

July 7, 1913

Selma, Alabama, Chapter No. 53

The United Daughters of the Confederacy Holds Called Meeting to Condemn the Slander of Robert E. Lee and Family in the History of Woman Suffrage, by Susan B. Anthony and Others. Strong Resolutions Passed.

By James Callaway.

THE U. D. C. RESOLUTIONS.

THE U. D. C. is the greatest organization of women in the world. Besides its philanthropic mission in aiding the old soldiers "who fought and lived," erecting monuments to perpetuate the valor and courage of those who died, and providing scholarships for girls who desire an education, and doing thousands of things of an eleemosynary character, one of the chief objects of the organization is to preserve Southern history and to keep the "record straight."

The Daughters of the Confederacy feel the iniquity of the slander perpetrated upon General Lee and his daughter, Annie Carter, and are calling upon the authors of that fabrication to correct the falsehood.—*Macon Telegraph*.

RESOLUTIONS OF U. D. C. CONDEMNING SLANDER OF ROBERT E. LEE.

At a called meeting of Chapter No. 53 of the United Daughters of The Confederacy, at Selma, Alabama, May 17, 1918, the following resolutions were adopted:

WHEREAS: It has been brought to the notice of this Chapter that in Volume 11, page 23, of The History of Woman Suffrage, by Susan B. Anthony and others, a most unwarranted, false, and malicious attack is made upon the character of Robert E. Lee, the sacredness and sanctity of his home invaded, and his family maligned as here literally quoted:

THE HISTORY.

Vol. 11, page 23: "Many women showed their love of country by sacrifices still greater than enlistment in the army. Among these, especially notable for her surroundings and family, was Annie Carter Lee, daughter of Gen. Robert E. Lee, commander-in-chief of the rebel army. Her father and three brothers fought against the Union which she loved, and to whom she adhered. A young girl scarcely beyond her teens when the war broke out, she remained firm in her devotion to the National cause, though for this adherence she was banished by her father as an outcast from that elegant home once graced by her presence. She did not live to see the triumph of the cause she loved so well, dying the third year of the war, aged twenty-three, at Johns Springs, N. C., homeless, because of her love for the Union, with no relatives near her, dependent for care and consolation in her last hours upon the kindly services of an old colored woman. In her veins ran the blood of "Light-horse Harry," and that of her great aunt, Hannah Lee Corbin, who at the time of the Revolution protested against the denial of representation to taxpaying women, and whose name does much to REDEEM that of Lee from the INFAMY of late so justly adhering to it."

The falsity of the statement is shown by the following letter of Mary Custis Lee, daughter of Gen. R. E. Lee:

THE LETTER.

The Jefferson, Richmond, Va., April 20, 1918.

"My Dear Sir: Let me thank you for the quotations from Dr. H. E. Shepherd's 'Life of Lee.' The 'Cady Stanton' and Susan B. Anthony fabrication are such I can scarcely believe they would have promulgated such wholesale falsehoods. As a matter of fact, while my father, like many of the old army officers, was not a secessionist, and hoped to the last that civil war might be averted, we young people were much more violent in our feelings and expressions, and you may be sure that there was no dissentient voice among us.

"My father went down to Richmond the day Virginia seceded, and my mother was given at first only twenty-four hours in which to pack up and dispose of her large household affairs and the children. Packing up was going on all night, nobody attempting to sleep, and the next afternoon we young people were all sent up to Ravensnorth, an old family place some fifteen miles back in Fairfax county, and where a great aunt of ours was living, while my mother received permission to remain for a few days longer.

AS TO THE FABRICATION.

"The scandal is a fabrication, manufactured out of the whole cloth, without even the shadow of foundation, and one cannot imagine how it ever originated. My father's character was so pure and lofty, as well as winning, and his devotion to his children so well known, so demonstrative even, that he had no personal ones. So far as Annie Carter is concerned—poor gentle Annie—she adored her father, and he adored her, partly because she was named after his mother, whose memory he worshipped, and always attributed anything that was worthy in himself to her teachings, and training and influence; and partly because as a small child Annie had stuck the scissors into one of her eyes and ruined the sight, but not the appearance of it. Hence my father always had a special feeling of tenderness for her, so much so that he specially provided for her in his will. How ignorant were these slanders of my father's character!

"My mother was a great sufferer from rheumatism and hearing of the healing virtues of 'John Springs,' now called 'White Sulphur,' managed somehow to get down there with my two sisters, though traveling was very difficult at that time, and while there dear, gentle Annie died. My mother nursed her in sickness, day and night, and Annie died in her arms, and mother was broken-hearted over this first death of one of her seven children, and I am the last of the seven now living. Mother went with Annie and Agnes to North Carolina, and Annie, never strong, developed typhoid fever.

"I had been left with some near relatives in Virginia and Mildred, the youngest, was a little school girl in Winchester, until driven away by the tide of war, when she was sent down to 'St. Marys,' in Raleigh. My dear father could not leave his post, and was so overcome with grief over the death of Annie, the first death in his family.

"During our war large families were often separated, and necessarily so. I was myself separated from mine. Just recovering from typhoid fever so prevalent in Richmond at that time, my mother sent me down to King George county, to relatives living in a remote section, as she thought, and where I could have quiet and pure air for better recovery, and where it was not anticipated the 'Yankees' would ever come. But one morning we awoke to find ourselves in their lines, surrounded—the Fredericksburg campaign having begun. I was there virtually a prisoner the whole winter, and there heard by a stray letter of my sister's death. This explains why I was not with Annie when she died."

(Signed) MARY CUSTIS LEE.

Now, Whereas, In this same History of Woman Suffrage in Volume 4, published as recently as 1900, and pronounced good by its authors, the said Susan B. Anthony, and Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, (the latter still living) we find on page VIII, of the said Volume 4, and signed by Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, these words:

"The money which Miss Anthony now had, enabled her to carry out her long cherished project, to put the History free of charge in the public libraries. It was thus placed in twelve hundred libraries in the United States and Europe. Mrs. Stanton and Mrs. Gage, who had contributed their services without price, felt that it should be sold, instead of given away and in order to have a perfectly free hand, she purchased their rights.

In addition to libraries, she has given it to hundreds of schools, and to countless individuals, writers and speakers, whom she thought it would enable to do better work for the franchise."

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That we, the U. D. C. Chapter 53, do hereby brand as absolutely untrue and without foundation the said statements in The History of Woman Suffrage, concerning Robert E. Lee, and his family, hitherto so honored of all men, all honest historians whose writings are based upon fact and truth, and we demand that the same be diligently corrected and condemned.

We urge all Chapters of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, Confederate Veterans, and Sons of Veterans, to take similar action; and

WHEREAS, as above stated, this unwarranted libel upon the justly revered name of Robert E. Lee, has been placed in "twelve hundred libraries in the United States and Europe, and hundreds of schools, and given to countless individuals," be it further resolved that The United Daughters of the Confederacy pledge themselves henceforth, to deny and prove false this intentional insult to a People, and to one of God's noblest characters, Robert E. Lee.

Be it further resolved, that action be taken to protect our children and others, uninformed, to the end, that this unmitigated falsehood may not pollute the pages of future history.

We take this occasion to extend to the beloved daughter of Robert E. Lee, our heartfelt and sincere thanks, that in spite of the shock and sorrow that knowledge of this gratuitous insult has brought to her, and her horror of the consequent publicity, she has, like the true, brave daughter of a father without reproach, come forward, as was but just and due to the name she bears, and the millions who still revere the memory of her noble father, as one peerless among men and denied and disproved this malicious, shameful falsehood.

We extend to her, renewed assurance of our love and loyalty, being thankful that it is our privilege and honor to uphold with her help, and incontrovertible testimony the spotless name of Robert E. Lee.

MRS. R. E. LEE'S LETTER.

The Confederate Veteran, always as acute as Miss Mildred Rutherford in keeping the record straight, reproduces on its editorial page the letter of Miss Mary Custis Lee settling for all time the slander against General Lee and his daughter, Annie Carter, which was published especially under the supervision of Susan B. Anthony, whom, Mrs. Ida Husted Harper says was "exceedingly careful in scrutinizing all the material that went into the Official History."

Following the letter of Miss Mary Custis Lee, the editor of the Confederate Veteran makes these comments:

"It was General Lee's intention after the war to have his daughter's remains taken to Virginia, but after visiting the place and seeing how the grave was cared for he was content to leave his dear one to that tender care forever. Over her grave was erected the first monument ever placed by women to the memory of a woman, only women of Warren county being asked to contribute.

"At its dedication in the summer of 1866 Col. James Barron Hope was the orator and delivered an elegiac ode, published in full in Dr. Henry E. Shepherd's 'Life of Lee.' In writing Colonel Barron some time afterward, Mrs. Robert E. Lee thanked him for a sketch of the monument and said:

"I have often longed to visit it, and it is an inexpressible comfort to me to daily view this image of a spot so dear. I have loved to think of her dying so quietly in that lovely place, where the foot of our invaders never trod; to know, too, that she was spared the misery of seeing the downfall of the cause she so much loved. She only met the doom Heaven often awards to its favorites, and I am content."

Lord Wolsley, who visited the Confederate army, thus wrote of its commander: "I have met many of the great men of my time, but Lee alone impressed me with the feeling that I was in the presence of a man who was cast in a grander mould and made of different and finer metal than all other men. He is stamped upon my memory as being apart and superior to all others in every way—a man with whom none I ever knew and very few of whom I ever read are worthy to be classed."

[July 7, 1919]

"Mars' Henry" Watterson, the Noblest Roman of them all "Speaks in Meetin'"

THE BLOT ON THE SCUTCHEON

His Famous Editorial, Condemning the Woman's Bible, Feminism and Woman Suffrage.

I.

The combine of, shall we not say cowardice and cupidity, which characterizes the average American newspaper in the matter of Woman Suffrage is the most discouraging, discreditable, and dishonoring feature of contemporary journalism.

The publishers are afraid of diminished circulation, the Editors of feminine nagging. Between them the leading dailies of the larger cities and towns—notably those along the Atlantic seaboard—ignore the issue for the most part and bar its discussion. In both the dread of consequences is a misconception alike of public and manly duty as of commercial forecast and business interest; because in the long run readers could be multiplied and service rendered and consideration achieved by the adequate treatment of a question, important indeed to men and the state, but of transcendent moment to Women themselves. Yet, vital as it is, the press is silent.

In Maine during the recent campaign where the Woman Suffrage amendment was beaten two to one the newspapers shunned debate as far as they could. In New York, where a campaign is on, they durst not lift a pen in opposition. Excepting the New York Times, we fail to discover a single leading journal which seems willing or able to call its soul its own. It is the same in Philadelphia, in Baltimore and in Boston.

Down the Southern Coast—at Richmond, Charleston, Savannah, Mobile and New Orleans—the braves appear to be paralyzed, though the state lines and social conditions are seriously and immediately menaced. They that were erst so glib decanting about "Southern Rights" stand all agape and have never a word to say, whilst a clumsy Trojan Horse, open on both sides so that the Greeks are visible to the naked eye, is trundled along into the very Holy of Holies by people who were but just now proclaiming death and destruction to all things Southern. Even as news they will not print the truth.

Truly noise, assertion, impudence go a long way, for it is safe to estimate that not one intelligent woman anywhere has considered the Suffrage matter in all its bearings and reached the definite conclusion that in spite of all she wants to vote, whilst at the South no intelligent woman can thoughtfully consider it without reaching the conclusion that accomplishing nothing for women, it can only bring evil upon the electorate. Under the existing enlargement of the franchise we have fallen low enough, Heaven knows; but, doubling this by the addition of millions of good women and bad women, black women and white women, cannot fail to sink us and our institutions still lower. What appreciable good could be attained it is impossible to conceive.

The professional politician—seeking lines of least resistance—the popular preacher, not daring to offend an active, albeit a minority section of his congregation—can always and easily be bullied by the shrieking sisterhood. Meanwhile, the soul of Susan Anthony, like that of Old John Brown, goes marching on. It goes marching on toward the Feminist goal of blatant infidelity, rejecting the Religion of Christ and Him Crucified and repudiating the man-made Bible of Moses and the prophets in favor of Elizabeth Cady Stanton's "Woman's Bible," which teaches the religious heresies of Voltaire, Paine and Ingersoll, along with the Free Love theories of Mary Wollstonecraft, Victoria Woodhull and Ellen Key.

II.

Feminism is essentially—it is almost exclusively—Woman's Question. The baptism is the least part of it. If there were nothing else involved, and, by some miracle, Universal Suffrage could be brought about between night and morning, the result would be negligible as a political force and very disappointing to those excellent women who expect much from it.

In the centers of population—especially in hotly contested elections—certain obvious evils and abuses would rally every purchasable woman, every ignorant woman, at the polls. Not a few good women, intelligent women, carried away by party zeal and campaign excitement, would be lured into unwomanly demonstration. At the South the colored ladies would be largely—often perhaps solely—in evidence. To what end?

In the frontier States where Woman Suffrage, adopted to invite population, has prevailed, and we see no sign of elevated conditions, purified politics or better government. The woman voters divide much as the men voters. There are no cities and consequently no crowding, no mobs and no dives.

We need not ascribe the turbulence in California and Colorado to Woman Suffrage. But the woman voters have shown themselves powerless to abate, or quell it, even if they have made any attempt. Assuredly they have made no organized attempt.

Nor need we regard the unimportant figure that the first woman Representative in Congress has cut at Washington as evidence of feminine incapacity for public affairs. As an example Miss Rankin is not inspiring. But, if she were as dominating as Elizabeth, or Victoria—if she had the genius of Madame de Stael, or Vittoria Colonna—if she possessed the wit, eloquence and charm of the wife of Roland—her gifts would not lead to the betterment of government and were more profitably employed outside the bull-ring of politics for the betterment of the human species. The Member from Montana, being out of place, does not fit into the prevailing order. It proves nothing the one way, or the other.

The capacity of Woman is not an issue at all. When put to it she can fight, she can speak and she can vote just as well as the men can. The question turns not upon her aptitudes. It is, did God and Nature design her to fight, to speak and to vote, or did God and Nature invest her with higher and nobler yet equally indispensable duties and functions?

Any fool can fight and vote and most fools do speak. Woman, reflecting men put above such commonplaces. They hold her not merely the Mother of the World—clearly specified and qualified by God and Nature for that great office—but, by reason of this elevation, the Moral Light of the Universe, without whose ministrations children could not be reared and except for whose modifying influence the

male creation would become little better than the brute creation.

Nor is any considerable body of our women excited on the subject of the ballot. If they were, and demanded it, they would speedily get it. The feminine instinct, so much more acute than that of the male, conceives the concept of woman in the life of man—fully establishing and unassailable—and draws warily back from a political scheme proposing to swap a certainty for an experiment. It were at best of doubtful advantage. But, what of this experiment if it be merely the prelude to a vast, revolutionizing movement aimed to abolish sex distinctions altogether and to put the man on the same low plane of equalized brutality; no more love and marriage; no more reciprocal tenderness and interdependence; the lights of the home extinguished; the poetry of girlhood; the chastity and chivalry of manhood—the religion and romance of the old order—gone out of life, and in their stead, the Code of the new order as advocated by the Wollstonecrafts and Woodhulls of history set forth by Mrs. Cady Stanton in her "Woman's Bible" and accepted and promulgated by the leaders of the proposal to obliterate geographic divisions and abolish Home Rule by a Constitutional Amendment Federalizing Woman Suffrage and, at one fell swoop, ending our time-honored system of National and State Powers with their admirable and necessary checks and balances.

It means revolution—far-reaching revolution—the saying being no less true than trite that revolutions never go backward.

III.

To be sure all this is flatly disputed by the perverted advocates of Woman's Suffrage who merely scratch the surface of the discussion and either see not, or refuse to see, the depths below. Our least investigation will attest, it admits of no denial. The proof is abundant, as the Courier-Journal has shown over and over again.

We need not go back to what might be sneeringly dismissed as ancient history to summon the common law wife of William Godwin to the stand. We need not even go to Europe, to call Ellen Key and the Pankhursts, who have ruled here at home an organized body of highly educated and intellectual women who, planting themselves upon Mrs. Cady Stanton's "Woman's Bible," preach its gospel with resonant earnestness at all hours of the day and night wherever a hall may be hired or a soap box be improvised.

This "Woman's Bible" was compiled, as we learn from its title page, by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and copyrighted by her in 1895. On the revisory committee appear the names of Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, Mrs. Robert Ingersoll, Mrs. Helen H. Gardner, Lucinda B. Chandler, and other women of their faith and order. The contributors, as commentators, are Ellen E. Dietrick, Louisa Southworth, Lucinda B. Chandler, Matilda Gage, Frances E. Burr, Rev. Phoebe A. Hanford and Clara E. Neyman. The object of the book is to overthrow the "old family" Bible as we have it and supplant it with a new Bible inspired by these women. As a reason for a new Bible Mrs. Stanton says:

THE DIFFICULTY IN WOMAN'S CASE IS THAT THE WHOLE FOUNDATION OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION RESTS ON THE TEMPTATION AND MAN'S FALL, HENCE THE NECESSITY OF A REDEEMER AND A PLAN OF SALVATION. AS THE CHIEF CAUSE OF THIS DIRE CALAMITY, WOMAN'S DEGRADATION AND SUBORDINATION WERE MADE A NECESSITY. * * * IF WE ACCEPT THE THEORY THAT THE STORY OF THE FALL IS A MYTH, WE CAN EXONERATE THE SNAKE, EMANCIPATE THE WOMAN, AND RECONSTRUCT A MORE RATIONAL RELIGION, AND THUS ESCAPE ALL THE PERPLEXITIES OF JEWISH MYTHOLOGY.

The plan of the work is to take a quotation where woman is mentioned from Paul or Timothy or any other of the Apostles, and proceed to show that the woman is degraded and given no place in the New Testament but that of an inferior, and the reasons for its publication being, as Mrs. Stanton says, that "We need a religion based on Science and Nature. We have made a fetish of the Bible, and now, 'As Christ is the head of the Church, so is man the head of the woman.' This idea of woman's subordination is reiterated times without number from Genesis to Revelation, and is the basis of all church action."—From Preface to Vol. II.

In one of his recent close studies of Mrs. Stanton and her "Bible," and its influence, James Callaway makes the following illuminating compilation:

"Sarah A. Underwood, one of the commentators, says: 'The influence of the Bible against the elevation of woman has been great because of the infallibility and the Divine authority with which the teachings of the Bible have been invested.'"

"Mrs. Stanton in her comment on the widow whom Jesus praised for casting in her two mites—all she had—does not approve of the widow's conduct. Instead of the commendation Jesus gave her, Mrs. Stanton says: 'Self-development is a higher duty than self-sacrifice, and should be woman's motto.'"

"Joseph K. Henry of the Revising Committee, says: 'Let him who can show just cause why woman should not look to reason and to science rather than the Scriptures for deliverance; let him speak now, or forever after hold his peace.'"

"When reason reigns and Science lights the way, a countless host of women will move in majesty down the coming centuries. A voice will cry, 'Who are these?' and the answer will ring out: 'These are the mothers of the coming race, who have locked the door of the Temple of Faith and thrown away the key.'"

"On nearly every page of the 'Woman's Bible' is a fling at the Scriptures. And yet what a following Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton has! She was Susan B. Anthony's preceptor and this 'Woman's Bible' was Susan B. Anthony's textbook. Suffragette writers in the magazines of the day teach what the 'Woman's Bible' teaches. This idea of marriage as set forth in the New Testament is ridiculed. Mrs. Pankhurst caught the meaning of this New Bible when she declared her object was to demoralize the world of society, shame the churches and upset the whole orderly conduct of life."

"It made a convert of Miss Rebecca West, who says 'that woman's self-sacrifice for the home is a sin.' It made a convert of Inez Millholland Boissevain, who wrote: 'This pressure toward a constantly growing freedom on the part of woman means in the long run the institutions most certain to be changed are the home and marriage itself. It made a convert of Jane Ashley, former secretary of the National Suffrage Association, who says: 'In the choice of love woman is as free as man. She must be in position to act freely where her strongest impulses are concerned. No one should give account of himself or herself, and no third party has the right of intervention.'"

"Metto L. Sterne, a convert, says: 'The present marriage ceremony will be abolished, together with other useless ceremonies. The State should care for the children.'"

"Dr. Anna Shaw, a convert, says: 'I would pension all mothers and have them provided for by the State. I believe motherhood should be independent of any man.'"

"On page 12, Introduction to Volume I, Cady Stanton, the author, says: 'Bible historians claim special inspiration for the Old and New Testament with its miracles opposed to all known laws. * * * I do not believe that any man ever saw God, or ever talked with God or that He told the historians what they say He did, and so long as women accept the position they assign her emancipation is impossible.' She declares the story of Moses about Mt. Sinai is all a myth.

"Matilda Gage, a member along with Mrs. Chapman Catt and Mrs. Robert Ingersoll, of the Revising Committee, in Vol. II, says: 'That even the most enlightened nations are not yet out of barbarism is due to the teachings of the Bible. We are investigating the Bible's influence under Judaism and under Christianity and pronounce it evil.' 'We in the above refer to the 'Revising Committee' and Commentators. 'In Vol. II, Josephine K. Henry, of Versailles, Ky., of the Revising Committee, says: 'We claim that woman's advancement is due to civilization, and that the Bible has been a bar to her progress. * * * How strange it is that the average Christian woman holds the name of Paul above all others, oblivious to the fact that he has brought deeper shame, subjection and servitude and sorrow to woman than has any other human being in history.'"

It will be a popular religion in Europe after the war. There will be an immense excess of women, a corresponding decrease of men, and, as after the Thirty Years' War" it was ordained that one man should have many wives, and that no child should be held illegitimate, no matter how born, so after the war we may expect the spirit of feminism to prevail, and no questions asked. There will be no escape. They are already proclaiming that Christianity is a failure. But with the end of the war there will be an added reason, the need of more people.

We have a foretaste of what to expect even in Staid Old England. In a recent sketch Sir Conan Doyle tells us what he sees on the streets of London every evening. He graphically describes the parade of young women by the hundreds, walking the pavements, arm in arm, laughing loudly and singing and making remarks to the soldiers. "They do not belong to the ranks of the unfortunate women—most of them do not—but are engaged during the day performing the ordinary task of messengers, porters, stenographers, office keepers and such occupations as fell before to young men," says Sir Conan, justly alarmed by the spectacle of such wanton abandonment.

If such things be possible now, what must happen when this kind of harlotry is justified by public policy looking to repopulation and "sanctified" by the Religion of Nature," seeking the freedom of women through the overthrow of the Religion of Christ? They tried it in Babylon and Tyre. They tried it in Athens and Rome. What came of it history tells us. But the Modern Aspasia will learn none of the lessons of history. She glories in her shame and workshops at the Free Love Shrine of Max Eastman who makes jokes and ribald cartoons at the expense of Jesus of Nazareth and swears in five keys and seven languages upon "The Woman's Bible" of Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

* * * * *

Here, to come back to our text and point of departure, we have the most vital question of modern times—in the Southern part of North America involving our political being and our social structure—everywhere involving life, religion and morals—with a newspaper press asleep to all appearance; deaf and dumb, and blind, as well; in the great cities, silent as the tomb; in the smaller cities, empty as a house-to-let; in town and village, emulating the vacuity of its betters! Since Christian civilization has gone to smash among the high-brows of the East and self-government has become a lost art in Gotham, it were a kind of fatuity to look in that general direction; but the South, what do we see there! The Capital of Virginia once had a press that gave lessons in political economies and Charleston at least one newspaper that almost made the War of Sections. Time was when the word of John Forsyth went forth from Mobile to the farthest corners of the Republic, and Kendall, Bullitt and Walker made New Orleans a National sounding-board of wit, wisdom and eloquence. Alack the day! Forsyth is dead and Erwin Craighead grown in years ago. Even the Bakers are gone from the Crescent City, leaving Robert Ewing too busy chasing party shadows, and young Thomson looking too sharply after Champ Clark's presidential qualities, to bother about the structure of society and the danger of the Universe. Fanaticism has the floor. Why phoee-walls and slip in and out of silent alleys, and wonder what time o' night it is, and whether 'twill ever be day! As for the honor of the cloth—a free, independent, fearless, upright, outspoken press—inspired by the memory of by-gone glories—invigorated by the sense of public and professional duty—they will none of it; they have none of it; nowhere; and nobody left to tell the tale except the Courier-Journal, which was and ever will be—as the Good Book says—"one among ten thousand and altogether lovely."

"Lest Ye Forget"—Write Your Representatives in Congress and Your State Not to Vote for Woman Suffrage.

