QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH
2020, VOL. 106, NO. 1, 48–71
https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2019.1704428

"Second Line to Bury White Supremacy": Take 'Em Down Nola, monument removal, and residual memory

J. David Maxson

Department of Communication Arts and Sciences, The Pennsylvania State University, PA, USA

ABSTRACT

As Lost Cause statues come down across the country, communities are forced to reckon with monumental absences. While the rhetorical significance of monuments is well-established in scholarly literature, the rhetoric of monumental absence is not as thoroughly covered. To better understand the role that monumental absence plays in both public space and civic life, this essay theorizes residual memory as the remaining rhetorical potency that clings to a commemorative site after the focal object or structure of memorialization is removed. To demonstrate the theoretical utility of residual memory and contribute to ongoing public debates about Lost Cause monuments, this essay uses rhetorical field methods to conduct a rhetorical analysis of Take 'Em Down NOLA's "Second Line to Bury White Supremacy." The secretive night time removal of the Liberty Place Monument in New Orleans on April 24, 2017 and the activist celebration that followed two weeks later provide an exemplary case for exploring how residual memories can be used to resist and revise regressive practices of public memory.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 11 December 2018
Accepted 10 December 2019

KEYWORDS
Absence; public memory; Lost Cause; Confederate monuments; rhetorical field methods

"As we move forward, to the left, be reminded that's the *former location* of the white supremacist monument," Angela Kinlaw, educator, activist, and co-founder of Take 'Em Down NOLA, exclaimed through a megaphone. Pointing four blocks away toward the end of Iberville Street near the Mississippi River where the Liberty Place Monument once stood, she reiterated, "Over there, that's the *former location* of the white supremacist monument! [emphasis added]"[1] Approximately one thousand marchers participating in the "Second Line to Bury White Supremacy" paused in a shaded patch of North Peters Street at the foot of a statue of New Orleans's colonial founder Jean-Baptiste Le Moyne, Sieur de Bienville in the French Quarter to listen to Kinlaw and catch their breath.[2] "We going in," Kinlaw added.

> And we going in with a celebration in the light of day. They know good and well they didn't put these monuments up in the dark, so why take them down in the dark? Let's celebrate! Put your fist in the air![3]

The New Creations Brass Band struck up "Ease on Down the Road" and the procession danced toward Canal Street. Eventually the second line would end at Lee Circle under a

CONTACT J. David Maxson jdmaxson@gmail.com

towering 60-foot Doric column holding a 16½-foot-tall statue of Robert E. Lee that was guarded, on this day, by scores of white nationalist demonstrators.[4] It was May 7, 2017, and for those gathered on North Peters the second line was an opportunity to celebrate the removal of a white supremacist monument and resist Lost Cause practices of memory that continue to dominate memorial landscapes across the American South. Threats of violence would not deter the peaceful celebration of "the good people of New Orleans."[5]

Four of New Orleans' most prominent Jim Crow-era monuments were slated for removal in the summer of 2017, with the first, an obelisk known as the Liberty Place Monument, disassembled on April 24th. By May 19th, statues of Jefferson Davis, P.G.T. Beauregard, and Robert E. Lee were also taken down.[6] Four months after the removal of the Liberty Place Monument, national uproar concerning Confederate statuary reached a calamitous pitch when a white supremacist rammed a speeding car into a group demonstrating against the armed "Unite the Right" rally in Charlottesville, Virginia. The attack killed Heather Heyer and wounded 19 other demonstrators.[7] Afterward, rather than condemn white supremacists, President Donald Trump infamously claimed that there was "blame on both sides."[8] Following the president's remarks, cities and towns across the United States—like Baltimore, Durham, Austin, and Memphis—rushed to remove Confederate statues. Others—like Nashville, DC, Charleston, Birmingham, and St. Louis—rekindled longstanding debates about whether these monuments belong in public spaces to begin with.

The removal of symbols of the Confederacy has received substantial press coverage since 2015, and media attention has only increased since the violence in Charlottesville. As monuments came down across the South and the rest of the nation, questions surfaced about what to do with spaces formerly occupied by Confederate iconography. Should new statues be erected? Should parks be renamed and repurposed? Where should the old statues go? Embedded in these questions is a concern with the civic responsibilities that places of public memory are supposed to enliven in their communities.[9] Monuments project communal values. When monuments are removed what happens to the values they previously enshrined? Would absent monuments be remembered, and, if so, how should they be remembered? Politicians, activists, preservationists, historians, artists, and journalists have all wrestled with these questions. While Confederate statues continue to spark intense disagreement, monument removal provides fertile ground for examining how communities make use of monumental absence. The removal of the Liberty Place Monument and the subsequent Second Line to Bury White Supremacy led by Take 'Em Down NOLA, proves an exemplary case for exploring the topics of monument removal, absence, and the rhetorical usefulness of residual memories. Take 'Em Down NOLA's public demonstration offers a rich example of the ways spaces of monumental absence, even ones steeped in white supremacist ideologies, can be used to resist oppressive structures of memory.

In this essay, I theorize residual memory as the remaining rhetorical potency that clings to a commemorative site after the focal object or structure of memorialization is removed.[10] Far from erasing public memories of monuments, the removal of prominent statuary creates rhetorical resources for communities that intend to use sites of absence as memorial touchstones that teach civic lessons about the past, present, and future. As I exhibit below, Take 'Em Down NOLA's Second Line to Bury White Supremacy used

the former site of the Liberty Place Monument to reject established Lost Cause practices of memory and remember the obelisk, instead, through the prism of hard-fought civil rights victories.

In order to demonstrate the theoretical utility of residual memory and contribute to ongoing public debates about the fate of Lost Cause monuments, this essay proceeds in five parts. First, I provide an overview of rhetorical scholarship concerning monumental memory and absence to set up a theory of residual memory. From there, I argue that memorial landscapes in the American South promote Lost Cause practices of memory that promulgate discourses of white victimage.[11] In the following section, I situate my methodological approach within the growing body of scholarship on rhetorical field methods, offering my essay as a corrective to dominant memorial narratives that ignore the voices of local activist communities and people of color. Next, I sketch a brief history of the Liberty Place Monument, detailing how the obelisk promoted Lost Cause practices of memory. Finally, I close with a rhetorical analysis of Take 'Em Down NOLA's Second Line to Bury White Supremacy. In this section, I argue that Take 'Em Down NOLA used their celebratory second line to tether residual memories of the Liberty Place Monument to the foot of Iberville Street. I argue that Take 'Em Down NOLA highlighted activist histories of New Orleans' communities of color to expose legacies of violence that are continually legitimized by prominent symbols of white supremacy. Far from ignoring or erasing the residual memories of absent monuments, Take 'Em Down NOLA offers an example of how residual memories can reshape dominant memorial practices, reorienting them toward social justice.

Rhetoric and monumental absence

That places of public memory are significant sites of rhetorical action has been, by now, well established.[12] "[T]he very durability of the landscape and of the memorials placed in the landscape," writes geographer Kenneth E. Foote, "makes these modifications [*i.e.* memorials] effective for symbolizing and sustaining collective values over long periods of time."[13] However, collective faith in the longevity of messages transmitted by memorial architecture is challenged by the sensational demolition of prominent monuments. Simply put, the recent upending of Confederate statuary across the country has simultaneously upended popular belief that monuments are static, permanent, and stable.[14]

The current moment is, of course, not the first time in history that an Ozymandian confidence in the enduring nature of monuments has been shaken. For instance, reflecting on the collapse of the Soviet Union, rhetorician Carole Blair underscores the impermanence of monuments in her influential chapter, "Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality." Blair's observations are particularly instructive when examining the current fate of Confederate monuments in the United States, so I quote at length:

> Some texts, by virtue of their constitutive material, are obviously intended to endure; and it seems a natural assumption, if not always a correct one, that such longevity is granted to texts that communities see as more important than others. Granite and bronze are more durable than ink on paper, and paper lasts longer than the moment of oral discourse. It is an interesting paradox of materiality, however, that durable materials may actually render a text more vulnerable. For example, any stone or metal structure, though composed of a hard,

> lasting substance, is more vulnerable to destruction by hostile forces than is a book or even oral speech. Natural weathering, vandalism, lack of maintenance, and even bulldozing (as we have seen vividly in news accounts from the republics of the former Soviet Union) are more or less constant threats to public memorial sites.[15]

In this passage, Blair affirms the rhetorical significance of monuments, presaging a groundswell in rhetorical analyses of memorial sites over the last two decades.[16] But Blair also opens the door for critics analyzing recently vacated monumental spaces, a path less commonly trod. In the context of the removal of Lost Cause monuments in New Orleans and across the United States, Blair's words find a new exigence.

Former monumental sites provide useful cases for reexamining the relationship between absence, space/place, memory, and rhetoric. While many rhetoric scholars have taken up the thorny topic of absence, perhaps Raymie E. McKerrow put it most directly when he argued that "*Absence* is as important as *presence* in understanding and evaluating symbolic action. [emphasis in original]"[17] Brian L. Ott, Eric Aoki, and Greg Dickinson expand on McKerrow's point, writing: "Absence is not without meaning; rather, it is a fully embodied rhetorical experience. And like a well-placed pause in a speech, it is a material space filled with affect."[18] Figuring absence as a "material space" has significant ramifications for scholars engaging places of public memory because it means that interpreting commemorative landscapes as singular and static spaces obscures their layers of multitemporal plurality.[19] Studying former sites of monuments opens opportunities for rhetoricians to consider how absence works as a rhetorically active component of any commemorative landscape, making the past feel tangibly present where monuments once stood.

Of course, not all absences exhibit the same rhetorical qualities, nor are they charged with the same rhetorical potential. For example, both a pause in a speech and taking down a statue create affective space, but the experience of hearing a pause in a speech does not resonate the same way as visiting an empty pedestal in a public park. Instead of analyzing absence abstractly, this essay focuses on monumental absence. Monumental absence delineates affective spaces created by the removal of public commemorative architecture. While absences in any landscape can be acknowledged or ignored, the former prominence of monuments—like the ones removed in New Orleans—make their absences substantially more difficult to overlook and, therefore, their rhetorical potential more profound. Monumental absences, unlike less publicly imposing absences, haunt the spaces they formerly occupied.[20] These hauntings, I argue, take the form of residual memories.

As I argued above, residual memory is the remaining rhetorical potency that clings to a commemorative site after the focal object or structure of memorialization is removed. Residual memory, so conceived, is the felt presence of monumental absence. This presence is created by the intermingling of memorial discourses and performances with remaining artifacts.[21] That is, when monuments are taken down some combination of plinths, plaques, signs, sidewalks, benches, ornamental foliage, etc., serve as cues to memory, providing palimpsestic clues that create a sense of the size, placement, and significance of bygone commemorative structures. Similarly, community imperatives to remember, including speeches, demonstrations, news media, social media, photos, archives, maps, etc., all but ensure a discursive afterlife for any prominent monument. Together, these memorial elements combine to demarcate monumental absence in historic places. As material artifacts signaling monumental absence recede, or are purposefully scrubbed

from the landscape, community efforts to remember must correspondingly increase in order for residual memory to remain tethered to a particular location. Residual memory, in short, conjures the haunting presence of monumental absence for those visiting an historic site, defining and directing how such a presence is experienced.

Monuments, more often than not, are imposing physical structures that offer ideological interpretations of historic figures, events, and places.[22] In addition to their size, expense, and connection to the legitimating institutions that erected them, most monuments garner authority to interpret history from their placement, often near the subject of commemoration. Placement, itself, exerts rhetorical influence. As rhetoricians Greg Dickinson and Giorgia Aiello point out, the design and function of "the urban built environment is communicative: It contributes to transforming and reproducing major ideological and structural conditions that, quite literally, mediate the everyday lives of individuals and communities."[23] In New Orleans, for example, the Liberty Place Monument and statues of Robert E. Lee and P.G.T. Beauregard were all originally erected in landscaped circles on busy streets with streetcar lines. These stone and metal structures were not only imposing focal points in the city's landscape, they were also highly trafficked nodes that commercial, tourist, and local passengers were forced to circumnavigate and literally look up to for over a century. As will be considered in greater detail below, the all-but-inescapable repetitiveness of traversing beneath Jim Crow-era monuments served to engrain Lost Cause memorial attitudes into the fabric of everyday movement in New Orleans.[24] When monuments such as these are removed, residual memory seizes the proximate authority previously held by now-absent monuments, but channels that authority for different purposes.

In terms of rhetorical appeals, monuments and residual memories of monumental absence function similarly: both curate affective experiences of closeness with the past by laying claim to the materiality of places deemed historically significant. However, monuments and residual memories diverge in their historical focus and interpretive approach. Monuments curate history ("this event matters") in space ("it all happened right here") while inviting a reverential attitude ("we must honor those commemorated by this monument"). Residual memory, on the other hand, does not treat monuments as conduits of a hallowed past; rather, monuments appear as rhetorical and ideological purveyors of select histories. The histories that are foregrounded by residual memory are not those commemorated by the monument, but the accreted social and cultural history of the monument itself. In this way, residual memory, as the materially felt experience of monumental absence, promotes critical sensibilities for evaluating the ways that the past has been monumentally represented.

Encounters with residual memory encourage a variety of questions, not the least of which includes: What monument used to be here? Why was the monument removed? Did the monument adequately represent history? What did the monument say about our collective values? How is our understanding of history different now that the monument is gone? Given that monumental absence allows historic sites to both inspire and authorize critical reflection, residual memories facilitate closer examinations of the rhetorical and ideological underpinnings of memorialization. As a result, residual memory allows communities to resist and revise hegemonic memories in the very places where such memories were imagined, celebrated, and circulated. Residual memories of absent monuments are rhetorically potent, facilitating collective conversations about the ways

monuments participate in the production of power, privilege, and place. To better understand how Take 'Em Down NOLA mobilized residual memories during the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy, more needs to be said about Jim Crow-era monuments in the South.

Southern memorial landscapes, the Lost Cause, and white victimage

Southern memorial landscapes are filled with architectural tributes to the Confederate States of America. In a recent study, the Southern Poverty Law Center counted 772 Confederate monuments on public property, the vast majority of which are concentrated in former slave-holding states, especially states that seceded from the Union.[25] Sanctioned by official approval, Confederate monuments serve as catalyzing nodes that collect, nurture, and distribute Lost Cause memories of the South.[26] "Whether the dominant image has been constructed through plantation museums privileging the elite experience of the era, or through obelisks, statues, and other monuments honoring the Confederate dead," writes rhetorician Patricia G. Davis, "the memorial landscape in the South has historically been a prime site through which the Lost Cause interpretation of the past has been advanced."[27]

From their positions of prominence, Lost Cause architecture extol sympathetic memories of the Confederacy.[28] In this way, the rhetoric of the Lost Cause is far more than a fringe attitude of post-Reconstruction white elites; it is an active and material part of everyday life in the South.[29] According to rhetorician Mark T. Vail, Confederate monuments are essentially relics of a Southern civic religion.[30] These relics, in the eyes of Lost Cause apologists, are responsible for carrying antebellum values of white benevolence, gentility, and superiority into the ever-unfolding future.[31] While Confederate monuments certainly stand-in as symbolic representations of the Lost Cause, the ideologies they represent extend beyond commemorative architecture, cohering in ways that are far more flexible and durable than sculpted stone and metal.[32] In other words, monuments do not replace active practices of memory; instead, they train collective habits of remembering. When monuments are removed, the memorial practices they coached linger.

Contemporary monument removal has triggered renewed narratives of white victimage.[33] Complaints that taking down a Confederate statue is tantamount to erasing history and destroying heritage have circulated broadly, appearing in the guise of legal suits filed by preservationist organizations,[34] published frequently in news media headlines,[35] passed into law by Southern politicians,[36] and used as a rallying cry by white nationalist protesters.[37] As anthropologist Baily J. Duhé observes, journalistic accounts and scholarly debates about New Orleans' Jim Crow-era monuments generally focus on "white-centered narratives."[38] The perspectives of local activists and communities of color are drowned out on the one hand by amplified laments about the loss of (white) heritage, and, on the other, the lionization of Mayor Mitch Landrieu as the progressive (white) authority singularly responsible for removing Confederate monuments in the city. As Duhé explains, framing public debates through the lens of white historical memory prevents "other communities and perspectives from being heard, further silencing already marginalized groups."[39] What we are left with is an exclusionary conversation that positions people of color—especially Southern activists—as agents of destruction who are incapable of representing themselves as part of the public, whose values and historical

perspectives are inconsequential, and who, in the context of both Southern and national memory, exist "outside of history."[40]

Architectural historian Dell Upton argues that the problem is symptomatic of both "traditional" and "subtler" variants of white supremacy. Reflecting on resistance to civil rights monuments throughout the South, Upton observes that popular discourses presuppose "that such monuments must meet white approval and that whites are neutral arbiters of what is fair and truthful in such memorials."[41] The same discursive patterns drive public debates regarding the removal of Lost Cause monuments. In response to the white-centered narratives that suffuse public discourse, Duhé insists that scholars must "refuse dominant, oversimplified narratives" and "create room to listen to the expertise of local community leaders who have been dealing with these debates and organizing these removals long before they were televised."[42] Following Duhé's admonition, I turn to rhetorical field methods to analyze Take 'Em Down NOLA's use of residual memories as a means for critiquing public symbols of white supremacy.

Rhetorical field methods

While rhetorical field methods constitute a fairly recent scholarly development, scholars writing about sites and rituals of public memory have repeatedly emphasized the importance of "being there."[43] Advocating for a thicker kind of critical engagement with rhetorical artifacts, one that takes into account the sensuous presence of bodies, Blair asks rhetorical critics, "What do we ourselves lose of an experience by not being present? And what difference does that loss make?"[44] One answer, offered by rhetorician Phaedra C. Pezzullo, is that critical presence, as a method of scholarship, invites a receptive stance toward change and discovery. "More than simply 'showing up,'" Pezzullo notes, "being present as a mode of advocacy suggests that the materiality of a place promises the opportunity to shape perceptions, bodies, and lives with respect to the people and places hosting the experience."[45] In a similar vein, rhetoricians Michael K. Middleton, Samantha Senda-Cook, and Danielle Endres emphasize the importance of sharing local experiences in their essay, "Articulating Rhetorical Field Methods." They write, "These efforts at in situ rhetorical analysis are valuable because they sharpen the ability for CR [critical rhetoric] to engage seriously the voices of marginalized rhetorical communities and mundane discourses that often evade critical attention."[46] As these scholars point out, presence, as a critical stance, allows rhetoricians to do more than embrace their own embeddedness in the networks of community and discourse that they study. Presence creates points of connection that facilitate creative collaboration between scholars and the communities most intimately familiar with the structures and discourses being critiqued. In other words, when it comes to research that engages public calls for social justice, critical presence allows scholars and activist communities to work together, thereby diminishing the likelihood that overlooked voices will remain overlooked.

Unsurprisingly, the imperative of "being there" tends to push critics into "the field." In their recent edited collection, *Text + Field*, rhetoricians Sara L. McKinnon, Robert Asen, Karma R. Chávez, and Robert Glenn Howard define "the *field* as the nexus where rhetoric is produced, where it is enacted, where it circulates, and, consequently, where it is audienced. [emphasis in original]"[47] Far from mandating that all rhetoricians take up fieldwork,[48] the editors of *Text + Field* argue that the field

> [I]nvites rhetoricians to attend to the way discourse moves, articulates, and shapes the material realities of people's lives in the everyday, in the public, and in their communities. It also allows scholars to attend to the often-unseen ways that individuals and groups respond, resist, and try to revise these instantiations.[49]

While scholars adopting rhetorical field methods use a variety of humanistic approaches that range from ethnography to focus groups to conduct their work, many share a commitment to engaging the rhetorical underpinnings of power, privilege, and marginalization through critical participation.[50]

The diversity of experiences, perspectives, voices, and communities encountered in the field make rhetorical field methods one way that scholars can more fully adopt intersectional approaches to advocacy and criticism.[51] For instance, participation in the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy made it clear that as "'a black-led, multiracial, intergenerational coalition,' with a strong emphasis on intersectional-awareness," Take 'Em Down NOLA is quite sensitive to the layering of oppressions that make symbols of white supremacy more or less dangerous for individuals inhabiting different bodies.[52] In response to this reality, Take 'Em Down NOLA organized a victory celebration that strategically foregrounded the experiences of people of color while including space for anti-racist allies to participate. Take 'Em Down NOLA also made clear that the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy was not simply a victory celebration for the nighttime removal of a single obelisk. Activists spoke, marched, danced, and sang against systemic racism, environmental injustice, economic inequality, gentrification and spatial segregation, over-policing, and inadequate public schooling, all of which, they point out, is entangled with white supremacist ideologies that are publicly celebrated in New Orleans' memorial architecture.[53] Without participating in the second line from start to finish, I may have erroneously believed that Take 'Em Down NOLA was only concerned with the fate of monuments. Participation made it clear that the second line was a part of an intersectional movement committed to social justice writ large; the removal of a few Jim Crow-era statues in New Orleans was only the beginning.

Second lining with Take 'Em Down NOLA gave me access to texts that would not have been available otherwise. Snippets of speeches, online news coverage, and scant photo and video documentation can be found of the event.[54] Additionally, references to the second line are made in Take 'Em Down NOLA's zine, *Roots Rising*.[55] However, in this essay, textual fragments from secondary sources serve a supplementary rather than primary role.[56] While I am not a member of Take 'Em Down NOLA, I arrived in Congo Square hours before the second line and helped organizers distribute leaflets about future collective actions. During the event, I collected audio recordings of the second line and preliminary speeches. I also took extensive fieldnotes and photos before, during, and after the demonstration. After the event concluded, I followed Take 'Em Down NOLA's activities via social media—primarily Twitter—and shared drafts of this essay with Take 'Em Down NOLA.

More than amassing a detailed collection of documents, I acted as both a scholarly observer and critically engaged participant.[57] In my audio recordings of the second line, I can be heard chatting loudly with other second liners, answering interview questions from a freelance reporter, shouting chants, asking for sunscreen, singing along with familiar brass band songs, recording notes about the second line route, thanking Take 'Em Down NOLA leaders, and nervously asking police officers if white nationalists in Lee

Circle had weapons. Undoubtedly, my presence changed, however slightly, the nature of the event. Second lining with other activists certainly enriched my perspective as a scholar and allowed me to act in solidarity with Take 'Em Down NOLA. From the vantage point of a critically present researcher, I was able to witness the intermingling of discourses as they wove together with bodily movements and monumental absences to create residual memories that resisted attitudes trained by Lost Cause statues. In the following section, I present a brief history of the Liberty Place Monument in order to explain the rhetorical potency of the obelisk's residual memories.

The Liberty Place Monument

The 20-foot limestone obelisk known as the Liberty Place Monument was erected in September 1891 at the foot of Canal Street on the seventeenth anniversary of the Crescent City White League's anti-Reconstruction "Battle of Liberty Place."[58] The highly orchestrated skirmish occurred on September 14, 1874, when "approximately 8,400 Democratic White Leaguers easily routed a racially mixed force of 3,600 metropolitan policemen and State militia units."[59] Viewed by thousands who "thronged balconies, rooftops, and the decks of steamboats to watch," the dramatic engagement lasted merely 20 minutes and resulted in 32 fatalities.[60] Framed by White Leaguers as a courageous and patriotic reassertion of self-determination and liberty in New Orleans,[61] the city's citizens of color vehemently disagreed, insisting that the skirmish represented the "*absolute denial*, not only of their rights as men and citizens, but even the bare protection to life and security for property afforded in the enforcement of law. [emphasis in original]"[62] Weighing these opposing interpretations, historian Lawrence N. Powell argues that the fight should be remembered within the context of the federal government's retreat from Reconstruction and the increasing boldness of bellicose Southern Democrats. In this light, Powell explains that the "battle" is more properly remembered as "a dramaturgical assertion of the right of the white upper class to rule at home."[63]

At no point in its history was the obelisk a neutral artifact that impartially recounted the details of an historic event. Instead, from the moment of its dedication, the Liberty Place Monument functioned as an explicit symbol of white supremacy that white politicians frequently referenced to justify Jim Crow policies.[64] For instance, anniversary editorials published in the *Daily Picayune* in 1901 and 1905 praise the Liberty Place Monument as a permanent reminder that the "odious system" of black enfranchisement would be met with white violence in Louisiana.[65] In 1920, during his successful gubernatorial campaign, John M. Parker, Sr. evoked his father's participation in the Battle of Liberty Place as evidence of his white supremacist bona fides: "my father fought as a member of the White League in the battle of Canal street, New Orleans, against the metropolitan police, which forever settled the question of the negro in politics so long as Louisiana was concerned."[66] To ensure that he was not misunderstood, Parker baldly stated, "I always have stood for white supremacy … "[67] On September 27, 1932, the Commission Council of the City of New Orleans called for the formation of the Board of Commissioners of Liberty Place to "be appointed from amongst citizens who took part in the Battle for white supremacy at Liberty Place on September 14, 1874."[68] After approval from Mayor T. Semmes Walmsley, the Board of Commissioners quickly added the following inscription to the obelisk's plinth:

> UNITED STATES TROOPS TOOK OVER THE STATE // GOVERNMENT AND REINSTATED THE USURPERS // BUT THE NATIONAL ELECTION NOVEMBER 1876 // RECOGNIZED WHITE SUPREMACY IN THE SOUTH // AND GAVE US OUR STATE.[69]

As these words make clear, by the 1930s, the Liberty Place Monument was not merely a de facto symbol of white supremacy in New Orleans, its function as a white supremacist icon was unequivocally recognized and endorsed by the city government. The inscription along with the hagiographic words of journalists and politicians underscore the racialized violence required to maintain a segregated society founded on antebellum white heritage.

Unsurprisingly, as Dell Upton observes, "Through the middle of the twentieth century, the monument was both a place of reverence for New Orleans's elite … and a rallying point for white supremacists."[70] By the 1950s, annual wreath-laying ceremonies at the obelisk had ceased,[71] yet the Liberty Place Monument continued to gain attention, largely due to the plinth's inflammatory valorization of white supremacy. The city removed the Liberty Place Monument twice for street improvements—in 1965 and 1989—but was forced to re-erect the monument both times. Even in the mid-1990s, the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, and the *Times-Picayune* all reported that the obelisk continued to galvanize white supremacists, especially former Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan and Louisiana state politician David Duke.[72] Put simply, the Lost Cause ideology enshrined in the Liberty Place Monument was far from inert. However, in the hands of activist rhetors like Take 'Em Down NOLA, the obelisk's residual memories, when encountered in the proper location, serve as material evidence that Lost Cause monuments organize, intensify, and encourage racist violence, political intimidation, and economic inequity.

Residual memories of an absent obelisk

In the middle of the night on April 24, 2017, twenty-four years after the reinstallation of the Liberty Place Monument, construction workers took down the obelisk. Mayor Mitch Landrieu's decision to remove the monument without public announcement shocked and angered both proponents and opponents of the Lost Cause icon.[73] Masked and body-armored crews working for an unnamed construction firm disassembled the Liberty Place Monument while armed police officers and hidden sharpshooters guarded workers laboring beneath a battery of floodlights.[74] Despite the obelisk's unannounced removal, word got out and a handful of protestors, casual onlookers, and journalists showed up behind New Orleans Police Department barricades to watch. Amongst them was Malcolm Suber, professor, activist, and co-founder of Take 'Em Down NOLA. Suber expressed dissatisfaction with the secretive removal to a reporter, "They could have done this, announced it and let people show their opinion. This is the coward's way."[75]

With the Liberty Place Monument dismantled and trucked to an undisclosed location, little remains of the obelisk to alert passersby to its former presence. In many ways, the monument feels consigned to oblivion. In March 2018, Mayor Landrieu announced plans for the city to collaborate with Paper Monuments, a New Orleans-based "public art and public history project," to determine what should replace statues of Jefferson Davis, P.G.T. Beauregard, and Robert E. Lee.[76] According to the *Times-Picayune*, the

"Liberty Place site, which is located behind a parking garage at the foot of Canal Street, will remain as-is."[77] Sue Mobely, co-director of Paper Monuments, commented on these plans in an October 2018 podcast interview with Paul Farber of Monument Lab, "[N]othing's happened there; nothing needs to happen there. I'm not sure most people recognize that it's missing. There's no pedestal. It had already been, sort of, removed from public space and the public view."[78]

In early-May 2017, less than two weeks after the obelisk's removal, I visited the site of the former monument. All that is left is a nondescript granite plinth resting on a cement block. The plinth has a few squiggly scars from a plaque that construction workers pried off. Even though many pedestrians walk within fifteen feet of the monumental site, a result of the nearness of two parking facilities servicing the French Quarter, hardly anyone even looks at the former location of the Liberty Place Monument. An inclined cement path leading up to the plinth garners the most attention. While I examined the area, I overheard a child suggest that the ramp would be perfect for skateboarding. Landrieu and Mobely's impressions of the site are mirrored in my fieldnotes: "At a glance from the sidewalk, the plinth could be just another extension of the sewage system."[79] Confirming my suspicions were the remarks of a parking attendant who works in front of a garage that faces the empty plinth. I asked if she witnessed the removal of the obelisk and she replied with a quick double-take, exclaiming, "Oh my God! It's gone. I wonder how long it's been gone?"[80] Already, residual memories of the Liberty Place Monument appeared to be receding into the quotidian cityscape.

Given the obelisk's sudden removal, its scant memorial remains, and its historic associations with two separate locations, it was unclear in May 2017 where, if anywhere, the residual memories of the Liberty Place Monument would coalesce. However, in response to City Hall's refusal to commemorate the occasion, Take 'Em Down NOLA organized the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy, a public celebration of the removal of the obelisk and an ostentatious show of support for the impending removal of three other Lost Cause statues. The second line kicked off a distinctly New Orleanian ritualized process that grafted the residual memories of the obelisk's monumental absence to the foot of Iberville Street.

Second lines and monumental absence

"Take 'Em Down NOLA exists for the purpose of removing all symbols to white supremacy from the landscape of New Orleans," Angela Kinlaw announced energetically through a portable speaker system in Congo Square before the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy paraded into the French Quarter. "We understand that symbols are used to bond people around cultural values, political values, and ideologies that show up in the form of a system and that oppresses people," Kinlaw continued. "And so, today, we're celebrating movement toward change."[81] Kinlaw's address set the tone for the upcoming demonstration. Countering recurrent Lost Cause narratives and white victimage tropes circulated by defenders of Jim Crow-era statues, Kinlaw and other Take 'Em Down NOLA leaders insisted that monument removal was not a shameful act that erased history. Instead, monument removal was a necessary step in the process of remembering the past in a more capacious register, a step that enables people of color to occupy space in both the city's historical imaginary and its unfolding future.

Take 'Em Down NOLA's Second Line to Bury White Supremacy mobilized one of New Orleans' most recognizable street traditions to celebrate the removal of the Liberty Place Monument and delineate space for residual memories of the now-absent obelisk. The decision to host a second line parade was strategic and freighted with symbolic significance. New Orleans' communities of color have historically used mock funerals, brass band music, and public parades to resist structures of white supremacy by performatively reclaiming urban space and promoting local practices of memory.[82] For instance, on February 17, 1865, less than two months before Lee's surrender at Appomattox, a notice was posted in the *New Orleans Tribune* announcing a two-day funeral service celebrating "the Death of American Slavery."[83] More recently, following the cataclysmic levee failures of 2005, no less than five jazz funerals were held to "bury" Hurricane Katrina. Most of these mock jazz funerals paraded through Gentilly, the Lower Ninth Ward, and other historically black neighborhoods that bore the brunt of the flooding. The Second Line to Bury White Supremacy fits comfortably within New Orleans's long-established repertoire of musical parading as collective commemoration, celebration, and protest.

Second lines, by virtue of their public and performative nature, call together communities through music, movement, and shared space; the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy was no different.[84] Before the New Creations Brass Band kicked off the second line, A Scribe Called Quess?, poet, educator, and co-founder of Take 'Em Down NOLA, spoke to the crowd. "We are one band, one sound," insisted Quess?. Playing with the imagery of a second line parade and the historic resonances of Congo Square, Quess? picked up speed, delivering his lines in a percussive cadence, emphasizing the last word of every sentence until second liners interrupted him with cheers: "This is our party. They ain't invited. They don't know the music. They don't know the tune. They can't dance to the rhythm."[85] Quess?'s anaphoric use of the impersonal subject pronoun "they" to reference white supremacists congregating in Lee Circle allowed him to bracket that group of demonstrators out of the celebration. But more importantly, when considering the residual memories of monumental absence, Quess?'s speech highlights how Take 'Em Down NOLA leveraged the legitimating cultural authority of second line traditions to challenge hegemonic memorial attitudes represented by Jim Crow-era statuary.

The evocation of local brass band traditions as a guiding metaphor and a living commemorative practice allowed Take 'Em Down NOLA to control the way the Liberty Place Monument's residual memories were publicly remembered in New Orleans. Put succinctly, Take 'Em Down NOLA argued that white supremacist monuments, like the recently removed obelisk, are inherently violent and that Lost Cause practices of memory must be replaced, but not forgotten. "This is the point of this entire conversation," Quess? continued as second liners cheered.

> I love my city; we all love our city. If we could only aim our music in the right direction—not just to the hearts, but to the minds. This is the most African city you gonna find in North America. We're just dominated by symbols of white supremacy; that's a crime. Somebody say, "That ain't right." [*Second liners: That ain't right!*] Ain't right at all.[86]

Through the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy, Take 'Em Down NOLA harnessed the cultural power of a venerated local tradition and the democratic authority of a community of demonstrators to transition the obelisk from an active emblem of hate to a residual memory that facilitates critical reevaluations of Lost Cause ideologies. In other

words, "We are one band, one sound" is a rhetorical claim to commemorative legitimacy, a claim supported by established local custom and popular sentiment.

Tethering residual memories

In addition to mobilizing resistance to Lost Cause iconography, the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy tethered residual memories of the Liberty Place Monument to the foot of Iberville Street. While such commemorative anchoring may seem preordained or inconsequential, it is, in fact, neither. By affixing residual memories of the obelisk to Iberville Street, as opposed to the Liberty Place Monument's original location at the foot of Canal Street, Take 'Em Down NOLA challenged Lost Cause practices of memory by literally shifting the foundational grounds on which legitimating narratives of the obelisk rest. The parade route and the imagery of the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy were instrumental in the rhetorical process of tethering residual memories of monumental absence to Iberville Street. Take 'Em Down NOLA used the obelisk's accreted history with Iberville Street to cast the monument's removal as a long-delayed civil rights victory rather than a benevolent, and politically opportunistic, gesture from the city's mayor.

Second line parade routes are intentionally designed to draw attention to important locations, events, communities, and individuals in New Orleans.[87] For example, it is not uncommon for second lining brass bands to stop at predetermined locations and play dirges to mourn the passing of a beloved member of the community.[88] Through this ritual, the departed are made present through the musical and place-based enlivening of communal memory. In a similar manner, Take 'Em Down NOLA planned a parade route that began at the mythic birthplace of jazz—Congo Square—and ended at the foot of Robert E. Lee's statue. Significantly, the procession stopped at the intersection of North Peters and Iberville Street where Kinlaw pointed in the direction of the absent obelisk and announced, "As we move forward, to the left, be reminded that's the *former location* of the white supremacist monument."[89] With this stop, and Kinlaw's short speech, Take 'Em Down NOLA used the symbolic commemorative authority of second line traditions to enliven residual memories of monumental absence and attached them to Iberville Street. Take 'Em Down NOLA then cemented the commemorative significance of their stop by passing the original location of the Liberty Place Monument on Canal Street without a pause; the New Creations Brass Band turned up the street, away from the spot where the obelisk first stood, and kept marching without missing a beat.

In addition to the parade route, a common symbolic feature of jazz funerals and second line parades are memorial signs and t-shirts. Anthropologist Helen A. Regis writes that

> shirts, worn by living bodies, are made to stand for those very bodies that are missing from the second line. They mark an empty space, a void, making present in the streets of the city the absence of the dead.[90]

In a similar fashion, Take 'Em Down NOLA made present the monumental absence of the obelisk through prominent placards carried throughout the second line. The photograph on the placards, taken in 1993, featured the obelisk in its last public location on Iberville Street. Reflecting on her own looming memories of absent monuments in New Orleans, Kelly C. Porter, co-editor of Take 'Em Down NOLA's zine, wrote that, "these unmarked

spaces are a kind of invisible monument for those who care to remember."[91] By enlivening residual memories of the obelisk through the second line, Take 'Em Down NOLA encouraged people to encounter monumental absence at the foot of Iberville Street. The photograph itself warrants further consideration; however, to properly analyze the rhetorical significance of the image, Take 'Em Down NOLA's approach to monumental history and intergenerational activism must first be considered.

Remembering civil rights victories

As embodied practices of communal memory, second lines are constitutive expressions of continuity that knit New Orleanian communities of color together across time.[92] Take 'Em Down NOLA used the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy to emphasize legacies of black-led activism in New Orleans. In addition to dedicating the second line to "veteran civil rights heroes" and positioning elder civil rights activists at the front of the parade holding banners that read "Power to the People" and "Bury White Supremacy," Take 'Em Down NOLA highlighted the city's history of black-led activism through two 3×5-foot placards emblazoned with a photograph of Rev. Avery C. Alexander protesting the Liberty Place Monument in 1993 (Figure 1). Throughout the second line, the image of Rev. Alexander served as a reminder to both participants and bystanders that the processual struggle against structures of white supremacy is slow and regularly incurs violence. And yet, achievements, like the removal of a Lost Cause obelisk, are worth remembering for the lessons taught and the victories won.

Figure 1. Poster of Rev. Avery C. Alexander carried during the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy. Photograph by Abdul Aziz.

Note: Photograph used with permission of Abdul Aziz.

A useful starting point for the story of Rev. Alexander's photograph is the 1989 removal of the Liberty Place Monument. Orchestrated by Sidney Barthelemy, New Orleans's second mayor of color, the victory was short-lived: a Federal District Court ruling in 1993 forced the monument's reinstallation in "a historically appropriate spot."[93] To the chagrin of Lost Cause apologists, Barthelemy arranged for the obelisk's reerection in an obscure location a few blocks from Canal Street. Technically, the new location at the foot of Iberville Street was still within the boundaries of the Battle of Liberty Place, but the obelisk was now wedged inauspiciously in the shadow of a parking garage. While not the victory Barthelemy and civil rights activists wanted, the movement from Canal Street to Iberville Street was symbolically consequential in that the obelisk no longer rested on grounds hallowed by white supremacist violence and nearly 100 years of institutionalized Lost Cause nostalgia.[94] It was this relocation that caused the Liberty Place Monument to begin fading from New Orleanians' public consciousness even before its removal in 2017. And it was this relocation that Take 'Em Down NOLA seized to replace Lost Cause practices of memory associated with the obelisk.

Of course, 1989 was not the first time that New Orleanians of color took action to remove the Liberty Place Monument. The city's first mayor of color, Ernest N. "Dutch" Morial tried to remove the obelisk, but City Council halted the process in 1981.[95] In the 1960s and 1970s the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the NAACP's Youth Council called for the obelisk's removal.[96] Given these examples of black-led resistance, Take 'Em Down NOLA had a surplus of options for historicizing the absent obelisk. By selecting the photograph of Rev. Alexander, the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy used residual memories of the Liberty Place Monument to tell a story of incremental, yet persistent, civil rights victories that ultimately culminated in taking down the obelisk.

The event captured in the photograph carried by Take 'Em Down NOLA second liners occurred on March 3, 1993, when the "Friends of Liberty Monument" staged a rededication ceremony for the obelisk in its new location on Iberville Street. David Duke attended the ceremony as an invited speaker.[97] Rather than allow Duke and others to recast the Liberty Place Monument as an abstract symbol of Southern virtue, eighty-two-year-old Rev. Alexander led a group of protestors to the Lost Cause ceremony. One journalist reported that protestors "disrupted the hourlong ceremony by shouting slogans and singing spirituals, drowning out speakers."[98] The standoff became heated as protestors chanting "Down with white supremacy!" pushed—and were pushed—against the cordon of New Orleans Police Department officers.[99] At one point, a white NOPD officer put Rev. Alexander in a chokehold and forcibly dragged him away from the Liberty Place Monument while another white officer brandished a nightstick and followed closely behind. Kathy Anderson, a staff photographer for the *Times-Picayune*, caught the moment on camera, framing the shot with the limestone obelisk and the Confederate battle flag standing over the scene. The picture appeared on the front page of the *Times-Picayune* the following day sparking an uproar in New Orleans[100].

In no uncertain terms, the photograph of Rev. Alexander visually links the obelisk with histories of white supremacist violence. By framing the Liberty Place Monument near the most potent symbol of the Lost Cause—the Confederate battle flag—both the obelisk and the flag, by virtue of their proximity and the occasion, endorse police violence directed at one of New Orleans's most respected religious, political, and civil rights leaders. Unlike Anderson's photo, defenders of the obelisk typically depict the monument on its own

in sepia tone, black and white, or polychrome pastels—usually at the foot of Canal Street.[101] These hagiographic images create a faux patina that visually cleanse the obelisk of associations with violence.[102] Anderson's photo, on the other hand, evokes the ominous nearness of violence inspired by the obelisk through the sharpness of colors and the clash between civil rights activists and monument supporters protected by police officers. In short, the photo, as carried by Take 'Em Down NOLA second liners, shatters the pretense of separation between the obelisk as a Lost Cause symbol and enactments of physical violence perpetrated against people of color. In this image, Take 'Em Down NOLA found a synecdoche for their broader commitment to resisting structures of white supremacy.[103]

By tethering residual memories of the absent obelisk to Iberville Street, Take 'Em Down NOLA made specific examples of institutionally sponsored violence directed at people of color in the name of the Liberty Place Monument palpably present. In so doing, the residual memories presented by the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy challenged Lost Cause accounts of the Liberty Place Monument as a neutral marker of Southern history. When sepia toned memories of the obelisk on Canal Street are foregrounded, the most consequential episodes of civil rights activism are elided in favor of reverential White League propaganda. Seen through Iberville Street's history of protest, violence, defacement, and ultimate removal, Take 'Em Down NOLA forced residual memories of the obelisk to include the monument's own sordid past. Through the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy's joyful celebration, Take 'Em Down NOLA incorporated painful histories represented by the obelisk into a broader account of black-led civil rights activism, endurance, and victory.

Burying white supremacy

The Second Line to Bury White Supremacy was a performative critique of structural oppression that loosened the knots binding Lost Cause memorial attitudes to commemorative landscapes in New Orleans. Significantly, Take 'Em Down NOLA made the rhetorical choice not to ignore newly created monumental absence during their celebratory second line. Instead, they presented a more robust form of public remembering that linked residual memories of the Liberty Place Monument to legacies of black-led civil rights activism associated with Iberville Street. This change in historical perspective allowed Take 'Em Down NOLA to invert white-centered narratives of heritage and victimage that typically accompany the removal of Lost Cause architecture. The residual memories performatively evoked by the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy placed the Liberty Place Monument, and other white supremacist iconography, within the context of racialized violence and political terror that such monuments both foment and commemorate. As a result, Take 'Em Down NOLA offered a grassroots model for combining local commemorative traditions with residual memories of monumental absence to alter long-established practices of public memory.

Analysis of the Liberty Place Monument and Take 'Em Down NOLA's Second Line to Bury White Supremacy offers several important insights for scholars of rhetoric, space/place, and public memory. First, residual memories of monumental absence are unique rhetorical resources that both scholars and activist communities can use to critically reevaluate the roles that monuments play in public space. By virtue of monumental absence,

residual memories do not exist under the imposing material and ideological shadows cast by monuments. Monumental absence, then, creates the rhetorical conditions that enable public attention to focus on the accreted histories of monuments themselves rather than the histories monuments are designed to commemorate. Put simply, residual memories present monuments as rhetorical objects that are designed to manufacture feelings of reverence and closeness with carefully curated pasts. Using residual memories as an avenue for interpreting monumental absence allows scholars and activists to more readily identify the communities excluded from monumental representations of the past. Second, residual memories are not always apparent from a distance. While rhetorical fieldwork may not always be necessary for analyzing residual memories, critical presence does create opportunities to better understand the rhetorical processes of activist communities as they evoke residual memories and attach those memories to specific sites. Finally, the location of residual memories matters deeply in terms of framing the histories of bygone monuments. Place—and more specifically the histories ascribed to that place—arranges monumental narratives in ways that foreground certain historical perspectives while distancing others. As a result, sites of residual memory are key rhetorical components for either reaffirming or contesting established monumental practices of memory. Taken together, residual memory operates as the rhetorical ground for making monumental absence strategically local, present, and meaningful.

As Take 'Em Down NOLA made clear through the Second Line to Bury White Supremacy, the project of dismantling white supremacy might involve monument removal, but it certainly cannot end there. Examining how residual memories are mobilized through local traditions creates opportunities for scholars and activists to better understand how regressive memorial practices can be countered with broader memories of oppression and resistance. More inclusive memories must be shared; memories that foreground the voices and experiences of communities of color who continue to lead the struggle against institutionalized oppression. "[W]e're here for one purpose and one purpose only, which is to move forward in the celebration of the dismantling of symbols to white supremacy along with those systems that are to follow," Angela Kinlaw exclaimed just before the New Creations Brass Band kicked off the second line. "Let us be one band, one sound."[104]

Funding

This essay was made possible by a Predoctoral Fellowship from the Center for Humanities and Information at Pennsylvania State University as well as a Björn Bärnheim Research Fellowship from the William Ransom Hogan Jazz Archive and a Global South Fellowship from the New Orleans Center for the Gulf South at Tulane University.

Notes

1. Angela Kinlaw, author's audio recording of "Second Line to Bury White Supremacy," May 7, 2017.
2. Take 'Em Down NOLA reports approximately 1,200 demonstrators, while the New Orleans Police Department reports approximately 700 demonstrators. It is likely that the number of demonstrators fluctuated over the course of the event. "A Great Victory Yesterday," *Take 'Em Down NOLA*, May 8, 2017, http://takeemdownnola.org/updates/; Wynton Yates, "Groups

Clash Over Removal of New Orleans Confederate Monuments," *USA Today*, May 8, 2017, https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2017/05/08/new-orleans-confederate-monument-removal-protests/312608001/.

3. Kinlaw, audio recording.
4. "How Tall is the Statue of Robert E. Lee?," *WGNO* (New Orleans), May 19, 2017, http://wgno.com/2017/05/19/how-tall-is-the-statue-of-robert-e-lee/.
5. "Celebrate Them Coming Down," *Take 'Em Down NOLA*, n.d., https://www.facebook.com/events/759009697610511/ (accessed August 23, 2017).
6. The final cost totaled $2.1 million, with private donors covering approximately half and the city paying the rest. $1.1 million went to a private security contracting firm from Dallas, Texas. Richard Rainey, "Confederate Monument Removal in New Orleans Costs $2.1 Million," *Times-Picayune* (New Orleans), June 9, 2017, http://www.nola.com/politics/index.ssf/2017/06/confederate_monuments_removal_2.html; Richard Rainey, "Confederate Monuments: Extremist Threats Doubled New Orleans Removal Budget, Officials Say," *Times-Picayune* (New Orleans), June 9, 2017, http://www.nola.com/politics/index.ssf/2017/06/confederate_monuments_extremis.html.
7. Joe Heim, "Recounting a Day of Rage, Hate, Violence and Death," *Washington Post*, August 14, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2017/local/charlottesville-timeline/?utm_term=.f291071e8bb3.
8. Michael D. Shear and Maggie Haberman, "Trump Defends Initial Remarks on Charlottesville; Again Blames 'Both Sides'," *New York Times*, August 15, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/15/us/politics/trump-press-conference-charlottesville.html.
9. For more on "places of public memory" see, Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott, *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010).
10. In this essay, "residual memory" is not what gerontologist Belle Boone Beard defines as "those memories which remain clear and can be readily recalled in one's second century of living." Belle Boone Beard, "Social and Psychological Correlates of Residual Memory in Centenarians," *The Gerontologist* 7, no. 2 (1967): 120, https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/7.2_Part_1.120.
11. Bailey J. Duhé, "Decentering Whiteness and Refocusing on the Local: Reframing Debates on Confederate Monument Removal in New Orleans," *Museum Anthropology* 41, no. 2 (2018): 121, https://doi.org/10.1111/muan.12184.
12. See Dickinson, Blair, and Ott, *Places of Public Memory*; Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki, "Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting: The Reverent Eye/I at the Plains Indian Museum," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1 (2006): 29, https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420500505619.
13. Kenneth E. Foote, *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003), 33.
14. Geographers regularly emphasize the fluid quality of landscapes. For more on this subject, see Doreen Massey, *For Space* (London: Sage, 2015).
15. Carole Blair, "Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality," in *Rhetorical Bodies* ed. Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999), 37.
16. The study of memory as it operates in and through public space has steadily grown in popularity amongst scholars of rhetoric since the early-1990s. Dickinson, Blair, and Ott explore this interest in their edited collection, *Places of Public Memory*. Scholarly focus on the topic is also registered in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. See Carole Blair, Marsha S. Jeppeson, and Enrico Pucci, "Public Memorializing in Postmodernity: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial as Prototype," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77, no. 3 (1991): 263–88, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639109383960; Tamar Katriel, "Sites of Memory: Discourses of the Past in Israeli Pioneering Settlement Museums," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80, no. 1 (1994): 1–20, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639409384052; Greg Dickinson, "Memories for Sale: Nostalgia and the Construction of Identity in Old Pasadena," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83, no. 1 (1997): 1–27, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639709384169; Cheryl R. Jorgensen-Earp and

Lori A. Lanzilotti, "Public Memory and Private Grief: The Construction of Shrines at the Sites of Public Tragedy," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84, no. 2 (1998): 150–70, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639809384211; Barbara A. Biesecker, "Remembering World War II: The Rhetoric and Politics of National Commemoration at the Turn of the 21st Century," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 4 (2002): 393–409, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630209384386; Kenneth S. Zagacki and Victoria J. Gallagher, "Rhetoric and Materiality in the Museum Park at the North Carolina Museum of Art," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95, no. 2 (2009): 171–91, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630902842087; Jennifer L. Jones Barbour, "Stirring Up and Smoothing Out the Landscapes of Commemoration: Authenticity, Building, and Consumption in Public Memorials," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 96, no. 1 (2010): 89–102, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630903512739; Thomas R. Dunn, "Remembering 'A Great Fag': Visualizing Public Memory and the Construction of Queer Space," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 97, no. 4 (2011): 435–60, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2011.585168; Carly S. Woods, Joshua P. Ewalt, and Sara J. Baker, "A Matter of Regionalism: Remembering Brandon Teena and Willa Cather at the Nebraska History Museum," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 99, no. 3 (2013): 341–63, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2013.806818; Lee Pierce, "A Rhetoric of Traumatic Nationalism in the Ground Zero Mosque Controversy," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 100, no. 1 (2014): 53–80, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2014.888461; Thomas R. Dunn, "'The Quare in the Square': Queer Memory, Sensibilities, and Oscar Wilde," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 100, no. 2 (2014): 213–40, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2014.959987; and Mina Ivanova, "The Bulgarian Monument to the Soviet Army: Visual Burlesque, Epic, and the Emergence of Comic Subjectivity," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 100, no. 3 (2014): 273–302, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2014.982159.

17. Raymie E. McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis," *Communication Monographs* 56, no. 2 (1989): 107, https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758909390253.
18. Brian L. Ott, Eric Aoki, and Greg Dickinson, "Ways of (Not) Seeing Guns: Presence and Absence at the Cody Firearms Museum," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 8, no. 3 (2011): 217, https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420.2011.594068.
19. For more on the layering of memory in New Orleans see Shannon Lee Dawdy, *Patina: A Profane Archaeology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016). For more on spatialized time see Doreen Massey, *For Space*.
20. This essay approaches haunting through the localized spaces and performance traditions of New Orleanians. For more on performance, memory, and haunting in New Orleans, see Joseph Roach, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996). For more on collective trauma and ghost tours in New Orleans, see Lynnell L. Thomas, *Desire and Disaster in New Orleans: Tourism, Race, and Historical Memory* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014); and Tiya Miles, *Tales from the Haunted South: Dark Tourism and Memories of Slavery from the Civil War Era* (Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 2015). For a critical archaeological account of New Orleans as a city haunted by material remnants of the past, see Dawdy, *Patina*. For contemporary activist accounts of the relationship between haunting and New Orleans' commemorative architecture, see A Scribe Called Quess?, "Grounded by Sky," *Roots Rising: The Take 'Em Down NOLA Zine* 1 (2019): 3–4; Jessica Bordelon, "4 Heartless Horseman," *Roots Rising: The Take 'Em Down NOLA Zine* 1 (2019): 5; and Kelly C. Porter, "Ancestors in the Struggle: The Legacy of Reverend Avery Caesar Alexander," *Roots Rising: The Take 'Em Down NOLA Zine* 1 (2019): 13.
21. V. William Balthrop, Carole Blair, and Neil Michel, "The Presence of the Present: Hijacking 'The Good War'?," *Western Journal of Communication* 74, no. 2 (2010): 171–72, https://doi.org/10.1080/10570311003614500.
22. Foote, *Shadowed Ground*, 1–35.
23. Greg Dickinson and Giorgia Aiello, "Being Through There Matters: Materiality, Bodies, and Movement in Urban Communication Research," *International Journal of Communication* 10 (2016): 1295, ISSN 1932–8036.

24. Phaedra C. Pezzullo and Stephen P. Depoe, "Everyday Life and Death in a Nuclear World: Stories from Fernald," in *Public Modalities: Rhetoric, Culture, Media, and the Shape of Public Life*, ed. Daniel C. Brouwer and Robert Asen (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010), 91.
25. "Whose Heritage? Public Symbols of the Confederacy," *Southern Poverty Law Center*, June 4, 2018, https://www.splcenter.org/20180604/whose-heritage-public-symbols-confederacy.
26. In this essay, I follow rhetorician Mark T. Vail's definition of the Lost Cause. Vail writes that, "The components of the Lost Cause myth's discourse are constituted in part by themes of racial imparity that attempt to resituate Southern Whites as a chosen people whose political, social, and economic privilege over Blacks was wrongfully supplanted by Reconstruction politics. The Lost Cause was a postwar rhetorical apologia absolving the abrogated antebellum decorum that valued hierarchy, paternalism, and racialized nobility and liberty for Whites." Mark T. Vail, "Reconstructing the Lost Cause in the Memphis City Parks Renaming Controversy," *Western Journal of Communication* 76, no. 4 (2012): 419, https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2011.651257.
27. Patricia G. Davis, *Laying Claim: African American Cultural Memory and Southern Identity* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2016), 21.
28. For more on Confederate monuments as "visual narratives" that spread Lost Cause ideologies, see Davis, *Laying Claim*, 21–22.
29. Lost Cause narratives spread well beyond the South in the twentieth century. For more on the post-Reconstruction adoption of Lost Cause myths, see David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Boston: Belknap Press, 2001).
30. Vail, "Reconstructing the Lost Cause," 420.
31. Davis, *Laying Claim*, 7; Kristan Poirot and Shevaun E. Watson, "Memories of Freedom and White Resilience: Place Tourism, and Urban Slavery," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 45, no. 2 (2015): 95–96, https://doi.org/10.1080/02773945.2014.991879; Vail, "Reconstructing the Lost Cause," 419–20; and Dell Upton, *What Can and Can't Be Said: Race, Uplift, and Monument Building in the Contemporary South* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), vii-viii, 15–17.
32. Blair, "Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites," 37.
33. Duhé, "Decentering Whiteness," 120–5; Vail, "Reconstructing the Lost Cause," 417–37.
34. Manuel Torres, "Lee Circle Battle Moves to Court: Federal Lawsuit Filed to Halt Monument Removal in New Orleans," *Times-Picayune* (New Orleans), updated Dec. 18, 2015, https://www.nola.com/politics/index.ssf/2015/12/lawsuit_filed_to_halt_monument.html#incart_river_index.
35. For example, see Melba Newsome, "Is Removing Confederate Monuments Like Erasing History?," *NBC News*, April 25, 2017, https://www.nbcnews.com/news/nbcblk/are-removing-confederate-monuments-erasing-history-n750526; and Logan Strother, Spencer Piston, and Thomas Ogorzalek, "Are Confederate Monuments Our Heritage or Symbols of Hate?," *Newsweek*, July, 9, 2017, https://www.newsweek.com/are-confederate-monuments-our-heritage-or-symbols-hate-633678.
36. Seven former-Confederate states have laws protecting Confederate monuments from removal. "Whose Heritage? Public Symbols of the Confederacy."
37. Avi Selk, "'The Battle of New Orleans': David Duke Expects Confederate Statue Defenders to Mass on Sunday," *Washington Post*, May 6, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-nation/wp/2017/05/06/the-battle-of-new-orleans-david-duke-expects-confederate-statue-defenders-to-mass-on-sunday/?utm_term=.a2443290d722.
38. Duhé, "Decentering Whiteness," 121.
39. Duhé, "Decentering Whiteness," 121.
40. Davis, *Laying Claim*, 32.
41. Upton, *What Can and Can't Be Said*, viii.
42. Duhé, "Decentering Whiteness," 121.
43. Carole Blair, "Reflections on Criticism and Bodies: Parables from Public Places," *Western Journal of Communication* 65, no. 3 (2001): 274–76, https://doi.org/10.1080/

10570310109374706. See also Roberta Chevrette, "Holographic Rhetoric: De/Colonizing Public Memory at Pueblo Grande," in *Text + Field: Innovations in Rhetorical Method*, eds. Sara L. McKinnon, Robert Asen, Karma R. Chávez, and Robert Glenn Howard (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2016), 151; Dickinson and Aiello, "Being Through There Matters," 1295; Sara L. McKinnon, Robert Asen, Karma R. Chávez, and Robert Glenn Howard, "Introduction: Articulating Text and Field in the Nodes of Rhetorical Scholarship," in *Text + Field: Innovations in Rhetorical Method*, eds. Sara L. McKinnon, Robert Asen, Karma R. Chávez, and Robert Glenn Howard (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2016), 7; Michael K. Middleton, Samantha Senda-Cook, and Danielle Endres, "Articulating Rhetorical Field Methods: Challenges and Tensions," *Western Journal of Communication* 75, no. 4 (2011): 395, https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2011.586969; and Candice Rai and Caroline Gottschalk Druschke, "On Being There: An Introduction to Studying Rhetoric in the Field," in *Field Rhetoric: Ethnography, Ecology, and Engagement in the Places of Persuasion*, eds. Candice Rai and Caroline Gottschalk Druschke (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2018), 1–21.

44. Blair, "Reflections on Criticism and Bodies," 276.
45. Phaedra C. Pezzullo, *Toxic Tourism: Rhetorics of Pollution, Travel, and Environmental Justice* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2007), 9.
46. Middleton, Senda-Cook, and Endres, "Articulating Rhetorical Field Methods," 387.
47. McKinnon, Asen, Chávez, and Howard, "Introduction," 4.
48. McKinnon, Asen, Chávez, and Howard, "Introduction," 5.
49. McKinnon, Asen, Chávez, and Howard, "Introduction," 4.
50. To be sure, not all rhetoricians in the field are concerned with critiquing structures of power. For examples of scholars conceptualizing rhetorical field methods as a critical project, see, Middleton, Senda-Cook, and Endres, "Articulating Rhetorical Field Methods," 386–406; Michael Middleton, Aaron Hess, Danielle Endres, and Samantha Senda-Cook, *Participatory Critical Rhetoric: Theoretical and Methodological Foundations for Studying Rhetoric In Situ* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2015), xiii-xxix; McKinnon, Asen, Chávez, and Howard, "Introduction," 1–21; and Rai and Druschke, "On Being There," 1–21.
51. For more on intersectionality, see Kimberlé Crenshaw, *On Intersectionality: Essential Writings* (New York: New Press, 2019).
52. Clint Smith, "The Young Black Activists Targeting New Orleans's Confederate Monuments," *The New Republic*, May 18, 2017, https://newrepublic.com/article/142757/young-black-activists-targeting-new-orleanss-confederate-monuments.
53. Kinlaw, audio recording; Malcolm Suber, author's audio recording of "Second Line to Bury White Supremacy," May 7, 2017; A Scribe Called Quess?, author's audio recording of "Second Line to Bury White Supremacy," May 7, 2017.
54. For instance, see Kat Stromquist, "Photos from Sunday's Take 'Em Down NOLA March to Lee Circle (Slideshow)," *Gambit* (New Orleans), May 7, 2017, https://www.theadvocate.com/gambit/new_orleans/news/the_latest/article_9c76bad1-ccc3-5e6f-9261-082129dfb0a0.html; Jacqueline Kantor, "'Every Time I Sweat, It Makes Me Think of My Grandparents, Sweating': NOLA Protesters Clash Over Confederate Monuments," *Jezebel*, May 8, 2017, https://jezebel.com/every-time-i-sweat-it-makes-me-think-of-my-grandparent-1795027443; Yates, "Groups Clash Over Removal"; and "Peoples Celebration & Second Line to Bury White Supremacy," *Take 'Em Down NOLA*, accessed Oct. 5, 2018, http://takeemdownnola.org/events/2017/5/3/peoples-celebration-second-line-to-bury-white-supremacy.
55. Published in 2019, "Roots Rising" chronicles Take 'Em Down NOLA's foundation, grassroots coalitions, goals, and accomplishments. The zine can be purchased through the following link: http://takeemdownnola.org/store/roots-rising-the-take-em-down-nola-zine-volume-1.
56. The necessity of assembling textual material by venturing into the field is a common justification for rhetorical fieldwork. See McKinnon, Asen, Chávez, and Howard, "Introduction," 6; Whitney Gent, "When Homelessness Becomes a 'Luxury': Neutrality as an Obstacle to Counterpublic Rights Claims," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 103, no. 3 (2017): 235, https://doi.org/

10.1080/00335630.2017.1321133; Middleton, Senda-Cook, and Endres, "Articulating Rhetorical Field Methods," 387, 389.

57. By critically engaged participant, I simply mean that I brought my scholarly expertise on jazz funerals and New Orleanian places of memory to the second line. My dual stance as a second liner and a researcher reciprocally benefited one another yielding enriched insights as both a critic and an activist.
58. Lawrence N. Powell, "Reinventing Tradition: Liberty Place, Historical Memory, and Silk-Stocking Vigilantism in New Orleans Politics," *Slavery & Abolition* 20, no. 1 (1999): 127–49, https://doi.org/10.1080/01440399908575272.
59. Powell, "Reinventing Tradition," 131. While the "Battle of Liberty Place" took place nearly a decade after the Civil War, popular memories circulated after the fact by the city's white elite presented the skirmish "as a surrogate for New Orleans's nonexistent Confederate glory." Upton, *What Can and Can't Be Said*, 53.
60. Powell, "Reinventing Tradition," 131.
61. See, for example, Frederick N. Ogden, "14th September: Official Report of Gen. Fred. N. Ogden," *Daily Picayune* (New Orleans), October 2, 1874, Redex's Early American Newspapers (1690–1922); "September and November," *Daily Picayune* (New Orleans), November 8, 1874, Redex's Early American Newspapers (1690–1922); "A Glorious Anniversary," *Daily Picayune* (New Orleans), September 14, 1901, Redex's Early American Newspapers (1690–1922); "Liberty Day," *Daily Picayune* (New Orleans), September 14, 1905, Redex's Early American Newspapers (1690–1922); and Stuart Omer Landry, *The Battle of Liberty Place; The Overthrow of Carpet-Bag Rule in New Orleans—September 14, 1874* (New Orleans: Pelican Publishing Company, 1955), 1–4.
62. "The Truth," *Weekly Louisianian* (New Orleans), October 24, 1874, Redex's Early American Newspapers (1690–1922).
63. Powell, "Reinventing Tradition," 131. For a corroborating interpretation of the skirmish, see, Upton, *What Can and Can't Be Said*, 50–4.
64. See, for example, Powell's account of the way memories of the "Battle of Liberty Place" were used to incite a lynch mob to brutally murder eleven Sicilians in 1891. Powell, "Reinventing Tradition," 128.
65. "A Glorious Anniversary"; "Liberty Day."
66. "Yells for Parker Rock Courthouse," *Times-Picayune* (New Orleans), January 10, 1920, Redex's Early American Newspapers (1690–1922).
67. Parker's full statement is, "I always have stood for white supremacy and I never took a seat in the Progressive convention until that party adopted unanimously a resolution making it absolutely a white man's party throughout the South. God has ordained that the white man is the superior of the negro and that the white man is to govern for the white man and for the negro." "Yells for Parker Rock Courthouse."
68. Landry, *The Battle of Liberty Place*, 230.
69. Dorothea Lange took a photo of the plinth in 1936. Dorothea Lange, "File: One Side of the Monument Erected to Race Prejudice New Orleans Louisiana 1936.jpg," *Wikimedia Commons*, June 18, 2013, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:One_side_of_the_monument_erected_to_race_prejudice_New_Orleans_Louisiana_1936.jpg.
70. Upton, *What Can and Can't Be Said*, 53.
71. Judith K. Schafer, "The Battle of Liberty Place: A Matter of Historical Perception," *Louisiana Cultural Vistas* (1994), http://www.knowlouisiana.org/the-battle-of-liberty-place.
72. John E. DeSantis, "Monumental Division in New Orleans," *Washington Post*, March 22, 1993, https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1993/03/22/monumental-division-in-new-orleans/22f3e654-20bc-4748-822a-78aa2d2df42e/?utm_term=.25e89b4424b5; Frances Frank Marcus, "A New Orleans Monument to Strife Stirs Up More," *New York Times*, March 31, 1993, http://www.nytimes.com/1993/03/31/us/a-new-orleans-monument-to-strife-stirs-up-more.html; Michael Perlstein, "5 Arrested at Monument Ceremony—Legislator Leads Protest," *Times-Picayune* (New Orleans), March 8, 1993, http://infoweb.newsbank.com.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/resources/doc/nb/news/

0FA80BE1A592296E?p=AWNB. For an analysis of David Duke's defense of the Liberty Place Monument as the "stage of misremembrance on which whiteness is traditionally performed," see Roach, *Cities of the Dead*, 239–42.

73. The mayor did not unilaterally order the removal of the Liberty Place Monument. At Mayor Landrieu's behest, New Orleans City Council voted on December 17, 2015, in a 6–1 decision, to remove four of the city's most prominent Jim Crow-era monuments. Immediately, four preservationist groups contested the decision in court, contending that the city did not have the authority to remove the monument. On March 6, 2017, following over a year of litigation, the 5th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals ruled in favor of New Orleans City Council, clearing the way for monument removal. Bill Chappell, "New Orleans Can Remove Confederate Statues, Federal Appeals Court Says," *National Public Radio*, March 7, 2017, http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2017/03/07/518986603/new-orleans-can-remove-confederate-statues-federal-appeals-court-says; Kevin Litten, "New Orleans Confederate Monuments Can Come Down, Court Rules," *Times-Picayune* (New Orleans), March 7, 2017, http://www.nola.com/politics/index.ssf/2017/03/confederate_monuments_appeals_1.html.
74. Jeff Adelson, "Removing New Orleans' Liberty Place Monuments Means City Moving to 'Place of Healing,' Mitch Landrieu Says," *The New Orleans Advocate*, April 24, 2017, http://www.theadvocate.com/new_orleans/news/article_2d8c0e22-2940-11e7-9d19-ff9e52d31f52.html.
75. Adelson, "Removing New Orleans' Liberty Place."
76. "About Paper Monuments," *Paper Monuments*, accessed October 17, 2018, https://www.papermonuments.org/aboutus/.
77. The parking garage abuts Canal Street, but the remains of the Liberty Place Monument are actually at the foot of Iberville Street. Kevin Litten, "Mitch Landrieu Announces Process for Replacing Lee Monument," *Times-Picayune* (New Orleans), March 7, 2018, https://www.nola.com/politics/2018/03/mitch_landrieu_announces_proce.html.
78. Sue Mobley in Paul Farber, "Paper Monuments," October 15, 2018, in *Monument Lab*, produced by Monument Lab, podcast, MP3 audio, 1:02:20, accessed November 27, 2019, https://monumentlab.com/podcast-1/2018/10/14/episode-003-paper-monuments-bryan-c-lee-jr-and-sue-mobley-hm6gs.
79. Fieldnotes, "Liberty Monument,' French Quarter, New Orleans, LA, 5:16pm 5/6/2017."
80. Fieldnotes, "Liberty Monument."
81. Kinlaw, audio recording.
82. Helen A. Regis, "Blackness and the Politics of Memory in New Orleans Second Line," *American Ethnologist* 28, no. 4 (2001): 752–77, www.jstor.org/stable/3094934; Helen A. Regis, "Second Lines, Minstrelsy, and the Contested Landscapes of New Orleans Afro-Creole Festivals," *Cultural Anthropology* 14, no. 4 (1999): 472–504, https://www.jstor.org/stable/656542; Matt Sakakeeny, *Roll With It: Brass Bands in the Streets of New Orleans* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2013), 33–6; Matt Sakakeeny, "Resounding Silence in the Streets of a Musical City," *Space and Culture* 9, no. 1 (2006): 41–4, https://doi.org/10.1177/1206331205283889; Michael G. White, "Dr. Michael White: The Doc Paulin Years," *The Jazz Archivist* 23 (2010): 3–9, ISSN 1085–8415; Bruce Boyd Raeburn, "Faith, Hip-Hop, and Charity: Brass-Band Morphology in Post-Katrina New Orleans," in *Hurricane Katrina in Transatlantic Perspective*, eds. Romain Huret and Randy J. Sparks (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2014), 145–7; Joel Dinerstein, "Second Lining Post-Katrina: Learning Community from the Prince of Wales Social Aid and Pleasure Club," *American Quarterly* 61, no. 3 (2009): 624, https://www.jstor.org/stable/27735010.
83. "Attention: Mort de E'sclavage Americain!," *New Orleans Tribune*, Feb. 17, 1865, Redex's Early American Newspapers (1690–1922).
84. Regis, "Second Lines," 480; Regis, "Blackness," 756.
85. Quess?, audio recording.
86. Quess?, audio recording.
87. Regis, "Second Lines," 479–81.

88. Sakakeeny, *Roll With It*, 24.
89. Kinlaw, audio recording.
90. Regis, "Blackness," 766.
91. Porter was not referring to the Liberty Place Monument, but, rather, to a missing statue of Rev. Avery C. Alexander. Porter, "Ancestors in the Struggle."
92. Regis, "Blackness," 756; Sakakeeny, *Roll With It*, 6; Raeburn, "Faith, Hip-Hop, and Charity," 143–44; and White, "Dr. Michael White," 2–20.
93. Marcus, "A New Orleans Monument to Strife."
94. In 1879, twelve years before the obelisk was erected, an editorial in the *Weekly Louisianaian*, a Republican newspaper run by New Orleanians of color, claimed that any celebration of the "famous *coup d'etat*" was simply a shameful commemoration that "gratifies the military vanity of the minority." The editorialist concluded, "It is more than time this celebration should be buried with the hates and prejudices consequent on the turbulent and unreasoning politics of the past." "The Day We Celebrate," *Weekly Louisianian* (New Orleans), Sept. 20, 1879, Redex's Early American Newspapers (1690–1922).
95. Frances Frank Marcus, "New Orleans Journal; A Monument That Can't Find a Home," *New York Times*, November 29, 1992, http://www.nytimes.com/1992/11/29/us/new-orleans-journal-a-monument-that-can-t-find-a-home.html.
96. Rev. Marie Galatas, author's audio recording of "Second Line to Bury White Supremacy," May 7, 2017; Kevin Litten, "Efforts to Remove Confederate Monuments in New Orleans Go Back Decades," *Times-Picayune* (New Orleans), updated March 14, 2017, https://www.nola.com/politics/index.ssf/2017/03/confederate_monuments_liberty.html; Gordon Chadwick, "Protest and Removal of Battle of Liberty Place Monument," *New Orleans Historical*, accessed August 9, 2018, http://www.neworleanshistorical.org/items/show/283; Upton, *What Can and Can't Be Said*, 55.
97. Gary Boulard, "Historian Sees Red Over White Supremacist 'Help,'" *Los Angeles Times*, June 9, 1993, http://articles.latimes.com/1993-06-09/news/mn-1245_1_white-supremacy.
98. Michael Perlstein, "5 Arrested at Monument Ceremony—Legislator Leads Protest," *Times-Picayune* (New Orleans), March 8, 1993, NewsBank.
99. Perlstein, "5 Arrested at Monument Ceremony."
100. Anderson's photo also ran in the *New York Times*, see: Marcus, "A New Orleans Monument to Strife." Anderson's photo can be viewed at: http://www.nola.com/politics/index.ssf/2017/03/confederate_monuments_liberty.html.
101. A quick search for the Liberty Place Monument on Ebay or Etsy will reveal the market for images.
102. For more on the artificial creation of patina in New Orleanian objects and places, see Dawdy, *Patina*, 112–42.
103. A black and white drawing of Anderson's photograph created by New Orleanian artist Toni Jones is prominently featured in an essay about Rev. Alexander in Take 'Em Down NOLA's zine. "Ancestors in the Struggles," 11.
104. Kinlaw, audio recording.