

Title: Adam Domby, The False Cause: Fraud, Fabrication, and White Supremacy in Confederate Memory

Podcast: Half Hour of Heterodoxy

Episode: 86

Transcript

[Welcome to *Half Hour of Heterodoxy*, featuring conversations with scholars and authors and ideas from diverse perspectives. Here's your host Chris Martin.]

Chris Martin: Adam Domby is my guest today. He's a history professor at the College of Charleston and we will be talking about his research on the statue of Silent Sam at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

The statue commemorated a Confederate soldier and was erected at a main university entrance in 1913. Domby was a student at Chapel Hill in the early 2010s and researched the dedication speech of the statue showing its connection to white supremacy.

The statue was pulled down by activists in 2018 and there has been an ongoing legal dispute over what to do with the statue. We will also be talking about Adam's new book *The False Cause: Fraud, Fabrication and White Supremacy in Confederate Memory* published in February this year, which is partially about the lies told by the people who sponsored this statue but mainly about lies told about North Carolina's history and the South's history after the Civil War and the function of those lies.

So you begin your new book with a reference to the statue of Silent Sam on the campus of UNC Chapel Hill and you talk about your letter to the Daily Tar Heel, the campus newspaper, about that statue. Tell me a bit about that letter and how that changed, how people at UNC viewed that statue.

Adam Domby: Yeah, it's a really good question. It's really how in many ways I came to this book. This is not a book I intended to write. It was a book that I sort of fell into. I first found the speech – I went to the archives as a young graduate student looking for – to just write a semester paper, a term paper about the local Confederate monuments because I figured it would be an interesting example to use and the documents were nearby and I went in the archives and I found this speech, this dedication speech that had really – from 1913, that had been overlooked by historians largely and in this speech, Julian Carr who was an industrialist and sort of the leading Confederate veteran in North Carolina, he sort of led the veterans organizations. He's sort of the wealthiest Confederate veteran. He was also a very powerful political figure in conservative democratic politics of the time and an alumni of UNC as well.

He spoke at the dedication and of the Confederate monument at UNC and he – in it he said essentially that this monument is a monument to the success of white men over African Americans. He says outright this is a monument to white supremacy if you will and then he says,

“Let me tell you what I did to help ensure white supremacy,” and he says really this is about the years after the Civil War as much as the years during the Civil War.

So in other words, when reconstruction was ended, it’s what he was talking about. He said, “Let me tell you what I did to help.” He says, “I horsewhipped” and then to quote him, “a negro wench until her skirt hung in tatters.”

So he was bragging about whipping a woman for trying to assert her independence and for publicly maligning a white woman basically. She had insulted a white woman. So he beat her with a whip.

This was something he bragged out and before this point, the monument was already controversial, if you will. People would point it out that this was a monument to a Slaveholders' Republic, people who had fought to maintain slavery. The debate was not new. But it was sort of a fringe debate. It came up every couple of years, but it wasn’t a major issue on campus in the way that it would become one. Sort of a central issue that the chancellor started paying attention to. It would show up in the Daily Tar Heel occasionally.

Well, as always, another letter came up and said this is a monument to slavery and someone replied saying this monument has nothing to do with white supremacy and me being very naïve at the time, and not fully comprehending I think the impact this monument had on especially students of color and faculty of color thought, well, this is a chance for me to use my research, to teach some people about Jim Crow.

That’s really – because the monument went up in the Jim Crow era and so the monument was really celebrating the success of Jim Crow is what Julian Car had been saying, right? The overturning of reconstruction, the institution of white rule was what made this monument possible in his mind and I said let me just put a letter out there saying here’s what they said at the dedication and then people – maybe we will get a historic sign in front of it that will let people learn about Jim Crow. This will be a great teaching tool.

At the time, like I said, I really was naïve and sort of – what was to come and also the impact this monument had on students of color because I hadn’t really talked with them yet and in time I would come to realize the negative impacts this monument was having on campus and the growing negative impacts it would have as the monument became a flash point that would attract white supremacists actively to campus that were armed and that happened that they had an armed white supremacist showing up on campus to try to protect the statue. That sort of was to me the – meant the monument had no choice but to go at that point once you have students not feeling – literally not feeling safe in the immediate vicinity of that monument because of armed men. It’s a done deal. You can’t have it on campus anymore.

But at the time I thought we’re going to teach people. So I sent out this letter. Here’s what they said at this dedication and it shifted the debate in a way I didn’t expect and I want to make clear it was really the activists who did the work here. I just put the research out there and they ran with it. They did the job of educating people. They would stand out there on game days. They

would write letters to the editor at the various newspapers. They would talk to reporters. They would put up signs. They would have protests and they educated people about this speech and they said this is – the debate shifted from being one about is this a monument to slavery too? Is this a monument about white supremacy? Which is a subtle but important distinction.

When I first found that speech, no one really was – no faculty member was talking about removing – that’s what I’m saying. If you talked to any faculty member at the history department at the time, they were like, “It’s not an issue we need to worry about. There are bigger things.”

By the time the monument was torn down by students, over 10 departments had passed resolutions in which the faculty and those departments have called for the removal of the monument and laid out why they felt it should be removed and each time it involved this speech.

So in a way, the activists really took historical research and this is a great example of how student activists can take the research of their professors and use it to change their campus. So the result of that research not only has led to the removal of a monument on UNC Chapel Hill’s campus. It also led to the renaming of two buildings in Durham including one on Duke’s campus and one that was in the Durham school system. They were both named after Julian Carr.

So it was their sort of activism as well that made me realize this was an issue that mattered today. This was an issue that was worth bringing up and led me to write the book. So this speech has really shifted and led to – by I would say 2017, there was not local support for the monument.

The local mayor wanted it removed. The local city council wanted it removed. The faculty of UNC Chapel Hill wanted it removed. Carrboro’s local government wanted it removed. So sort of everyone around it locally wanted it removed. The state didn’t want it removed. So it was only a matter of time until it’s removed because a monument in a community that doesn’t want it will eventually be removed either legally or extra-legally and in this case, it was extra-legally because legal means had been removed by the state legislature.

Chris Martin: And tell me about who Julian Carr was and what you discovered about him in the course of this book.

Adam Domby: So Julian Carr was an industrialist. He has been celebrated by some historians for his help developing the economy of North Carolina. We might call him a job creator in today’s sort of political discourse. He was also a Confederate veteran and he had mills. He was heavily involved in numerous industries including tobacco and textiles, numerous mills around North Carolina and he was a millionaire. He was one of the richest men in North Carolina, if not the richest.

He was a – he lived in Durham, North Carolina. He was – he had been at UNC during the Civil War before being conscripted and he had – he was also a philanthropist. He gave a lot of money and his philanthropy is often celebrated. He gave – he helped save Duke University with his philanthropy at one point which as a UNC graduate is questionable whether that’s a good thing or bad thing of course. But the – he also gave money that included to African-American schools.

It's historically black colleges. That philanthropy though of course came with a catch about what was being allowed to be taught and also that he got to give speeches at graduation ceremonies and what not. So he did help shape North Carolina, but he also shaped the memory of the Civil War in North Carolina. He was the leading Confederate veteran in the state. He led the local – the statewide veteran's organization.

He also would rise to lead the national United Confederate Veterans organization. So he was sort of the leading Confederate veteran. He spoke at more dedications I think than anyone else that I've ever been able to find, looking at numerous dedications. So he's constantly being asked to give speeches and he was also a major player in conservative democratic politics.

He runs for senate in 1900 and he pushes really an agenda of white supremacy. It's clearly in his agenda as he's pushing these policies. So the speech that he gave has made – has led people in the last – oh, I would say decade to reevaluate whether or not Julian Carr is really worth celebrating or if his legacy is more complex if you will, because he really is – he's a complex figure and that he's devoted to white supremacy and he spends a lot of money and a lot of time and a lot of effort.

He buys newspapers and makes sure they publish white supremacist articles. He buys numerous newspapers and basically gives them to a former Klan leader so that he can publish white supremacist rhetoric. So when he runs for senate, he runs on the platform of the white man shall rule or die. It's his sort of platform.

He loses because he's considered too moderate on racial issues. He's not racist enough basically. So that's why he ended up losing his senate campaign. But despite this, he is a – he's sort of a major player in the politics of the time and he helped shape early 20th century North Carolina in ways that we've often missed.

Chris Martin: And on a larger sense, do you feel like we sometimes miss the purpose of monuments because we don't find – we don't simply look at the speeches or the people who put them up?

Adam Domby: Yeah. I think we often do miss monuments and I think in some ways, that's by design. I mean I think the idea of a really effective monument is to be subtle in some ways, is that you sort of accept the message of that monument, that this is somebody worth celebrating without even realizing you're accepting it, right? Walking by it daily and not thinking is this a monument we should have – should we celebrate it? It just becomes, oh, there's a monument of Confederate soldiers. Confederate soldiers are worth celebrating.

It's sort of this subtle daily interaction with it where it seems like it's part of the background. It's what makes monuments in some ways effective. So I do think that we often ignore the purposes of monuments. They're not exquisitely stated usually on the monuments all of the goals that – when you think about – and this is also why monuments don't teach us history. People say, oh,

you're trying to erase history. It's like what history do I learn from looking at a monument? And it says duty is the sublimest word in the English language. That teaches me very little history.

It teaches me that if somebody wanted to use a trite phrase, that duty is the sublimest word in the English language, which is a sort of meaningless drivel. So I do think that it does – monuments can be subtle.

Chris Martin: So your book is not entirely about Julian Carr or the statue and the title of your book again is "*The False Cause*". False is the keyword there. So your book is largely about not just the speech but some of the lies in the speech. So tell me a bit first more generally about how you investigate lies and whether there was an intent to deceive. Like what evidence do you as a historian use?

Adam Dombey: Actually it was a fundamental question actually in the peer review process interestingly when one of my reviewers sort of objected to my use of the word "lie". So I did have to clarify actually. I did have to write – rewrite the introduction in ways to clarify what I meant by lie and – because lies in theory have intent, right? And so is this just a misstatement? Is it a falsehood or a lie, right? And this is sort of a fundamental question we have today a lot of times when we're dealing with current politics. Is the president lying or is he just misstating something? And the reporters have struggled with what to call misstatements and I think listening to some of the reporters who are dealing with this helps me – sort of guide me on this actually in that if it's by itself, it could be understandably a mistake.

But when it's continual, when you have a continual trend of constant misstatement even when it's called out, then it becomes clear that there is either a lie or a general if not mendacity, a sort of – a disinterest in accuracy.

So for me, it was often very hard to establish when something was a lie and when something was just a falsehood. What I realized was that the repeating of someone else's lie, whether known as a lie or not, often has the same impact as a lie.

So whether something becomes a falsehood is less important than whether the person who's repeating is a lie because what we do know is that when Julian Carr stood up there and he – and said this is how many men went from the University of North Carolina, he knew he had made the numbers up because he made them up the week before.

So what it requires is deep research and so you have to sort of remember that there are other people who are contradicting and calling out the lies that Carr was saying at the time although he ignores them and he frequently responds to – in some cases and other times, he will respond to them to say they were wrong.

The fact that he's saying they're wrong shows that he knew there's this counter-narrative, right? So the very act but I don't know that lies, when you talk about lies, he's not necessarily trying to fool anyone. I think in some cases, these lies are – everyone knows they're lies. But it's the act of lying and being able to get away with it is a show of power and we see something similar in

modern politics according to people like Masha Gessen, who sort of analyzed Vladimir Putin and Donald Trump in the way that they lied, that to their supporters, the fact that they can say this lie and no one can call them out on it is an expression of power.

So for me, when we talk about historical memory, which is what I – I’m a scholar of historically or in the past, scholars have really focused on the selective aspects of it and I come in and say – so selective memory, right? You have what’s remembered and what’s forgotten and both are equally important when you’re trying to understand how historical memory functions.

Sort of what I like to think of as one of my contributions is that I think there’s a third element that we need to pay attention. What’s made up? What’s absolutely false? And whether it’s made up on purpose or not almost is incidental. It almost doesn’t matter on some of it. It does in the end at times matter but it can be – the intent is almost less important than its effect and the way that – by looking at places where people have lied, where these falsehoods are created, where misstatements are repeated again and again despite people – probably should have known better than to restate these anecdotes or stories.

What we see is that these falsehoods are covering over the most troublesome aspects of the past for the individual who’s lying. So it actually sort of highlights what’s most important in some ways when trying to understand how people are dealing with and reconciling the past with the present and what is needed in the present because memory is always about the present.

When you look at a monument, you’re not just looking at – especially a Civil War monument. It doesn’t really reflect the war so much as it reflects the time the monument is put up. So what was needed at the time the monument put up, you can really discover by looking at where things are fabricated, whether purposefully or not purposefully. It’s almost incidental.

Chris Martin: All right. Yeah. It is interesting for me one of the first books about US history I read when I moved to the US, I think I read it maybe five years after I moved here was *Lies My Teacher Told Me*, which is ...

Adam Domby: Classic.

Chris Martin: ... mostly about high school history textbooks and it seems like universally not just in America. High school textbooks sanitize history so they’re not too offensive to any of the parents involved and end up lying to students about things. That only does not seem like an American thing.

Adam Domby: Yeah. I think that’s actually – it’s a great – it’s a classic book, right? And I think a lot of historians know it. But one of the things that’s really interesting about how we do high school history and elementary school history – and this is [0:18:41] [Indiscernible] is that it’s determined not by historians. It’s really determined by political figures and that has really shaped and certain states have an outside impact.

For instance Texas, California and Florida because of the size of their population, their standards matter and Texas's actually standards are perhaps one of the most important and controversial in that the Texas State School Board has a surprisingly large amount of power in dictating what will be in state curriculum for all the public schools in Texas and because it's such a big state with so many people, that influences what other states end up having to buy, right?

They might not make a New Hampshire edition of US history but they definitely make a Texas edition if you're a textbook manufacturer. So for years for instance, the Texas School Board was led by a dentist and I always tell my students this.

I say, "Will you let me pull your teeth? I'm a doctor," and they always say no and I'm like, "Well then why are you letting a dentist determine your history?"

So the way that we – history is often viewed and we see this fight pop up every decade or so. We saw it in the '90s. We saw it more recently with the AP curriculum redesign that – of what should be included and what is the purpose of a high school history class.

A lot of people think it's to instill sort of civic pride or patriotism or nationalism and that requires you to erase a lot of history and in the original sort of – in the American case, the people who were really – the first to really try to control curriculum is the United Daughters of the Confederacy and they're wildly successful in controlling what goes in textbooks in the South.

So I think it's an important aspect for us to – I think history can still be exciting and I think in some ways, memory allows us to find the most exciting parts by looking at those lies. I think in some ways lies are a way to get students thinking about wait, I learned this wrong and there's nothing more sort of compelling to a student than telling them what they learned as a kid was false because then they want to know why did my teachers tell me something false and that to me I've noticed is something that Americans do want to hear about.

Learning that what they learned was a lie is something that draws them in. They care about learning the truth and when they find out that everything they learned in high school or some of what they learned in high school was false, they immediately want to know, "Why was I told something that wasn't true? Why was I lied to?"

That's something that people latch on to when they are lied to. People are offended by it and they want to know why and it's a way to get students thinking about historical memory which is one of the reasons why from a teaching standpoint, I really like this approach and I think it's an effective approach to sort of talk to students about lies because I think it's more – it's easier to grab on to than just well, this is selective than what we focus on, which is much more nuanced in some ways and important aspect of memory.

But when you're talking about the teaching side, bringing out those really clear examples where right, this has just been lied to you. It's not just erased. It's not just selective. It's straight-up fake. It's false.

Students want to know why that happened and it's a great window for teachers to then allow students to start thinking about these issues of how does historical narrative influence our current politics and how does it shape our current politics. How does it shape who we are, our identity as people? Because that's really what this is all about is that when you're talking about historical memory, it's all about the present. It's always about the present.

These lies are not about just being remembered fondly. They're about political power. They're about controlling modern North Carolina in the case of the book and so I think lies are a great teaching tool as well as a great analytical tool.

Chris Martin: Right. And sciences I think – maybe fraud is a little more common than lies and one way to get students interested is by telling them about stories of fraud or telling them about – experiments that have gone out in the canon as being conducted honestly but actually being done a bit fraudulently like the Stanford Prison Experiment. That's one that has become very controversial now for that reason.

Adam Domby: Or the classic one with autism, the – where the – the autism vaccine study.

Chris Martin: Right, yeah.

Adam Domby: It's one that you can get into really well. I know with my students, when we talk about sort of what sources you trust and we talk about citation counts, I always tell them like don't trust the citation count because the citation count just reflects whether something is cited. It doesn't reflect whether it was cited to say this is a good example or bad.

So one of the most cited studies in – if you go on Google Scholar and look at citation counts is the autism vaccine connection study that the Lancet revoked. But because everyone who writes about vaccines now has to cite that and say this is incorrect, it has a massive citation count.

Chris Martin: Yeah, it's a perverse effect of being a uniquely bad article. But getting back to UNC Chapel Hill, we want to talk about the time the statue was erected. So were UNC professors at the time – and this was an era where many white people in North Carolina were voting for the Republican Party, which was the anti-slavery party. So it was not – you point out it was not a homogenously ...

Adam Domby: Right. In the 1890s, it's not. So yeah, the faculty at the time.

Chris Martin: So were UNC – faculty, yeah. Were they indifferent to the fact that there was a monument to a Confederate soldier being erected on their campus as opposed to in a public square in the city?

Adam Domby: You know, it's a really good question and it's interesting because in some ways this monument serves both purposes because it is actually just across the street from the post office/courthouse as well, which is across the street. So it almost serves both purposes.

We don't 100 percent know faculty's reaction to it. We know that the administration basically ensured it happened and it's the fundraising and this has been a legal issue more recently. Most of the money is not raised by the United Daughters of Confederacy, which is the standard in most Confederate monuments. So this monument is a little unique in how the money was raised in that the college president does most of the fundraising and in the end the college actually pays for the last \$500 or so of it.

The president pays out of pocket and then gets reimbursed by the college because the UDC fails to live up to its side of the bargain. They were supposed to give one-third and the fact that this sort of fundraising was distinct actually led to this ongoing lawsuit over whether or not the Sons of Confederate Veterans can have ownership of the statue and the court found that they can't because it doesn't belong – it never belonged to the UDC they ruled, which is – it has been sort of a fascinating legal battle.

But getting back to this question of the professor at the time, I suspect they knew. We don't know for sure. I mean the professor I'm most interested in when I think about this topic is the history department, right? Because they're the ones that should know better and we do know who's in the history department at the time and it includes a guy named Hamilton and Hamilton was the – was a reconstructionist. He wrote the book *Reconstruction in North Carolina*. He was a student of William Dunning and so Professor Hamilton who Hamilton Hall is named after was himself a white supremacist who really espoused many of the same views as Julian Carr.

So my expectation, we don't know if he was there at the dedication. I wish I could find letters proving he was there. My expectation is he probably – I would not be surprised if he was there. If he wasn't, I think he had no problems with the story that was being told and the lies being told. He would write similar stories in his books about African-Americans not being fit to rule and that the Klan as a force for good, right? This sort of – story in history that pretends reconstruction was a terrible period of corruption and misrule and that whites fixed everything by disenfranchising African-Americans is one that he contributed to. So I suspect the fact that he was OK with it.

Chris Martin: And you also talk about how there's this connection between elementary and higher education and the Lost Cause myth. That's one of the references to the phrase the "Lost Cause" in your myth – I mean the phrase the "Lost Cause" in your book. You point out in your book that that's one of about four different narratives that have existed since the Civil War. Tell me a bit about how those four narratives developed. I'm asking that because I think people outside history aren't familiar with this classification scheme.

Adam Domby: Yeah, and there are different ways of classifying it. If you ask David Blight, you get one. If you ask Caroline Janney, you get another. If you ask me, you get a third, right? And that's sort of the nature of memory. Memory is sort of a fluid thing. It's not ever stagnant or clear where the boundaries are but you have to have basic narratives and I will just sort of lay them out real quick.

The Lost Cause which the book is most concerned with is really a narrative put forward by white southerners, primarily pro-Confederate white southerners to be specific, and southerners who espouse the Confederacy as an honorable system or an honorable organization that fought not for slavery but for state's rights, that slavery was a positive good and it's full of these sort of mistruth and it was a narrative used to uphold white supremacy again and again throughout history.

You also though have other narratives. You have a narrative of white northerners up north who are saying no, this is not – the war was about saving the union and we're the heroes of the story and whether that's a reconciliationist or a bit of narrative, it depends on the historian you ask, and then you have in the – so you also have an African-American memory and what David Blight has called an emancipationist memory, a memory that remembers the war is a war for freedom, a war that ended slavery, a war that is worth celebrating the outcome of and that this was a glorious outcome. Not a lost cause but a one cause if you will as Barbara Gannon would put it and this sort of alternate narrative.

There's this other narrative that I think has largely been ignored which is a white southern unionist memory, which is distinct from an African-American unionist memory. You have African-Americans who have a distinct memory of the war. But you also have a southern unionist memory of the war of white southerners who did not support the Confederacy and there's – we know for instance that at least 100,000 white southerners fought for the United States military and to give that some sort of scale, 100,000 white soldiers is larger than the army of Northern Virginia ever was at any one point, which is Robert E. Lee's army.

So that's a massive shift of manpower. And why are these guys not remembered? There's also numerous people who just are sort of ambivalent and they often get lumped in as unionists but often they just don't want to fight themselves. They end up getting mostly erased.

Chris Martin: So were those soldiers mostly from the Appalachian region and what became West Virginia?

Adam Domby: So they were from all over to be honest. The Appalachian region perhaps contributes more of them. West Virginia of course. Tennessee contributes a lot. But you also have them in Mississippi. Pretty much every state with the exception I think of South Carolina contributes at least one unit of white southerners to the United States military.

They're often used as sort of scouts and home guard if they're actually units. But then you also have white born southerners who join up with say a Maryland regimen. They come across the border and join the Maryland regimen or they come North and they join a Pennsylvania regimen, right? So you have some guys who perhaps weren't born. I mean we often think of – we often talk about how many of the West Point graduates who were in the US military resigned and joined the Confederate military.

Well, plenty of them didn't. Some of the leading generals of the Union Army were southern born and chose to stay with the – to keep their oath, to not break the oath that they took when they

were at West Point to defend the country. General Thomas is perhaps the most famous who in the Western theory is sort of crucial and so this sort of idea that white – all white southerners were Confederates in any area is really inaccurate and there's quite a bit of – and of course there's also Black Southerners that are often forgotten.

Chris Martin: So is that the fourth narrative?

Adam Dombey: I mean I think the – depending on how you count them, right? You have this emancipationist memory that really celebrates the USCT, the United States Colored Troops which were African-American troops that made up 10 percent of the Union Army by the end of the war. We're talking somewhere in the order of 180,000 USCT soldiers, 80 percent of whom were probably formally enslaved.

I mean you should think about those numbers. Again, this is another shift of massive manpower. This is manpower that could have been used – the soldiers perhaps by the Confederacy because the Confederacy did not allow black troops. But it was manpower that could be used to build trenches, to keep the crops running, so that you can – and to do other sorts of labor that would allow more white men to be in the front lines.

So it's another shift of labor from the Confederacy to the union. You start thinking about the amount of men that are being shifted, you're talking somewhere in the order of over a quarter of million. That's a lot of people that are being shifted over. It makes up somewhere in the order of probably – I would guess – I would have to do the math but over 15 to 20 percent of the Union Army you're talking about, which is a substantial number of people. So it would have undermined the Confederacy's war effort in a way that's often forgotten today because unionists have been largely forgotten

They've been erased to this as part of the lost cause that recalls all white supporting the Confederacy because in the early 20th century it was convenient to remember all white supporting the Confederacy because it justified everyone voting for white supremacy now. It justified uniting whites as an electoral group and convince people to vote in a certain way because supposedly whites had always worked as a group even though they hadn't ...

Chris Martin: Right, right, and that raises the issue of identity, which is a good place to end this. You point out that narratives are about creating identity. So it's not just a historical issue. It's a psychological and sociological issue here. Changing narratives involves getting people to sometimes uncomfortably uncover things about their identity. So how do you cope with this? When you're teaching, how do you address this issue? That people's identities might be based in false narratives.

Adam Dombey: I mean I think I've had numerous students who do struggle with this. This is not something that isn't – isn't a very real occurrence in the classroom that anyone who teaches a large number of students from the Deep South are going to run into. Perhaps elsewhere as well.

I mean I grew up learning aspects of the Lost Cause. It wasn't until I got to college that suddenly my mind was blown when I learned a bunch of what I learned was false and it's how I became a historian in some ways. It's part of my own story.

But the key here I found is primary sources and it's a lot easier with students than it is with older folks. People who are in their 50s and 60s who spend a – you know, most of their life identified because of their ancestors are – have a very different reaction than someone who's in say their 20s and is still figuring out who they are in college.

They're reachable in many ways and you can talk to them and when you put the primary sources in front of them, this is sort of what I find works best. By putting the primary sources in front of students, by showing them here are the Articles of Secession that say we're seceding because of slavery. It's very hard to disagree with them if you're not already heavily tied.

That's the beautiful thing about college students is that most of them, their sense of identity is shifting as it is already. So you have a chance to teach them really good history and have them sort of question who they want to be and whether they – how they want to shape their identity and I have a lot of students who – I have some students who were used to be members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy themselves as children and they choose – they struggle with it and they end up getting – deciding to apply for PhD programs ultimately and going on to master's programs to study history, specifically to study the Lost Cause as they can draw them in.

But primary sources, I mean you can't – you don't have to take it from me that the war was about slavery. Me telling you that isn't very effective. Me saying here let's just look at what South Carolina said, that's effective.

Chris Martin: Well, Adam, that you for joining us on the show. It has been great having you. I'm sorry you can't do a typical book tour with this book. I hope you're able to do that at some point. But I appreciate you doing this interview.

Adam Domby: Well, I appreciate you inviting me. It's great. I'm happy to reach another audience and hopefully others can sort of take the lessons of this book in their own work and expand upon it because I think it is – it's something that right now looking at the ties between lies and white supremacy is a really powerful set of tools and one that is a really important set.

Chris Martin: Adam's book once again is *The False Cause: Fraud, Fabrication and White Supremacy in Confederate Memory*. It was published by the University of Virginia Press this year. You can learn more about him at his website www.adamhdomby.com and follow him on Twitter at @AdamHDomby.

If you have any comments about today's episode, you can contact me at podcast@heterodoxacademy.org or tag me on Twitter at @Chrismartin76. If you enjoyed the show, please leave us a review on iTunes because it helps other people find out about the show. Thanks for listening.

[This podcast is produced by Heterodox Academy. Find us online at www.heterodoxacademy.org, on Twitter at @HdxAcademy and on Facebook. This podcast is for informational purposes only and doesn't represent the views of Heterodox Academy.]

[End of transcript]

Transcript by Prexie Magallanes as [Trans-Expert](#) at Fiverr.com