

“‘The Vindictive Nature of Our Enemy’: The Eviction of Confederate Families from Atlanta”
Lisa Tendrich Frank

2014 Filson Historical Society Academic Conference
“The Hard Hand of War: Civilians and Irregulars in the Civil War”

Do not cite or reproduce without the written permission of the author ©2014

As the white women of Atlanta fled their homes in September 1864, local leaders cried foul. William Tecumseh Sherman, they proclaimed, had violated both the unstated and stated rules of war when he evicted Confederate civilians from their homes and turned them into refugees. Sherman hardly shied away from these allegations, and instead proudly proclaimed them to be the hollow protests of a weakened enemy. In the process, he revealed one of the many ways that the Civil War was, in LeeAnn Whites’ words, a “crisis in gender.” “These fellows,” Sherman wrote in a private letter, “have a way of leaving us to take care of their families, but when I took Atlanta I ordered them all to quit and a big howl is raised against my Barbarity—Butler is the Beast—Sherman the Brute & Grant the Butcher. This is somewhat on the order of the school bully who if he cant whip you, can call you hard names or make mouths as you listen.”ⁱ Sherman, in this brief explanation, rejected the premise that he had an obligation to protect and care for the Confederate civilians in his midst. They were a hostile enemy, not his domestic dependents, and those who complained had only themselves to blame for abandoning their own responsibilities.ⁱⁱ As he asserted: “the only way the people of Atlanta can hope once more to live in peace and quiet at home, is to stop the war, which can only be done by admitting that it began in error and is perpetuated in pride.”ⁱⁱⁱ

In this debate over the treatment of civilians, Sherman and his Confederate detractors agreed on very little. On one issue, however, they concurred: female civilians were the responsibility of men, and therefore invasions and occupations of homefronts necessarily created

dilemmas for the soldiers involved. For Sherman, the policy of removal resolved the crisis by physically ending the need to provide for white women of the South; for Confederate leaders, Sherman's policy of removal demonstrated his negligence and disregard for his paternal obligations. For Sherman, the treasonous behavior of women made them subject to the "hard hand of war"; for Confederate detractors, the sanctity of womanhood should have shielded them from such abuse.

On several notable occasions, the Union Army forcibly removed Confederate women and children from their homes and otherwise emptied entire towns of their civilians. Sherman's actions in Atlanta may be the most memorable of these events, but similar large-scale evictions took place in Roswell, Georgia and, more dramatically, in four counties in Missouri.^{iv} Although all of these instances resulted in the forced removal of white civilians from their homes, historians have often described these actions as "evacuations." Treating them as evacuations, however, has implicitly led scholars to understand these evictions as something done on behalf of the civilians rather than something done to them—as attempts to shield women and families from the war rather than as actions that brought war's "hard hand" down on them. Furthermore, this terminology draws attention away from the intended benefits that evictions provided the Union army and instead focuses upon the unintended or unfortunate consequences of war. The removal of families, however, was not a benevolent act to keep women out of the line of fire. The Union Army coercively expelled women from their homes because doing so allowed the United States to make a quick, and largely overlooked, military strike at its female enemies without waging a sustained war against them and then absolved Union men of their responsibility to care for hostile women during the ensuing occupation.^v

The eviction of female civilians both resolved and revealed an aspect of the Civil War's "crisis in gender."^{vi} The conundrum was rather straightforward. On one hand, Sherman and other Union officials paternalistically recognized that the rules of war and of nineteenth century propriety required them to adhere to various restraints when it came to the treatment of women and civilians.^{vii} On the other hand, Sherman and other Union officers acknowledged that elite white women were not a powerless and passive enemy on the sidelines. They acknowledged that these women served as the backbone of Confederate morale and nationalism, and provided much-needed resources and labor for the Confederate war effort. In addition, and perhaps most importantly, Confederate women could undermine the occupying Union force by waging feminine forms of guerrilla warfare or by engaging in other less aggressive but still menacing gendered ways. Evictions resolved this challenge, as they allowed Union officers to follow their mandate to protect and provide for families in their midst while absolving them of a sense of responsibility for those who were not under their control. Even the process of evictions, which was necessarily a military tactic conducted against women, could be justified by Lieber's code which proclaimed that "the more vigorously wars are pursued the better it is for humanity" and which recommended that commanders "throw the burden of the war, as much as lies within his power, on the disloyal citizens."^{viii} In this context, Sherman insisted that Confederate women could not be shielded from the harm that unavoidably would occur through eviction or occupation. It would be impossible to shield them entirely from these adversities. "You might as well appeal against the thunder-storm as against these terrible hardships of war. They are inevitable," he explained.^{ix}

By 1864, after years of fighting against and dealing with Southern guerrillas in Tennessee and along the path to Atlanta, Sherman understood many of the complications that occurred

when armies met civilians. These complications held true whether those civilians were male or female. As a nineteenth-century student of war, Sherman recognized this reality before the Atlanta campaign ensued. He had learned from his experiences in Florida's Seminole Wars as well as those during the Civil War that women and civilians were just as much the enemy as were soldiers; he knew that to defeat an army he must defeat the soldiers' support systems. Furthermore, guerrilla warfare made it difficult to discern between combatant and non-combatant and to create military policies that affected one but not the other. Sherman had learned the lesson early on and used it in response to protests over his actions in Mississippi in 1863, when he asserted "we are justified in treating all the inhabitants as combatants." He refused to be swayed by requests for leniency or help because "Of necessity in War the Commander... may take your house, your fields, your everything, and turn you all out, helpless to starve. It may be wrong, but that don't alter the case. In War you can't help yourselves, and the only possible remedy is, to stop war."^x It was within this context and with this mindset that Sherman's forces captured Atlanta on September 2, 1864. When Confederate troops fled the railroad city, more than one thousand civilians. Southern women, children, and men, most of whom were elderly, remained in their homes. They were not soldiers, but Sherman and others feared that they would resist and would cause problems for the army; in any case the presence of hostile Confederate civilians would make Atlanta less than hospitable for the occupying force. As a result, on September 8, 1864, Sherman issued Special Field Orders 67, which ordered the eviction of all civilians from Atlanta. The general insisted that families had no place in Atlanta now that it had become a Union command post. In addition, he refused to feed, clothe, shelter, or otherwise support this hostile and dependent feminine population. Sherman turned the citizens of Atlanta into refugees.

More than one thousand Confederate refugees, all searching for shelter left behind homes and much of their personal property in Atlanta.

Almost immediately after issuing Special Field Orders 67, Sherman made his paternalistic logic clear to Confederate authorities. In response to Confederate John Bell Hood's outrage, Sherman insisted that the eviction was charitably done on behalf of women. "God will judge us in due time, and he will pronounce whether it be more humane to fight with a town full of women, and their families of a brave People at our back or to remove them in time to places of safety among their own friends and People."^{xi} In this response, Sherman explained that the eviction ensured the safety of these "helpless" female civilians as he cast himself in the role of protector. Furthermore, he asserted, "it is a kindness to these families of Atlanta" because his order would "remove them . . . from scenes that women and children should not be exposed to." In addition, Sherman criticized Confederates for thinking that civilians should remain in Atlanta. Throwing their characterizations of him back at them, he continued that "the 'brave People' [Confederates] should scorn to commit their wives and children to the rude barbarians who thus as you say violate the Laws of War, as illustrated in the pages of its dark History."^{xii}

Confederate leaders rejected Sherman's explanation of the order even as they embraced the paternalistic logic that shaped it. For example, Atlanta's Mayor and two members of the City Council "petition[ed]" Sherman "to reconsider the order requiring [civilians] to leave Atlanta." As they urged him to rethink his actions they cast Sherman's treatment of women and children as unmanly. They appealed to his masculine obligations, "You know the woe, the horrors and the suffering cannot be described by words." The Atlanta politicians also stressed the blamelessness of female Confederates: "What has this helpless people done, that they should be driven from their homes to wander strangers and outcasts and exiles?"^{xiii} This response, which has been

dutifully repeated by many Southerners and scholars since its publication, confirms the mythology that “helpless” women needed to be spared from the horrors of an occupying force.^{xiv}

Sherman used his public response to these complaints to further bolster the illusion that the evacuation was a benevolent act that sheltered Confederate civilians from the horrors of war. After all, he told the city officials, “The use of Atlanta for warlike purposes is inconsistent with its character as a home for families. There will be no manufactures, commerce, or agriculture here, for the maintenance of families, and sooner or later want will compel the inhabitants to go.” Sherman posited that his solution provided these families with a way to leave before they ran out of food and other necessities. Women would not be able to fend for themselves in the militarized town. The goal of the “evacuation,” therefore, was to limit female suffering. Sherman even insisted that the process of kicking families out of their homes with very little time to prepare or pack would be done with charity. “I assert that our military plans make it necessary for the inhabitants to go away, and I can only renew my offer of services to make their exodus in any direction as easy and comfortable as possible.”^{xv} He publicly stressed his generosity by pointing out that he was offering Confederates transportation out of Atlanta before things in the city became even more difficult for families.

Privately and sometimes publicly, however, Sherman and other Union leaders acknowledged that the eviction of Confederate non-combatants served Union war aims. In particular, it was a way to prevent “secesh” women from harassing his soldiers and interfering in military operations. He did not want female Confederates waging gendered war on his troops as women in occupied New Orleans had done to Benjamin Butler’s force. Evictions would deny any possibility of chamber pots being dumped on Union soldiers, or of women otherwise treating them disrespectfully.^{xvi} As Sherman told Halleck, “I want it a pure Gibraltar and will have it so

by the first of October.”^{xvii} In comparing Atlanta to an isolated military post and key base of the British Royal Navy during the Crimean War, Sherman demonstrated his true aim: he wanted a base that had no interference from civilians, who had a “vindictive nature.”^{xviii}

In his letters to his wife, Sherman repeatedly stressed his desire to maintain the distinction between the work of war and the feminine distractions of domestic life. In those letters he alerted her to both the military and personal reasons for evicting enemy civilians from the city. Not only did he “take the ground that Atlanta is a conquered place” that he “propose[d] to use... purely for our own military purposes which are inconsistent with its habitation by the families of a brave people,” but he also bragged that after his orders were fulfilled “the town will be a real military town with no women boring me at every order I give.”^{xix} In his mind, a “real military town” would have no interference from women, especially not enemy women who would constantly nag him by endlessly protesting every move he made and every order he gave. Evictions eliminated this feminine nuisance. In addition he made it clear that there was no telling what this “brave people” might do if they remained in Union occupied Atlanta while he and his men planned for the next stage of their campaign. “I will have been a silly fool to take a town at such cost, and left it in the occupation of a helpless and hostile people.”^{xx} He again stressed the dangers of what “hostile people” might do, especially because they were “helpless” to respond to the occupying force in a predictable way. In this portrayal, Sherman presented female Confederate civilians as similar to cornered animals—unpredictable, desperate, and thereby dangerous. “I know the vindictive nature of our enemy, and that we may have many years of military operations from this quarter.” Therefore, he claimed “it wise and prudent to prepare in time” by evacuating the “vindictive” enemy, regardless of her sex.^{xxi}

Paternalism was not just the shared language of men. In many instances white women across the Confederacy used the language of paternalism to express their outrage against Sherman's orders. For these women, however, the language and logic of paternalism made their banishment from Atlanta into evictions and violations rather than evacuations and acts of charity. In their eyes Sherman "promulgated an Order so infamous that a Russian example must be sought if we would find a parallel amongst civilized nations."^{xxii} From Ravenswood, Georgia, one woman denounced the eviction. She considered it "dreadful for women and children to be turned out of doors homeless," and she saw the expulsion as particularly harsh because it occurred at the start of winter. She stressed that in the "darkened annals of history" there were no others who, like the Union, "wage[d] war upon helpless women and children."^{xxiii} Like many others, she used the paternalistic language of "helpless women" to emphasize the offensive nature of Union actions. Confederate women railed against the inhumanity of being evicted from their Atlanta homes. North Carolinian Catherine Edmondston was similarly repulsed that "He finds it for the interest of the US that every inhabitant should be banished from Atlanta & its vicinity." In her mind there was only one result: "What can he expect but resistance to the death from every Southern man, woman, & child in the future?"^{xxiv} Whereas Sherman tried to make it seem like clearing Atlanta of its female civilians was for the civilians' own good (much like American officials did in the case of Indian removal), women around the Confederacy saw the situation quite differently.

Sherman was not bothered by these characterizations of him and his military orders. Although he publically insisted that he acted with charity, he routinely insisted that the punishment and upheaval that he caused was just. Sherman anticipated that his order would be met with resistance and complaints, but rejected the idea that Confederate women deserved

protection and benevolence. In a letter to Halleck days before he issued Special Field Orders 67 he contemplated its effects on the population as well as his future response to it. "If the people raise a howl against my barbarity & cruelty, I will answer that War is War & not popularity seeking. If they want Peace, they & their relations must stop War."^{xxv} In Sherman's mind, elite women's role in the Confederate war effort justified the eviction of Atlanta's civilians. Furthermore, the responsibility for their protection belonged to Confederate men. Evicting the instigators of the war was a just punishment. As a result, Sherman ignored their pleas for clemency, throwing their own active role in supporting and supplying soldiers back in their faces: "Now that war comes to you...you deprecate its horrors, but did not feel them when you sent car-loads of soldiers and ammunition, and moulded shells and shot, to carry war into" other places.^{xxvi} Sherman's response to complaints from the Mayor and members of City Council of Atlanta clearly highlighted his belief in taking retribution on the female enemy. "War is cruelty, and you cannot refine it; and those who brought war on the country deserve all the curses and maledictions a people can pour out."^{xxvii}

Although issued by Sherman, the orders for the eviction of Atlanta's civilians reflected a desire to punish Confederate Women that existed across the Union's rank and file. Like their commander, many Union soldiers believed that Confederate women had brought these consequences upon themselves. For example, J. Dexter Cotton acknowledged the moral challenge inherent in the orders. He realized that "It seems very hard," but then justified the necessity of such actions. He proclaimed that it "serves them right for most of the women of the south are generally stronger secess than the men."^{xxviii} Sherman's soldiers wanted their families to understand that they fully supported Sherman's actions against Confederate women. They also wanted to justify their participation and support of these orders. One soldier urged his family to

“read ... Sherman’s letters to Hood in reference to the removal of the women & children of Atlanta” because “They are so good, just the sentiments of his whole army. Such a general, one that is not afraid to treat with them as they deserve, is the man we like to fight under.”^{xxix} Not only were Union soldiers not worried about evicting Southern women from their Atlanta homes, but they also gloried in it. They relished the fact that Confederate women were finally getting what they deserved.

Even Union clergy rejected the idea that Confederate women deserved protection and otherwise supported Sherman’s orders to evict women from Atlanta. Reverend George S. Bradley, who traveled with Sherman’s troops, ridiculed the notion that soldiers should treat Confederate civilians with charity. He like many others in the Union ranks saw mercy as something that Confederate women did not deserve. “So far as the women are concerned, we might as well spare our pity, for they are the worse secessionists, and why should they not suffer.” He further wanted these civilians to feel the consequences of their actions. “Let them understand that secession means something more than a holiday parade.”^{xxx} Bradley’s attitudes showed not only a lack of empathy for Southern civilians, but also a paternal outlook that dismissed white women as frivolous girls who reduced war to nothing “more than a holiday parade.”

Many Union civilians supported the eviction of white women from Atlanta and they dismissed the notion that occupying forces should protect enemy civilians from the hard hand of war. From the safety of the Union homefront Sherman’s wife expressed her delight in her husband’s actions in Atlanta. “I am charmed with your order expelling the inhabitants of Atlanta as it has always seemed to me preposterous to have our Government feeding so many of their people” Furthermore, she decried the Confederacy’s “insolent women particularly for they are

responsible for the war and should be made to feel that it exists in sternest reality.”^{xxxix} Many Union women shared Ellen Sherman’s perspective and applauded the harsh treatment of their Confederate counterparts as a valid wartime tactic and a necessary step in ending the war.

The decision to evict Confederate women resulted from more than an individual desire for vengeance. Rather than seeing it as an unfortunate necessity, Sherman pursued eviction as a central part of his strategy to “utterly ... negat[e] Davis’ boasted threat and promises of protection.”^{xxxix} In Atlanta, Sherman put into action the lessons he learned in Florida’s Seminole Wars and during his tenure as Memphis’s wartime governor.^{xxxiii} War and hostility did not confine themselves to armies. As he noted in 1862, “all the South is in arms and deep in enmity.”^{xxxiv} As a result, by 1864 wanted to bring war to “all the South,” regardless of age or sex. Furthermore, Sherman acknowledged white Southern women’s dedication to the Confederacy and involvement in the war effort clear early in the conflict, explaining to his brother, Ohio senator John Sherman, that “the entire South, man, woman, and child are against us, armed and determined.”^{xxxv} Sherman conceived of slaveholding Southern women as Confederates, rebels, and enemies, and treated them accordingly. In this light, Sherman’s eviction of white Southern women from Atlanta was no accident. “I want peace, and believe it can now only be reached through union and war, and I will ever conduct war with a view to perfect & early success.”^{xxxvi}

The campaign that began in Atlanta ultimately led to peace and “an early success.”^{xxxvii} Sherman’s understanding of slaveholding Confederate women as enemies shaped his plans for the eviction of Atlanta and then for his Georgia, and Carolinas campaign. Unwilling to leave women outside of the boundaries of warfare and acknowledging their place in the Confederate war effort, Sherman pursued a campaign that used gender ideas to undermine his female enemies instead of to protect them. He similarly used gendered language to justify and explain his

actions. Sherman recognized the vital role that elite women continually played in sustaining Confederate soldiers on the battlefield, and he vowed to strike at the geographic and metaphoric heart of the Confederacy. In bringing war home to female civilians, Sherman and his soldiers hoped to destroy Confederate support and to bring about a rapid end to the war. Sherman's Special Field Orders 67 is best understood as an eviction of female Rebels rather than as an evacuation of helpless civilians. Women were the intended targets of the military policy, and they suffered most directly because of it. At the time, the fates of the white women were the focus of the grievances expressed by Confederates about the injustice of the policy, and the presence of the women were similarly at the heart of most Union explanations for the wartime policy.

Notes:

ⁱ WTS to Eugene Casserly, 17 September 1864, *Sherman's Civil War: Selected Correspondence of William T. Sherman, 1800-1865*, edited by Brooks D. Simpson and Jean V. Berlin (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 713.

ⁱⁱ For more about Sherman's gendered warfare against elite Southern women, see Lisa Tendrich Frank, *The Civilian War: Confederate Women and Union Soldiers during Sherman's March* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, Forthcoming 2015); Lisa Tendrich Frank, "Bedrooms as Battlefields: The Role of Gender Politics in Sherman's March," in *Occupied Women: Gender, Military Occupation, and the American Civil War*, edited by LeeAnn Whites and Alecia P. Long (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2009), 33-48

ⁱⁱⁱ William T. Sherman to James M. Calhoun, Mayor, E. E. Rawson, and S. C. Wells, representing the City Council of Atlanta, 12 September 1864, *Sherman's Civil War*, 708.

^{iv} In retaliation for William Clarke Quantrill's raid on Lawrence, Kansas, on August 25, 1863 Sherman's foster brother and brother-in-law Thomas Ewing, Jr. issued General Order Number 11. This order forced the evacuation of more than 20,000 civilians from four counties in Missouri. For a look at these events through the lens of gender, see Lee Ann Whites, "Forty Shirts and a Wagonload of Wheat: Women, the Domestic Supply Line, and the Civil War on the Western Border," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 1:1 (March, 2011): 56-78.

After his troops captured the manufacturing town of Roswell, Georgia, Sherman's orders were to cause "utter destruction" and "arrest all people male & female connected with the factories no matter what the clamor and let them foot it under guard to Marietta, whence I will send them by cars to the North." William T. Sherman to Kenner Garrard, 7 July 1864, *Official Records*, Series 1, vol. 38, pt. 5, 76.

^v The difference in terminology becomes clearer in the contrasts between Sherman's decision to "evacuate" Confederate civilians from Atlanta and the decisions of Confederate officials to evacuate Southern civilians from places in the line of battle. Despite the implications of the term evacuation Sherman gave his orders to suit his wartime objectives, he did not make them on behalf of Confederate civilians. Although the validity of the order to evacuate in the latter case are ripe for discussion in another context, the term evacuation has obscured the experiences of Confederate women and children and otherwise misstated the military intent of the wartime tactic.

^{vi} See LeeAnn Whites, *The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender: Augusta, Georgia, 1860-1890* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995).

^{vii} On wartime ideas about masculinity see, for example, Lorien Foote, *The Gentlemen and the Roughs: Manhood, Honor, and Violence in the Union Army* (New York: New York University Press, 2010); Stephen W. Berry II, *All that Makes a Man: Love and Ambition in the Civil War South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003). On the need to recognize the homefront as an important aspect of Civil War decisions and battles, see LeeAnn Whites and Alecia P. Long, *Occupied Women: Gender, Military Occupation, and the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2009).

^{viii} General Orders No. 100, April 24, 1863, *Official Records*, Series III, vol. 3: 148-164. On Lieber's Code, see John Fabian Witt, *Lincoln's Code: The Laws of War in American History*

(New York: Free Press, 2012), esp. 231-49; Mark Grimsley, *The Hard Hand of War: Union Military Policy toward Southern Civilians, 1861-1865* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), esp. 149-151. Grimsley notes, that the ambiguity of the Lieber code both “enjoined Union forces to behave with humanity” and “declined to set specific limits on what those forces might do to achieve victory.” *Hard Hand of War*, 151.

^{ix} William T. Sherman to James M. Calhoun, Mayor, E. E. Rawson, and S. C. Wells, representing the City Council of Atlanta, 12 September 1864, *Sherman’s Civil War*, 708.

^x William T. Sherman to H. W. Hill, 7 September 1863, *Sherman’s Civil War*, 536, 537.

^{xi} William T. Sherman to John Bell Hood, 10 September 1864, *Sherman’s Civil War*, 706-707.

^{xii} William T. Sherman to John Bell Hood, 10 September 1864, *Sherman’s Civil War*, 706.

^{xiii} James M. Calhoun, E. E. Rawson, and S. C. Wells to William T. Sherman, 11 September 1864, in William Tecumseh Sherman, *Memoirs* (New York: Penguin, 2000), 493.

^{xiv} For a recent examination of the mythology and memory surrounding Sherman, see Anne Sarah Rubin, *Through the Heart of Dixie: Sherman’s March and American Memory* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014).

^{xv} William T. Sherman to James M. Calhoun, Mayor, E. E. Rawson, and S. C. Wells, representing the City Council of Atlanta, 12 September 1864, *Sherman’s Civil War*, 708.

^{xvi} On Butler’s conflict with women in occupied New Orleans, see Alecia P. Long “(Mis)Remembering General Order No. 28: Benjamin Butler, The Woman Order, and Historical Memory.” In *Occupied Women*, 17-32; Jacqueline Glass Campbell, “‘The Unmeaning Twaddle about Order 28’: Benjamin Butler and Confederate Women in Occupied New Orleans, 1862,” *Journal of the Civil War Era* 2 (March 2012): 11-30.

^{xvii} William T. Sherman to Halleck, 9 September 1864, *Supplemental Report of the Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War*, Volume 1 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1866), 193.

^{xviii} William T. Sherman to James M. Calhoun, Mayor, E. E. Rawson, and S. C. Wells, representing the City Council of Atlanta, 12 September 1864, *Sherman’s Civil War*, 707.

^{xix} William T. Sherman to Ellen Sherman, 17 September 1864, *Sherman’s Civil War*, 717.

^{xx} William T. Sherman to Ellen Sherman, 1 October 1864, *Sherman’s Civil War*, 728.

^{xxi} William T. Sherman to James M. Calhoun, Mayor, E. E. Rawson, and S. C. Wells, representing the City Council of Atlanta, 12 September 1864, *Sherman’s Civil War*, 707.

^{xxii} Catherine Ann Devereaux Edmondston, 16 September 1864, “*Journal of a Secesh Lady*”: *The Diary of Catherine Ann Devereaux Edmondston, 1860-1866*, edited by Beth Gilbert Crabtree and James W. Patton (Raleigh: Division of Archives and History, 1979), 615.

^{xxiii} Sarah Elizabeth Wilson to J. H. Wilkes, 19 November 1864, Edward Marvin Steel Papers, Collection of Heiskell, McCampbell, Wilkes, and Steel Family Materials, Wilkes Family Correspondence, SHC.

^{xxiv} Catherine Ann Devereaux Edmondston, 16 September 1864, “*Journal of a Secesh Lady*,” 615. See also, Ella Gertrude Clanton Thomas, 23 September 1864, *The Secret Eye: The Journal of Ella Gertrude Clanton Thomas, 1848-1889*, edited by Virginia Ingraham Burr (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 238.

^{xxv} William T. Sherman to Henry Halleck, September 4, 1864, *Sherman's Civil War*, 697.

Sherman frequently used the word “howl” when referring to reactions to his military decision. As James Reston, Jr. recognized, “neither states nor soldiers howl; civilians do, particularly women.” Reston, *Sherman's March and Vietnam* (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1984), 93.

^{xxvi} William T. Sherman to James M. Calhoun, Mayor, E. E. Rawson, and S. C. Wells, representing the City Council of Atlanta, 12 September 1864, *Sherman's Civil War*, 709.

^{xxvii} William T. Sherman to James M. Calhoun, Mayor, E. E. Rawson, and S. C. Wells, representing the City Council of Atlanta, 12 September 1864, *Sherman's Civil War*, 708.

^{xxviii} J. Dexter Cotton, 17 September 1864, Cotton Papers, Library of Congress.

^{xxix} Edward Allen, 25 September 1864, Allen Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. See also, Horatio Dana Chapman, 20 September 1864, *Civil War Diary: Diary of a Forty-Niner*, (Hartford: Allis, 1929), 95. The idea that Confederate women were getting what they deserved continued throughout the campaign. One described it as “a horrible state of affairs [that] they had brought upon themselves.” James Leath, 23 December 1864, Journal, Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

^{xxx} George S. Bradley, 28 December 1864, *The Star Corps; or, Notes of an Army Chaplain, During Sherman's Famous "March to the Sea"* (Milwaukee: Jermain and Brightman, 1865), 225.

^{xxxi} Ellen Sherman to William T. Sherman, 17 September 1864, as cited in John Marszalek, *Sherman: A Soldier's Passion for Order* (New York: Vintage Press, 1993), 286.

^{xxxii} William T. Sherman to Ulysses S. Grant, 6 November 1864, *Sherman's Civil War*, 751. On

Sherman's goals for the entire campaign, see Frank, *Civilian War*. Although later scholars would debate the importance of the homefront, Sherman had no doubts about its power. In all of his tactics and many of his writings, Sherman acknowledged women's power to affect the course of war.

^{xxxiii} See Marszalek, *Sherman*, 188-201, esp. 195-196; Michael Fellman, *Citizen Sherman: A Life of William Tecumseh Sherman* (New York: Random House, 1995), 135-148. While in Memphis, Sherman evicted families of Confederate guerrillas and threatened to evict all civilians. “I will expel every secession family from Memphis if [guerrilla] war is to be continued.” Sherman as quoted in Fellman, *Citizen Sherman*, 141.

^{xxxiv} William T. Sherman to Grant, 4 October 4 1862, *Official Records*, Series 1, vol. 17, pt. 2:261.

^{xxxv} William T. Sherman to John Sherman, 22 September 1862, *The Sherman Letters: Correspondence Between the General and Senator Sherman from 1837 to 1891*, edited by Rachel Sherman Thorndike (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1894), 162.

^{xxxvi} William T. Sherman to James M. Calhoun, Mayor, E. E. Rawson, and S. C. Wells, representing the City Council of Atlanta, 12 September 1864, *Sherman's Civil War*, 709.

^{xxxvii} William T. Sherman to James M. Calhoun, Mayor, E. E. Rawson, and S. C. Wells, representing the City Council of Atlanta, 12 September 1864, *Sherman's Civil War*, 709.