritance.\(^{218}\) This tailored reduction of the Communist Manifesto focused on the ways in which communism particularly threatened DAR members as women of prized heritage and inherited priviledge. Daughters were particularly concerned about the danger that radicalism posed to children, and the DAR believed that as women, they had they authority and responsibility to lead youth to 100 percent Americanism. As the 1920s rolled into the 1930s, members became increasingly concerned about communism infiltrating schools. In response, the DAR

\(^{218}\) PDAR, 1928, 176; PDAR, 1920, 36-37; PDAR, 1929, 179; PDAR, 1937, 76.
advocated for a statewide teacher’s oath (of allegiance to the nation) and ousted suspicious teachers locally.\textsuperscript{219}

DAR members feared that radicals particularly targeted children and young adults. The Daughters believed that communists encouraged children to defy parental authority and the law in a mission to destroy all capitalists. The DAR believed these radicals encouraged children to become dependent on the federal government while simultaneously instructing them to spit on the American flag.\textsuperscript{220} For the Daughters, the Communist assault on youth was exemplified by the Young Pioneers, the children’s affiliate of the Communist Party USA. Because the Daughters saw the “six principles” as perfect antitheses to their own mission, they understood the Young Pioneers as specifically designed to threaten patriotic children’s organizations such as the Boy Scouts and the Children of the American Revolution.\textsuperscript{221}

In the early 1930s the Texas DAR began maintaining a collection of alleged communist propaganda in Austin—and some local chapters maintained their own collections as well—in order to educate members and other responsible citizens about such dangers.\textsuperscript{222} \textit{Who are the Young Pioneers?}, the Young Pioneers’ introductory pamphlet, was a likely piece in such collections. Daughters would find their worst fears about radical youth organizing confirmed by the

\textsuperscript{220} PDAR, 1926, 50-51; PDAR, 1930, 76, 202; PDAR, 1935, 73.
\textsuperscript{221} PDAR, 1929, 53; PDAR, 1930, 202.
\textsuperscript{222} PDAR, 1930, 34, 201; PDAR, 1931, 193; PDAR, 1932, 181.
contents of the pamphlet. Issued in 1934, *Who are the Young Pioneers?* was a call to workers’ children of all races and backgrounds to unite for friendship, fun, and working class solidarity.

*Who are the Young Pioneers?* by Martha Campion presented a collection of “all true” stories of workers’ children who called their fathers “scabs,” organized strikes in schools, and demanded free lunches and clothing. Campion assured children that in the Young Pioneers, their actions and beliefs would be truly valued. The pamphlet asserted that children played central roles in directing and maintaining the Young Pioneers.223 This was a marked contrast to the multiple layers of adult supervision built into the structure of heritage organization auxiliaries such as the Children of the American Revolution, Children of the Republic of Texas, and Children of the Confederacy.

The pamphlet handled the subject of domestic revolution and radical action carefully.224 But *Who are the Young Pioneers?* heaped praise on Russia, depicting it as a paradise for workers, and particularly for workers’ children.

According to the pamphlet, children in the Soviet Union “ran the schools,” having the ability to suggest changes to the curriculum and even possessing pathways

---


224 Campion wrote that the Young Pioneers worked toward the formation of a “new system, a new kind of government, in which America will really belong to the workers who have made it.” But she also emphasized that the overthrow of government would only be achieved with the support of a majority of the working class. A character in one story explained, “the reds in this strike are not working to overthrow the government. They're fighting with the rest of the workers for decent wages...A few reds can’t start a revolution by themselves here in Brooklyn.” Campion, *Who are the Young Pioneers?,* 8.
to remove dull teachers. The Soviet Union was also home to many children’s theatres, publishing houses, sports meets, camps, and orchestras—directed and maintained primarily by the children themselves, according to the pamphlet. “Pioneers of the Soviet Union have every chance to be what they want to be, and to do the sort of work they like,” Campion assured readers.\textsuperscript{225}

Who are the Young Pioneers? further denounced the construction of American patriotism that the Daughters prized so highly. The pamphlet concluded with a series of frequently asked questions, one of which was, “Should Workers’ Children Join the Boy Scouts?” The Daughters, along with the Legion, saw the Boy Scouts as a patriotic ally and as “a modern knighthood” of “strongholds for future America.”\textsuperscript{226} Who are the Young Pioneers? asserted that the Boy Scouts was a minion of the “boss class” and served as a training ground for the foot soldiers of capitalist wars. Its patriotism was so false it necessitated scare quotes:

\begin{quote}
The “patriotism” of the Boy Scouts and the bosses means defending the government and the property of rich and corrupt millionaires and their politicians, and preventing the workers from getting a living from their labor…The Boy Scouts and the bosses call being willing to give your life or health or killing workers of other countries or fighting workers of your own country “Love of Country.”\textsuperscript{227}
\end{quote}

The Young Pioneers loved their country too, the author asserted, but they wanted all workers to share the country’s resources and beauty.

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{225} Ibid., 18-21.
\item\textsuperscript{226} PDAR, 1932, 69.
\item\textsuperscript{227} Campion, Who are the Young Pioneers?, 26.
\end{footnotes}
One story in *Who are the Young Pioneers?* might have drawn particular attention from Texas Daughters. “A Pioneer of the South” presented the narrative of Leslie, a Young Pioneer living in the black belt under the sharecropping system (his race is not explicitly given). The story explains how sharecropping trapped black farmers in a system of near-slavery, and how farmers’ efforts to unionize were met with capitalist resistance and Klan violence. Jim Crow was yet another manifestation of the capitalist strategy of diving workers by race and ethnicity, the story asserted, but white sharecroppers in the South were beginning to wake up. Interracial collaboration particularly infuriated the southern capitalist establishment, so it fell to Leslie and his Young Pioneer comrades to serve as lookouts for union meetings. Leslie and his friends appeared as “small dark figures” in the dead of night, distributing leaflets to croppers before crouching by the side of the road watching for the approach of the Klan or the sheriff.228

Campion’s depiction may have been drawn from an actual Young Pioneer’s life experience, or perhaps this narrative was a more fictionalized account that played into childhood games of playing spy and lookout. Regardless, the image of dark children hiding in the shadows, distributing radical literature and protecting interracial meetings, played into Daughters’ fears that the communist threat was also linked to what they variously termed “interracialism,” “Negro-ism,” or “so-called social equality.”229 As historians such

228 Ibid., 11-13.
229 PDAR, 1930, 61, 218.
as Glenda Gilmore have documented, the modern civil rights movement did have roots in interwar US communism.\(^{230}\) Southern anti-communists kept black and white Communists well in check, and the activism of specific black southern Communists was apparently too underground to receive mention in the Daughters’ meetings. However, the quiet march of “so-called social equality” in the interwar period sounded alarm bells to the Daughters. Each organization paid tribute to a specific national lineage, but the Daughters shared an understanding of their heritage as white, as well as an understanding that white heritage was worthy of celebration and protection.

**The “Call of Blood and Race”: Racial Conservatism among the Daughters**

Texas Daughters negotiated racial boundaries in several ways. UDC meetings were especially replete with praise for white and “Anglo-Saxon” heritage. UDC members understood whiteness as a part of their identity that was both more than and epitomized by their southern heritage. Anglo-Saxon heritage, they believed, was imbued with a natural tendency toward the defense of individual liberty and self-government. This tendency marked the Anglo-Saxon as “the superior of all races.”\(^{231}\) Despite this conviction that their own heritage was naturally superior, Daughters saw it as part of their mission to protect the hegemony of whiteness. A stated element of the Texas UDC agenda was to

\(^{230}\) As the *Pioneer* pamphlet insinuated, Communists saw Jim Crow as an example of labor exploitation as well as racial discrimination, and organizing around issues such as lynching brought black Americans into the Communist Party USA. Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore, *Defying Dixie: The Radical Roots of Civil Rights, 1919-1950* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2009), 99.

\(^{231}\) PUDC, 1920, 42; PUDC, 1922, 86; PUDC, 1925, 60-61.
“fasten more securely the rights and privileges of citizenship upon a pure Anglo-Saxon race.”

Beginning in 1934, individual chapters engaged in annual letter-writing campaigns that pressured Texas politicians to support Confederate history so that white children would learn “the glory of their race.”

The Texas UDC protested local and national manifestations of black empowerment and interracial collaboration. Houston’s Oran Roberts Chapter protested the employment of “colored hall boys in preference to so many white boys that are available” by sending letters to the employer, Continental Oil Company, as well as the Better Business Bureau and the Houston Chamber of Commerce. In Fort Worth, UDC members “vigorously” opposed a Texas Cooperation on Interracial Cooperation meeting as disruptive to the “harmonious relations now existing between Whites and Negroes.” Forty miles east, Dallas Daughters protested a speaking engagement of NAACP secretary Walter White. UDC members also denounced representations of “creeping social equality” in popular media. The Texas Division UDC issued resolutions of protest against showings of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* as well as the seating of black viewers at

---

232 PUDC, 1924, “President’s Message,” unnumbered page.
233 PUDC, 1934, 42.
234 In the early 20th century, “hall boy” often referred to a low-ranked employee in an estate or hotel; however, in the 1930s Houston oil industry, a “hall boy” was a messenger or go-fer. It was an entry-level position. *Port of Houston Magazine* (September, 1963), 13. Oran M. Roberts Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Chapter Minutes, meeting of July 20, 1939.
pageants and plays. In 1938 the Texas Division further issued a resolution, to be sent to the leading producers of the US motion picture industry, requesting that directors ensure their films present “life as regards the white and colored race” in line with the UDC’s standard of racial representation.

A “mixed cast” play at the Dallas Little Theatre particularly disturbed Texas Daughters, who joined together with other “patriotic bodies” to stop production of the play. Reflecting on the successful protest, Division president Mrs. C. C. Cameron explained:

We would encourage in every way a Negro Little Theatre as we would a white, but we believe God was wise and had a purpose in mind when he gave us colors in people as well as colors in flowers, and as a group of southern people we wish to return to Him His colors as He intended them to be.

Mrs. Cameron’s statement insinuated that this racially mixed media production could lead to a sexual mixing of the races and thus an alteration of “His colors.” Cameron’s assertion that the Texas UDC would support a black theatre may appear disingenuous, and indeed no instances of such support appeared in the

---

238 PUDC, 1938, 93-94.
239 The Dallas Little Theatre was a space for the production of plays featuring non-professional actors from the community. The “other patriotic bodies” that joined the UDC’s protest of the play are not named in UDC records, but likely included the Dallas DAR and American Legion, given Dallas UDC chapters’ frequent collaboration with these organizations and similar anti-interracial protests made by the 1930s Dallas DAR. An ensuing letter to the editor in the Dallas Morning News praised the Daughters’ actions. James E. Payne, “Bad Example,” Dallas Morning News (May 29, 1935), 2.
240 PUDC, 1935, 59-60.
organization’s records. The statement was thus not a prescription or description of actions taken by the Daughters but perhaps was connected to the idea that southern whites—particularly UDC members—had a special and benevolent (although always separate and unequal) relationship to black people and blackness.

Reminisces and imaginings of black men and women permeated interwar UDC meetings at the state and local level and were more prevalent than protests against black empowerment and even declarations of adoration for their own whiteness. The practice of “playing in the dark,” as described in Toni Morrison’s work on blackness and whiteness in American literature, is a useful rubric for understanding how Daughters used blackness to work out the meaning of whiteness. Morrison explains that the Africanist persona is a reflective figure in the white literary imagination, which serves as a space for the white writer to explore his or her own fears and desires.241 “Happy throngs of darkies” were key to the Daughters’ construction of the Old South as a place that “never seemed so close to heaven.”242 The slaves of the Daughters’ memories were one-dimensional characters whose primary trait was loyalty and love for the South and white southerners, even after the Civil War.

The Daughters particularly celebrated the memory of “old black mammy,” who was understood as both a friend and a mother figure. Fragile white children were shielded by the boundless love provided by mammy, but they also came to

242 PUDC, 1922, 90; PUDC, 1924, 97.
an understanding of racial distinction through this figure. Through knowing and understanding mammy’s dialect and “superstitious” beliefs, white children arrived at a special and deeper knowledge of blackness. “If you have never heard mammy tell about ghosts and hants…you have little idea the superstition of the black race,” remarked Mrs. J. B. Powell. The Daughters dedicated time to the study of African folklore in their meetings as a method of preserving this special knowledge.243

Playing in the dark and the centrality of mammy were highlighted in Mrs. Mary Johnson Posey’s prize-winning story, “The Land of Dixie,” which was read before the 1926 state convention by the Division president. At the climax of this romantic retelling of the war, Confederate Colonel Johnson must escape the federal troops that have surrounded the plantation. His wife Josephine summons the help of Mammy, assured that she will be able to work out a solution. Mammy’s idea is to dress the Colonel in her clothes and paint his face with soot as a disguise. Mammy advises the blackface Colonel, “Don’t say airy word unlessen you hab ter, and make dem niggerlike when you does speak,” and leads him to a safe location—her cabin. When a Yankee soldier stops the two on route, Mammy quickly alleviates the danger. She informs the Yankee that she and “Melissie” are just “peaceable niggers” on “our way to de quatahs.” After allowing the two to proceed, he and other Union soldiers make their retreat.

243 PUDC, 1921, 121; PUDC, 1922, 90; PUDC, 1923, 117-118; PUDC 1924, 96-97; PUDC 1927, 30, 87-89, 96; PUDC, 1928, 87-90; PUDC, 1930, 12; PUDC, 1933, 17; PUDC, 1934, 61-72; “Slave Time Melodies are Big Part of American Folk Music, “Mamie Folsom Wynne, Dallas Morning News (Nov. 14, 1926), 1.
When Colonel Johnson relays the story to his southern compatriots, they laugh. But they also praise him, not Mammy, for outwitting the “Federal fox.” In “The Land of Dixie,” mammy knowledge—both mammy’s own knowledge and whites’ knowledge of mammy’s capabilities and mannerisms—serves as a stabilizing force for white southerners.

While the UDC’s focus on the southern past led to a particular fascination with blackness, imaginings of other races also played a role in the Daughters’ construction of themselves and their understanding of race. Texas Daughters saw Native Americans as a separate and inferior race conquered by the natural supremacy of white settlers. However, the Daughters also believed Native Americans were worthy of sympathy and charity, and the Texas Division UDC supported local tribes through its Indian Relations committee. The Daughters believed that Native Americans were, like white southerners, proud of their racial distinction and heritage. While UDC members would never admit to possessing a trace of black heritage, lineage from Pocahontas—supposedly possessed by both Texas Division founder Mrs. J. C. Muse and first lady Ellen Wilson—was cherished.
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244 PUDC, 1926, 80-86.
245 PUDC, 1925, 83; UPDC 1937, 26; PUDC, 1938, 100. The DRT and DAR shared this understanding of Native Americans as both a conquered race and a people worthy of charity. PDAR, 1923, 25, 47; PDAR, 1924, 109; PUDC, 1928, 30; PDAR, 1930, 73, 92; PDAR, 1932, 86; PUDC, 1937, 26, 96, PDAR, 1938, 35, 155, PUDC, 1938, 55, 100.
246 PUDC, 1923, 29-31.
The state’s Chicano population did not receive as much attention from the UDC as its Native American population did, but an El Paso member’s report provided some insight into the Daughters’ understanding of this group. In her 1921 report, “How El Paso is Americanizing the Mexican Child,” UDC member and school superintendent Miss Myra Prater identified the Chicano population as a “problem, and a grave one.” Chicano children were, in Prater’s estimation, naturally lethargic, dirty, and slow learners. But through gradual and continued efforts, the Mexican child could be made to learn American ways. “He [the

247 By Chicano/a I refer to people of Mexican descent living in the US (specifically Texas). “Chicano” was not a popular term for people of Mexican descent until the 1960s. In the interwar period, Mexican-descent American citizens referred to themselves as “Mexico Texanos” or Tejanos. This terminology referenced an older and more established connection to the state of Texas as well as a distancing from recent immigrant Mexicans. Tejanos resented white ‘Texans’ collapsing of Tejanos and immigrants under the term “Mexican.” Among the Daughters’ work, it is often unclear whether “Mexican” referred to American citizens or new immigrants. Thus I have chosen a term, Chicano, that collapses the two but references a more positive and rights-oriented collapsing rather than a collapsing based on racial discrimination. Further, “Chicano” is understood as having special reference to Texas Mexicans, and I believe that the particular history and demographics of the state may make the experience of Texas Daughters with “Chicanos” different from other Daughters’ experience with “Mexicans” and Latin Americans. Correspondingly, recent scholarship suggests, the life experience and racial self-understanding of Texas Chicanos was in many ways unique (and perhaps should not be used to make generalizations about Chicanos in other states that border Mexico) due to Texas’ connection to “southern racial formation.” Laura Pulido and Manuel Pastor, “Where in the World Is Juan—and What Color Is He?: The Geography of Latina/o Racial Identity in Southern California,” American Quarterly 65 (June 2013), 312; Cynthia E. Orozco, “The Origins of the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) and the Mexican American civil rights movement in Texas with an analysis of women’s political participation in a gendered context,” (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1992), 15; Neil Foley, The White Scourge: Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 8; Brian D. Behnken, ed., The Struggle in Black and Brown: African American and Mexican American Relations During the Civil Rights Era (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2011), 16; Patrick D. Lukens, A Quiet Victory for Latino Rights: FDR and the Controversy over “Whiteness” (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2012), 180.
Mexican child] has become cleaner and brighter and a more promising prospect for a citizen.\textsuperscript{248} The word \textit{citizen} was not used by Daughters in reference to other non-white groups. While Prater’s report was perhaps the only time in this period that the subject of the state’s Chicanos emerged at an annual UDC convention, this phrasing is important because DRT and DAR members similarly expressed views that Mexican Americans had the capability of attaining citizenship.

Another dimension of the Daughters’ understanding of Chicanos was reflected in the 1938 film, \textit{The Texans}, starring Randolph Scott. Set in the immediate aftermath of the Civil War, this romantic western follows two former Confederates—Kirk Jordan, a die-hard who wants to build an alliance with Mexico and resume war against the US, and Allan Sanford, a more reconciliation-minded man—and Ivy Preston, the un-reconstructed belle who must choose between the two. This film was unique and especially dear to Texas Daughters, who were concerned about the representation of the South in Hollywood. \textit{The Texans’} producers had requested the Texas UDC to verify the accuracy of historical details in the film. Paramount Studios invited the Texas Division UDC president and historian to the world premiere in San Antonio, where the two saw themselves on the big screen in a preview newsreel alongside lead actor Randolph Scott. The Daughters were thrilled about the film and its debut in Texas’ major cities.\textsuperscript{249}

\textsuperscript{248} PUDC, 1921, 53, 51-57.
\textsuperscript{249} PUDC, 1938, 37-38, 70.
Unlike members’ own recollections of the Civil War and Reconstruction, this film featured no black characters. Instead, in The Texans, the Old South setting of the plantation is exchanged for a ranch, cattle take the place of cotton, and Mexicans assume the role of loyal servants.\textsuperscript{250} After the Civil War has ended, father-less and brother-less Ivy Preston hopes to evade a federal tax on 10,000 cattle on her ranch. She enlists the help of former Confederate soldier Allan Sanford to drive the cattle out of state. At first she plans to take the herd to Mexico to aid Kirk Jordan and other die-hard rebels as they prepare for an attack on the Union. But as Ivy falls for Allan Sanford, she decides to instead take the cattle to a new rail line in Kansas as sell them for profit.

Along the way, Mexican characters loyally serve Ivy and the rest of the former Confederates, providing comedic relief as well as aid to their cause. Rosita “Rosie” Rodriguez and Juan Rodriguez are an older Mexican couple employed by the Preston family. They appear to live on the ranch in separate quarters, and travel with the family when they leave the ranch. Rosie, played by un-credited Italian-born actress Anna Demitrio, is a domestic worker whose constant concern is the welfare of Ivy Preston and her elderly grandmother. Like a mammy, Rosie speaks in a dialect and believes in superstitions (here represented by campy displays of Catholic devotion). When the cattle drive is ambushed by Comanche Indians, Rosie and Juan take up guns and fight alongside the Preston family and other former Confederates. When Juan is shot,

\textsuperscript{250} The Texans in Classic Western Round-up Volume 2: The Franchise Collection, DVD, directed by James Hogan (1938; Universal City, CA: Universal Studios, 2007).
Rosie exclaims, “Juan! Juanito!” kisses her enormous rosary necklace, and places it over Juan before returning to the shootout and the defense of the white group. Juan’s death is not remembered or mourned afterward, by Rosie or other characters. Like the black characters in UDC Old South memories, Juan and Rosie are one-dimensional characters whose over-arching trait is loyalty and devotion to white people.

DRT members also celebrated their southern identity but rarely indulged in the extensive racial fantasies of the UDC. Still, occasional DRT references to the imagined Old South were in line with the UDC’s ideal of happy slaves cared for by benevolent masters and mistresses.²⁵¹ Despite DRT members’ shared connection to the Republic of Texas—which fought against Mexico for independence—interwar-era DRT members did not demonize Mexicans as some had in the years before World War I. Instead, the Daughters saw Mexicans as a part of Texas history. Members dressed as “Mexican senoritas” and sang Spanish songs in DRT pageants. Sometimes, Mexican American boys and girls were enlisted to fulfill these roles. By the late 1930s, some children with Hispanic last names appeared in membership rolls of the Children of the Republic of Texas. While Americanization of any kind was not a DRT objective in the interwar period, some members (particularly those near the border) were interested in the Americanization of the Chicano population.²⁵²

²⁵¹ PDRT, 1936, 71.
²⁵² PDRT, 1921, 65, PDRT, 1923, 32; PDRT, 1935, 11.
The Presidio chapter’s report showed the role that the history of the Republic of Texas could play in Americanization of Chicanos in particular. In 1938 the chapter’s president reported that Mexican children in Presidio displayed a great interest in Texas history. The children connected to this history not only because it was inherently interesting, but because the chapter ensured that “Mexican heroes who helped the cause of our Republic” were made prominent in the narrative. Chapter president Mrs. Martin believed this inclusive retelling of history could cultivate patriotism among Chicano children. She explained:

These [Mexican] children not only studied historical facts but they had names of their own to be proud of. And being a race of enthusiasts, giving them a definite part in our history should prove a great stimulus in making good citizens of these youngsters in the future.  

Like UDC member Myra Prater’s report on the Americanization of Mexicans in El Paso, the Presidio chapter’s report was atypical and not representative of the routine work of most chapters. But these reports on Chicanos, isolated as they may have been, reflected a shared belief of at least some DRT and UDC members that Mexican children could grow into American citizens.

The DAR engaged with Chicanos and African Americans regularly and at the local, state, and national level through its Americanization program. However, the DAR shared the UDC’s belief in Anglo-Saxon superiority and protested anything that appeared to threaten the stability of white supremacy and “racial purity.”\textsuperscript{254} DAR leaders issued frequent warnings that “negro-ism” was a wing of

\textsuperscript{253} PDRT, 1938, 69.
\textsuperscript{254} PDAR, 1921, 38; PDAR, 1934, 154.
the Communist agenda. However, they also understood “so-called social equality” as a threat in its own right.255

DAR members were particularly infuriated when Dr. C. H. Tobias, Secretary of the Colored YMCA, came to speak in Dallas in November of 1930. Tobias made a number of speeches before black and white audiences in Dallas. He promoted interracial cooperation and “the elimination of the double standard existing between white and black races.”256 Dr. Tobias delivered a lecture on “The Basis of Adjustment of Racial Relationships” to Southern Methodist University students (whose attendance was mandatory, Daughters emphasized). The Dallas DAR, “believing this practice unfair and dangerous,” issued letters of protest to the university and YMCA. This incident was apparently disturbing enough to be mentioned in the Dallas chapter’s reports for the next two years.257

But unlike the UDC and DRT, the DAR engaged with black children and adults in its Americanization efforts. According to the Texas DAR, Americanization was “an educational process of unifying the native and foreign born in perfect support of American principles.”258 The language of unification in this definition hinted at the more reciprocal approach to assimilating immigrants practiced by early-twentieth-century progressives, but the phrase “perfect support of American principles” was more revealing of the DAR’s intentions in the

255 PDAR, 1929, 77; PDAR, 1930, 61, 76; PDAR, 1931, 191; PDAR, 1932, 179, 181.  
257 PDAR, 1930, 218-219; PDAR, 1931, 251; PDAR, 1932, 181.  
258 PDAR, 1924, 33.
interwar period. As another member explained, the task of Americanization was to teach boys and girls “the fundamentals of civil government, the need for good government, and the necessity for its maintenance at all costs through the will of an intelligent, conservative majority.” Although instruction and aid in civic participation was offered, conformity to conservative DAR ideals was expected.

The DAR’s efforts to Americanize the black community focused primarily on children. Through the 1920s and 1930s, DAR and Children of the American Revolution (CAR) members delivered “patriotic programs” and flag ceremonies to black schools and facilitated the celebration of “Constitution Week” in these segregated schools. Texas Daughters also distributed the DAR Manual for Citizenship at black schools, libraries, and churches as a method of promoting patriotism as well as reducing illiteracy. The DAR’s work with black children and adults was framed with a UDC-like understanding of race relations.

Mae Wynne McFarland, a UDC and Daughter of 1812 as well as a DAR, explained that, according to the law of noblesse oblige, the Daughters had a “sacred obligation” to do everything possible to help black Americans be “good citizens.” However, McFarland’s analysis of the present state of the black population insinuated that black Americans were better “citizens” when they were not citizens at all. She explained that while black people were “by nature” faithful and trustworthy, the young members of the race were lacking in virtue.

McFarland connected this degradation of morals to the lack of formal training.

259 PDAR, 1929, 151-153.
from “kind masters and mistresses” endured by their enslaved ancestors.

McFarland was the National Chairman of the DAR’s Sons and Daughters of the USA, a children’s organization that was to be open to all “regardless of race, color, and creed.” But as her speech showed, the inclusion of black Americans in DAR objectives was a promotion of DAR ideology, not racial equality.

The DAR also sought to “Americanize” the state’s Chicano population. People of Mexican descent in interwar Texas lived in a complex system of legal and extralegal segregation that shared some similarities with the state’s segregation of black citizens. Chicano children attended separate “Mexican schools,” and local statutes kept Chicanos out of other public facilities such as libraries and hospitals. Cities were de facto segregated into white, black, and Chicano neighborhoods, and signs proclaiming “No Mexicans Allowed” kept Chicanos out of stores, restaurants, and work sites. Extralegal lynching “justice” also targeted Mexicans. Neil Foley has argued, “In Texas, unlike other parts of the South, whiteness meant not only not black but also not Mexican.” Some white Texans saw Chicanos as racially other and racially inferior, and many whites living in areas with a large Chicano population saw these “foreigners” as an economic and cultural threat. Especially by the lean years of the Great

261 PDAR, 1929, 151-153.
262 Between 1882 and 1862, Texas lynch mobs murdered 352 blacks and 141 whites. Of these white lynch victims, historians estimate at least fifty, and probably more, were of Mexican descent. Behnken, The Struggle in Black and Brown, 52, 50-51.
263 Foley, The White Scourge, 5.
Depression, white Texans generally agreed that “Mexicans were not a legitimate citizenry of the United States.”

Much of the Texas DAR’s work with Chicanos was similar to their efforts to Americanize other non-whites and foreigners. DAR members instructed Chicano children and adults on proper care of the US flag through demonstrations and the dissemination of “flag etiquette” cards to Mexican schools and children’s groups. DAR members organized patriotic plays and pageants that were performed before Chicano children. Perhaps these plays, often featuring white children dressed in colonial garb, signaled the DAR’s racialized patriotism to Chicano audiences. However, the Daughters reported that the Chicano children joined in when the white child actors broke into patriotic songs and “seemed thrilled to learn something of the Constitution of the U.S.” While the DAR’s “patriotic education” was frequently pedantic, it may not have been entirely one-sided. For instance, two Sons and Daughters of the USA clubs were formed in Mexican schools in Benbrook. One was named the Robert E. Lee chapter, but the other was named for Lorenzo de Zavala, a Mexican politician who aided Texas in its war for independence. In 1931 Daughters intertwined American and Mexican history when they gave a prize for the best student essay on Early American history to a paper on the Mayan Civilization.
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Mexican girls and women in particular were the subject of DAR “relief” efforts, which sought to further Americanization through domestic education. By means of the DAR’s Girl Homemakers Committee, Mexican girls were taught “proper” hygiene, cooking, sewing, and other aspects of home economics. “Girl Homemakers” were further encouraged to sell the small garments they sewed, becoming little capitalist entrepreneurs as well as proper ladies. DAR chapters engaged in similar work with adult Chicano women throughout the 1920s and 1930s. DAR members provided food, clothing, and financial assistance to needy Chicano families. A single Daughter from Brownwood reported providing “counsel, charity, and spiritual help” to forty Mexican families in her hometown. Daughters aided in the beautification of Mexican neighborhoods and even raised funds to provide a scholarship for a “young Mexican” to attend a business college.

The DAR gave both black Texans and Chicanos copies of the DAR Manual for Citizenship. When the Daughters gave black men, women, and children the Manual for Citizenship, their goal was to instill respect for the DAR, the US, and US laws. When given to Chicanos, though, this purpose combined with another aim: to help people born in Mexico to become naturalized US citizens. Daughters distributed thousands of Manuals for Citizenship to Mexican consul offices, among Mexican missions, and at immigration stations. They also offered citizenship and English classes to Mexican-born men and women.

269 PDAR, 1921, 66; PDAR, 1925, 92; PDAR, 1930, 221; PDAR, 1932, 173, 283; PDAR, 1933, 81, 89; PDAR, 1934, 195; PDAR, 1935, 147, 156, 185, 254; PDAR, 1938, 148.
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Immigration authorities reportedly told the Daughters that Mexicans who studied the DAR *Manual* “stand better examinations than those who do not.” The DAR’s promotion of citizenship among Chicanos could be both intimate and broad ranging. For instance, a member in San Angelo reported that she spent hours coaching one Mexican woman for citizenship. Another chapter printed and distributed 500 circulars to Chicanos to instruct them in paying their poll tax. Daughters thus not only helped people of Mexican descent become citizens; they encouraged them to fulfill their civic duty by voting.

This promotion of citizenship reflected an important particularity of the DAR’s Americanization of (and conception of) this group. The DAR’s work with black and Native American Texans rarely applied the word “citizen” to members of these populations. However, the Daughters frequently, and often with delight, designated “Mexicans” as citizens. The Amarillo DAR chapter gave a “Christmas treat to 76 eager and appreciative young Mexicans who are growing into useful American citizens.” In the mid-1930s multiple chapters gave awards to “outstanding little American citizens” in Mexican schools. For the Daughters to openly and without reserve declare these children to be *American* citizens separated them from the mainstream of white Texans, for whom US citizenship and Mexican descent were incompatible. But at least some UDC and DRT
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members would have agreed with the DAR’s enthusiasm for Chicanos as US citizens.

The DAR even worked with the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), a civil rights organization often understood as the Mexican American equivalent of the NAACP. In 1932 the Texas DAR sent copies of the Declaration of Independence, US Constitution, and other “patriotic documents” to all thirty-five chapters of the LULAC. This same year, the Brownsville chapter collaborated with their local LULAC branch to distribute 500 copies of the DAR *Manual for Citizenship*.276 State-level DAR work with LULAC was unique to this year, although the Laredo chapter reported cooperative work with LULAC in 1948 and even as late as 1955.277 The Texas DAR’s distribution of reading material to LULAC branches was a less involved and intimate strategy than some other methods Daughters used to “Americanize” Chicanos. But this moment of connection with LULAC was important because it suggested (however subtly) that the DAR’s opposition to “so-called social equality” and civil rights did not necessarily apply to Chicano rights.

LULAC was on the conservative end of civil rights organizations and indeed shared many ideals with the DAR. Established in 1929, the organization drew its membership from middle-class Chicanos, often doctors, lawyers, and other professionals. LULAC’s founding principles combined a mission to combat segregation and inequality with a firm dedication to American principles and

276 PDAR, 1932, 182, 317.
277 PDAR, 1948, 159; PDAR, 1955, 246. By the post-WWII era, DAR work with Chicanos became more sporadic and localized to chapters on the border.
adopted George Washington’s prayer as the “official prayer” of the organization.\footnote{278}{George Washington’s prayer for the United States of America is as follows: “Almighty God, We make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy Holy protection; and Thou wilt incline the hearts of the Citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to Government; and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow Citizens of the United States at large, and particularly for their brethren who have served in the Field. And finally that Thou wilt most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that Charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind which were the Characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed Religion, and without a humble imitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation. Grant our supplication, we beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.” Edward D. Garza, *LULAC: League of United Latin-American Citizens* (Thesis, Southwest State Teachers College, 1951), 18.} LULAC endorsed free market capitalism and denounced the spread of “communistic propaganda.”\footnote{279}{Benjamin Marquez, “The Politics of Race and Assimilation: The League of United Latin American Citizens 1929-40” *The Western Political Quarterly* 42 (Jun., 1989), 359.} In the interwar period, a primary anti-segregation strategy used by the LULAC was to argue that Chicanos were members of the white race, or at least not “colored people” to be lumped in with blacks. Historians have seen this “whiteness strategy” as part of what defined LULAC as moderate at best and assimilationist at worst.\footnote{280}{Lukens, *A Quiet Victory for Latino Rights*, 98-104; Ariela J. Gross, “Texas Mexicans and the Politics of Whiteness” *Law and History Review* 21 (Spring, 2003), 198; Marquez, “The Politics of Race and Assimilation,” 358; Orozco, *The Origins of LULAC*, 4. Some historians today acknowledge that the “whiteness strategy” was not entirely agreed upon within LULAC.}

Unfortunately, it is unclear from the historical record whether or not the Texas DAR knew about LULAC’s whiteness strategy. Perhaps not, as LULAC’s first major anti-segregation case, 1930’s *Del Rio ISD V. Salvatierra*, was not a
victory for LULAC or its whiteness strategy.\textsuperscript{281} LULAC’S role as a civil rights organization (rather than just an “Americanization” organization for Chicanos) became clearer to Texans in 1936, when it successfully fought the classification of Mexicans as nonwhite on the US Census.\textsuperscript{282} An awakening to LULAC’s civil rights agenda may explain why the DAR did not report statewide work with the organization after 1932. However, given the DAR’s tendency toward reporting any instance of “creeping social equality” or threats to “racial purity,” it seems likely that such a revelation would warrant a condemning report at the annual Texas DAR convention—and such a report is not found in the organization’s records.

But the Texas DAR certainly understood Chicanos as being of a different and separate race. DAR clubs for children that were open to “all races” were segregated into white, black, and Mexican groups. DAR relief work also segregated “Mexican” efforts from those targeting whites or blacks.\textsuperscript{283} For the Daughters, history was a key method of interpreting and navigating present-day issues. According to this history, “Mexicans” were definitely not “white.” The DAR state historian’s retelling of the Texas Revolution characterized the battle between Mexico and Texas as a race war. Americans sympathized with the
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Texas colonists because, she explained, “The call of blood and race is the strongest in the world”; shared whiteness, even more than shared nationality or ideology, explained US support for Texas’ independence. Mexico placed heavy taxes on white Texas colonists, she continued, because “they [Mexicans] saw the Americans, people of a different race, speaking a different tongue, strong, energetic and masterful, drawing daily nearer to the Rio Grande.”

Texas DAR members likely did not see Chicanos as white. But they did see Chicanos as citizens and potential citizens, and some DRT and UDC members shared this view. The DAR’s work with Chicanos could be characterized as cultural imperialism and was certainly limited in comparison to even the “conservative” civil rights efforts of LULAC. But this work does suggest that the Daughters saw Chicanos as not only less inferior than blacks but as worthy and capable of the citizenship that the Daughters themselves treasured so much.

**Conclusion: The Daughters and Conservatism**

The Daughters demonstrated alignment with the American right in many ways and can be usefully considered as part of the “conservative women’s bloc” identified by Kirsten Delegard. Like other American conservative women, the Daughters (especially the UDC and DAR) embraced the ballot. Their understanding of their role as voters was still shaped by gender. Sometimes this gendered understanding was reflected in an apparent deference to male political authority. However, this chapter suggests that the “male centered” aspect of the
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Daughters’ political action reflected new alliances with conservative men and a breakdown of their cooperation with other women’s clubs. In the interwar era, the Daughters cultivated an alliance with the newly formed American Legion. The DAR particularly aligned with this organization’s right-wing agenda, but the UDC and DRT also collaborated with the Legion and its female Auxiliary. This new ally exposed Daughters to a wider variety of hard-right ideas. But the Daughters also had something to teach Legionnaires. Their aid in Legion parades and other “patriotic” public displays boosted the communist authority that made the Legion so powerful. Alongside the Legion, the DAR led the charge against communism, which it saw as deeply oppositional to America and Americanism. Indeed, the literature of the Communist Party USA did threaten the Daughters’ ideology and social standing. Daughters likewise opposed “interracialism” as a threat to their status and historical memory.

The Daughters shared an apparent racial conservatism that viewed whiteness as distinct and superior to blackness. The UDC and DAR were active in opposing manifestations of racial liberalism and “so-called social equality” in the state. But labeling the Daughters as racially conservative is complicated by the Daughters’ conceptions of Chicanos. Most Daughters saw “Mexicans” as a distinct and non-white race. But in contrast to their conceptions of black and Native American people, Chicanos were seen as citizens or potential citizens. Some Daughters actively worked to make Chicano children feel more included in Texas history, to naturalize adult Mexico-born individuals, and to help Chicanos
claim the rights of US citizenship. Curiously, in this regard, the Daughters (at least some members) were more liberal than most white Texans.
CHAPTER 4: THE DAUGHTERS CONFRONT THE SECOND WORLD WAR

When the United States entered the Second World War, women’s organizations were called upon to embrace a shared American nationalism and make a patriotic contribution to their country and its allies. While previous “total wars” in U.S. history also enlisted women’s time and labor, contemporary American women understood World War II to be a woman’s war “as no other war has ever been.” American advertising agencies cooperated with the federal government to target American women in appeals that aligned female patriotic war service not only with the youthful beauty of the pin-up girl but also with the prestige expressed by women such as those in the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), Daughters of the Republic of Texas (DRT), and United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC). Wartime advertising executive James Webb Young pointed to the DAR and UDC as examples to clarify American women’s interest in cultivating and displaying high-class status, or in his words, “prestige.” Young recommended advertisers connect their products to these messages of prestige and pedigree to appeal to American women. The American general public recognized the prestige, pedigree, and patriotism of the DAR, DRT, and UDC before and during the war. While “Rosie the Riveter” may come to mind when we imagine women in WWII today, during the war such
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expressions of female patriotism faced criticism from those who believed wage labor was not only un-womanly but also potentially un-patriotic.

Daughters envisioned themselves as bulwarks of patriotism and could not let a call to aid their country go unanswered. Diving into war work could, indeed, benefit the organizations. War work provided opportunities for Daughters to connect to their cherished historical ideals of patriotic womanhood of the American Revolution, Texas Revolution, and Civil War. War work could bring the organizations greater public recognition. War and war work could also threaten the organizations’ membership numbers and particular historical foci. More frightening for the Daughters, though, the war put their own lives and the lives of their loved ones’ at risk. The DAR, DRT, and UDC would serve as sites for members to not only contribute to the war effort but also to cope with the dislocations and confusions of a war that would leave no American woman unchanged—even those most committed to tradition and memories of decades past. This chapter examines how the DAR, DRT, and UDC utilized historical memories and conceptions of gender to navigate the complex web of national and international issues that arose during World War II, including the meaning and purpose of “patriotism” and “Americanism,” woman’s role in war, and the citizen’s relationship to her county’s wartime allies.

Before the War: Peace and Pan Americanism

The years immediately preceding World War II were a joyful time for members of the DRT, DAR, and UDC. All three organizations joined in the celebration of the
centennial of Texas’ independence in 1936, bringing members of the different organizations together in collaborative projects and shared festivities. Of course, the DRT benefited most from the centennial and reported that its membership grew in leaps and bounds this year.\textsuperscript{287} The statewide excitement and camaraderie of the centennial aside, average chapters of the DRT, DAR, and UDC focused on promoting history and their linage locally rather than at the state, federal, or international level. Most Texas UDC chapters could be found placing flags and “Confederate Catechisms” in nearby schools, celebrating Confederate holidays, and holding teas and parties.\textsuperscript{288} DRT chapters were similarly “happy, active, and prosperous” as they gave out prizes for historical essays written by local school children, joined in town parades, and studied the history of Texas Independence.\textsuperscript{289}

Since the Progressive Era, the DAR’s agenda was less exclusively historical than the UDC or DRT as it emphasized the maintenance of “Americanism” in contemporary society. In addition to holding teas, observing patriotic holidays, and holding essay contests, DAR chapters continued to work locally to promote Americanism among white, black, and Chicano populations. At the state level, DAR Americanism efforts began to drop off by the late 1930s because, as one member explained, “so much work of this type is being done by Government agencies.”\textsuperscript{290} But local chapters and members continued their efforts
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to provide financial assistance to poor non-whites, present flag pageants and patriotic programs in the barrios, and assist Mexico-born individuals in the naturalization process. In many ways DAR work among non-whites became more individualized in the years before the war and was often carried out by particular enterprising members—particularly those who taught in public schools or Sunday Schools, and those who lived in border towns.\textsuperscript{291}

Controversial and contemporary issues such as racial segregation, labor rights, and immigration were greatly overshadowed by the central preservationist and patriotic agendas of the Daughters in the years before WWII. Even members of the most politically engaged and aggressive of the three—the Texas DAR—generally emphasized the pleasures and pleasantries of their work in these years. In 1939 all three organizations looked forward to what they thought would be a bright, stable, and celebratory future. Each organization’s “Golden Jubilee”—its fiftieth anniversary—would fall some time in the 1940s. Marking a half-century of work encouraged the organizations to look back with pride on their past achievements and to celebrate their endurance.

Like most Americans in the late 1930s, the Daughters were weary and wary of war. As trouble brewed overseas, they prayed for peace. Members of the UDC, DAR, and DRT looked to their neighbor to the South, Mexico, for cooperation in creating a more peaceful world through “Pan-American” friendship. By acting locally with Mexicans and Mexico, they hoped international war and unrest would not reach Texas. In 1939 the DRT Division president

\textsuperscript{291} PDAR, 1939, 43, 47, 54, 108-109, 114-118, 144, 156.
emphasized, “Let us use every opportunity to further the cause of peace – Peace in the World, Peace in the Americas.” She hoped the DRT would exert its influence to complete a Peace Park in Big Bend County to unite Texas and Mexico. The UDC, which had a “Prayer for Peace” play at its 1939 convention, advocated greater patriotism but also “the better understanding between nations.” In 1941 the DAR even petitioned the Texas Legislature to make Spanish courses compulsory in public elementary and high schools. The Texas DAR understood this measure as necessary because of the state’s “greater proximity to the Pan American countries” and hoped it would promote trade, mutual defense, and common understanding.

Members of the three organizations were involved in the Pan American Round Tables of Texas, a women’s organization that hoped to bring women from the U.S. and Mexico together to cultivate friendship and mutual understanding.

The Pan American Round Tables of Texas was founded in 1916 by Mrs.
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292 DRT president Mrs. Frederick Schenkenberg gave a more dire address to the DRT board of management. She warned DRT board members of the “fifth column”—late 1930s parlance for seditionists in and outside the US—and the increased need for patriotism in light of “totalitarian powers [that] are ruthlessly seeking to overthrow our nation and the freedom of the individual.” That Schenkenberg saved this speech for the board of management, while focusing on peace and historic preservation in addresses before the larger membership, reflected how such “political” talk remained taboo for many DRT members. Importantly, Schenkenberg was also the president of a Dallas chapter of the DAR. Mrs. Frederick Schenkenberg, “Address to Board of Management,” September 16, 1940, Lillian Owen Edwards Papers, 1831-1952, Dolph Briscoe Center.
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Florence Griswold, a white woman from southwest Texas.\footnote{However, the first official Pan American Conference between women of the US and Mexico did not occur until 1919. Most, or perhaps all, of the founding members of the organization were Anglo. Lois Terry Marchbanks, \textit{The Pan American Round Table} (San Antonio: Avon Behren Press, 1983), 5-11.} Mexican immigrant women who joined the Pan American Round Tables were primarily upper-class conservatives fleeing revolution and unrest in their native country. Like wealthy conservative Mexican immigrant men, their ideologies did not shift as they moved across the border, and they began to develop alliances with affluent Anglos. Like both the Daughters and the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), these women hoped to “uplift” poorer immigrant masses by providing food, medicine, clothing, and education. Unlike the Daughters and many LULAC members, some Chicano women in the Pan American Round Tables promoted the sustenance of Mexican (rather than American or Mexican-American) identities among immigrants. In San Antonio, Chicano women affiliated with the Round Tables organized celebrations of Mexican national holidays and promoted Spanish-language news and media outlets.\footnote{Juanita Luna Lawhn, “The Mexican Revolution and the Women of \textit{El México de Afuera},” in \textit{War Along on the Border: The Mexican Revolution and Tejano Communities}, ed. Arnoldo De León (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2012), 158, 168-172.} The activities of particular branches of the Round Tables could vary greatly depending on their leadership, relationships to other local Anglo and Chicano organizations, and the needs of (or perceived dangers of) local immigrant populations.

Members of the DRT and DAR were particularly involved with Texas’ Pan American Round Tables. Hally Ballinger, co-founder of the DRT, founded the...
Houston Pan American Round Table in 1940. Several hundred DAR members attended the Pan American Round Table exposition in 1938. White leaders of the Pan American Round Tables emphasized that it was “not just another club with social status and local cultural status to maintain.” But programs at state-level meetings included such frivolous events as “Education through Decoration” (studying Mexico by examining Mexican “costumes” and voting on decorated Mexico-themed tables), and a garden party at the estate of noted Houston socialite Miss Ima Hogg. Such events treated Pan Americanism as yet another avenue for white upper-class socializing. Indeed, many white members of the Round Tables could not speak or read Spanish anyway.298

Some affluent Chicanos and Chicanas welcomed the support of Anglo women who shared many of their ideals as well as, in a relative sense, their social position. Others affiliated with the Round Tables but carried out the bulk of their work independent of the state organization and white leaders. But especially as the Chicano middle class began to grow and stabilize in the early 1940s, some voiced disagreement with white charities and benevolence and called more openly for Mexican American political rights.299 Alonso S. Perales, a LULAC founder who sometimes disagreed with its more conservative policies, stated his disapproval of the Pan American Round Tables in a series of epistolary

exchanges with that organization's founder, Mrs. Florence Griswold. “I am firmly convinced,” Perales wrote, “that it is not by means of banquets and flowery speeches but by doing justice to the descendants of Juarez, Hidalgo, and Bolívar in Texas that Pan Americanism can be most effectively promoted.”

Perales faulted not only Griswold and the Round Tables but the entirety of “our Anglo-American friends and fellow citizens” for failing to strike at the heart of the problems faced by Chicanos: racial discrimination. Apparently, Griswold had claimed that the Round Tables had not received sufficient encouragement from persons of Hispanic descent, and that issues of racial discrimination were political in nature and thus outside the realm of influence for a benevolent women’s organization such as the Round Tables. These reasons, perhaps, served as an excuse for the lack of real activism by white Round Table members. Perales firmly disagreed on both points and outlined examples of racial discrimination against Mexicans in education, employment, and the legal system. This racial discrimination was particularly infuriating to Perales as a Texan, because, as he pointed out, Tejano men made possible the independence of Texas. “And, further,” he added:

…this territory once belonged to our ancestors on both the Mexican and Spanish sides, and if there is any such thing as a real, dyed-in-the-wool, honest-to-goodness American, we Americans of Hispanic descent are better qualified than anyone else to claim that title.
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Perales claimed to treasure his (apparently former) friendship with Mrs. Griswold and pointed to examples outside Texas where Anglos did fight against racial discrimination.\textsuperscript{301} But his letter displayed heartfelt anger and disappointment more than hope. Griswold responded in kind. Infuriated that Perales had published his letter to her in the Spanish-language newspaper \textit{La Prensa}, Griswold tartly replied, “At all times I have felt that you had grown to be a man in mental caliber. I regret that in print you appeared so small.”\textsuperscript{302} Without addressing any of Perales’s accusations, Griswold turned away from the problem as her organization continued to operate as more of a social outlet than an activist one.

Perales and Griswold’s disagreement did not mark the end of the Pan American Round Tables of Texas, or of the broader idea of Pan-American cooperation and between the U.S. and Mexico. But it does highlight important tensions over race that were present but frequently avoided in the Pan-American and Chicano-targeted charitable work of Anglo women like those in the Round Tables and the Daughters. Over the course of WWII, the Daughters’ enthusiasm for Pan-Americanism and peace faded. The Daughters’ work with Chicanos also tapered off but did not disappear entirely. This decline was not entirely due to the Daughters’ turn towards war work. It also stemmed from wartime fears of international ideologies and shifting domestic racial politics.

\textsuperscript{301} Ibid.
“The Dogs of War have been Unleashed”: Daughters’ Conceptions of
World War II before U.S. Involvement

The Daughters were not as involved as some American women were with early
efforts to support U.S. allies abroad such as the “Bundles for Britain” campaign,
but they became increasingly anxious and aware of world events in 1940 and
1941. The U.S. moved uneasily toward intervention through the creation of a
peacetime draft at home and the Lend-Lease Act to aid allies abroad.
Meetings of the DAR, which had been the most involved of the three
organizations in terms of WWI war work, became immersed in the issues and
language of war in 1940 and 1941. The DAR state regent explained to members:

Across the seas the dogs of war have been unleashed. The roar of
cannon, the whistle of flying shrapnel, the rattle of the machine gun, the
whine of the bullets, the bursting of death-dealing bombs, all serve to
remind the American woman that she has an opportunity, a responsibility,
and a duty to do great and everlasting good for the land for which our
forefathers bled and died.

The DAR responded to global crisis in WWII with a mandate to do good for the
nation of their forefathers, not for allied nations.

The DAR carried out its mission to “do great and everlasting good” with its
newly created American Red Cross Committee, while also continuing its work
monitoring supposed “un-Americanism” among teachers and elected
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politicians. The UDC and DRT identified the funding of scholarships and membership increase as their major objectives in 1940 and 1941, but in these years they became more aware of national and global issues than they had in the first World War. Nineteen forty-one was the DRT’s Golden Jubilee year, and they invited the Sons of the Republic of Texas (SRT), UDC, DAR, and other heritage organizations to join them for a lavish celebration at the Alamo, the foremost symbol of the DRT’s success in preserving the history of Texas’ Independence. Each DRT chapter representative received a hot-off-the-presses copy of Fifty Years of Achievement, History of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas, a 400-page catalog of the organization’s many accomplishments. 

Yet even on this day of celebration, war was not far from the Daughters’ minds. The capstone of the Golden Jubilee was a proclamation made by the mayor of San Antonio designating the date of the DRT’s fiftieth anniversary as “Flag Presentation Day.” The mayor and the Daughters advocated flag presentation as a war measure that would “answer the challenge of the non-democratic forces of the world” with Texas flags to symbolize commitment to democracy and vigilance against “subversive influence.” DRT members focused on their organization and their state in the years before U.S. intervention, but they saw practices of Texas patriotism and pride as bulwarks against U.S. enemies and un-Americanism.
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The UDC, while largely focused on its own organizational goals in the early years of WWII, became increasingly interested in “Americanism”—a cause the Confederate Daughters rarely promoted in peacetime. Their understanding of how to promote Americanism was akin to the less activist and controversial Americanism strategies practiced by the interwar DAR and American Legion; primarily, the UDC practiced Americanism by emphasizing U.S. patriotism at UDC events and by supporting the efforts of mainstream charitable organizations like the Red Cross. As the Texas Division president explained in 1941, “In this time of war and rumors of war members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy are happy to do all within their power to show allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to demonstrate the American’s Creed at every opportunity.” Rather than adopt an official UDC Americanism or Red Cross committee, however, the president encouraged members to promote Americanism and prepare to aid their country by taking courses offered by the Red Cross, joining extant local Civilian Defense and British War Relief Organization, and praying for “the men and boys who stand ready to fight for our nation.”

This individualist approach to Americanism brought mixed results. The Oran Roberts chapter of Houston, for example, did contain members who reported and encouraged work for the Red Cross and Bundles for Britain. But when official requests for assistance came to the chapter from the Red Cross, the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, the American Legion
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Auxiliary, and other local aid organizations, little or no action was taken that would involve the entire chapter. The individualist approach also made UDC work and war work compete for members’ time. The Division First Vice President reported that her repeated efforts to organize new chapters in 1940 and 1941 were met with the same response: “we are so busily engaged in war work—knitting for the Red Cross, British Relief and other defense work, that we do not think it advisable to undertake another activity until the present emergency is over.”

**Texas and Texas Daughters face World War II**

The DAR, DRT, and UDC recognized that the U.S. was becoming increasingly entangled in global affairs in 1940 and 1941, and each prepared in its own way. But Pearl Harbor still came as a tremendous shock to the Daughters, as it did to all Texans and Americans. With Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and U.S. entrance into the war came a call for the nation's women to give their all to America and her allies. This call was especially powerful for the Daughters, whose organizations were founded on remembrances of wars past. Before the war, Daughters’ remembrances of historic battles were romantic and chivalric.

The Texas UDC’s theme song, approved in 1939, was typical of the organizations’ imaginings of the past. Written by the Division’s Poet Laureate, Bessie Hale Everett, the Division theme song proclaimed, “We’re proud of the
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glorious birthright, our forefathers died to save.” But death and suffering of Confederate soldiers was not the focus of the song; nor was the South’s loss. Memories of the Civil War’s hardships and failures were greatly eclipsed by the song’s evocations of “valiant and brave” Confederate soldiers, “bright shining armor,” and the matchless fame of the South, “where loftiest ideals are nurtured, and chivalry traces its birth.”

But only one year later, Bessie Hale Everett’s imaginings of the Civil War had shifted, as evidenced by her 1940 poem published in the Division’s *Annual Proceedings*, “The Song of Brotherhood.” The poem begins with a scene of the prosperous and blessed Old South, home to brave and noble citizens. But peaceful Dixie is awakened by the sounds of war; “Louder, rang the clattering hoof-beats/Louder, clanking sabers grew.” The poem quickly turns to a visceral and pained remembrance of the war and its aftermath:

Four long years of deadly combat,
Bitter years of strife and toil;
Hundreds sleep beneath the snow-drifts,
Thousands rest beneath the soil.
True to principles of justice,
Fought they on the battle field,
Home they came, foot-sore and weary,
Bearing naught, save Honor’s Shield.
Devastation met their vision;
Homes of plenty lay in waste,
Currency and holdings vanished...
Now, we have but few survivors,
Maimed and crippled, old and bent,
But the fearless eye of battle
Never yet, has lost its glint.\(^{314}\)

\(^{313}\) PUDC, 1939, 20.  
\(^{314}\) PUDC, 1940, 112-113.
In “Song of Brotherhood,” Everett depicted the advance of the Civil War aurally, with soldiers’ stomping boots and clashing swords growing ever more deafening. The soldiers are portrayed as honorable and heroic, but representations of their chivalry are crowded out by visions of the enduring suffering of those who survived and the haunting deaths of those who did not. Everett’s “Song of Brotherhood” presented UDC members with a more tangible, more urgent, and more emotional portrait of the Civil War that would have resonated with many Texas Daughters. Although the U.S. had not even entered the war when Everett composed the poem, the sounds of military preparations at the numerous camps operating and being constructed around Texas would have been loud and clear to residents of the state. Everett was a resident of Weatherford, TX, and would have heard the machinations of war preparation emanating from nearby Tarrant County, where the construction of the national headquarters of the Air Force Training Command was under way. Especially as the war progressed, nearly all cities and towns with UDC, DRT, and DAR chapters were in proximity to existing, new, or temporary military facilities.315

The sights and sounds of WWII became louder and more frightening as the U.S. entered the international conflict, and members of the DAR, DRT, and UDC looked to history for strength and inspiration. The UDC Division President

315 Texas was a center for U.S. military preparations in WWI, and with WWII the military’s presence in the state grew even larger, especially in the area of aviation. WWII also aided the growth of private industries producing war-related goods in Texas. Further, Texas contributed a larger percentage of its population to the armed forces than any other state. McKay, Texas After Spindletop, 182, 186-187.
instructed members to “Think what Southern women did in the War Between the States and show that you are worthy of your heritage” as she encouraged members to maintain commitment to both the UDC and their nation in wartime.\textsuperscript{316} Mrs. Avery Turner similarly called members to service by evoking their duty to the past. She urged every member to join the Red Cross, explaining, “This [war work with the Red Cross] will be one of the biggest factors in winning the war for freedom, for which George Washington fought and bled and died.”\textsuperscript{317} Members of the DRT also found a new appreciation for their historical memories during wartime. The chairman of the San Jacinto Battlefield committee remarked on the deeper pride she felt for the historical site, as American WWII soldiers overseas helped her fully understand “the courage and difficulties under which our brave men fought on this hallowed ground.”\textsuperscript{318} While the Daughters were always inspired by heroes of the past, the outbreak of war across the world and the discordant sounds of war preparations in Texas brought a renewed verisimilitude to their imaginings of war. These memories inspired members to “prove worthy” of their heritage by contributing to the U.S. and Allied war effort.

\textbf{The Daughters’ War Work}

After Pearl Harbor, millions of American women resolved to “do their bit” to help win the war. Women’s “war work” could take a variety of forms, from planting a Victory Garden to joining one of the new women’s military branches such as the Navy WAVES (Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service) or the
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Army WAC (Women’s Army Corps), headed by Texas’ own Oveta Culp Hobby. At the outset of the war, federal leaders imagined woman’s role as one of providing a “spiritual and physical reserve” on the home front by caring for children and providing husbands and boyfriends with beautiful and doting partners worth fighting for.\textsuperscript{319}

Yet as the war’s material needs became more pressing, women were urged to support the war with their own paid labor, rather than just volunteer work in their communities. During the war over four million women joined the American blue-collar workforce in shipyards, munitions plants, and a variety of other industries, as well as serving “pink collar” positions as secretaries and bank tellers. Most women did not intend to remain in the workforce after the war.\textsuperscript{320} For some women and many men, the idea of women wage laborers—especially female soldiers--could be disturbing. In the words of one male GI writing home to his wife, “You join the WAVES or WAC and you are automatically a prostitute in my opinion.”\textsuperscript{321} While a multitude of paid and unpaid “war work” opportunities were presented to and seized by American women, tensions over proper gender roles underlay how and why women chose how to support their nation during the war.

\textsuperscript{319} McEuen, \textit{Making War, Making Women}, 2, 101.
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The DRT, DAR, and UDC shared a commitment to helping provide for the war’s material needs through volunteer work with the American Red Cross. All three organizations urged chapters to be “100 percent” in Red Cross membership, and some chapters dedicated weekly or monthly meetings to Red Cross work. With the Red Cross, the Daughters sewed garments and surgical dressings, made kits for soldiers, donated blood, participated in salvage drives, and raised money. Work with the Red Cross brought members of the three organizations together, such as when the DAR and DRT of Dallas came together to establish a new Red Cross center. The Red Cross also provided Daughters with a new avenue to establish public leadership roles by serving as supervisors and instructors at their local Red Cross. Some Daughters drove miles beyond their homes, transporting supplies and wounded soldiers as members of the Red Cross Motor Corps. Other Daughters served as “Gray Ladies” and nurses’ aides and stepped into crowded and chaotic hospitals to provide medical assistance and hospitality. Daughters served as Red Cross staff assistants and fundraising chairmen. The Daughters gave hundreds of thousands of hours to Red Cross work. The Daughters also invested in the war effort by buying and selling war bonds, independently and through the Red Cross. Furthermore, organizational funds were used to buy large war bonds.
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A form of war work especially dear to the Daughters' hearts was honoring and caring for soldiers. Independently and through work with the United Service Organizations (USO), the Daughters provided reading material, playing cards, freshly baked cookies, and hospitality to soldiers stationed in Texas. In cooperation with the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary, they helped arrange patriotic parades and other celebrations to honor enlisted men alongside veterans of past wars. Members even welcomed soldiers into their own households so that they might enjoy a home-cooked meal.\textsuperscript{326}

Entertaining and paying tribute to WWII soldiers provided an opportunity for longstanding UDC, DAR, and DRT activities to be reformulated as wartime patriotic service. The DRT members who staffed the Alamo gave a warm welcome and special attention to visiting soldiers stationed at nearby Randolph Field. Members who served at the DRT Museum in Austin worked overtime, keeping the museum open an extra day so that soldiers could visit from Camp Swift.\textsuperscript{327} The DAR aided the war effort and reinforced the social standing of its organization by redirecting the efforts of its Girl Home Makers clubs toward war work. The Girl Home Makers clubs were designed to foster domestic skills and patriotism among immigrant and underprivileged girls. WWII offered an opportunity to fuse these two aims by enlisting the girls in nursing and sewing for sick soldiers and sailors.\textsuperscript{328}
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The Daughters took on a different form of war work when they helped defend the home front as Civilian Defense volunteers. President Roosevelt established the Office of Civilian Defense (OCD) in 1941 to coordinate home front defense efforts, preserve civilian life and property, boost national morale, and create avenues for civilian volunteer participation in these efforts. Especially after Eleanor Roosevelt became assistant director in late 1941, the OCD reached out to every (white) citizen—man, woman, and child—to take part in improving and defending their communities through war work. More than most forms of war work, Civilian Defense brought government into the daily lives of everyday citizens.329 Women were especially recruited for several positions including Staff Corps, Drivers Corps, Messengers, Air Raid Wardens, Emergency Food and Housing Corps, Medical Corps, and Nurses’ Aides Corps. Some of these positions, such as Nurses’ Aids and Food and Housing, were aimed exclusively at women. But others, such as Aid Raid Wardens, targeted “natural leaders” of both genders.330 Housewives were specifically valued as “block leaders” who explained government programs, sold war stamps, surveyed local needs, and recruited other women for war industries in their local area.331 Members of the

DAR, UDC, and DRT joined local Civilian Defense programs, and several assumed roles as coordinators and directors.\textsuperscript{332}

The Daughters also implemented “civilian defense” efforts of their own that fused organizational goals of promoting their history and point of view with the OCD’s aim of fostering home-front patriotism and morale. The UDC literally fused the two with the creation of its Patriotic Activities and Civilian Defense Committee in 1942. This committee oversaw and recorded chapters’ and members’ efforts with local Civilian Defense branches, as well as other “war work” with the Red Cross and USO.\textsuperscript{333} The committee also spearheaded the creation of a Texas Division UDC Nurses Training Fund to fill the need for nurses outlined by the OCD. The funds were specifically designated, however, for “a girl of Confederate lineage.”\textsuperscript{334} Thus the UDC was able to promote its heritage while also aiding Civilian Defense.

The DRT hoped to defend the home front with Texas flags. As they had before the war, the DRT donated flags whenever a patriotic occasion arose. During WWII, the DRT donated flags to the Red Cross, USO, servicemen’s facilities, and OCD Civilian Morale committees. Ensuring that Texas flags were still flying was a way for DRT members to defend and preserve “the home front,” which they understood as both Texan and American. When the state capitol and other government buildings’ Texas flags were replaced with American flags in

\textsuperscript{332} PDRT, 1942, 62-68; PUDC, 1942, 62, 94; PDRT, 1943, 161, 172; PDAR, 1943, 92, PUDC, 1944, 60.
\textsuperscript{333} PUDC, 1942, 32.
\textsuperscript{334} PUDC, 1942, 66; PUDC, 1943, 28.
response to war, the DRT began a series of negotiations to defend and promote the flying of the state flag. Conferences with the State Board of Control led to the replacement of the Texas flag on several buildings, and eventually, the creation of a new flagpole to allow the Texas flag to fly alongside the American flag above the state capitol building. Furthermore, the DRT’s persistent efforts led Judge Weaver Baker, chairman of the Board of Control, to write to all public institutions in the state with the direction that both flags (U.S. and Texas) be “displayed each day during the war.”\textsuperscript{335} The DRT’s success in promoting state patriotism in a time when the federal government called for national unity was facilitated by the fact that Texas contributed more WWII soldiers than any other state, a fact of which the Daughters were well aware. The DRT’s Flag Chairman boasted, “It has been said that our Texas flag is used on so many foreign battlefields that our boys have been asked if Texas is fighting for a separate peace.”\textsuperscript{336} Texas’ strong representation in the war effort helped position the DRT’s defense of state flags as purely patriotic goal.

Defending the home front was a central DAR objective before the war, and WWII created avenues for the organization to promote and expand such efforts. The DAR had a National Defense committee and an annual National Defense program well before 1939.\textsuperscript{337} Also before the war the DAR’s Committee on
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National Defense through Patriotic Education already performed a number of “things done to counteract un-American activities” that would align well with the objectives of the Office of Civilian Defense. Like OCD “block leaders,” DAR chapters held programs to inform members and the public about national defense news. They also hoped to foster citizenship and national morale by holding patriotic observances, giving radio talks, and holding essay contests on citizenship and history in the schools. With the outbreak of WWII the need for “patriotic education” became more urgent and valued; as Committee Chairman Mrs. Dudley P. Germane remarked in 1941, “An awakened public has cooperated in this work as never before.” Chapters bought copies of the DAR’s National Defense Handbook and National Defense News, sharing them with other organizations, media outlets, and everyday citizens. DAR “Patriotic Education” materials were distributed on army bases, at hospitals and schools, and among “foreign and negro groups.” Networking with other organizations and personal connections to “well-known educators and professional men,” the DAR held public programs on patriotism and defense, gained coverage for their organization and preferred patriotic messages in newspapers, and promoted their agenda over the radio waves.  

The mission of the DAR’s Committee on Civilian Defense through Patriotic Education was closely related to that of another DAR committee: The Americanism Committee. Both committees defended the home front against un-
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Americanism in ways that sometimes worked to shore up nativist concepts of citizenship and national belonging. But the DAR Americanism committee focused more on work among “the underprivileged.” Through this committee, members distributed the *D.A.R. Manual for Citizenship* in Mexican Community Centers, at naturalization courts, rural schools, orphanages, black schools and churches, and “among the foreign-born.”

As in the interwar period, the “foreign born” targeted by the Texas DAR typically referred to the Chicano community and encompassed Spanish-speaking native-born Texans as well as Mexican immigrant and migrant individuals. Enthusiasm for developing “Mexican” boys and girls into “little American citizens” decreased at the state level, but local DAR chapters and members carried on the work, sometimes with surprising degrees of reciprocity.340 For instance, the border-town-dwelling members of the Mission Chapter voted to have the Mexican National Anthem played at their meetings “as a gesture of friendship toward our southern neighbor.” They further encouraged local schools to play the anthem so that the children would learn to identify it.341

Still, the national and state DAR’s message of Americanism, and the model of citizenship promoted in the organization’s *Manual for Citizenship*, aimed to prevent political dissention and labor unrest as much as they promoted patriotism. The *Manual for Citizenship* emphasized that each citizen had “a share in the government of his community,” and that the Constitution was a guarantor
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of a “ladder of prosperity open and equal to all.” The Americanism committee provided financial and educational aid to “the underprivileged,” but—importantly—did not work to make the Manual’s promises of equality a reality. Member Marion Day Mullin’s statement on racial minorities captured the organization’s limited perspective well: “If they [racial minorities] are to be granted the rights of American citizenship then they must be carefully educated concerning its responsibilities. If they are to have a place in the economic life of the country, they should be trained to do the job well.” The DAR’s Americanism Committee—before, during, and after the war—may have offered an avenue of empowerment to some underprivileged and minority citizens, but its most obvious function was one of civilian defense against social unrest and divergent ideologies.

“Well Done, Soldier!”: Servicewomen and the Daughters

World War II was the first U.S. war to offer women the opportunity to defend their country not only as “war work” volunteers but as members of the military.” The Women’s Army Corps (WAC), the Navy WAVES, Coast Guard SPARS, and Marine Corps Women’s Reserve (MCWR) were proposed as a wartime strategy to release more men for combat duty. The work of WWII
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servicewomen was, by and large, in traditionally feminized areas such as health care, communications, and clerical work. Military policies and procedures treated servicewomen very different from men. But to American women supporters, and the servicewomen themselves, the ability to join the military in a capacity other than nurse, temporary employee, or volunteer was an important marker of woman’s full citizenship and an exciting new avenue for expressing patriotism. The emergence of servicewomen would change, albeit slowly, the Daughters’ gendered conceptions of patriotism.

The DRT, DAR, and UDC were avid supporters of WWII servicewomen. Chapters cooperated with military regional directors to publicize and recruit women for WAVES, SPARS, and WAC. The Beaumont chapter of the DRT alone helped to enroll sixteen women for WAVES and SPARS in 1943. The DRT allowed and encouraged the WAC and WAVES to use the facilities of the Alamo. The DAR supported the recruitment of WAVES, WAC, and SPARS among its junior organizations. At the 1943 Annual Convention of the Texas UDC, a meeting was adjourned to allow all members to attend a WAC induction ceremony to which they were specifically invited. Women in uniform were welcomed into the Daughters’ chapter meetings as honored guests. Daughters were eager to hear about WAC, WAVES, and SPARS, and also wanted to honor
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these patriotic women.”\textsuperscript{349} The DRT President signed hundreds of certificates of honor, bearing the DRT seal, to WAVES.\textsuperscript{350}

In 1943 the UDC passed a resolution praising the “patriotism and pure purpose” of servicewomen and condemning “any and all efforts to discredit the motives and character of these women.”\textsuperscript{351} This was a timely measure, as rumors of immoral and sexually promiscuous servicewomen surfaced in 1943. Recruitment posters for servicewomen presented the female soldier as embodiments of white femininity, clad in fashionable fatigues (with matching handbags, even) and donning perfectly applied lipstick.\textsuperscript{352} Such an image was not too far from reality, as women in uniform were held to stringent gendered standards of conduct and appearance. But civilian and enlisted men resisted the concept of the female soldier, accusing servicewomen of drunkenness, pregnancy, homosexuality, and promiscuity to such a degree that the Secretary of War had to publicly defend them.\textsuperscript{353}

In the midst of these scandalous reports, the UDC stood by the servicewoman’s side not only because it supported the military, but also because one of its most esteemed members was a WAC. Lieutenant Charlee Kelly, who was the daughter of the Texas Division UDC Treasurer as well as a member herself, first addressed the Division’s Annual Convention in 1942. Outlining the purpose of the WAC to her audience, she explained, “The Daughters of the
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Confederacy can very readily understand that the Corps carries on the work begun by the courageous women who sent their gray-clad men to fight the battles of the ‘War Between the States.’” She believed that military men would soon “say of us [the WAC] as they must have said on countless occasions of you [the UDC], ‘Well Done, Soldier!’”

Lieutenant Kelly framed the WAC as an extension of the same gendered patriotism expressed by the UDC, and some members followed her path. The next year, the Division reported that its members could be found serving in WAC, WAVES, SPARS, MCWR, and the Army and Navy Nurses. Members and junior members of the DAR and DRT also joined the military. Although generally female recruits were unmarried, Mrs. D. P. Germane, former Division chairman of the DAR’s National Defense Committee, became a member of the WACs in 1944. DAR junior members also enlisted in WAC, SPARS, and WAVES. The DRT could claim Lieutenant Caroline Atkinson and Ensign Constance Jones among its members. Atkinson, who was also a member of the DAR, eventually attained Major rank. Though most women in the military performed clerical work, DRT member Constance Jones trained at Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to study radar for the Navy. Her work helped develop
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radar systems that were used to defend against coastal attack and guide missiles for the possible invasion of Japan.\textsuperscript{359}

Another well-educated DRT member, Emma Shirley, enlisted as a WAC.\textsuperscript{360} Shirley was soon in charge of publicity for the WAC’s Eighth Service Command. She wrote newspaper articles and made speeches promoting and recruiting for the WAC. Shirley later recalled the lack of response she sometimes received from the women’s clubs, churches, and PTAs she tried to educate about the WAC. She remembered that one time, “I made this impassioned talk about how the WACs could help win the war, which they could. And when it was over, this woman got up very sweetly and nicely, and said, ‘I’m going home to tell my maid that she must join the WAC… I thought it was kind of catty.”\textsuperscript{361} Men were not the only Americans to dismiss and disparage servicewomen. In the mind of the woman at the meeting—and perhaps in the minds of other mature, economically comfortable white women—a woman performing military work must be of a lower class. But officially the DAR, DRT, and UDC saw servicewomen as embodiments of the highest patriotism and citizenship, and supporting women in the military was a valued aspect of the Daughters’ war work.

Work with (and sometimes, as) servicewomen altered the Daughters’ understanding of how gender shaped patriotic service. Before WWII, the

\textsuperscript{360} PDRT, 1944, 94.
Daughters’ war discourse separated men and women into unequal and distinctly gendered wartime roles. The glory and physical suffering of war belong to men, while woman’s duty was one of rehabilitation and paying tribute. The Daughters categorized their war work as for “the boys” or “our sons” who faced the true hardships of battle. A well-received speech by Judge E.A. Berry at the 1919 DRT convention captured the gendered understanding of war the Daughters endorsed and carried out in World War I and previous wars. Berry explained:

If I were a sculptor and could place in statue my conception of the monument that should be erected to heroic women of America to commemorate their war work, I would erect a plain marble shaft. On the summit I would place an American soldier. On his manly form I would place a soldier’s uniform…At the foot of that monument I would place an American woman, kneeling in the attitude of prayer. In her hands I would place such hospital equipment as would bring cheer to the wounded soldier and comfort to a departing soul…and the only inscription I would write on this monument would be these words: “She hath done what she could.”

Berry’s way of honoring patriotic womanhood delineated the circumscribed paradigm within which the Daughters performed war work before WWII. The Daughters did win admiration from powerful men and the general public when they performed patriotic service. However, as in Berry’s imagined statue, their contributions remained eternally far below men’s war work yet were all that they, as women, were capable of.

Throughout WWII, some Daughters continued to frame their war work as “for the boys” (rather than for their country). But the existence of servicewomen did slowly alter the Daughters’ discourse of war work. While generally
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maintaining their own work as maternal, the Daughters began to frame that maternal care as an aid to men and women in uniform. As a UDC member explained in 1943, “The Women of Texas are giving their treasures, their sons and their daughters to carry on this conflict.”  

In her poem, “Service,” the DRT Poet Laureate wrote:

To freedom’s cause we dedicate  
The service of our sons;  
...  
To country’s cause we freely give  
The work of daughters too.  
We ask that God will give them aid  
In everything they do.

When the war was over and the Daughters looked toward honoring the conflict’s veterans, the gendering of “veteran” was slightly but irrevocably altered in the Daughters’ minds. The UDC Division President Antoinette Dunavant addressed the 1946 Annual Convention, saying, “The faith our grandfathers, fathers, brothers, sons and daughters held on the battlefields of the three wars be yours today and hereafter.”

The Daughters always shared wartime faith with men. But the daughters of the Daughters were the first to join “grandfathers, brothers, [and] sons” on the “battlefield.” WWII servicewomen did not engage in combat. Still, the Daughters placed their contribution in the same category as men’s: a category of military wartime service that the Daughters’ grandmothers, mothers, and most sisters could not claim.
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The Daughters as Citizens: New Opportunities and Concerns Foreign, Domestic, and “Pan-American”

The Daughters’ understanding of the relationship between gender and citizenship was also shaped by their experiences in WWII. As the first war since women had gained the right to vote, WWII presented new avenues for women to use political means to achieve patriotic objectives. For many years the three organizations used the petition and letter-writing as a political strategy to effect change. As American women had done long before they had the vote, the Daughters wrote letters to local, state, and national politicians to advance organizational objectives. But since the interwar period, the DAR differed in the model of citizenship it offered members. DAR members were instructed to use the power of the vote to effect political changes far broader than the DRT and UDC’s political missions of historic preservation, education, and beautification. For the DAR in 1939, citizenship was “on par with motherhood.”

Unlike the UDC or DRT, the DAR used the vote and the petition in their war work. Whereas the DRT and UDC’s legislative committees concentrated on issues directly relating to their organization (Confederate pensions, official recognition of Texas and Confederate holidays), the DAR urged members to use politics to win the current war. The DAR pushed legislative action against the
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367 An action taken by the DRT in 1940 provides a small but important caveat to this claim. At their Annual Convention in 1940, the DRT passed a resolution to send an official message to Martin Dies, Jr. of the House Un-American Activities Committee in praise of his patriotic service “defending Americanism” and “guarding our country against forces that seek to undermine and destroy it.” Dies, the House
right of workers to strike because they believed strikes would decrease wartime production capacity. They supported the selective service act and the ROTC, as well as soldiers’ right to vote. The DAR urged its members to act as watchdogs of local, state, and national political representatives, to pay their poll tax, and to use a firm standard when voting for politicians.368

This increased and more urgent involvement in the political process was captured by the DAR Legislation Committee’s call to members to act as “citizen, voter, and homemaker.”369 While the DAR prized both femininity and citizenship before the war, during WWII emphasis on citizenship increased. Indeed, at the 1946 Annual Convention of the Texas DAR, the Legislation committee encouraged members to give even more attention to political issues in the postwar era.370 Although the DRT and UDC did not address the broader array of political issues that the DAR did in the WWII era, cross-membership among the three organizations and local-level cooperative efforts may have led all Daughters to pay closer attention to the ways in which national and international

Representative from Texas’ Second Congressional District, was a dedicated anti-communist whose wide-ranging attacks on suspected communists received criticism and eventual backlash from the general public. The DRT’s support of Dies in 1940 may be linked to similar calls to support Dies made by the DAR in 1939. While the DRT’s 1940 pro-Dies resolution did mark an important and rare involvement with broader and more controversial politics, it did not include a call to members to vote. For this reason, as well as the exceptional nature of such a DRT measure and the fact that it occurred before U.S. intervention, I maintain that the WWII-era DRT was generally less engaged in politics than the DAR. PDRT, 1940, 48; PDAR, 1939, 143, 148.
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political issues affected the country, and how they, as citizens, might shape these issues.

With the advent of WWII, Americans came to understand they were living in an increasingly globalized world. This brought about another shift in understanding among the Daughters. The DAR, DRT, and UDC advocated a Pan-American and internationalist outlook in the earlier years of the war, supporting friendship with Mexico, aid to Russia, and war relief for China. In 1942 some DRT and UDC members cooperated with local chapters of the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) to raise money for scholarships and even to honor Tejano patriots of the Texas Revolution.

Furthermore, during WWII, small numbers of women and children with Hispanic last names such as Perez, Fernandez, and Carvajal, began to be found among the ranks of the DRT and (primarily) Children of the Republic of Texas (DRT). Some women and children with Anglo last names began to claim Tejano ancestors as the legitimation for their membership in the DRT. Some women gained considerable authority in their chapters, such as Mrs. Albert (Eleanor Rentíro) Fernandez, who gave historical speeches and served as Vice President of the Brownsville chapter. Thanks to the work of LULAC, “Mexicans” were reclassified as “white” on the 1940 U.S. Census. Mrs. Fernandez and her CRT-member son Albert Fernandez, Jr. were marked as racially white on the Census,

371 UdC, 1942, 98, 231; PDRT, 1942, 46, PDAR, 1942, 75.
372 UdC, 1942, 102; PDRT, 1943, 163.
373 PDRT, 1941, 169, 179; PDRT, 1942, 62; PDRT, 1943, 196, 209, 218, 227; PDRT, 1944, 114, 142; PDRT, 1945, 82, 149.
and perhaps fellow DRT and CRT members understood them to be so.\textsuperscript{374}

However, the phenomenon of these new Chicano DRT and CRT members did not come up for discussion at statewide DRT meetings during WWII.

The DRT's understanding of the relationship between race, nation, and Pan-American sentiment was expressed more clearly in member Rachel Blunter Hebert's 1942 long poem, \textit{Shadows on the Nueces}. In the words of Corpus Christi President (and head of the History Department at Texas College of Arts and Industries) Mrs. J.E. Conner:

“Shadows on the Nueces” is a historical poem of Chepita, a Mexican woman executed for the murder of an Anglo American. The story has it that Chepita’s son did the deed but that Chepita, to shield him, accepted responsibility for the crime. This story, touching as it does the inter relation [sic] of the races, promotes the moral of the “good neighbor policy” in a very effective way.\textsuperscript{375}

Although the story of Chepita (sometimes spelled “Chipita” in other sources) took place in 1863, Hebert’s retelling of the Texas legend invented new characters and details that helped the narrative explore ideas about race and nation relevant to WWII-era Texas.

In her concluding notes, Hebert identified Pedro Rodriguez—Chepita’s father in the narrative—as a fictitious character. A Mexican-born man who fought to the death alongside Anglos in the Texas Revolution, Pedro was designed to

\textsuperscript{374} 1940 U.S. Census, Cameron County, City of Brownsville, TX, population schedule, enumeration district 3143, sheet 4B, lines 47-49, Fernandez, A.M., Fernandez, Eleanor, Fernandez, A.M., Jr.

\textsuperscript{375} PDRT, 1942, 63. Conner wrote the forward to the book, where she identified “the clash of war with its unnatural race alignments” and the “special racial and sectional forms” of “the sacrificing quality of mother love” as key themes in the narrative. J.E. Conner, “Forward” in Rachel Bluntzer Hebert, \textit{Shadows on the Nueces} (Atlanta, G.A.: The Banner Press of Emory University, 1942), unnumbered page.
represent the “liberty-loving Mexicans” who had earned themselves a place in Texas history. Yet Pedro also represents Mexican “pride of race,” as Hebert presents Pedro retelling proud stories of his Aztec forebears to young Chepita. Chepita’s troubles begin when she falls for and has a child with an Anglo man, who absconds with the child. As an adult years later, the son returns to Chepita’s guest house (from which she makes her living). Chepita recognizes him as her son, but before she gets a moment to confront him the son robs and slays another trader staying at Chepita’s—an Anglo man named John Savage. The son flees to Mexico never to be seen again, and after trying to cover it up, Chepita is identified by Texas Rangers as the main suspect. Chepita quietly accepts her fate, saying, “I am not guilty” but refusing to identify her son as the murderer.376

In Hebert’s account Chepita’s wrongful execution was not the fault of the Anglo judge and jury, who were sympathetic to Chepita but bound to follow the law. Hebert presented Chepita’s silence (and her father’s advice to be silent in times of trouble) with some frustration, but the poem does not place the blame on Chepita or Pedro either. Rather, Chepita’s problems appear to stem entirely from the existence of her border-crossing, deviant son. Hebert quipped, “Mixing blood might make fiendish creatures!”377 In Shadows on the Nueces, Pedro and Chepita are undeniably Texans, but they are also proud and distinct members of the “Mexican” race. They can collaborate with and befriend Anglos. But the racial

---
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mixing of Anglo and Mexican produces a criminal whose ability to cross the border into Mexico makes him particularly dangerous.

This “Pan-American” narrative perhaps offered DRT members a kind of logic that legitimated welcoming a few pedigreed Tejanas into their organization even as they and many Texans became anxious about the border-crossing migrant Mexicans coming into the U.S. through the federal government’s “Bracero Program.” The Bracero Program, implemented in 1942, was a war measure (although it endured into the postwar era) to supply needed labor to U.S. farms with migrant Mexican workers who would be guaranteed a minimum wage and livable working conditions. Texas, however, refused to participate in the Bracero Program for the first five years, and conditions for legal and illegal Mexican workers in the state were notoriously poor. While some Daughters promoted “Pan-Americanism” throughout the war, Texan’s refusal to participate in the Bracero Program, its poor treatment of Mexican workers, and Mexico’s reciprocal decision to ban its “braceros” from entering the state, proved “Pan-American cooperation” between Texas and Mexico to be a failure.\(^\text{378}\)

The fading of the international and Pan-American sympathies of the DRT and other Daughters was clearly visible as the war drew to a close. Although the Daughters did not remark on the Bracero program specifically, the DRT and DAR passed anti-immigrant resolutions in 1944. The DRT’s Beaumont chapter

adopted a resolution recommending “strict observance” of quota immigration after the war.\textsuperscript{379} The Texas DAR noted that increasingly “unpromising” and “undesirable” immigrants were gaining citizenship and worried about the “trend toward a relaxing of the requirements for entrance [to the U.S.] after the war.” The Division passed a resolution opposing unrestricted immigration at the cessation of hostilities.\textsuperscript{380} Behind these sentiments were concerns about ideologies such as communism and socialism, as well as fears about the economic and racial future of Texas. UDC Division President Ella Robertson expressed a sentiment that prevailed among many Daughters in 1944: “[This year] finds our nation still at war,—war with nations that would trample God underfoot. Never before has our country been confronted with such a need for loyalty.”\textsuperscript{381}

**Conclusion**

This need for “loyalty” to the nation would grow even stronger with the emergence of the Cold War and Second Red Scare. The World War II experience brought about new ideas, and new concerns, that the Daughters would bring to their work in the Cold War period. During WWII the Daughters located ways in which their own national objectives could be amplified by connecting to national “patriotic” rhetoric. By performing myriad forms of war work, the Daughters connected their Texan, Confederate, and early American nationalism to current American patriotism, gained greater public recognition, and

\textsuperscript{379} PDRT, 1944, 79-80.  
\textsuperscript{380} PDAR, 1944, 30, 91-93.  
\textsuperscript{381} PUDC, 1944, 25.
affirmed their personal connections to the military legacies of their ancestors. During WWII, the Daughters developed further connections with each other and other local organizations. They found a new model of patriotic womanhood in the WWII servicewoman. Some members, especially those in the DAR, gathered new ideas about citizenship and internationalism. In the DRT, complex issues of the race and national belonging of Chicanos simmered, but did not yet boil over—perhaps due to the conservative (albeit different) racial understandings of Anglo DRT members and middle-class Tejanos. The Cold War would not bring about “liberation” for most American women. But for the Daughters, the period’s prevailing conservatism and emphasis on Americanism would provide ample opportunities to build on their WWII legacy.
CHAPTER 5: TEXAS DAUGHTERS AND THE RISE OF THE CONSERVATIVE
“HOUSEWIFE,” 1946-1960

The years between 1946 and 1960 are remembered as a time of restrictive conceptions of womanhood. The stereotypical postwar housewife, as identified by Betty Friedan in her germinal *The Feminine Mystique*, was bound by the strictures of hyper-feminine (white) womanhood to an often unfulfilling life of domestic routine. Postwar experts and advertisers presented the suburban housewife as a “dream image” of feminine fulfillment in a life devoted to husband, children, and home. This idealized housewife “had no thought for the unfeminine problems of the world outside the home; they wanted the men to make the major decisions. They glorified in their role as women, and wrote proudly on the census blank: ‘Occupation: housewife.’”382 According to Friedan, this ideal created a “problem that has no name” among American women. Finding themselves unfulfilled by this limited feminine sphere but without the language or tools to dismantle it, some women descended into apparent neurosis. Housewives interviewed by Friedan expressed feelings that they did not exist and had no personality. They burst into episodes of crying and anger but could not identify the cause. Toward the end of the postwar era, discontent among American housewives became a nationally recognized issue. Some women began to speak with each other and identify “the problem that has no name” as stemming from societal gender roles, not failures of their own. Friedan argued, “We can no

longer ignore that voice within women that says: “I want something more than my husband and my children and my home.” For Friedan and other feminist women this “something more” was equal opportunity and independence for women in work, politics, and education. The pursuit of such a goal would require a new wave of feminist organization and activism in America.

While Friedan’s imagining of the housewife was a call to feminist action, liberal men in Texas employed this same image of the repressed housewife to chastise and dismiss conservative women’s activism. Remembering the political scene in Dallas in the decade before the Kennedy assassination, liberal reporter Warren Leslie pointed to the “compulsive right-wing woman” as one of the most central figures of Texas conservatism. Leslie saw in the “right-wing woman” a diseased and disturbed form of womanhood—prone to alcoholism, extramarital sex, and compulsive consumption—whose political extremism exceeded that of the most radical right-wing men. Indeed, levelheaded conservative men became alienated from and even feared their right-wing wives. In his 1964 bestseller _Dallas Public and Private_, Leslie described the right-wing woman:

Such a woman is over thirty-five, sometimes well over. She does not have a job. Her children are gone from the household most of the time or for good. The husband is well off, sometimes very successful…‘The marriage has lasted fifteen or twenty years and, in Thurber’s words, the magic has gone out of it…Like other points of contact, the sexual relationship has either died entirely or comes alive rarely and without joy…[The women] say to themselves, “What am I here for? Who needs me? What should I do?”

---
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These were the women who found an “outlet” in right-wing extremism, according to Leslie. Conservative women were a frighteningly tangible reality to postwar liberals, especially in Texas. While liberal women’s activism declined after suffrage passed, conservative white women’s activities continued and in some places became even stronger. Texas was home to some of the largest and most active chapters of American conservative and right-wing women’s organizations in the first half of the twentieth century.

Historiography on conservative women’s activism in the postwar era also crystalizes around the figure of the American housewife. This is perhaps best encapsulated by the title of Mary Brennan’s work on postwar anti-communist women, *Wives, Mothers, and the Red Menace*. She argues that most anti-communist women activists were married, white, and middle-class. Most had children, and few had jobs outside the home. Michelle Nickerson’s work on later postwar conservative women’s activism, “Moral Mothers and Goldwater Girls,” further confirms that conservative women activists were “mostly homemakers and mothers.” Catherine Rymph’s *Republican Women* similarly argues that many of the conservative women who joined Republican women’s clubs after WWII were “housewife activists.” As June Melby Benowitz explains in her article, “Reading, Writing, and Radicalism: Right-Wing Women and Education in the Post-War Years,” the centrality of schools to conservative crusades in the
postwar era opened space for women, particularly women with children, to enter the world of politics.\textsuperscript{385}

The average member of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the United Daughters of the Confederacy aligned in many ways with the image of the housewife described by postwar liberals and current historians. Most members were married.\textsuperscript{386}

Generally, the Daughters were middle and upper class. While it is difficult to assess exactly how many members had jobs outside the home, typical chapter meetings were held in the early afternoon, which would have prevented many working women from regular attendance.\textsuperscript{387} Some Daughters were younger women, but through the years most members were, in Warren Leslie’s words, “over thirty-five, sometimes well over.”\textsuperscript{388}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{386} “Mrs.” Appeared far more frequently than “Miss” in the Daughters’ membership lists. PDRT, 1955, 87-249; PUDC, 1955, 67-97; PDAR, 1955, 285-289.
\item \textsuperscript{387} Oran Roberts chapter UDC minutes, meeting of October 20, 1949; October 19, 1950; June 7, 1951; Minutes of the William Barret Travis Chapter, October 7, 1953, Daughters of the Republic of Texas, William Barret Travis Chapter, Records, 1892-1994, Dolph Briscoe Center.
\end{itemize}
I argue that a significant number of conservative-leaning Texas women who either called themselves or were defined by others as “housewives” had experience in organizing and advocating through heritage organizations. The UDC, DAR, and DRT were not equally “conservative.” However, all three organizations performed actions and statements in the 1950s that aligned with the Texas right wing’s agenda and rhetoric. This chapter also introduces a new object of study, the anti-communist Minute Women of the U.S.A., and resumes analysis of Fort Worth right-wing activist Ida M. Darden. Like heritage organizations, Darden and the Texas chapters of the Minute Women deployed discourses of gender and nationalism. But perhaps more crucially, Texas white women’s heritage organizations had personal and ideological connections to both the Minute Women and Ida Darden. The postwar relationship between heritage organizations and more identifiably conservative women and ideology further suggests that heritage organizations played a role in the formation of grassroots conservative activism in the postwar era. This chapter traces that relationship with a focus on anti-communism, opposition to the Civil Rights movement, and commitment to “traditional” conceptions of gender, three areas that were central concerns of postwar American conservatives. In conclusion I examine Texas liberals’ failure to fully recognize the cultural and political significance of this “housewife” activism.

Texas Women confront “isms”

The Daughters emerged from World War II with an expanded conception of the role and responsibilities of their gender and their organizations. Before this war, the veterans the Daughters honored were always men. The advent of servicewomen in WWII introduced the Daughters to a more active form of patriotic womanhood. Such a model appeared at a critical moment, as WWII also awakened the Daughters to the new possibilities and dangers of an increasingly globalized world. At the 1946 DRT annual meeting, members were told that “We have found out through World War II, in which Texans played an important part, that we live on a very small earth and must acquire a world viewpoint. There is nothing that can happen on earth with which we are not vitally concerned.” The UDC Texas Division president also emphasized the increasing entanglement of the domestic and international at their 1946 annual meeting. Urging that the patriotic work of the UDC must not cease with the end of WWII, she took a citizen’s creed before the assembled members: “I believe in my country and her destiny, in the greatest dream of her founders, her privileges cherished, her freedom defended.” The 1946 Texas DAR annual meeting presented a stark depiction of a newly translational America. The National Defense committee chairman exclaimed, “Never before has there been such a need for women to keep informed on current changes as today. Never before has our American way of life been so threatened as it is today, when we have foreign isms seeking to engulf Americanism.”

---

In Texas, the DAR would not be alone in its vigilance against “isms.”

“Texas as a state has been especially active in fighting communism,” boasted National Defense committee chairwoman Mrs. Emmette Wallace at the 1955 Texas Society DAR meeting. Mrs. Wallace continued:

A bill to outlaw the party [the Communist Party USA] was passed in 1954….The Loyalty Oath is required of all who are on the state or federal payroll, of teachers, and of those who serve on the various boards and commissions….There is a commission on un-American activities in Texas and we are fortunate in having an “America-First” governor whom we recognized for his work with an Award of Appreciation.\(^{391}\)

This laundry list provides only a sampling of the anti-communist measures taken by Texas in the postwar era. Much anti-communist agitation occurred at the grassroots and local level in Texas, particularly in the schools, which had long been a site of heritage organizations’ activism. Heritage organizations along with the Minute Women played important roles in creating the highly charged anti-communist atmosphere of postwar Texas. The DRT, UDC, and DRT engaged in varying degrees of anti-communist activism that were shaped by each organization’s pre-1946 involvement with anti-communism, the particular “nation” it celebrated, and its connections to the more identifiably anti-communist Minute Women of Texas.

The Minute Women of the U.S.A. was a national anti-communist women’s organization founded in Connecticut in 1949. Founder Suzanne Stevenson envisioned the organization as a nonpartisan and non-racialist club that would mobilize the untapped power of conservative women’s votes to combat the

\(^{391}\) PDAR, 1955, 173.
legacy of the New Deal: high taxes, progressive education, big government, and internationalism. The founding and Connecticut-based members of the organization were also individualist feminists; although they did not champion women’s rights broadly, they believed gender should not delimit their own participation in politics.392 This individualist feminist orientation was reflected in the organization’s political strategy, which encouraged members to act as individuals and to avoid representing themselves as a coherent group. Individualist feminism was also signaled in the organization’s rhetoric. Explaining why members should not act as a coherent pressure group, Stevenson argued, “our personal pride in our own individual freedom prompts us to act as individual American citizens.”393

The early Connecticut-based Minute Women elected to focus on taxes and limiting government rather than on the anti-communist part of their agenda. However, as women across the country—especially southern women—found themselves compelled by the Minute Women’s message, the individualist-feminist, tax-focused, and non-racialist orientation of the organization began to fade into the background.394 Texas chapters of the Minute Women were central to shifting the organization’s focus toward anti-communism and racism. Houston women formed a Minute Women chapter in 1951. Houstonian Mrs. H. Thomas

393 “Minute Women of the United States of America, Inc.” pamphlet (n.p., no date), George S. Ebey Collection Box 3 (Houston Metropolitan Research Center). Emphasis mine.
394 Scher, “Cold War on the Home Front,” 188.
wrote to Stevenson, “I would respectfully suggest the addition of one important principle to those admirable ones which you have already listed—It is the principle of States Rights!” Stevenson quickly obliged and added states rights to the organization’s objectives.\footnote{The Minute Women of America, Inc. (newspaper) (Southport, CT: March 1951), 1-2.}

The Houston chapter quickly became the most active and notorious Minute Women chapter in the nation and the most militant anti-communist organization in Houston. The Houston Minute Women focused their efforts on eradicating Communism from the city’s public schools. They used their connections with local national political leaders and the conservative \textit{Houston Chronicle} newspaper to smear liberal educators in the Houston Independent School District (HISD) and the University of Houston with allegations of Communist and racial integrationist leanings. From 1951 through 1958, their efforts led to the dismissal of numerous liberal HISD and University of Houston teachers and administrators, the censoring of textbooks and guest speakers, and eventually, the election of Minute Women and their supporters to the board of HISD. The Houston Minute Women’s activities were reported on in publications across the country including the Atlanta \textit{Constitution}, \textit{Time Magazine}, \textit{The Nation}, and the Spanish-language newspaper \textit{La Prensa}. In 1953 the Minute Women’s extremism was “exposed” in an eleven-part series in the \textit{Houston Post}, but the organization soldiered on throughout the postwar period. Historian George Norris Green identifies the postwar Houston Minute Women as “the most
powerful pressure group in Houston since the heyday of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920’s.\textsuperscript{396}

Like members of heritage organizations, many of Houston’s Minute Women were elite and wealthy women who might write “Occupation: housewife” on the census. Many of the Houston chapters’ members were indeed members of heritage organizations like the DAR and DRT. Historian Don Carleton has said that “cross-fertilization” among the Minute Women and DAR was “rampant.”\textsuperscript{397}

Such overlap was logical given the Minute Women’s focus on education in their fight against communism. The Minute Women’s stand against “progressive education” (a stand also formally adopted by the DAR) was compelling not only to everyday “housewives” but also to Parent-Teacher Association leaders, public school teachers, and wives of school administrators who joined the organization.\textsuperscript{398}

Fort Worth right-wing columnist Ida Darden had strong ties to the Minute Women and to heritage organizations. Her books were “required reading” for Minute Women, and her daughter Helen Thomas served as the Houston Minute Women’s “ideologist.” Drawing on her mother’s work and political connections,
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\textsuperscript{398} Ibid., 125.
Thomas provided the research Minute Women used to attack their liberal opponents.\textsuperscript{399} The relationship between heritage organizations (particularly the DAR), the Minute Women, and Ida Darden was reciprocal; Darden praised the work and patriotic example of the Minute Women and DAR in her newspaper, \textit{The Southern Conservative}.\textsuperscript{400} 

Ida Darden’s campaign against Communism was longstanding, broad, and fervent. Darden was a former lobbyist with connections to economic and social conservatives in the worlds of business and politics. She cut her teeth in politics with the Texas Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage and ran for Congressional office in the early 1930s. But by the 1950s, Darden increasingly isolated herself from formal politics and positioned herself as a political outsider in her critical and satirical works.\textsuperscript{401} In 1949 she and wealthy former Senator R. A. Stuart established \textit{The Southern Conservative} newspaper, the content of which would be entirely determined by Darden. “My Night,” a satire of Eleanor Roosevelt’s “My Day” column, was a popular item in Darden’s paper. When Darden was “deluged by a shower of mail” from Washington politicians and journalists praising the column, she published the articles as a collection in her 1951 book, \textit{My Night}.\textsuperscript{402} Like that of women in the Minute Women and heritage
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organizations, Darden’s anti-communism was part of a broader attack on growing federal power.

The DAR’s long-held opposition to “isms” would lead it to strong anti-communist activism and a relationship with the Minute Women in postwar Texas. The DAR’s opposition to Bolshevism and Communism in World War I swung the organization to the right, and since then the DAR’s anti-racialism was increasingly fervent.403 The postwar era, however, marked a sharp uptick in the attention the DAR gave to fighting “isms,” most particularly Communism. In 1946 Texas DAR members were asked to “redouble your efforts” in the organization’s Americanism and National Defense committees.404 The DAR’s 1946 call to action in these committees was well heeded, as the Americanism chairman reported in 1948: “We all felt at once that this [Americanism] was the most important Committee…And after receiving the reports from the State Chairmen in the Southwest Division, I am more convinced that everyone else thinks this too.” The reports revealed that the Texas Society DAR’s Americanism committee was “far and away” the best in the Southwest Division.405 As the National Defense committee chairman reported, the growing enthusiasm for these two committees revealed the “intense desire of every chapter member to stamp out communism.”406

404 PDAR, 1946, 94, 117.
405 PDAR, 1948, 89.
The DAR also battled Communism and other liberal and radical movements through its resolutions. Resolutions passed at annual Texas DAR meetings were sometimes sent to state and national politicians, but they also served to bring attention to and unify members’ opinions on specific issues. Many postwar Americans opposed Communism. However, through resolutions read before annual and chapter meetings, members of the DAR were exposed to a more complex conception of the Communist threat and the political strategies needed to combat it. Before 1950, the Texas DAR’s lists of resolutions were typically short; most were resolutions of thanks to hosts and guests. But by the early 1950s pages of DAR resolutions attacked Communism and the growth of US federal power from various angles, such as “Opposition to All Forms of World Government,” “Approval of Constitutional Amendment by Senator Bricker,” “Opposition to Japanese Peace Treaty,” and “Opposition to Converting Atlantic Treaty into a Political Atlantic Union.” Many resolutions passed by the Texas DAR came from the National Society, DAR, but in the postwar era the Texas DAR would also pass resolutions—most often connected to issues of anti-communism and national security—that they passed along and recommended to the national DAR.407

DAR resolutions encouraged members to become acquainted with international and domestic politics and provided a list of subjects for members to write to politicians about and to vote on. Members were continually instructed to inform themselves about issues (particularly those relating to Communism and

federal power), to write their senators often, to pay their poll taxes, and to vote in every election. Internal surveys of the Texas DAR reported that most members were registered voters and voted often.\textsuperscript{408}

In the early 1950s education was a topic of increasing concern to both leaders and average DAR members. In 1951 the Texas DAR began a movement to remove supposedly subversive textbooks from public schools. This campaign proved popular among the membership. One year later the Texas DAR asked the Texas UDC for advice on creating its own textbook committee (the UDC had a longstanding textbook committee that worked to eradicate “false histories” of the South and the “War between the States”). The DAR contacted the Texas state board of education in an effort to have “un-American” textbooks removed, and members worked on the local level to remove subversive books from local schools.\textsuperscript{409} DAR members were compelled to act by leaders’ dramatic rhetoric, such as that employed by textbook committee chairwoman Mrs. E. L. Harwell in 1953:

\begin{quote}
The whole aim of this committee [Investigation of the Use of Subversive Textbooks in Texas Public Schools] is expressed by the last words of the American’s Creed: “and to defend it against all enemies.” For who knows how this Communistic infiltration into text books will affect the future of America?...We should more fully realize the dangers that confront our youth; for we know that pro-socialist educators have seized control of many of our schools today.\textsuperscript{410}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
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Yet the results of members’ investigations into the public schools did not support repeated calls for urgency such as Harwell’s. When surveyed as to whether their local schools had “swung to the left,” most chapters consistently reported that they had not (although some had a “tendency that way”). Still, the Daughters maintained vigilance against Communism and liberalism “creeping” in the schools and elsewhere well into the late 1950s.

The postwar UDC and DRT were less focused on fighting Communism than was the DAR, yet both were in agreement with the DAR’s anti-communist agenda. Although more focused on celebrating and honoring their own nations, the Republic of Texas and the Confederate States of America both recognized the need for increased Americanism in the midst of the early Cold War. The UDC and DRT advocated a common tactic in the fight against foreign “isms” and cultural-political instability: increase organizational unity and conformity. In 1948 the UDC Texas division president encouraged increased adherence to the UDC Constitution and bylaws, “even if it is not just suitable to our ideas,” because the nation was “in such turmoil and confusion.” The DRT president similarly instructed members to hold a standard of “unmatched loyalty” to their organization. Maximizing loyalty among heritage organization members may not appear a particularly useful or even logical tactic in the fight against Communism and “un-Americanism.” Yet as the UDC division president explained in another address, “we feel that the upholding of the principles on which we are founded
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has been a stabilizing influence to our nation." Members of the UDC and DRT, along with those of the DAR, understood their heritage as representing the best of American ideals.

But in contrast to their actions in previous decades, UDC and DRT also took more direct action against Communism in the postwar era. In 1957 the DRT established a standing committee on Civil Defense, and the president recommended that members “enlarge” their civil defense work. The DRT’s program encouraged members to learn how to best protect themselves in the event of nuclear attack. The committee cited the “continuation of the Cold War with the communists” as necessitating the creation of this committee, which the division president hoped would grow in following years. The DRT’s Civil Defense committee was led by a member from Red Scare hotbed Houston.

Since its inception, the Texas UDC almost never passed resolutions that did not relate to Confederate veterans, historic buildings, or internal organizational business. An exception to this trend emerged in 1952 when the Texas division passed a resolution against communism. The lengthy resolution declared that the Texas division “is opposed to and does not endorse any

---

415 Whereas the DAR’s National Defense committee focused primarily on education, the DRT’s Civil Defense committee aligned with the civil defense program of the National Security Resources Board. Civilian defense aimed to train Americans to avoid panic in the event of nuclear attack, and to maintain public morale in the face of such a threat. Both men and women were recruited for civilian defense positions (wardens, emergency vehicle drivers, medics, instructors) and in many ways civil defense jobs were less gender-specific than broader American understandings of gender. See Laura McEaney, Civil Defense Begins at Home: Militarization meets Everyday Life in the Fifties (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000).
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socialistic or communistic principles, parties or groups, or any man or woman in
public office or running for public office who are in favor of or who uphold any
socialistic or communistic principles.” This resolution was introduced by a
member from a Houston UDC chapter, suggesting possible connections to
Houston’s Red Scare climate and Minute Women’s activism.417

Four years later, the candidacy of Minute Women Bertie Maughmer for
HISD school board was announced in a Houston UDC chapter meeting. Bertie
Maughmer’s mother-in-law, Mrs. Earl Maughmer, was a UDC leader who served
in chapter and division-wide leadership positions including division radio and
television director, division treasurer, and president of Houston’s Oran Roberts
chapter. She also led the Houston chapter’s children’s auxiliary, of which Bertie
Maughmer’s children were members.418 While the Red scare died down in Texas
by the mid-1950s, anti-communist women activists like Maughmer helped
perpetuate the endurance of anti-communist rhetoric in the public sphere and
within women’s heritage organizations.

In 1954 the Texas legislature passed the Communist Suppression Act,
which created a special police school to train local officers in combatting “all
subversive activities.” Officers utilized the techniques of wire-tapping and
extralegal spying learned at this school to gather information not only on
professed Communists but also on liberal politicians. But in this same year, anti-

417 PUDC, 1952, 86.
418 PUDC, 1939, 157; PUDC, 1940, 103; PUDC, 1941, 133; PUDC, 1946, 12; PUDC, 1952, 30, 37-38.
communism began to lose some of its political effectiveness.\footnote{Carleton, \textit{Red Scare!}, 264-265.} The Army-McCarthy hearings delegitimized the authority of the Red Scare’s most prominent star, Joseph McCarthy. As an anti-communist crusader, McCarthy presented himself as a masculine former Marine and an independent Washington outsider. This image was highly appealing to the Daughters, as it cohered with their valuation of military masculinity and their increasing distrust of the federal government. But the televised Army-McCarthy hearings shattered this image, painting McCarthy as an unstable deviant engaged in an illicit relationship with his aide Roy Cohn.\footnote{Andrea Friedman, “The Smearing of Joe McCarthy: The Lavender Scare, Gossip, and Cold War Politics,” \textit{American Quarterly} 57 (Dec., 2005), 1105-1108.} While not entirely eliminating anti-communism from public discourse, the televised downfall of McCarthy greatly weakened its political usefulness nationally and in Texas, where it had been a key conservative strategy. Even in highly conservative Houston, a liberal majority was elected to the school board by voters tired of scare tactics in politics. But \textit{Brown v. Board} and its implementation ruling renewed conservative activism in Texas.\footnote{Carleton, \textit{Red Scare!}, 279-282.}

\textbf{“The Civil Rights menace rears its ugly head”}

The strength of anti-communist activism in Texas played a crucial role in later battles over desegregation in the state. In the 1940s Texas’ system of racial segregation had begun to crack in small but important ways. Some of this cracking was facilitated by the complexity of race relations in a state that shared the South’s history of slavery and discrimination against blacks but also had a
longstanding and segregated Chicano population. Segregation of and
discrimination against Chicanos differed from that of black Texans because it
was mostly de facto (by custom) and not de jure (by law). While not targeted by
Jim Crow laws, Chicanos in Texas faced discrimination at the polls, in education,
in business, and other aspects of everyday life. Lynching and other forms of
racial violence were inflicted on the Chicano community as well as the black
community in early twentieth-century Texas. In the early years of WWII, violence
against Mexican nationals and Chicanos in Texas prompted the Mexican
government to halt its guest worker program. The nation’s reliance on the labor
provided by Mexican agricultural guest workers led the US State Department to
pressure Texas into passage of the Caucasian Race Resolution of 1943.422

This resolution sought to mend the state’s relationship with Mexico,
opening with the declaration that “all nations of the North and South American
continents are banded together in an effort to stamp out Nazism and preserve
democracy” and emphasizing that “our neighbors to the South are cooperating
and aiding us in every way possible.” Yet in this gesture of good neighbor policy,
Texas offered a resolution that did not name “Mexicans,” “Mexican-Americans,”
“Latins,” “Latin Americans,” or “Tejanos” as its object. Instead, the resolution

422 Lisa Y. Ramos, “Not Similar Enough: Mexican American and African American
Civil Rights Struggles in the 1940s” in The Struggle in Black and Brown: African
American and Mexican American Relations during the Civil Rights Era, ed., Brian D.
Behnken (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2011), 27; Tyina Leaneice Steptoe,
“Dixie West: Race, Migration, and the Color Line in Jim Crow Houston” (PhD diss.,
University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2008), 129, 134, 139; William Henry Kellar, Make
Haste Slowly: Moderates, Conservatives, and School Desegregation in Houston (College
Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1999), 4-9.
declared that “All persons of the Caucasian Race” were “entitled to full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of all public places.”

Despite the resolution, Mexican nationals and Mexican Americans continued to face discrimination in the state throughout WWII and postwar era.

The idea that Mexican-descent individuals were part of the “Caucasian Race” can be traced to the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which considered those of Mexican descent to be “white,” at least on paper. But most Anglos in Texas and other parts of the Southwest saw Mexicans as a separate and inferior race. In the 1940s and 1950s, Chicano civil rights activists used the argument of Mexican “whiteness” to argue against discrimination and segregation of their communities; as Caucasians, they argued, Chicanos should not be subjected to discriminatory practices. In 1948 the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) successfully contested the deliberate segregation of Mexican-descent children in Texas public schools in the case of Delgado v. Bastrop Independent School District. The US District Court ruled that segregation of Mexican students was a violation of the Constitution. Loopholes in the ruling allowed de facto segregation of early elementary Mexican students to continue until the late 1950s. However, this ruling mobilized Chicanos in the fight against discrimination, and brought into question what “whiteness” meant in Texas.
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Texas’ system of black-white segregation also cracked in the 1940s and 1950s, but postwar conservatives ensured that it would not break. Two US Supreme Court cases key to the Civil Rights movement originated in the State. The 1943 decision *Smith v. Allwright* ended the white primary in Texas and in many other southern states. In 1950 *Sweat v. Painter* ruled that law school applicant Heman Marion Sweat be admitted to the University of Texas Law School because separate black law programs did not have equal facilities. This opened the way for black Texans to enter UT’s law program as well as other graduate programs in medicine and dentistry.\(^{425}\)

These two cases were critical to the development of the Civil Rights movement in the US and in Texas. But a focus on the schools brought about by *Brown v. Board* reinvigorated the activism and enthusiasm of those who had formerly come to the “rescue” of white Texan children’s apparently fragile hearts and minds: conservative activists and politicians. In Houston, the liberal majority elected to the school board in the wake of the Red Scare’s disintegration was replaced by a conservative majority utilizing a rhetoric of race that shared ideological and strategic connections to anti-communist rhetoric.\(^{426}\) In Houston, and in Texas as a whole, conservatives effectively delayed public school desegregation for over a decade. Texas’ enduring resistance to implementing

\(^{425}\) Kellar, *Make Haste Slowly*, 42; Campbell, *Gone to Texas*, 424.

\(^{426}\) Carleton, *Red Scare!,* 283-287.

Texas white women’s heritage organizations did not take formal public stands against either Mexican-American or black desegregation. Yet their rhetoric of “heritage” became more salient in the midst of debates on race, and in different ways the DRT, DAR, and UDC revealed that they understood that heritage as white. At the 1950 DRT annual meeting, two changes were made to the organization’s by-laws. Member Mrs. Schenkenberg presented an amendment that would substitute “any white woman” for “any woman” in the membership requirements. Another member, Mrs. Maresh, dissented and moved to strike out the word “white” from the proposed amendment. Both women were former DRT presidents. Mrs. Maresh was seconded, but the motion to remove the introduction of race into the DRT membership requirements lost when a standing vote was taken. After this convention, whiteness became a requirement for membership in the DRT. As the afternoon session of the 1950 DRT meeting progressed, a motion to introduce whiteness into the requirements for the
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428 Unfortunately, numbers of the standing vote were not reported in the Annual Proceedings. PDRT, 1950, 41, 125; *Daughters of the Republic of Texas Patriot Ancestor Album, Volume 2* (Turner Publishing Company, 2001), 14.
children’s auxiliary, the Children of the Republic of Texas, was introduced as well. It passed without dissent.429

The DRT’s decision may have been a response to black Civil Rights activism, but there were no reported attempts made by black women to join the organization in this period. But by WWII, some women and children with Hispanic last names appeared in DRT membership lists. Still, in many Anglo daughters’ memories, “Mexicans” were a different race.430 In 1949 Delgado v. Bastrop ISD ruled that Mexican children were white. Perhaps some Daughters worried that the ruling would lead Chicanos to claim other “white” spaces such as heritage organizations and saw the revision of membership requirements as a way to prevent an influx of Chicanos into the DRT. But the numbers of women and children who had Hispanic last names and/or claimed a Tejano ancestor held relatively steady from the WWII period through 1960; Chicana members were not

430 But by the late 1940s, “different” may not have meant inferior in the minds of Anglo DRT members. In 1948, the San Antonio DRT (as well as the San Antonio UDC), sent a “Princess” to represent their organization at the annual Black and White ball held by the Selene Club (Club Feminil Selene), a San Antonio Chicana social organization. A DRT member explained, “The Selene Club is composed of young ladies from our fine Latin-American families. Originally the club activities were confined to Latins only, but the last few years they have sent bids to many of our clubs and organizations to enter a princess.” That the UDC—a more forthright proponent of “racial integrity”—would also enter a princess suggests that while Club Selene members were presented as different (as “Latins”), they were either seen as being “other white” or, at least, were not considered as threatening as black Texans.
kicked out of the organization due to this ruling.431 But perhaps Daughters wanted to assure the general public that all DRT members—including the small numbers of Chicanas that joined the organization during and after WWII—were not “colored.” Whether the aim of the DRT’s decision was to prevent black Texans from joining, to curb an influx of new Chicano members, or to confirm the whiteness of Tejana DRT members, it made the DRT officially “whites’ only,” thus aligning the organization with racial conservatism.

In 1939 a racially conservative stance had brought the National Society of the DAR public scorn when the organization refused to allow black opera singer Marian Anderson to perform at the DAR’s Constitution Hall in Washington, DC. Liberals and Civil Rights activists denounced the DAR and created a subsequent “freedom concert” where Anderson performed at the Lincoln Memorial. First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt revoked her membership with the DAR and repudiated the organization in her newspaper column, “My Day.” Even some supporters of segregation decried the DAR’s handling of the situation in this national and public setting.432 Following this public relations debacle, the national DAR allowed Marian Anderson to perform at Constitution Hall in 1942 and again in 1953 before a desegregated audience. Yet, as an analysis of the Texas Division suggests, the DAR did not repudiate its racial conservatism in the postwar era.

431 Although it is difficult to make a definite claim given variances in chapter reports, there appear to have been anywhere between two and ten Chicanas in the organization in any given year. PDRT, 1946, 143; PDRT, 1947, 180, 208; PDRT, 193, 196, 201, 202; PDRT, 1951, 210, 233, 263; PDRT, 1955, 116, 118, 147, 166, 220, 242; PDRT, 1957, 145, 154, 182, 191; PDRT, 1959, 149, 159; PDRT, 1960, 145.
432 Morgan, Women and Patriotism in Jim Crow, 152-155.
As in previous decades, the Texas DAR continued its patriotic education work with non-white children after WWII. As part of their “Americanism” efforts, DAR members donated reading material and gave assistance to black and Mexican schools and groups.⁴³³ Non-white children and adults could be recipients of the DAR’s patriotic instruction and its charity, but they could not be made to represent the American heritage that belonged to the DAR and other patriotic white Americans. In 1957 a Denver, Colorado, DAR chapter declared that only “American Boys,” not Mexican boys, could carry the American flag for their ceremony at the State industrial School for Boys. The Denver Chapter’s Patriotic Education chairwoman reportedly quipped, “You wouldn’t want a Mexican to carry Old Glory, would you?”⁴³⁴ In their consideration of this “much publicized” event, the Texas DAR State Officers’ Club argued “the facts” of the story (which are not specified in the Officers’ Club report) showed the Denver chapter to be in the right, and the Texas Daughters commended their actions.⁴³⁵

This was a marked departure from DAR attitudes in the interwar period, when many Texas DAR members were enthusiastic about the Americanism of Mexican children and saw them as potential “little American citizens.” Well after Brown v. Board, the Texas DAR continued to support what it called “the Christian
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⁴³³ In the WWII and postwar era work with non-whites was more often carried out by particular chapters and members than a state-wide effort. While a few chapters continued to focus on outreach to non-whites, in many chapters these efforts were eclipsed by a growing focus on other modes of promoting Americanism and National Defense. PDAR, 1947, 99; PDAR, 1948, 93, PDAR, 1951, 89, 100, 119, 125; PDAR, 1953, 118, 183, 196; PDAR, 1957, 85.
⁴³⁵ PDAR, 1957, 272.
principle of racial integrity.” In the last DAR meeting of the 1950s, members “played in the dark” as they opened the meeting with the singing of “Negro Spirituals.” Yet in the same meeting, they passed a resolution opposing the proposed Civil Rights Act as “un-constitutional and enemical [sic] to the best interest of our nation.”

The DAR’s anti-desegregation stance was linked to its anti-communist stance and its opposition to the expansion of federal power. The equality of races secured in the constitution of the USSR presented American conservatives with apparent evidence of the entanglement of Communism, racial liberalism, and federally enforced racial equality. Prominent segregationist Strom Thurmond criticized the Fair Employment Practice Commission and the “misnamed civil rights program” as “nothing more than an American edition of the Russian all races law.” The Texas DAR drew a similar connection in its opposition to the UN Convention on Genocide, which defined the causing of serious bodily or mental harm of a racial (or national, religious, or ethnic) group as an act of genocide subject to international punishment. In its resolution against the Convention on Genocide, the Texas DAR cited its “marked resemblance to the All Races Law of Russia” and further noted that the Convention was “supported

436 PDAR, 1959, 60.
437 PDAR, 1960, 49, 53-54.
in part by the leftist element in our nation and in the world. In the wake of
*Brown* and *Brown II*, the Texas DAR’s Legislation Committee reported that a
prominent topic in the chapters was the US Supreme Court, whose decisions put
states’ rights, segregation, and the “right to legislate against Communism” in
jeopardy. For the DAR, as for many postwar conservatives, Communism and
racial equality both signaled the encroachment of federal power.

The triangulation of federal “encroachment,” Communism, and
desegregation drawn by the DAR was shared by the Texas Minute Women and
Ida Darden. In their notorious smearing of liberal HISD deputy superintendent
George Ebey, the Houston Minute Women circulated a pamphlet that made
explicit connections between Ebey’s racial liberalism and his supposed
Communist leanings. Headlined “We’ve got your Number, Dr. Ebey,” the
pamphlet emphasized Ebey’s work as a consultant for the Oregon Forum on
Intergroup Relations, the stated purpose of which was the elimination of “all
barriers as to race, creed or color.” The pamphlet linked the elimination of racial
differences to Communism and Communists and explained, “So we see that
whether cleverly garbed in humanitarian phrases or brazenly stated by
Communist Party members the real purpose of these various groups is to work
for the substitution of the New Social Order in place of the American manner of
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social living.” Conservative ideologist Ida Darden agreed and praised the Minute Women as well as the DAR for their actions against Communists, integrationists, and the burgeoning federal power that supposedly augmented both. Elaborating on her low opinion of the US Supreme Court—a perspective she shared with the Texas DAR—Darden described the Court as a “judicial wrecking crew” that commanded the “unstinted approval of pro-Communists, Negroes and other minority groups” but “rendered responsible Americans speechless, bewildered and alarmed for the future of Constitutional government in the United States.”

The discourse of heritage and “racial integrity” employed by the DAR and UDC was less prevalent but still important for the Minute Women and Ida Darden. The information and membership pamphlet for the Minute Women listed the protection of “precious heritage” as a reason the reader should join the organization. While this heritage was not explicitly racialized in the nationally distributed pamphlet, the actions of the Houston Minute Women suggest it took on connotations of whiteness for Texas members.

Ida Darden connected racial integrity and racial segregation more explicitly, and in so doing she shed light on the connection between heritage and
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446 Less data is available on the Dallas Minute Women, but according to a newspaper article in 1956, Dallas “minute women” were, among other groups, called to organize and “oppose Negro registration in which schools.” “Texas Citizens Council Hears Attack on Segregation Ruling,” Dallas Morning News (Sept. 9, 1956), 10.
racial conservatism. In an exasperated 1957 column she decried the “terrific racial integration binge” that “seriously offended the decent instincts of white and colored alike.” Darden implied that “decent” white and black Americans opposed desegregation and the impending creation of “one mongrelized race in a One-World Government” because both races prized protection of their “heritage” and “racial integrity.” Yet Darden’s condemnation of all black children in the Washington, DC, public schools as “immoral,” and her ridicule of “A Washington Negress [who] Charges that the Law ‘Done Her Wrong’” revealed that she only saw one race—the white—as possessing a valuable, moral, and truly American heritage. Indeed, the title of the newspaper she created to spread her conservative message, *The Southern Conservative*, to her suggested not only a geographical location but also the southern heritage of the “people of Dixie” who “come out ‘a shootin’” when “the Civil Rights menace rears its ugly head.”

No discourse of “heritage” was more important for proponents of segregation and states’ rights than the southern and Confederate heritage celebrated by the UDC. In the wake of the Dixiecrat revolt of 1948, the Confederate battle flag gained increasing prominence as a symbol of opposition to desegregation. When Texas public schools finally integrated in the late 1960s and 1970s, the enduring presence of Confederate symbols, flags, and mascots in public schools cultivated discord—and sometimes violence—between black and
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white students.\textsuperscript{449} In the postwar era the UDC did not make anti-Civil Rights resolutions like the DAR or racialize its membership requirements like the DRT. The connection between segregation and the UDC’s aim of honoring the Confederacy was likely already clear to members and to the broader Texas public. In chapter meetings, members discussed states’ rights and passed around newspaper articles that opposed desegregation.\textsuperscript{450}

But more revealingly, increased focus on racial politics in the 1950s appears to have correlated with a renewed sense of social relevance for the UDC. Immediately following WWII, the organization reported “lack of interest and cooperation by the teachers in the schools concerning our awarding medals for essays and contests pertaining to our Southern history” and only a small increase in children’s auxiliary membership. By 1950 the UDC faced a practically depleted treasury and claimed their “entire structure was being challenged.”\textsuperscript{451}

But in 1953 the UDC division historian noticed an emergent trend: “There has never been a time in the life of our organization when the public-at-large has been so interested in Confederate history as now.” The next year the division president confirmed the existence of “evidence of an awakened interest” in the UDC’s activities and message. Perhaps the most striking proof came from the report on the Children of the Confederacy, which bragged, “Last year we thought we had done so well when we reported 92 new members, but this year we have

\textsuperscript{450} Oran Roberts Chapter UDC Minutes, 1947, 105; Minutes, 1956, 77-78.
\textsuperscript{451} PUDC, 1948, 44-46; PUDC, 1950, 28.
235 new members.” This enthusiasm did not wane through the 1950s. In 1957 the Radio and TV Committee chairman explained that UDC objectives, activities, and projects were “paralleling Community, National, and International needs and trends.” In 1960 the division president was awed and inspired by the reinvigorated Children of the Confederacy, which now boasted an annual camp and its own state-wide annual Convention. She remarked, “As long as the youth of our land have such reverence, love and patriotism as do these young people, certainly we will always have a Confederacy.” As Texas students remained in segregated schools, and as Confederate symbols and flags continued to mark public schools and other state facilities, this imagining of an enduring Confederacy was all too real.

**Gender and Power**

The UDC, DRT, and DAR used the language and logic of gender to create an image of their organizations and missions as stabilizing forces in turbulent postwar times. In the 1950s the idea of moral motherhood still endured, but psychological, social scientific, and popular discourses introduced doubt about the “natural” or biological positive influence of mothers. Furthermore, mothers were blamed for sexual and gendered abnormalities of children. In the face of this anxiety, heritage organizations presented themselves as bastions not of “natural motherhood” but of “traditional motherhood.” Against the 1950s mother-blaming context in which they lived, members of heritage organizations
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presented themselves as good mothers capable of growing a masculine white male citizenry and a feminine white female citizenry.

Cold War anti-communist and civilian discourse emphasized the importance of family stability to national security. In this rhetoric, woman—especially the housewife—is given a special role as the intermediary between the state and the future citizen. In the early 1950s the DRT, like the UDC and DAR, carried out this agenda by reinforcing its commitment to children, a commitment that belonged particularly to women and women’s organizations.  

One manifestation of the DRT’s gendered mission to educate and care for children was the Children of the Republic of Texas’ “Presentation Pilgrimage,” which began in 1951. For the Pilgrimage, DRT members shepherded boys and girls in the CRT to a site of historic or political significance to be officially recognized by state officials such as the Chief Justice of the Texas Supreme Court or the Governor. The state official would deliver a speech that praised not only the patriotism of the children but also the role of the DRT in inculcating that patriotism. In early years, the Pilgrimage focused primarily on “Patriotic Debutantes” (young women CRT members) with male CRT members serving as guards, escorts, or flag bearers. In subsequent years, however, both boys and girls were equally recognized as “patriots.” The aim of the Pilgrimage was “to groom our youth with responsible living in the FAMILY, CHURCH, AND STATE; separate but cooperative foundational units in our great Republic.”
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gendered role of the DRT was thus a sort of “republican motherhood” or patriotic maternalism that served as a bridge between family and the state as it educated and prepared future citizens.

At an annual Texas UDC Convention the division president bemoaned, “We are overshadowed by an atomic cloud” and warned members of the turbulent times through which they were living. “Yet,” she continued, “we feel that the upholding of the principles on which we are founded has been a stabilizing influence to our nation.” The UDC stood for southern traditions that would soothe domestic unrest and transnational anxieties. This “sisterhood of womanly women,” as division president Ruth Moyers Snoddy called the UDC, found in gender a language to build on and also update traditional maternalist clubwoman rhetoric and strategy.

The UDC’s *Annual Proceedings*, published and circulated to members and chapters, cultivated members’ alignment with maternal duty by featuring photographs of “mascots.” Especially in the 1950s, these mascots were almost entirely toddler-age boys and girls. Full of potential and brimming with health, these children’s bodies were a testament to the superiority of Confederate lineage. The UDC paid special attention to cultivating masculinity in the 1950s. Most of the “mascots” for the organization were young boys, and boys’
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achievements were emphasized in the *Annual Proceedings*. In her report on the Children of the Confederacy, UDC member Mrs. R. R. Matthews told the convention that the junior auxiliary gained seventy-three new members, and that “Thirty-three of these are boys, of which we are so proud.” The UDC also reached out to young men by connecting the organization’s historical work to the contemporary American military. The division awarded numerous “crosses of honor” to the veterans of World War I and II but gave special recognition to young military cadets. Each year since 1949, the Texas UDC awarded the Albert Sidney Johnston Saber to the most distinguished cadet at A&M College; photos of this presentation were a regular feature in the bound copies of the state annual convention notes that were circulated to members and local chapters. The images of healthy boys and masculine young men contained in the organization’s *Annual Proceedings* were a testament to the successful maternal influence of the UDC.

The Texas UDC also honored models of female citizenship that cannot be defined as maternal. They supported the organization of chapters in colleges and chapters that, like the Varina Howell Davis chapter organized in 1947, could accommodate the hours of working women. Since its formation, the UDC typically sought political change by lobbying, letter writing, and other grassroots and behind-the-scenes efforts. These strategies were in keeping with the traditionalist and maternalist orientation of an organization with clubwoman roots.
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and former anti-suffragists in its ranks. Although Texas was one of the few southern states to ratify the Nineteenth Amendment, the Texas UDC generally steered clear of discussions on traditional politics or voting. But in the 1950s, the Daughters became more engaged with politics. In 1951 the UDC’s patriotic service committee performed outreach work to increase poll tax registration among members and their communities. In the same year, the Memphis, TX, chapter sent telegrams to Senators Tom Connally and Lyndon Johnson asking them to vote against socialized medicine. Supreme Court decisions such as *Brown v Board* particularly awakened the Daughters. In 1956 the legislation committee chairwoman explained, “The enactment of certain legislation, the failure to pass other bills—and the Supreme Court’s policy of giving social interpretations—rather than legal or constitutional, have made us all realize the importance of understanding the implications of legislation.” That year the Dallas chapter petitioned senators and congressmen on the McCarran Walter Immigration Act and invited to their chapter meeting conservative Republican Bruce Alger as a guest speaker. The Houston chapter gave an award of merit to Mrs. Frank G. (Dallas) Dyer of the HISD school board, a member of the Minute Women who helped delay desegregation of Houston public schools. In the postwar era Texas UDC members also campaigned on behalf of more directly “Confederate” causes, such as voting in support of a pension for Confederate widows, and working to have the name of Albert Sidney Johnston high school
changed “when the school became a negro school.” However, in the 1950s, the Texas UDC—especially chapters in cities like Houston and Dallas—expanded its interests in ways that cohered with the DAR’s broader conservative agenda.

Like the UDC, the DAR embraced a certain maternalism, but it also expanded the boundaries of that maternalism. A member explained in 1960, “As the nurture of children is the particular province of all women, so the patriotic education of children is the particular province of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Unlike the postwar UDC or DRT, the DAR continually encouraged its members to educate themselves on political issues and to vote but insisted this was a part of woman’s duty rather than “playing politics.” As member A. A. Forester explained in 1959, “America’s first line of defense is found in our homes, our churches, and our schools.” She continued, “The United States is losing the cold war [sic]—the intellectual and spiritual war—the war of ideas and ideals—the real war. The ICBM [intercontinental ballistic missile] will become obsolete or needless if the minds of our youth have already been enslaved to the theories of collectivism.” Woman’s responsibility was to maintain this “line of defense” in the home and school as housewives, through DAR activism such as textbook monitoring, and by voting on the issues that would affect the lives of future generations.

461 PUDC, 1951, 82; PUDC, 1953, 81-82; PUDC, 1956, 156, 191, 212; PUDC, 1957, 145; Kellar, Make Haste Slowly, 69, 127-128.
Although the DAR pushed the boundaries of maternalism by calling on members to vote, they also policed the boundaries of gender and sexuality more than the DRT or UDC. The DAR’s “Girl Home Makers” program educated young lower-class and immigrant girls in the skills of housewifery such as cooking and sewing. The development of such gendered skills would aid the young women not only when they grew up to be wives, but would also make them “better daughters.” While the DRT and UDC were silent on the issue of sexuality, toward the later 1950s the DAR made resolutions against sex in films and advertising and against pornography. The DAR’s motion picture committee began reviewing films not only for their patriotic content but also for their “standard of morals.” The motion pictures committee chairwoman alarmed fellow Daughters that “persons report that even their 6 and 7 year old children are conscious of the scarcity of clothes and the promiscuous behavior of actresses.” This sexuality was not only alarming in and of itself, but was also a marker of the “subtle effort of Communism in the film industry.”

In her newsletter the Southern Conservative and her book My Night, satirical columnist Ida Darden trafficked heavily in discourses of gender and sexuality. Darden’s use of humor opened space for her to employ themes of sexuality in her work, which was atypical in the Texas right wing and among right-wing women generally. Perhaps as a response to liberal men’s characterizations of conservative women’s sexuality, Darden declared liberal women to be

“frustrated females” and recommended they “fight syphilis instead of segregation.” In a “My Night” column that parodied a UN meeting, Darden satirically assumed the character of Eleanor Roosevelt to introduce a guest speaker, a woman who “gave great emphasis and dignity to the cause of racial tolerance” by wedding “her colored garbage man.” Playing on southern whites’ fears of racial integration, Darden sexualized human rights to make a mockery of 1950s liberal internationalism.

Darden’s conception of womanhood was particularly complex and contradictory. She chastised non-conservative women using a masculinist rhetoric more typically deployed by male liberals at the time. In a column titled, “Radical Females Do Not Represent American Women,” Darden explained that radical females “trail[ed] off after every queer creature and creep who happens along and whose only claim to fame is that their warped and kinky brain has cooked up a solution for the social ailments of the world.” In another article, Darden elaborated further on women’s political incapacity, writing, “Being natural bargain hunters, most of us have proved easy victims of [political] candidates….To many of us the packing of the Supreme Court was in the same category as packing a lunch.”
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Darden’s denunciation of liberal women would lead a reader to believe she thought her gender was simply not fit for politics. Although she maintained that granting women the right to vote was a mistake, she believed “If the republic is to be saved, it looks like women must do it.” The conservative womanhood Darden praised was not, as one might expect, a maternal and domestic womanhood. Her ideal womanhood was assertive and strong-willed, ready and able to confront liberal women and men. In her work, Darden specifically identified the Minute Women and the DAR as embodiments of an ideal activist conservative womanhood. She emphasized that members of these organizations had “no timidity whatever” and should in fact be honored for being “militant and outspoken women” who would rescue the nation from un-Americanism.467

**Texas Liberals and the “Compulsive Right-wing Woman”**

Postwar American liberals also used gendered and sexualized discourse to draw a firm cultural and political line between themselves and conservatives and to distance liberalism from “enslavement” to Communism and other transnational dangers. While sexuality was an emergent discourse in 1950s US politics, gender was a well-established and powerful trope in American political rhetoric since the nation’s founding. For example, gender was used as a way of coding class and racial differences in colonial Virginia as women were marked as either “good wives” or “nasty wenches.” The ideal of “Republican Motherhood” encouraged white women in the American Revolution to understand motherhood as a form of civic duty, and encouraged men to respect and protect those

---

women. Gender was also used to mark partisan differences after the Civil War; Republicans emphasized the moral influence ascribed to women, while Democrats presented themselves as the champions of white patriarchy. Postwar liberals combined new and old gendered rhetoric and positioned liberalism as a bastion of virile and heterosexual masculinity. This masculinist and hetero-normative strategy was central to 1950s American liberal political efforts, from the smearing of Joe McCarthy as a homosexual to the “mother-blaming” strategy deployed to combat racial conservatism by blaming both white prejudice and black “failure to achieve” on female pathology.

In Texas, liberal men’s masculinist ethos made conservative white women appear as a particularly disturbing threat. Yet this ethos also encouraged liberal men to lump together and dismiss all conservative women as politically frivolous. Nationally, women became the majority of the voting public by the 1940s. Texas liberals of the 1950s griped about this development, as they believed that most of the “girls” who began surging to the polls were wealthy and conservative.

---


Texas Observer reporter Bob Bray invited readers, “Think of it. Instead of electing a Demo or a GOP, a conservative, liberal, moderate, or what have you, we might one day soon be choosing the president by the way that, say, he parts his hair.” In his condemnation of the “compulsive right-wing woman,” Warren Leslie similarly blamed conservative women’s political actions on the shortcomings of their gender. He explained:

The quest for security and status shows up in woman’s age-old search through yellowed documents for genealogical proof of her existence…these women join one of the dozens of old patriotic societies which exist all over America and especially in the South, the region of this country which has been valiantly defending its status since the Civil War….Since problems of insecurity often bring on anger and the desire to lash out, it is not surprising that in emotional matters (and in America, that would certainly include politics) women are often angrier than men….especially a certain type of woman, the type who might end by wishing to place a sign reading HANG EARL WARREN on her car bumper.

Yet Warren Leslie’s analysis did not fully recognize the active role of heritage organizations or more recognizably conservative activist women like the Minute Women and Ida Darden in the emergence go the “right-wing woman” in Texas. According to Leslie, women’s conservatism was not a political belief but rather a manifestation of their insecurity and joblessness. By characterizing the right wing woman as motivated solely by status anxiety, Leslie failed to apprehend the well-developed strategies behind right-wing women’s activism in Texas.

---


472 Leslie, Dallas Public and Private, 104-105.
But perhaps most crucially, Leslie and other Texas liberals did not recognize how conservative women used and maintained political connections. A political cartoon appearing in the liberal Texas Observer newspaper depicted Governor Price Daniel as beholden to conservative Texas voters, depicted as a woman. Captioned “Please Beg Me,” the cartoon showed Governor Daniel on his knees before a blonde housewife. While columns in the Texas Observer tended to portray women voters as easily swayed by handsome men and simplistic rhetoric, this cartoon hinted at the relationship between politicians and conservative women activists. Heritage organizations, primarily the SAR (the DAR’s male counterpart), were occasionally mentioned in the Texas Observer’s laundry lists of conservatives. Yet in the Texas Observer’s columns opposing traditionalist history in the schools, heritage organizations were never mentioned, despite their strong activism in this arena.

Conclusion

Heritage organizations did in fact have an active relationship with Price Daniel and other conservative politicians. DRT leaders had regular telephone conversations with Daniel, who also gave a historical address at the Alamo for a DRT celebration. The DAR strongly supported Daniel and urged the National DAR to rally behind him and the conservative cause he supported, the Bricker
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Amendment. The DAR, DRT, and UDC worked regularly with politicians to push their historical projects, such as the preservation of historic sites, naming buildings after historical figures, and proclamations of patriotic holidays. Statements such as “I have the assurance that our legislature is friendly to the UDC” were prevalent in committee reports, as were thanks to politicians such as Daniel and Allan Shivers for assistance granted. Conservative politicians were invited guest speakers at DRT, DAR, and UDC meetings.

The relationship between heritage organizations and politicians could be reciprocal, as Governor Allan Shivers appointed a DAR member to the state’s Defense and Disaster relief board, and the state senate passed a resolution honoring the DRT. The DAR continually pressed members to write and to vote, and most members were active voters. In the 1950s Texas UDC members became more closely aligned with the DAR’s political strategy and stance. DRT members were not typically encouraged to vote or to be involved with political issues outside the scope of the organization’s goals; however, DAR and UDC delegates appeared at every annual DAR meeting, and vice versa. Invitations from one heritage organization to another to attend a meeting or event were also

---
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common at the local level. The sharing of ideas and strategies between like-minded women may have increased voting participation and political awareness among members of all three organizations.

White women’s heritage organizations in Texas upheld the conservative ideals of anti-communism, “racial integrity,” and conservative gender roles. They actively spread their message through work with public schools and children’s groups, their relationships with conservative politicians, and by voting. They fit the “housewife” model identified by liberals and current historians as the embodiment of conservative women’s activism in the postwar era. Yet in naming conservative women as housewives, scholars risk underestimating the political skills and connections held by many of these women. Kathleen Blee and Kimberly Creasap have argued that the rise of the New Right brought large numbers of conservative women into politics “for the first time.” Yet the “new tactics” such housewife activists deployed—assembling together in small groups to write letters to politicians—were long used by members of heritage organizations on behalf of historical preservation and more overtly conservative agendas.\(^\text{481}\)


The 1960s brought many disappointments to American conservatives. Republican Richard Nixon, under-promoted by Dwight D. Eisenhower and criticized by conservatives for his compromises with the moderate Republican wing, lost to John F. Kennedy in the 1960 US presidential race. Under the presidencies of Democrats Kennedy and especially Lyndon Baines Johnson the liberal state appeared to reach into every aspect of American life. American mainstream media outlets lampooned the members of right wing organizations like the John Birch Society as pathological racists. Conservative Americans invested their hopes in the 1964 presidential campaign of “Mr. Conservative” Barry Goldwater, who lost in a historic landslide by winning only five states in the Electoral College. After he lost, many of his right wing supporters were ousted or sidelined within the Republican Party by moderates. Nixon ran successfully for the presidency in 1968. But once in office his economic and foreign policies betrayed the notion that he had evolved into a “true” anti-communist and anti-statist conservative like Barry Goldwater.⁴⁸²

These national-level setbacks betray the real story of American conservatism in the 1960s. These years were key to the building of a “New Right” that fused the concerns of anti-statist, anti-communist, pro-capitalist, and pro-religious/”traditional” values conservatives into a recognizable movement that

eventually wrested control of the Republican party from moderates and continues to be the dominant force in that party today. The Goldwater campaign of 1964 fused years of planning by conservative intellectuals with a groundswell of grassroots activism, and was a boon to conservative media outlets and to the involvement of women within conservatism. Women played key roles in the Goldwater campaign, from DAR member Phyllis Schlafly and her bestselling book *A Choice not an Echo* to the “Goldwater Girls,” volunteers whose neat clothes, dignified demeanor, and bright smiles assured onlookers that a Goldwater presidency would bring a “return” to a more wholesome and traditional America.483

The 1960s left a mixed legacy for white women’s heritage organizations in Texas. In this turbulent decade, some UDC and DAR leaders grew more fierce in their right wing rhetoric. DAR leaders became more conversant with the breadth of conservative ideology and more connected to conservative media and organizations. Especially after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, UDC presidents further situated the UDC as part of the “conservative majority” and underscored the role of their organization in resisting desegregation. However, in both the UDC and DAR interest in the key campaign of textbook monitoring declined. DRT members maintained relationships with important conservative

---

men in and outside of politics and grew more business-oriented in relation to the
Alamo property. But controversy over the Alamo in the late 1960s brought the
DRT into the national spotlight in ways that led some members to leave the
organization.

The Alamo was always central to the DRT, but in the 1960s, the property
became an important financial resource to the organization. Member Mrs. T. E.
McCray was appointed Director of the Alamo in 1960. McCray was chosen not
for her knowledge of Texas history—which she admitted she needed to brush up
on—but for her credentials as a businesswoman. McCray completely reorganized
the business methods and procedures of the Alamo; she established a detailed
budget, implemented monthly fiscal reports, and worked to increase souvenir
sales (which comprised the vast majority of Alamo gross profits). Gross profits
from the Alamo grew steadily and substantially; from 1960 to 1965 gross profits
grew by over 50 percent, and first broke the $100,000 mark in 1965. In 1969
gross profit from the Alamo was a startling $264,916.69. Alamo profits were used
for the improvement of Alamo facilities, the hiring of more employees, and
sometimes, DRT leaders’ travel and other expenses (since the Alamo fund now
had more money than the DRT). The only decline in Alamo profits was from 1969
to 1970, when profits dropped from the decade’s record high to $169,412.12.484

This decline may have been related to a controversy in 1969 that made a
lasting impression on local and national perspectives on DRT. In 1968 DRT
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board of management members first learned that a production company was planning to film scenes in front of the Alamo for a comedy, *Viva Max!*. Daughters were infuriated.\textsuperscript{485} *Viva Max!* was based on a book by Jim Lehrer that told the story of a modern-day Mexican general, Maximilian (Max) Rodrigues de Santos, who reclaims the Alamo for his country. The book poked fun at Texas Rangers, local and national politicians, the US Army, and the DRT. In the book, “Daughters of the Texas Revolution” appear as little old ladies who respond to Max’s re-occupation of the Alamo by squawking, “He’s a Communist!”\textsuperscript{486}

DRT president Mrs. William Scarborough was determined to prevent the filmmakers from “invading” the Alamo and Alamo grounds. She told *Viva Max!* producer Mark Carliner that his crew could not approach the Alamo grounds and forbade him from including shots of the Alamo chapel in the film. However, Carliner had already secured permission to film on Alamo Plaza from the San Antonio City Council. Scarborough took $4551.45 out of the Alamo fund to pay for attorneys in a failed attempt to get a court injunction to stop the filming. The DRT suspended tours of the Alamo and draped a black cloth over the chapel doors as three weeks of filming *Viva Max!* began in 1969. In San Antonio the Daughters along with other self-described “patriots” attacked the filmmakers in the press and in public demonstrations. Many other San Antonio residents, however, were elated by the filming—especially the eighty-seven “unemployed Mexicans” who signed on as extras with Max’s army, and the forty whites who

\textsuperscript{485} PDRT 1968, 30.
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seized the opportunity to satirize their conservative neighbors by playing “local bigots” in the film. A story about the controversy soon appeared in *Life* magazine. Author Gary Cartwright’s article, “Remember the Alamo, please,” opened with a photo of a dour and old-fashioned looking Mrs. Scarborough. Cartwright’s retelling of recent events at the Alamo depicted Scarborough and the DRT as ignorant, bumbling, and downright silly. While the DRT’s own records do not mention their failure to stop *Viva Max!*, Cartwright reported that the film and DRT leaders’ responses to it provoked dissention and desertion among the organization’s ranks.487

The Alamo continued to be a site of controversy after 1970. In 1980 three Chicano rights activists were arrested for climbing atop the hallowed shrine. Houstonians Damian Garcia, Hayden Steel Fisher, and Abilgail Bayer replaced the Alamo’s Texas flag with a red flag to symbolize Chicano liberation and unfurled a banner proclaiming, “Revolutionary Mayday 1980—Take history into our hands,” as they shouted through a bullhorn to a growing crowd of onlookers. DRT leaders called the activists’ behavior “an outrage” and applauded as they were arrested. In 1988 the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) protested the Alamo complex debut of the DRT-approved (and corporate sponsored) IMAX film, “Alamo…The Price of Freedom,” for ignoring and belittling

---

the role of Tejanos in the Alamo. LULAC further appealed (unsuccessfully) to the state of Texas to transfer custody of the Alamo from the DRT to LULAC.  

In the 2000s, the DRT met increasing criticism as the organization used Alamo profits and state funds to bolster the expansion of the DRT library and other organizational facilities. Texas lawmakers responded by transferring custody of the Alamo to the Texas General Land Office in a 2011 arrangement that allowed the DRT to remain as “stewards” of the Alamo, albeit under new guidelines. But a 2012 report by the Texas Attorney General’s office found that the DRT failed to adequately preserve and maintain the Alamo, misappropriated state funds to pay the group’s own legal fees, and expelled members who disagreed with DRT leaders. That this report came from the desk of conservative politician Greg Abbott perhaps especially stung older DRT members who recalled the cozy relationship their organization used to have with powerful conservative Texans. The Attorney General’s report made headlines, and the Texas public sided against the DRT.


In December of 2012, the Land Office told the DRT to “remove its furniture and other items from the Alamo.” Members flocked to the shrine to solemnly remove organizational records and materials, and to take down the precious heirlooms that, for almost a hundred years, members had entrusted to the organization. The portrait of Clara Driscoll—that Daughter who used her great wealth to help to the DRT wrest control of the property from the “de Zavala faction” in 1905—was taken down. Perhaps Adina de Zavala would have been pleased with the version of history that now prevails at the Alamo. Preservation of historic documents and the site itself is now central to Alamo business operations. The Alamo special exhibit of Fall 2013, “Alamo Origins: The Spanish Birth of Texas,” utilizes original Spanish language documents to tell a multi-layered story that incorporates Native American historical actors.490

The 1960s also left a legacy of waning influence and control to the Texas UDC as the political usefulness of their preferred narrative of history waxed and waned. In 1961 Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV) commander Frank La Rue, Jr. penned a letter to UDC member Annie B. Giles in praise of her recent work of Lost Cause history, Rags and Hope: Recollections of Val C. Giles. He wrote, “Through people such as yourself the South will be perpetuated through these dark days of reconstruction.” The interpretation of the 1960s as a second “reconstruction” resonated with many white southerners who saw federal power

dismantling the South’s racial system yet again. Texas UDC president Tops Gilreath believed “U.D.C., C. of C. [the Children of the Confederacy], and S.C.V. should go hand in hand down the road for it will take that for us to live as decent American White Southern people [emphasis in original].” The way to resist the “revolution that is doing on,” she believed, was to “Be Southern, think Southern, and teach your children to be a true child of the South.”

The Texas Division of the UDC held its seventy-third annual convention in October 1969. Ten months had passed since Richard Nixon stepped into office as the president of the United States. Texas UDC president Norma Linn Scott exclaimed to the audience, “The Renaissance of the South is upon us!” She elaborated:

Since the 1954 Supreme Court Decision, which brought from others alien to us so much accusation, acrimony, and hatred to our beloved Southland, interest in our section has revived...The silent, well-behaved conservative majority of Americans has suddenly become articulate...America’s eyes are being opened to the manner in which the South has lived and the means she used to protect herself and solve her own peculiar problems. Other regions in the United States now express their belief in us since they have learned by bitter experience with their own recent problems—problems which we in the South solved long ago.  

Scott believed that the growing influence of American conservatism would ensconce the relevancy of her heritage and her organization. In some ways the UDC did remain relevant in 1960s Texas. The organization prevented the Texas legislature from removing Jefferson Davis’s birthday from the list of official state holidays. Chapters still held essay contests, handed out Confederate flags to
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schools, and entered floats in parades. The Victoria, TX, UDC chapter’s entry for a city parade featured “little boys in Confederate uniforms” and “ladies wearing costumes befitting the Confederate era” in a carriage driven by a “negro driver.” Efforts such as the Victoria chapter’s float offered Old South race relations as a cherished memory worth celebrating in the midst of African American civil rights protests.493

But the Texas UDC was not as successful in preserving the supremacy of the Lost Cause narrative as its leaders hoped. The 1960s marked a sharp decline for the UDC’s once-influential textbook committee. Books that criticized the Old South and Confederacy were now in the hands of Texan schoolchildren, and UDC textbook committee chairmen repeatedly complained that she was “not able to do anything about the textbook problem.” Interest in the committee waned among chapter members, and the chairmen sometimes elected to not even make a report at the annual convention. Reports from other outreach committees—like the radio and TV committee, the civil defense committee, and the legislative committee—also became more infrequent, which perhaps reflected members’ reticence to publicly identify as “Confederate.” Even Tops Gilreath, the UDC president who saw the UDC’s narrative as critical to the future of “American white Southern people,” recognized that participation in Confederate heritage organizations was declining. She pointed out, “Look, how few children we had last night [at the UDC annual meeting].” “Where is the UDC? Then, how many UDC members attend even one meeting of the SCV?” she asked. While the

UDC's message may have been more salient for unapologetic white southern racists in the 1960s, by the later years of the decade open declarations of white supremacy became taboo even for self-described conservatives.494

Karen Cox argues that the UDC's activities were “a natural compliment to Jim Crow politics.”495 In 1965 the Civil Rights Act and Voting Rights Act finally overruled the last of the Jim Crow laws, and in so doing, muted the efficacy of the UDC, its historical narrative, and its public activism. In recent years the organization has surfaced occasionally to defend the Confederate battle flag but generally kept a low profile. In 2006 the national UDC made headlines when Strom Thurmond’s biracial daughter applied to become a member of the organization. Her lawyers were ready for a legal battle, but UDC leaders said she was welcome to join if she could provide the proper paperwork. The Southern Poverty Law Center asserted that the membership of Confederate heritage organizations was still overwhelmingly white. But at least officially, the organization no longer embraces white supremacy as a part of Confederate heritage and is indeed boastful of its few black members.496

Today’s DAR has also distanced itself from the now-controversial attitudes, ideologies, and activities of its past. In the 1960s, DAR leaders in and outside Texas were deeply involved with the nascent conservative movement.

495 Cox, Dixie’s Daughters, 160.
The most notable DAR leader of the 1960s (and beyond) was Phyllis Schlafly of Illinois. Schlafly was a well-educated young mother who balanced her housewifely duties with local activism through the DAR and the Illinois Federation of Republican Women in the 1950s. Schlafly climbed the DAR ranks from chapter regent, to state chairwoman of National Defense, to national chairman of National Defense. In 1962, Schlafly began delivering a weekly radio program, “America Wake Up,” which was sponsored by the Illinois DAR and broadcast by twenty-five stations. DAR chapters, Republican women’s clubs, and other organizations wrote to Schlafly and asked her to speak at their meetings; Schalfly obliged as many requests as she could. But Schalfly’s appeal was largely regional until the publication of her 1964 book, *A Choice not an Echo*, made her a nationally important voice in American conservatism.497

Like many other American conservatives, Schlafly was an enthusiastic devotee of Barry Goldwater; *A Choice not an Echo* was designed to promote his 1964 bid for the US presidency. But the book was also a manifesto against the moderate and liberal wing of the Republican party, which Schlafly saw as dominated by elites and “secret kingmakers.” She presented the Goldwater campaign as a true “grassroots” movement that would stand strong in the face of “left wing propaganda” from the mainstream media. According to *A Choice not an Echo*, contemporary foreign and domestic problems could be solved by strong leaders (like Barry Goldwater) whose principles were based on simple but eternal
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truths derived from the lessons of the past. In April of 1964, Schlafly self-published an initial run of 25,000 copies of *A Choice not an Echo*. The enthusiasm with which the book was received cannot be overstated. By November of 1964, *A Choice not an Echo* had sold three and a half million copies. When Goldwater lost, Schlafly and other conservatives lost authority within the Republican Party but maintained and even grew their base of grassroots supporters. Schlafly’s DAR credentials and six children helped her represent herself as a family-first housewife. In the 1970s Schlafly re-emerged on the national scene as the face of conservative resistance to the Equal Rights Amendment.  

At the state annual convention in 1966 Texas DAR member Mrs. B. W. Woolley relayed “one of the greatest experiences” to her fellow Daughters. At the convention of the national DAR, Woolley heard Phyllis Schlafly speak on her newest work, *Strike from Space*. Woolley gushed, “She [Schlafly] is beautiful, well informed, dynamic and a wonderful mouthpiece for the DAR.” Woolley encouraged audience members, “If you have the means to hear her you should.” Texas Daughters did not have to wait long. In 1967 Schlafly appeared as a guest speaker at the state convention in Houston. Schlafly’s remarks at the Texas

---


499 *Strike from Space* was one of three books on national defense that Schlafly co-authored with retired naval officer Chester C. Ward in the 1960s. The books combined Schlafly’s moral imperative to fight communism to extinction with Ward’s technical expertise and reputation on issues of national defense. Critchlow, *Phyllis Schlafly and Grassroots Conservatism*, 164-165.
DAR’s “national defense luncheon” were unfortunately not reproduced in the organization’s annual proceedings. But reports from the state national defense committee showed that Schlafly’s dedication to “the principles of Constitutional Government” came through strongly in her speech.\textsuperscript{500}

Texas DAR members in the 1960s were well acquainted with conservative media, supported rising conservative stars, and were connected to other right wing organizations. The Texas DAR endorsed Operation Abolition, a 1960 film produced by the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) that utilized footage of the anti-HUAC protestors in San Francisco to show that Communism was still a domestic threat. The Texas DAR’s National Defense committee reported, “Nearly all if not all of the Texas Daughters will see or have seen the film.” Screenings of Operation Abolition remained a popular feature in chapter meetings.\textsuperscript{501} Barry Goldwater’s ghostwritten manifesto Conscience of a Conservative was also a popular discussion topic among DAR chapters. The work of Texan Dan Smoot, a dedicated conservative on a mission to flush out suspected communist infiltrators, was another favorite of the Daughters. The Texas DAR National Defense committee sent out thousands of copies of “Dan Smoot Reports” to members, and presented positive reviews of Smoot’s The Invisible Government to local civic groups. Texas DAR members endorsed the work of conservative politicians Strom Thurmond and Bruce Alger. Some

\textsuperscript{500} PDAR, 1966, 77; PDAR, 1967, 35-36, 49, 90.
chapters collaborated with the John Birch Society, a far right anti-communist organization.\textsuperscript{502}

Through resolutions and letter-writing campaigns, the Texas DAR inculcated a range of conservative beliefs among members. The Texas DAR told members that efforts to secure equality such as the Fair Housing Bill and the Civil Rights act were cleverly disguised federal power grabs. They were incensed by the Supreme Court’s decision to outlaw state-sponsored prayer in schools, and accused the Court of “legislating by judicial decrees.” Daughters opposed sex education, restrictions on gun ownership, and welfare—all of which appeared as socialism or communism in Daughters’ eyes. Especially by the end of the decade, DAR leaders appeared even more enraged by the advances of their “leftist” enemies than they had been in the 1950s. Texas DAR leaders told members that “minority groups” were out to “destroy educational institutions, military defense, and the normal operation of business and commerce.” When the Supreme Court struck down Texas’s anti-sodomy statute in the landmark 1970 case \textit{Lawrence v. Texas}, Daughters were aghast. Now, they believed, homosexuals could openly “prey upon impressionable youth without fear of legal punishment.”\textsuperscript{503} Like other men and women in the conservative movement, DAR members’ political beliefs were not simply a reaction to the protests, youth
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culture, and ascendant liberalism of the 1960s. Much of the Daughters’ philosophy still stemmed from the anti-communist perspective that had dominated the organization for decades. But the 1960s presented the Daughters with a greater range of infuriating people and ideas than ever before.

The decade started out strong for the Texas DAR’s textbook committee. In 1961 Daughters wrote over a thousand letters to politicians in protest of un-American textbooks and federal aid to education. Even the Texas Children of the American Revolution joined their parents in protest. DAR members credited bills on textbooks and Americanism courses pending in the state legislature to their letter writing campaigns in 1962 and 1963. They found allies in this work among another conservative organization, Texans for America. Locally, members were appointed to school board committees on textbook selection.

But in 1964 interest in textbooks began to waver. The textbook committee chairman reported that while some chapters were more enthusiastic than ever, 25 percent of chapters did not report any investigation into local schoolbooks, or any letters to politicians and educational leaders. By 1967 the textbook committee offered members a much less activist method of fighting un-Americanism in schools. Daughters were told to read their own children’s books to make sure at least their own little ones would not be at risk. Mrs. Chas. E. Hudson, who took headed the Texas DAR textbook committee from 1968 through the end of the decade, was exasperated. She blamed “the degradation of our

---
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youth in dope addicts, hippies, and adherents to the new morality’ on the anti-
Christian, anti-American education they received in today’s schools. “Members
[of the DAR] are indifferent,” she said, “because they don’t know what has
happened to the textbooks.” Despite her annual warnings before the Texas DAR
convention, by 1970 fewer than 50 percent of chapters took any active part in the
work of the textbook committee.506

For both the DAR and UDC, textbooks were a key focus of activism in the
decades before 1960. Daughters cared deeply about eradicating un-American
and un-southern texts from public schools, and in years past, the Daughters’
authority over manners of education appeared secure. The 1960s were a time of
unprecedented federal interventions in education. In addition to the Supreme
Court’s decisions on racial integration and prayer in schools, the 1965
Elementary and Secondary Education Act brought federal funds and influence
into public school systems across the nation. This act was the most far-reaching
federal legislation affecting education ever passed by Congress.”507 These
perceived threats to children’s fragile minds riled DAR and UDC leaders, but for
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average members, growing federal authority in the education perhaps made
textbook investigation too controversial—or perhaps, too doomed to fail.

The DAR was the most fervently and broadly conservative white woman’s
heritage organization of the 1960s, but today it has moved furthest from that
orientation. The DAR’s website now boasts that it is “one of the most inclusive
genealogical societies in the country” and welcomes women of “all races and
ethnic backgrounds.” The organization claims that its members hold an array of
religious affiliations, “including Catholic, Mormon, Jewish, Buddhist, and
Islamic.” In 2012 the Daughters removed some references to God and Jesus
Christ in the DAR Opening Ritual to make it more welcoming to non-Christian
members. This move drew the ire of FOX News and other conservative news
media outlets, which accused the organization of “naively embracing
pluralism.”

This same year, Olivia Cousins of New York became the first black woman
to founded and lead a DAR chapter. Her chapter now has thirteen members, five of
whom are black. Cousins was well aware of the organization’s historic role in
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opposing racial integration and civil rights for black Americans. But she maintained, “I’m a part of this country, and my presence needs to be recognized.” The presence of non-white DAR members like Cousins is a result of these individuals’ determination but also reflects the DAR’s efforts to be more inclusive. The organization now offers a free guidebook, *Forgotten Patriots: African American and American Indian Patriots in the Revolutionary War*, to “inspire the interest of descendants in their ancestors and in the work of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.” At 874 pages, this document is perhaps the most extensive genealogical guide to non-white American Revolution participants.

White women’s heritage organizations in Texas were part of a movement of conservative women that began in the interwar era and coalesced in the 1950s. They played a smaller role as the movement and grew stronger and more diverse after 1970. The image of the “little old lady” that attached to conservative women of the mid-twentieth century also attached to white women’s heritage organizations. While the image of the conservative woman of the twenty-first century is a young, attractive, and enthusiastic Michelle Bachmann or Sarah Palin, today’s Daughters are still thought of as dour “little old ladies.” In 2013 the membership of the DAR, UDC, and DRT in Texas is still primarily white and

---

middle- or upper-class. The historical narratives of each organization have grown less conservative since 1970, although they are still far more celebratory than critical. The public activism of today’s Texas Daughters rarely extends beyond historical preservation. Few Houstonians know about the activities of our multiple UDC, DAR, and DRT chapters. The Daughters I met as I gathered material for this project were kind, welcoming, but cautious women. Several wanted to assure me that their organizations were not racist. The Daughters’ romantic visions of the American Revolution, Texas Revolution, and Civil War may still hold some attraction for conservative, extreme right wing, and outwardly racist women. However, these organizations—so immured with the past—have now chosen to distance themselves from the most negative aspects of their own organizational history.
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