On February 22, 1902, members of the New York Southern Society gathered in the grand hall of the Waldorf Astoria for the Society’s sixteenth annual dinner. The menus were engraved, “illustrating a cotton field and an old darky with his corn cob pipe indulging in the sentiment ‘Take Me Back to the Place Where I first Saw the Light’.” Lyrics to “My Old Kentucky Home, Good Night,” “Dixie’s Land,” “I’se Gwine Back to Dixie,” and “Old Folks at Home” were printed and rendered for all those in attendance to sing along. Southern ladies and their friends flooded the balconies. Harvey Watterson of Columbia University’s Southern Club sat at the president’s table.¹

At nine o’clock, Judge Augustus Van Wyck, the president of the Society, called the assembly to order and spoke about the South’s longstanding commitment to cultivating the “highest civilization”—to cultivating man as a “moral, intellectual, and social free agent.”² He spoke about how the South, considering “her wealth,” has always been more committed to educating and uplifting “her negro population… than any of the Northern or Western commonwealths.” He reminded the assembly that the South had fought for and will continue to

---
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fight for “one victory, the victory of truth—the voice of justice.” Wyck’s words are a telling reminder of the subtle and strategic ways in which Southerns—at the turn of the twentieth-century—were attempting to reconstruct American history to accommodate Southern conservatism (and racism) in the contemporary milieu.

On November 9, 1886, the New York Southern Society was established to “promote friendly relations among Southern men residing or temporarily sojourning in New York City, and to cherish and perpetuate the memories and traditions of the Southern people.” The Society attempted to create a sense of community among Southerns living in the City, Southerns who either lived or had ancestors in “Delaware, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Tennessee, Arkansas, Kentucky, Missouri, or the District of Columbia.” Living or having ancestors in Confederate states was the criterion by which individuals were deemed eligible or ineligible for Society membership.

Hailing or having ancestral ties to the Confederacy, one way Society members could preserve the memories and traditions of Southern people was by reading and discussing self-reenforcing Southern literature. Four years after the Society was organized, members were hard at work curating a “Southern Historical Library” for the Society, named the “Garden Library of Southern Americana” after Hugh R. Garden, who was an active part of the curation process. Works were selected that “related to the history and literature of the South, in order that [the library] may portray the character and genius, and perpetuate the memories and traditions of the
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Southern people.” The library included “many rare and valuable…works, histories, biographies, essays, memoirs, speeches and novels portraying every phrase of Southern life and character…by authors whose names are inseparably associated with the history of our country”—by Southern and Northern authors alike so long as they depicted the South—the history of the Civil War and Slavery—on Southern terms.7

According to its 1981 “Catalogue,” compiled by librarian John Lillard, the Garden Library embraced works like, “The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government” by Jefferson Davis and “Notes on the State of Virginia” by Thomas Jefferson.8 However, A recent exploration into Columbia University’s Rare Book and Manuscript Library indicates that an original copy of “The Revised and Amended Prescript of the Order of the *** [Klu Klux]” also lived on the Garden Library’s shelves.9

In 1901, the Garden Library of the New York Southern Society was deposited in the Columbia University library, “where all members [could] access not only…the books of the Society but also…those of the Library of the University.”10 Nearly a century later, the Prescript was unearthed among the University’s archives, whose pages—stamped with Hugh. R Garden’s signature and the New York Southern Society Garden Library’s stamp—placed the Prescript in the late-nineteenth-century library. A letter with which the KKK pamphlet was bound also indicated that it was once available for Society members to read and discuss.

6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
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In the March 5, 1981, letter addressed to Hugh R. Garden, Nashvillian Nellie Porterfield explained how the Prescript had “escaped destruction when the ‘ghouls’ disbanded” and how it had been given to her “by an ex-member.” Porterfield noted, “as a positive command was issued to destroy every copy, & as I know that hundreds were burned at that time, I fancy there are very few in existence to-day.” Due to the limited quantity of Prescripts that survived—that is, the Grant Administration’s 1870-1 efforts to (re)enforce the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments against anti-black organizations like the KKK—Mrs Porterfield further expressed how valuable this copy of the Prescript could be for the Southern Society. “If I am mistaken,” Porterfield qualified, “you [Mr. Garden] will of course feel no obligation to make any use whatever of the book.” However, as Hugh R. Garden’s signature and the New York Southern Society Garden Library’s stamp suggests, the Society did feel obliged to make use of the book, making it available for Society members—and later Columbians—to digest.

The Society’s exclusion of “The Revised and Amended Prescript of the Order of the ***” from its 1981 catalogue may have been a matter of timing. The Garden Library may, very well, have received the Prescript just after the catalogue was compiled and published. Or the Society’s exclusion of the KKK pamphlet may have been a matter of something else entirely. As the Society intended to promote a certain history of the South,—namely, of the South being “a glorious, organic civilization destroyed by an avaricious ‘industrial society’ determined to wept out its cultural foes”—downplaying the extent to which the South actively and intentionally embraced (and relied upon) racism and white supremacy proved to be paramount. Consequently,

the literature and speeches made available to the members would only be made available in so far as they promoted a romantic history of the South that downplayed its virulent racism to a carefully-concealed racism.

In his 1902 address to the members of the Society at the Waldorf Astoria, president Augustus Van Wyck embodied this philosophy. After speaking of the South’s longstanding commitment to cultivating the “highest civilization” and of the Southern imperative to educate and uplift “her negro population,”—an imperative unmatched by Northern and Western commonwealths—Wyck then spoke of Christmas in the South. He recalled, as a child, mistaking the “darky…[making] the hickory wood fire” for Santa Clause; how that “old mammy” would exclaim, “Christmas gift, young Marse” and would hand him a present. Wyck remembered, “the negroes [coming] in troops to the ‘great house,’ bringing jugs and baskets to be filled, when one hears…‘I nursed your ma, I was with you’ Pa when he went courtin’.” He recalled how such claims were “advanced as entitling to special generosity”: “a dram [of eggnog was] given to every darky hand.” In the spirit of patriotism and family ties, Wyck concluded his address imploring his audience to “appreciate the blessings of the country in which you have been reared…to reverence the memory of your ancestors and perpetuate their inflexible virtues.”

Wyck’s words elucidate how, for Southerns living in New York City, (re)remembering and rewriting Southern history (and concealing the virulent racism therein) was the source by which Southern identity was both justified and embraced.

A year after Wyck’s highly regarded speech, Dean of Columbia College Dr. John Howard Van Amringe addressed the Society on the thriving relationship between Columbia University
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and the South, proving that this historically justified Southern identity was, indeed, being embraced. At the seventeenth annual banquet of the Society, held on February 21, 1903, in the same grand hall of the Waldorf Astoria, Van Amringe spoke of the South as materially, intellectually, and spiritually advanced. He hoped that Columbia alumni, who had become members of southern communities, were “[striving] as loyally and effectively as any son of the soil.” Van Amringe pledged to the Southern audience that their conservatism was not a defect but a blessing for every community with which they identified themselves:

So you see, gentlemen, we are well aware that no pent up region south of Mason and Dixon’s line confines your powers; you exercise them everywhere throughout the country and for the good of the communities with which you identify yourselves. You are no less good New Yorkers because you keep alive the memories and traditions and good customs of the places from which you cam hither.  

These words testify to the success with which Southerns were able to promote a positivistic account of their history and the extent to which Northerns were willing to embrace it. Moreover, according above excerpts, not only did Van Amringe embrace this post-War Southern identity, he also found it extremely valuable.

In the same 1903 address, “On Columbia University and the South,” Van Amringe spoke of the necessity for Southern students and professors on campus. “With the growth of our great schools or pure and applied science, of medicine, law, political science and philosophy, and with the removal from a confined quarter of town to Morningside Heights,” Van Amringe reported, “there are now two flourishing Clubs in the University made up of Southern students gathered here for the educational opportunities offered by Columbia.” Additionally, he reported,

---
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“important professorships in the University…are filled by distinguished sons of the South.”

Concluding the address, Van Amringe confessed that answering society’s most pressing political problems would be impossible without the diversity of Southerners:

> For [political problems’s] proper study and treatment there should be the widest possible experience, and the best attainable knowledge of varied conditions, a judgement trained and well informed in civic matters, a spirit thoroughly imbued with true Americanism, a large element of hope and an abounding philanthropy. Off all these essentials to civic wisdom and right civic action, the members of this society supply their full share, and I wish long life and success to the New York Southern Society.\(^{16}\)

For Van Amringe, the Southern gentleman living in New York—imbued with the moral, intellectual, and social courage of a civilization determined to *weep out its cultural foes* through history—represented the missing piece that would make Columbia’s intellectual community whole. As it so happened, Columbia’s strategic 1986 move to Morningside Heights ushered in a new era of Southern society.

> Around 1898, Souther society emerged as student-led clubs. On March 2, 1898, the Columbia Spectator reported, “The Southern Society is now in flourishing condition and has a list of over seventy-five members. Meetings are held every two weeks…to which all Southerners in the University are welcomed.”\(^{17}\) A December 4, 1900, Spectator article, however, places the Society’s beginnings in 1900 college year: “At the beginning of this college year,” the Spectator reported, “it was thought that it would be impossible to organize a Southern Club. It has been done, however, and is now working smoothly.”\(^{18}\) An article published in the December 14, 1906, Columbia Spectator

---

\(^{16}\) Ibid.


issue of Spectator announced “last Wednesday evening” as “the first regular meeting of the Columbia University Southern Club…held in Earl Hall.” The article further reported, “Enough members were present to give a most encouraging outlook for the future, the following states being represented: Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, South Carolina, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi and Texas.”

Notwithstanding the seemingly inconsistent and contradictory dating, the articles as a collective indicate that, between the years 1898 and 1906, Columbia students made several attempts at organizing a Southern society—and, further, that a lack of student interest was not to blame for the Society’s disorganization.

According to the Spectator archive, 1907 was most likely the year in which Southern students succeeded in maintaining a Southern Club through the end of the school year. On January 11, 1907, the Spectator reported that, in their “last Wednesday evening” meeting, “the future activities of the organization were discussed…and it was decided that the object of the club should be both to bring Southern men of the University together and to discuss political and economic questions pertaining to the South.”

Like that of New York Southern Society, the Columbia Southern Club’s mission, as the 1907 article indicates, was to create a sense of camaraderie among Southern students and to foster discussions on the political and economic state of the South in the early twentieth-century. Also like the Southern Society, between the years 1907 and 1910, the Club hosted a variety of Southern intellectuals and professionals whose speeches promoted and perpetuated a certain white-washed history of the South.


Through to the Summer of 1910, that is, when the Society was restructured, the Society hosted four prominent intellectuals and authors: professor W. R. Shepherd and judge J. B. Wise in April, 1908; journalist and future U.S. Ambassador to the United Kingdom Walter Page in October, 1908; and novelist Thomas Dixon Jr. in May, 1910. The differing viewpoints of these professionals reveal just how malleable Southern history was: it could vindicate contemporary white supremacy at the same as it could justify more progressive notions of Southern progress. We may ask ourselves: to what extent did the identities of Southern men of Columbia come to embody these historically reconciled paradoxes? To what extend were the identities of Southern students constructed on a historically concealed white supremacy?

On April 15, 1908, Professor Shepherd’s spoke of “The Old South.” He portrayed “very graphically the condition of the Southern planter before the war, showing the generosity, frankness and impetuosity of the old slave owners.” The honorable Mr. Wise then spoke of Southern women, “congratulating them on the courageous stand they had made with their husbands against the mighty forces of the North.” Appropriately, the subject of Mr. Wise’s address was “The Outlook of the New South.” Mr. Wise spoke on flourishing economic and political conditions of the South and predicted that “in a short time the blind animosity toward the North would be absorbed in a new progressive and national feeling.” Mr. Page would reiterated similar sentiments.  
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soldier.” In one “special meeting,” Southern men of the University were exposed to two seemingly estranged views reconciled into one.

Shepherd and Page’s words testified to the historical logic that would come to dominate popular opinion, that is, among New York Southern society in the twentieth-century. They defended a civilization of “generous” white masters and contented African slaves. They spoke of a South victimized by Northern avarice, of a slave democracy enslaved by Northern dictatorship. As an abused history would come to justify, they perpetuated the notion that the Southern cause (for the Civil War) was the right and true cause and, further, that that which was Right and True would always prevail over Northern invasion. Furthermore, as the excerpts of Shepherd and Mr. Wise’s addresses indicate, they accomplished to lay down a teleological conception of Southern history (and identity) that would reveal itself as the ultimate bearer of American nationalism. According the Spectator, the speeches were well received.

Two years later, the Columbia Southern Society hosted novelist Thomas Dixon, author of “The Leopard’s Spots,” “The Clansman,” and “Cowards”—which the Spectator described as “the new anti-socialist novel.” Admission to the meeting was by special invitation only, so we can assume that the meeting was less attended than preceding ones. However, for those who were lucky enough to secure an invitation, they would have heard Thomas Dixon speak of Klux Klan members as heroes and martyrs. They would have heard Dixon recall the history of Reconstruction as one of Northern failure. They would have heard Dixon portray “African Americans as heathens, sexual predators, undeserving of emancipation and unfit to expertise

24 “Southern Club Holds Social Meeting,” Volume LI, Number 153, 15 April 1908.

newly gained voting rights.” 26 They would have absorbed Dixon’s virulent racism that accused the North as having purposefully punished Southern whites by means of turning former slaves against them. Perhaps Dixon reiterated to Columbia’s Southern Society that, in “The Leopard’s Spots” and “The Clansman,” he was “giving utterance to the deepest soul convictions of 18,000,000 Southern people on this, the darkest problem of our country.” 27 Did the Southern men of Columbia believe him? that his novels told the true history of the Civil War and race relations in contemporary America? Notwithstanding evidence that would indicate whether or not the Southern Society embraced or rejected Dixon’s words, his mere presence at the Society’s May 12, 1910, special meeting reveals the extent to which the Society was willing to entertain and perhaps even vindicate white supremacy and violence against black folks. As the Society began to flourish in the summer of 1910, we may ask ourselves: to what extent was Columbia writ large willing to accommodate white supremacy and virulent racism among its students? To what extend did Columbia effectively facilitate white supremacy?

In the Summer of 1910, Teachers College alumni Dr. William Kilpatrick expanded the Southern Club as a summer session offering. As the July 21, 1925, Southern Club issue of the Spectator reported, Kilpatrick restructured and reorganized the Southern Club as a summer club for the express purpose of creating “some means of assembling the group of Southern students, far from their homes in Dixie, so that they might meet for mutual and profitable social


acquaintance.” With the explosion of the Columbia summer session, which grew from 2,600 in 1910 to nearly 13,000 in 1925, the Southern Club would develop into sixteen state clubs, which, by 1925, would contain a collective membership of over 3,500 students. Adopting the title of “Association,” the Southern Club would come to oversee the state clubs of Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia (in 1910); Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Mississippi (in 1911); Missouri, Louisiana, and Oklahoma (in 1912); Texas (in 1913) and Arkansas (in 1916). Further, Kilpatrick’s influence would transform the Club from a literary society into an organization which, as the Spectator reported in 1925, “was soon to take place in the forefront of the social life of a huge summer session a Columbia.”

In 1911, the Southern Club instituted its first “Reception and Stunt Night,” which soon became the centerpiece of social life on Columbia’s summer campus. Simply put, the Stunt Night provided state clubs the opportunity to portray the life and history of their respective states through reenactments. The only qualification of the “stunts” was that they had to be characteristic of the state. Stunts were thus judged according to their ability to “present…in a clever way the development and progress of the respective states.” As a result, the stunts tended to “[keep] alive the legends and traditions of the South, so rich and colorful in its folklore.”

---
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However, in the summer of 1921, the Stunt Night Committee added an additional qualification: there would be no more “Negro stunts” that year and—as the Spectator article published in 1923 indicates—the succeeding years as well. The barring of “Negro stunts” calls into question the extent to which state clubs relied upon black minstrelsy or at least mockery to keep alive the legends and traditions of the South. Additionally, the call to end “Negro stunts” questions what exactly precipitated the Committee’s decision?

The Committee’s efforts to bar “Negro stunts” proved to be futile. In the 1925 Southern Club issue of the Spectator, an article reported that Kentucky and South Carolina’s performances of blackness awarded them third prize and runner-up, respectively. The plot of Kentucky’s “Old Kentucky Home” was reported as follows: “A quartet, ostensibly singing through the radio, about the old south, entertains a modern family. The darky mammy enters with her pickaninny, and enjoys all the modern improvements.” And South Carolina’s “Street Scenes of Charleston” as: “Negro women with bright bandanas selling ground nuts in the street vied with laundresses carrying white bundles on their heads. Shoppers in the Square stop to hear a darky preacher talk against evolution.” Either the Committee fell back on its promise to bar “Negro stunts” or—perhaps more likely and telling—it didn’t consider the above performances of blackness “Negro


38 Ibid.
stunts.” If the latter is true, we may ask ourselves: just how virulently racist were the state clubs’s previous performances of blackness? As the Southern Club, by means of their Stunt Night, created the necessary conditions for racism to metastasize at Columbia well into the 1920s, another organization was hard at work in doing the same.

In 1884, the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) was founded as a national organization. In 1900, the UDC had 412 chapters and 17,000 members in twenty states and American territories. By 1914, the UDC expanded its reach to include 100,000 members nationwide. As the scholar David Blight reminds us, the Daughters were most notable for raising money for Confederate monuments; lobbying legislature and Congress for the reburial of the Confederate dead; working to reshape and rewrite history textbooks; distributing college scholarships to granddaughters and grandsons of Confederate veterans; running essay contests to raise historical consciousness among white Southern youth; and designating the official name for the Civil War as the “War between States.” According to Blight, at the time, the UDC was the guardian of Confederate history. For our present purposes, UDC’s efforts to reshape Southern and American history and raise historical consciousness among white Southern youth by means of running essay contests prove most relevant to Columbia’s history.

The UDC presumable emerged as a chapter on Columbia’s campus in 1898, the year in which Teachers College affiliated with Columbia University. Along with running essay contests, the UDC became known for hosting dances and parties with the Southern Club and various state clubs. On February 9, 1923, they even brought in Mrs. Livingston Rowe Schuyler, President of

---
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the UDC, who was “the feature of the program of entertainment at a Valentine party and dance
given by the Southern Club.”41 On February, 20, 1914, the UDC, in conjunction with the Georgia
Club and other Southern state clubs, gave a “monster theatre party…in honor of Misses Edith
and Mabel Taliaferro,” sisters who were “daughters of an old southern family and strong
devotees of the south.”42 Along with providing entertainment for the Southern students of the
University, the UDC, as early as 1906, also ran annual essay contests, in which the best student-
written essay, on a topic connected with South and the Civil War, was awarded a cash prize along
with a UDC medal. Initially, the prize was only awarded to Teachers College students.

On January 20, 1906, the Spectator announced, “the United Daughters of the
Confederacy have founded an annual prize of $100, to be awarded to the student of Teachers
College preparing the best essay on some topics connected with the activity of the South in the
Civil War.”43 The annual prize was co-founded by the “Society of Colonial Dame’s” who
awarded an additional $50 to students who prepared the best essay on topics of their choosing.
An announcement in the December, 6, 1910, issue of the Spectator revealed that students had
many topics to choose from:

The subjects for essays to be presented for the prize of fifty dollars and a medal
offered annually by the Society of the Colonial Dames are announced as follows:
1. The relation of the Iroquois to the English and French colonies and its effect on
   their early development.
2. The Expedition of George Rogers Clark to the Northwest Territory 1779.
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5. The Romance of Early American Historical Geography.

The subjects for essays for the prize of $100 offered annually by the United Daughters of the Confederacy are:
1. The Reserved Rights of the States under the Federal Constitution.
3. The position of Southern Leaders on the Crittenden Compromise.
4. The causes of the War between States.
5. Opposition to Secession in the South.44

A January 4, 1904, announcement in the Spectator provides necessary insight into the topics on which student essays were judged. The article reported:

Toward the end of the academic year prizes for essays will be given by the ‘Society of Colonial Dames’ an the ‘United Daughters of the Confederacy.’ The former society will give a many prize of $50 and a silver medal for competition upon one of the following subjects: ‘Social Division of Old Colony Times,’ ‘The New England Town School,’ ‘Student Life in the Old Colonies, ‘The Relation of the English Colonies to the Conquest of New France, ‘Puritanism in the Southern Colonies. The subject for essays submitted for the $100 prize offered by the ‘Daughters of the Confederacy’ is ‘Jackson versus Calhoun.’

November 15, 1916:

Topics: ‘‘The Constitution of the Confederate States,’ ‘The Foreign Policy of the Confederate States,’ and ‘Leaders in the Confederate Congress.’

“The competing is open to all students, either graduate or undergraduate, regularly enrolled in Teachers College.
Bibliography

**Primary Sources**
Columbia Spectator Archive, “Southern Club”


Columbia Spectator Archive, “United Daughters of the Confederacy”


Library of Princeton University

New York Public Library Digital Collections

<https://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433081771598>

<https://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433081771598>

New York Times Archive


Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University

“The Revised and Amended Order of the ***.” 1868. Pulaski, Tenn.

Secondary Sources
