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Abstract

This thesis explores elite and grassroots discourse concerning disputes over monument removal in New Orleans, Louisiana. By means of participant observation, narrative ethnography, and critical discourse analysis, I ground this study of political and academic arguments about Confederate monuments in the context of grassroots concerns regarding white supremacist symbols to inquire about how these divergent discourses relate to inequality in New Orleans. Ultimately, I argue that what is most at stake in each case studied here is speakers’ control over the “public mind” via their control over dominant narratives (van Dijk 1993a, 44-45). In order to preserve their power, each of these actors performed a range of discursive strategies and took stances on the monument debate, thereby allowing their audiences to consume their messages and align with them. Lastly, I show that, given their unequal access to political, economic, and symbolic resources, elites in this study were capable of enacting change in their local area in ways that grassroots organizers not because they lacked the same resources.
Chapter 1. Introduction

Sometimes the researcher must find their field of study. Other times “the field” finds the researcher. In my case, “the field” found me. On Halloween day of 2017, I received an email from one of my graduate committee professors, Dr. Helen Regis, about a grassroots organizer who was recruiting graduate student volunteers to do archival research at the Hill Memorial Library of Louisiana State University. Just two months prior, the violent “Unite the Right” rally took place in Charlottesville, Virginia, where hundreds of white supremacists and white nationalists gathered to protest the proposed removal of a statue commemorating Confederate General Robert E. Lee from the city (Stolberg and Rosenthal 2017). The rally resulted in tragedy when a young white nationalist rammed his sports car into a group of counter-protesters, killing activist Heather Heyer and badly injuring several others. President Donald Trump infamously blamed “both sides” for the devastation (Shear and Haberman 2017; Stolberg and Rosenthal 2017). That same year the city of New Orleans removed from its public landscape three Confederate monuments—to Robert E. Lee, P.G.T. Beauregard, and Jefferson Davis—and one monument commemorating a Reconstruction era white supremacist militia uprising against an integrated police force in Louisiana—the Liberty Place monument. The accumulation of these events led me to focus my thesis study on the controversial Confederate monument debate.

Over the course of November 2017, a fellow graduate student and I took several trips to the Hill Memorial Library to find information about a historic figure’s stance and actions relative to the Confederacy, slavery, and race relations in general. This public figure, Sophie B. Wright, was beloved by many New Orleanians as a philanthropist and schoolteacher and in New Orleans there are commemorative markers as well as a high school dedicated in her name. Her ties to the
Confederacy and to her slaveholding family, however, are what led us to peruse the archives. Thus, volunteer research became the catalyst for my continued engagements with the grassroots organization, Take ‘Em Down NOLA.

Take ‘Em Down NOLA (TEDN) is a grassroots coalition that protests and lobbies for the removal of all symbols of white supremacy in New Orleans, Louisiana and beyond. TEDN has received recognition in the local media in recent years for their protests. One leading organizer even appeared in a *New York Times* interview on May 12, 2017 discussing the purposes and aims of TEDN’s work (Blinder 2017). Starting with a fundraiser event in February 2018, most of my interactions with TEDN organizers took place at march and rally events, organizer meetings, and community forum events in New Orleans. I continued participating in these events throughout the fall semester of 2018. At these sites of public activism, my primary methods for data collection included participant observation and jotting notes. Upon returning home from these events, I fleshed out my fieldnotes, and in the fall semester of 2018 I began coding them for analytical themes\(^1\). Additionally, I continued to volunteer for archival research, sometimes working alongside TEDN organizers at the Howard-Tilton Memorial Library at Tulane University. In all, I accumulated roughly fifty hours of volunteer archival research.

On March 25, 2018, I joined TEDN in a public march called, “Take it to the Streets.” The march signified the closing action/celebration of a weekend long international conference organized by grassroots organizations from the United States and the Caribbean and hosted by TEDN in New Orleans. We marched from Lafayette Square to the Louisiana Supreme Court

\(^1\) See Section 3.4 for coding.
building, to Jackson Square, and finally to the Bienville monument between Decatur and N. Peters Streets. Our voices uniformly rang—“Educate! Agitate! Organize!”—and echoed along Chartres Street. Indeed those were the primary objectives of the march—to educate the public and visiting tourists, put pressure on the local government to serve the public wants and needs of New Orleans residents, and to organize in resistance against racialized systems of inequality. Although the monuments that we visited along this march were not Confederate monuments, they nonetheless had been established to commemorate powerful white men. That said, TEDN has set the standard for those who dare to imagine their city as a place devoid of any and all symbols that represent white supremacy (TEDN 2018).

Throughout the development of this study, I aimed to follow a collaborative approach. My efforts to engage in a collaborative research design are reflected in the project proposal\(^2\) and ethics review\(^3\) that I submitted to leaders of TEDN during my fieldwork. Due to an amalgam of obstacles—several of which were unavoidable, such as the time constraints of a master’s thesis—the current study did not develop along the collaborative trajectory that I had hoped it would. In the following section, I position myself in this struggle to achieve collaboration with members of TEDN.

1.1. Time to Toss Out the Cape: Chipping Away at the Savior Mentality

In building relationships with organizers of TEDN and throughout the process of developing this project, I felt the gut-check of my own reflexive pondering: Am I asking too much of TEDN

\(^2\) See Appendix D.

\(^3\) See Appendix E.
organizers who are already stretched thin as educators, activists, poets, parents, and so on? What do my methods mean for those that I write about? What do I, as a graduate student ethnographer, have to offer to people who might be giving their last second of free time that day to answer my questions or consult over my writing? Who does anthropology serve, and who am I really serving with this research? I continue to wrestle with the latter of these questions.

In the first chapter of No More Heroes, Flaherty (2016) offers a scathing critique of the academic “savior mentality,” which he relates to historical examples of colonial and white supremacist ideologies and practices. In the following, Flaherty considers how the savior mentality has plagued even the most well-intentioned academics:

Researchers and other scholars say they seek to help by bringing their skills to the study of an ‘underprivileged’ community. But in almost every situation the community has no say in the research goals or process and never even sees the final product (Flaherty 2016, 31).

I can agree with all but one aspect of this otherwise honest critique—that it does not fully acknowledge people’s agency to deny and delay other’s access into their ingroup in the first place.

For example, on February 24, 2018, a close friend of mine and I participated in a TEDN fundraiser for the first time. In fact, I had never participated in an activism-oriented event before and I was unsure about what to expect going into this one. TEDN hosted this fundraiser, called “The Throw Down,” in a weathered and spacious boxing gym that resembled a half-empty warehouse when the lights were on. Admission was relatively cheap (I think we paid $10 each for our tickets), and the scene was a clever mixture between a modern art exhibit, hip-hop house party, indoor rally, and boxing match (the boxing ring remained, and in fact, became the
centerpiece of the party as the stage for DJing equipment). Nervous at how they might receive me and my research topic, I nevertheless introduced myself to a handful of organizers—each encounter feeling more awkward than the one prior. Despite the gnawing suspicion that I had simultaneously said too much and not enough, each of the organizers welcomed me graciously and thanked me for coming.

In the months that followed, I tried earnestly to network with the leadership of TEDN, but to no avail. I messaged organizers on Facebook, sent them emails, called them, texted them…in a word, nothing. I maintained contact with only one grassroots organizer, with whom I had already been collaborating to gather archival information on an eclectic cast of public figures that ranged from late-18th Century Spanish Colonial governors to members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. I was growing anxious that my collaborative goals would prevent me from meeting my master’s thesis deadlines. I was also confused as to why no one would respond, given that I had already devoted numerous hours of archival research for TEDN and had even attended and participated in several meetings and marches. Looking back, my internal struggle felt akin to desperation at times and shared some parallels with the savior mentality that Flaherty condemns.

On May 8, 2018, I received a phone call from Rachel⁴, the white TEDN organizer and archivist with whom I had been in close contact for seven months. I expressed my frustrations about the situation and asked for advice in the matter. She explained that, as a predominantly Black-led organization, leadership of TEDN was typically reluctant to work with white

---

⁴ As noted in Chapter 3—to protect their identities, I have replaced the true names of all activists and organizers with pseudonyms.
researchers for the following reasons: (1) that academics often pose themselves as experts while excluding and/or distorting the voices of those in the communities they study; (2) that said research might contradict the goals and values of TEDN; (3) that social scientists have a knack for showing up long enough to get what they want and leaving without including the community of study in the research process itself; and worst of all, (4) that such research might be motivated by white supremacy. The literature shows that each of these concerns are backed by historic example, especially the last.

Baker (1998) impresses upon us, in stunning relief, anthropology’s historic role in the construction of the concept of race as rooted in white supremacist commonsense theories of a “natural” racial order, as well as the nascent discipline’s role in informing racist policies that were premised on the subordination of the Black race. Eventually, the white supremacist zeal which dominated the social sciences in the early 19th and late 20th Centuries was repelled by the radical visions and scholarly rigor of two founding fathers in the social sciences, Franz Boas and W.E.B. Du Bois; however, their efforts to dethrone racism in the social sciences were actively suppressed by their restricted access to funding and the overwhelming popularity of racist views espoused by their colleagues and mass media (Baker 1998, 99-126). As Lee Baker demonstrates, two of American anthropology’s most influential longitudinal impacts, from Plessy to Brown, have been to educate the public about the race concept and to shape the ways that race is experienced in everyday life by influencing policies that either maintain or resist our nation’s racial status quo.

Is it too surprising, then, given this well-documented history, that a predominantly Black grassroots organization gathered in the common goal of dismantling racist systems and taking
down white supremacist icons would share an attitude of reluctance toward a young, white, and male anthropologist? I must respond in the negative. If I had any aspirations of moving forward with my research, I would have to continue to “show up”5 and, beyond demonstrating profound interest, I would have to show my usefulness as a researcher to the organization. Therefore, Rachel advised me to attend as many events as possible, continue engaging respectfully with leadership and other organizers, and write up a condensed and accessible research proposal to submit to the leaders of TEDN. From March to November of 2018, I teamed up with a handful of organizers for several bouts of archival research at Tulane University, continued volunteering archival research hours for TEDN at the Hill Memorial Library of Louisiana State University, attended one TEDN public forum, a weekend-long international grassroots conference hosted by TEDN, an organizer meeting, five marches, and worked with Rachel on countless drafts of my research proposal; I am eternally grateful for her thoughtful critiques and enduring patience.

Throughout my thesis research, I witnessed tensions manifesting in disagreements over what monument removal should look like in New Orleans. This conflict was analogous to the palms of two hands being forced against one another but with the fingers slightly misaligned. Much of the discourse about monument removal that I analyze here was focused solely on Confederate monuments. These discussions were led primarily by New Orleans politicians and academics, some of whom were for monument removal and others who were against it. However, TEDN approached the issue of monument removal from a markedly different standpoint. Although TEDN organizers did explicitly favor the removal of Confederate

5 I define what it meant for me to “show up” in a New Orleans grassroots context in Section 3.1.
monuments from public spaces, their mission extended far beyond Confederate monuments to include all white supremacist symbols. Realizing the great breadth of TEDN’s aims, I perceived a discrepancy emerging between the two major forms of discourse presented here—that of grassroots organizers and the elite. Furthermore, through listening to grassroots organizers’ frustrations about members of the elite class in New Orleans, I was drawn to critically analyze the discourse of some of these powerful figures.
Chapter 2. Literature Review

2.1. A Brief Note on the History and Significance of Confederate Monuments

In order to understand contemporary debates, it is helpful to briefly review the history and significance of Confederate monuments in the U.S. South. Confederate monuments started cropping up around the Southern U.S. just a few years after the end of the Civil War. According to Winberry (1983, 110), the first two Confederate monuments were erected in 1867, one in front of a courthouse and the other in a cemetery. However, Winsboro (2016, 221) states that the first monument was erected a year earlier in Florida. Roughly 93% of Confederate monuments that were erected near courthouses were constructed after the year 1895, with the overwhelming majority of public monument constructions peaking around the year 1910 (Winberry 1983, 110). The next spike in Confederate memorialization coincided with the Civil Rights Movement, during which more than 45 public Confederate monuments were either dedicated or rededicated (Gunter and Kizzire 2016). These memorialization projects were primarily led by Southern women’s associations such as the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Ladies’ Memorial Associations but were also led by the Sons of Confederate Veterans among other historic preservation groups (Winberry 1983, 112; Winsboro 2016, 220). The Southern Poverty Law Center estimates that there are more than 700 public Confederate monuments in the U.S. currently, most of which are spattered across the South (Gunter and Kizzire 2016).

Winberry (1983, 114-117) offers four explanations for the rise in public Confederate monument constructions after the year 1900. Since these monuments were built several decades after the end of the Civil War, they were erected partially for the purpose of honoring the still living Confederate veteran population who were growing old and waning fast. Another
possibility is that these monuments represented, for white Southerners, the economic resurrection of the South after the Civil War. Next, the construction of monuments represented the rise of the Cult of the Lost Cause, which included the establishment of Confederate memorial groups, such as the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Finally, the increased construction of Confederate monuments in courthouse squares in the early 20th Century reflected the codification of Jim Crow policies in the South. Winberry’s discussion of the symbolism of Confederate monuments is striking because of his sensitivity to the dynamism of meanings attached to these monuments. Each of these sets of meanings are temporally and spatially context-dependent. However, Winberry is only considering the symbolic value that these monuments probably carried for white people. He does not question what significance these monuments held for Black people in the historic South, nor for those living in the contemporary South. Therefore, his symbolic analysis of these monuments is geographically and demographically restricted in its purview to the experiences and ideologies of a single racial group—Southern white people.

Winberry’s concluding remarks about the Confederate monuments and their significance in the South are worth recounting here:

*The Confederate soldier is not just the meaningless image or creation of a long-past and almost-forgotten era but is also part of the present.* The monument symbolizes the suffering that a county endured, the loss of manhood and vitality through death and maiming, and the heroic courage and loyalty that kept the ragtag, shoeless armies of the Confederacy in the field for four years. It symbolizes also the rise of the South out of the ashes of that war and the persistence through decades of poverty and isolation that have led finally to the region's vindication today as the "New South." *It is not a symbol shared necessarily by blacks or newcomers, but it does unite a people and their history...it is a symbol that differentiates the South and makes it unique. It is one of the few distinguishing landscape features in a growing sea of neon and concrete that has spread also across the South and has tended to homogenize the American scene. Perhaps it promises also the retention of certain traits that will keep the region distinctly Southern* (1983, 118-119; emphasis added).
Winberry’s conclusions intrigue me for several reasons. On one hand, the first line of this excerpt is a haunting foretelling of our present condition in the South. Although the debate over Confederate monuments has fallen in and out of fashion in popular media, nearly four decades after his article was published in the *Southeastern Geographer*, Winberry’s words have resurfaced with their initial force. The Confederate monuments are still very much a part of our day-to-day conversations of the current South, as I aim to demonstrate with this thesis.

On the other hand, it is interesting to note Winberry’s (1983, 119; emphasis added) avoidance in stating, “but it [the Confederate symbol] does unite a people and their history…” He shows no hesitation in excusing “blacks or newcomers” from the task of venerating dead white men that fought to maintain white supremacy and the subordination of Black people. Yet, he is reluctant to name the group which these symbols “unite”—white people from the South, white supremacists, Confederate memorial groups, and Civil War reenactors. Furthermore, his characterization of the Confederates as “heroic” and courageous in their cause (Winberry 1983, 118) resonates curiously with a memorial inscription that I once read while standing at the sloping entrance of the courthouse square in St. Francisville, Louisiana on October 6, 2017. The grey and weathered statue of an unnamed Confederate soldier stands before the courthouse steps, centered in the grassy lawn (see Figure 1). The soldier’s solemn eyes are longingly cast forward and down toward a small adjacent neighborhood of brightly colored blue and yellow houses, his rifle is held at ease and the image of a Confederate flag is carved into the marble column beneath his feet. Just below the flag, an inscription reads, “In memory of West Feliciana’s Confederate dead wherever at rest.” On the back face of the monument another inscription reads:

> On Fame’s eternal camping ground
> Their silent tents are spread
And Glory guards with solemn ground
The bivouac of the dead
For the dust of our heroes hath
Hallowed that sod
Where they struggled for right
And for home and for God

Winberry’s (1983, 118) conclusion that the monuments symbolize the “heroic courage and loyalty” of the Confederates resonates with this inscription and the narrative that it bestows. A marked business-as-usual sentiment seems to undergird his closing words on the significance of Confederate monuments. Perhaps Winberry’s minimization of Black people’s concerns about Confederate symbols (after all, they are not “shared necessarily by blacks or newcomers”), and
his implicit silence about the identity of “a people” who presently claim these symbols
“[promise] also the retention of certain traits that will keep the region distinctly Southern” (1983, 119).

My review of Winberry’s (1983) article above is an example of critical discourse analysis (CDA). In the next chapter, I explain what CDA is and why it is important for this study. In text analyses that follow, I explicitly use the CDA approach. This approach is helpful for understanding how issues of race, inequality, and oppression manifest in discourse, especially in the discourse belonging to the powers that be. In addition to the CDA approach, I have chosen to apply ethnographic methods to my study of political, academic, and grassroots discourse about monument removal in New Orleans. In the following chapter, I explain how and why I came to adopt this hybrid methodology of CDA and ethnography for the current study.

2.2. Hybrid Methodologies: Critical Discourse Analysis and Ethnography

In making language, and more specifically its use in discourse, the focus of my study, I hope to engage with my readers in a meaningful dialogue about the relationships between people and between people and utterances. Studying discourse is but one way of getting close to human relations. Conflict is a powerful kind of human relation. Inequality is yet another. I want to understand how discourse relates to and reproduces both types of relationships. This study, therefore, demonstrates how language-in-use can be analyzed to render these otherwise invisible social relationships visible.

According to Wodak and Reisigl (1999, 175), critical discourse analysts presuppose that “racism, as a social construct, as a social practice, and as an ideology, manifests itself discursively.” This does not imply, however, that racism always appears in an overt or blatant
fashion. For van Dijk (1992, 87), “[o]ne of the crucial properties of contemporary racism is its denial.” These denials may be shrouded in obscure forms and may operate as a face-keeping strategy to manage dissent, soften one’s speech, and even frame accusations of racism as the “real” form of intolerance (van Dijk 1992, 92, 104). Furthermore, Blommaert and Bulcaen (2000, 447) characterize discourse as “an opaque power object,” which the analyst aims to make “more visible and transparent.” This is, of course, a crucial objective of the current study—to explore how systems of inequality operate through and manifest in discourse.

I align with Blommaert and Bulcaen (2000, 449), who assert that language studies which address relations of power and inequality but which bear no positive effects for those who are most marginalized by this discourse do not qualify as CDA at all; rather, CDA “should have effects in society: empowering the powerless, giving voices to the voiceless, exposing power abuse, and mobilizing people to remedy social wrongs.” My only contention with this statement is its implication that researchers can give voice to the voiceless—expression is a human right, not a gift. Thus, critical discourse analysts tend to explicitly position themselves and their research in alignment with marginalized populations to challenge oppressive systems (van Dijk 2001, 352-353). Furthermore, like van Dijk (1993a, 19), I argue that academic treatments of non-elite, minority group perspectives about racism as biased and less worthy of scholarly interest are symptomatic of elite racism itself. If we (academics) choose to study racism while neglecting the perspectives of those most devastated by racialized social systems (see Bonilla-Silva 1997, 467), we assume a colonizing or missionizing role. I have aligned unapologetically with TEDN at several points throughout this paper and the research process; such a stance affected my decisions to analyze certain texts using the CDA method while excluding others.
Critics argue that CDA researchers have inadequately addressed the question of context in their studies (Blommaert 2001; Blommaert and Bulcaen 2000). Blommaert and Bulcaen (2000, 455-456) relate this problem to rising trends among critical discourse analysts who base their findings on their own political standings, ignoring broader social implications of the text. In avoiding relevant social context(s) or treating certain contexts as concrete, universal, self-evident, and thereby unquestionable, critical discourse analysts have often failed to adequately present the “social situatedness of discourse data” (Blommaert 2001, 15). Accordingly, some have suggested that researchers should employ a hybrid methodology of ethnography and discourse analysis to mitigate this weakness in the CDA literature (Blommaert and Bulcaen 2000, 460). I have used a mixed methodology of ethnography and CDA in the current study. In doing so, I have attempted to contextualize elite political and academic discourse about monument removal in relation to the grassroots counter-discourse I witnessed as a participant observer.

This hybrid approach enables me to analyze political, academic, and grassroots discourse about monument removal debates in New Orleans. I do not claim to study all discourse relevant to monument removal in this paper. Rather, I have selected three main texts for CDA, including: (1) a transcribed video recording of a lecture given by Tulane Professor and associate of both the Monumental Task Committee and the Beauregard Monument Association, Dr. Richard Marksbury, on November 13, 2017; (2) a local journalist’s interview with New Orleans Mayor LaToya Cantrell from April 2, 2018; and (3) former Mayor Mitch Landrieu’s speech about Confederate monuments, which he gave on May 19, 2017 at Gallier Hall in New Orleans. Admittedly, by selecting from this collection of current resources to explore this issue, I run the
risk of coming to static conclusions about racism that ignore more longitudinal, socio-historical perspectives (Bonilla-Silva 1997, 467). Therefore, although I am basing my analysis here on contemporary examples, I submit that there is ample room for future research. In such a project, I could draw from archival resources to gain a more processual perspective of the local discourse surrounding this issue. Nevertheless, the texts that I have chosen to study here, I hope, will provide some key insights which increase our understandings of how inequality manifests discursively.

The CDA literature does not proffer a methodological doctrine to which researchers must adhere. Rather CDA is an approach, an attitude about how texts should be analyzed, what to look out for (e.g., textual phenomena that are symptomatic of systems of power, inequality, racism, etc.), and how we as researchers should position ourselves in our research. According to van Dijk (2001, 352-353), CDA should neither be classified as a theory or a method, but an interdisciplinary approach to political and social problems as they emerge in discourse. Similarly, Blommaert and Bulcaen (2000, 447) describe CDA not as a strict methodology or school, but rather as a sort of broad mentality about discourse analysis that incorporates a range of disciplines and frameworks and that addresses issues related to racism, elite power, and inequality.

Nevertheless, I did make certain methodological choices in analyzing these texts. For instance, I paid attention to patterns of pronomial usage, tense usage, examples of indirect speech, reported speech, and more. To accomplish my initial analyses of the texts, I printed out either the whole document or an excerpt and I systematically studied the texts, line-by-line,
underlining different aspects of the texts in different colors. This approach was extremely useful in that I could return to the same text multiple times to search for different patterns.

To be sure, I am not suggesting that critical discourse analysts are the only language scholars that pride themselves on taking a firm ethical stance in alignment with marginalized people groups. Nor am I claiming that CDA is the only discourse analytic approach that is useful to transcend social injustices. The number of discourse analysts that are engaged in the project of dismantling systems of race- and class-based inequalities are plentiful, and their approaches diverse. The following quote by Gee (2014, 144; emphasis added) demonstrates that a fundamental understanding of and resistance to systemic social inequality is essential to the work of most discourse analysts:

> The fact that people have differential access to different identities and activities, connected to different sorts of status and social goods, is a root source of inequality in society. Intervening in such matters can be a contribution to social justice. Since different identities are enacted in and through language, the study of language is integrally connected to matters of equity and justice.

Therefore, CDA is not alone in its goal of working toward equity and social justice. Rather, what sets CDA apart from other discourse analytic approaches is its principle that we, as researchers, have an expressed obligation to effect “change through critical understanding” (van Dijk 1993b, 252). The measure of such “change” may be modest, especially when compared to the change enacted by activists who work tirelessly to resist oppressive systems (van Dijk 1993b, 253). At the very least, the idea is to open or continue dialogues about the domination of one group by another in hopes of those conversations leading to the mobilization of people toward equality, consciousness, and human dignity.
By adopting a CDA approach to the study of elite political and academic discourse, I assume that, in addition to making persuasive arguments, these agents of ruling and “symbolic” power (van Dijk 1993a, 46-47) use various discursive strategies to influence dominant narratives about Confederate monuments. Teun van Dijk (1993a, 44) defines the power elite in terms of their unequal access to resources, as well as in their ability to influence, control, and make decisions for large masses of people. These power elite regularly exercise their control via discursive means. By virtue of their abundance of resources and power, elites are the greatest stakeholders in the maintenance and perpetuation of their dominance via discourse (van Dijk 1992, 88). van Dijk (1993a, 44-45) argues that one of the most significant aspects of elite power manifests in elites’ ability to affect the “public mind” by controlling dominant narratives about racial and ethnic relations which are then recycled amongst the dominant ingroup. Elites assert this power through their reign over the mediation of information, as van Dijk (1993a, 45) explains in the following:

Thus, they [elites] control PR departments, press offices, press releases, advertisements, reports, and other publications that describe, explain, or legitimate what they do and say, and thus also have broad access to public discourse, primarily that of mass media…

In this study, I pay little attention to elite ownership of mass media; rather, I consider how the strategies that political and academic elites use to discuss issues about Confederate monuments help to preserve their control over dominant narratives of the Confederacy, race, and inequality.
Chapter 3. Methodology

This project required deep reflection on my part about the ethics of doing ethnographic research with a grassroots organization. It also required me to consider my own position in the field as a researcher and amateur activist. In the following, I detail how, in response to the needs and demands of the field, I transitioned between participatory and researcher roles while collecting data at TEDN marches. These transitions represented a shift in my methods from participant observation to the “observation of participation” (Tedlock 1991, 69), and in my writing from an “ethnographic memoir” to “narrative ethnography” (Tedlock 1991, 77). I also outline my processes for making jottings in the field, writing up fieldnotes, and coding. I conclude with a section on some methodological challenges that I experienced in the field. Finally, to preserve their identities, I have given pseudonyms all organizers, leaders, and marchers discussed in this thesis.

3.1. Some Ethical Considerations

For the purposes of my research, a dispassionate, detached, “fly-on-the-wall” approach was neither feasible nor appropriate. In fact, to employ any sort of covert methodology with TEDN would have been disastrous. In the initial stages of this project, organizers of TEDN regularly voiced their distrust toward academics. As I have previously mentioned, in May of 2018, I spoke with TEDN organizer Rachel over the phone about my research. By this time, I had already written a project description, but she suggested that I draft a distilled version of it in a

---

6 See footnote 4 in Section 1.1.

7 See Section 1.1.
more accessible style and submit it to leaders of TEDN for further feedback. Recall her warning: TEDN organizers tend to keep white academics at a safe distance. According to Rachel, these organizers feared that white academics would hijack the movement for their own career advancement, project themselves as experts above the organizers, or worse yet, that such research findings might be used for white supremacist goals. Their concerns were amplified by recent incidents of spying on their organization. In June 2017, TEDN leader Stewart denounced Mayor Mitch Landrieu for hiring the Trident Response Group out of Dallas, TX to spy on TEDN (Nobles 2017). He added that TEDN organizers had received anonymous threats, that their emails had been hacked, and he reminded his audience that the U.S. federal government had used similar tactics in the past to disrupt and deter activist organizations.

The American Anthropological Association (AAA 2012) takes a clear stance of disapproval regarding covert research methods in their 2012 Statement on Ethics (SOE)8. The 2012 SOE requires researchers to maintain candid and respectful relationships with the participants of their studies as well as keep open lines of informed consent with participants. In accordance with the AAA’s 2012 SOE, I made deliberate efforts to conduct my research and build relationships with TEDN organizers in an ethical manner.

Ethics was no afterthought, but rather, necessarily at the forefront of my interactions with TEDN organizers. For example, I began openly discussing my thesis with TEDN organizers from the first event that I attended, the “Throw Down” fundraiser, in February 2018. My research questions have transmogrified since these initial encounters; in fact, casual

8 See Appendix E.
conversations with organizers and their critiques have played a major role in determining the shape and direction of my research. Some of these initial conversations were cumbersome. Nevertheless, beginning with this open line of communication allowed me to gradually build relationships with TEDN organizers and develop a research project that was relevant to their expressed concerns.

As I was told by TEDN organizer Rachel, I ultimately earned a trusted and recognizable face among organizers by “showing up.” “Showing up,” in this context, meant attending TEDN events regularly and making myself useful to the organization by contributing to the goals of TEDN beyond the bounds of a march route. My volunteer archival work as well as my participation in TEDN activities, therefore, folded into my ethical obligation to “show up.”

Over the summer of 2018, I co-constructed a condensed project description\(^9\) with Rachel—a process which involved numerous rewrites and revisions. My initial plan was to collaboratively construct a code of ethics for this project with TEDN organizers. I modeled this process on the ethical code developed by students, faculty, and community members in *The Other Side of Middletown* (Lassiter et al. 2004). Students involved in this collaborative, community-based project reviewed various professional ethics statements and met with community members to co-design a code of ethics that fit the needs of their project (Lassiter et al. 2004, 20). In my own project, I drafted a review of the American Anthropology Association’s 2012 SOE\(^10\). I presented my project description, 2012 SOE review, and consent form to TEDN

---

\(^9\) See Appendix D.

\(^10\) See Appendix E.
leaders Kenney, Kendra, and Stewart at marches and organizer meetings over the summer and early fall semester of 2018. However, feedback on my proposal came slowly, if at all, over the following months. At the conclusion of the “Take ‘Em Down NOLA Rally and March” on October 4th, 2018 (eight months after my initial contact), TEDN leader Kendra kindly reassured me that I should not take their silence personally. She and other organizers had extremely busy schedules and, after consulting with one another about my proposal, they were not quite sure about how much time and effort each of them could devote to my project. Her response was neither a full acceptance nor outright rejection of my proposal, but I was grateful for any feedback that she was willing to give to me.

Ultimately, I never received an explicit “yes” or “no” about my ambitious proposal (which included plans to interview, meet regularly to review and discuss my thesis writing, and collaboratively construct a written product, such as a short book, that integrated findings from this research). Therefore, my project fell somewhat short of the collaboration that I hoped for. However, I did work together with one organizer to construct a project description, and our archival research involved elements of collaboration. Despite not having a clear answer about my proposal, I did regularly ask organizers for consent to write fieldnotes on TEDN public events. As rule of thumb, they were fine with me writing about anything that was said through a megaphone or done in public.

3.2. Shifting Identities in the Field

While collecting data on discourse at TEDN marches, my identity as a researcher was neither stable nor entirely separable from other roles that I performed. As it turned out, I enacted the three following participatory roles the most: researcher, marcher, and organizer. Each of these
roles allowed me to relate to people in the field in ways that generated insights otherwise unavailable to participant observers or discourse analysts alone.

Through my participation in marches and other events, I took an unapologetic stance of alignment with the goals and values of TEDN. In fact, I participated in marches to the extent that passersby often assumed I was an organizer. Some anthropologists may express anxieties about my involvement in these marches as essentially “going native.” However, such fears are based upon presuppositions that researchers and the people they study are fixed in a strict binary relationship with one another, such that the former is the objective scientist and the latter is the subject, the exotic “Other” (Tedlock 1991, 71). Actually, TEDN organizers were studying me just as I was writing about them. This was evident in that organizers took notice of my efforts to “show up” regularly. Furthermore, considering the context of TEDN’s heightened caution about spies and white academics, I chose not to distance myself from the activities of marching or writing, but rather, I deliberately positioned myself as an actor within both. Therefore, I have attempted to write in the style of a “narrative ethnography,” reflexively situating myself in the ethnographic data that I collected at TEDN events and in the analyses that followed (Tedlock 1991, 77-78).

Although I collected observational data at every march, I also held signs, marched, chanted, and even dressed like other marchers. Therefore, at several of the marches I was identified as a TEDN marcher by passersby and other marchers, and I indeed performed the activities of a marcher. In relation to my position as a researcher, the marcher role produced its own set of pros and cons. For instance, when organizers asked me to hold signs at marches, it
became exceedingly difficult to jot notes. As such, I was often forced to either jot down my notes immediately after an event, or even wait to get home to write full fieldnotes from memory.\textsuperscript{11}

Despite the difficulties that this role generated, marching allowed me to build relationships with organizers, interpret our surrounding environments, and understand the embodied experiences of marching in ways that would likely be unavailable to a socially distanced participant observer. For example, from the very first TEDN march that I participated in (called “Take it to the Streets”) on March 25, 2018, while marching along Decatur Street from Jackson Square, I noticed that Andrew Jackson’s name was etched on the walls and signs of restaurants and breweries nearby. On November 5, 2018, I traveled to New Orleans alone on an ordinary Monday to observe each of the spaces that TEDN normally visited along their marches. As I stopped to look around Jackson Square, aside from the famed equestrian statue of Jackson, I identified at least seven instances where Jackson’s name was printed on surrounding businesses, from the Jackson Brewing Company to Muriel’s Jackson Square Bistro. In several of these instances, the spelling of his name was modified such as in “JAX” and “Jaxson.” These observations led me to consider the enormous challenges that faced TEDN organizers in their fight to rid New Orleans of all symbols of white supremacy.

At two separate marches, organizers invited me to approach passersby with a petition clipboard and ask them to sign a statement which called for the removal of all monuments, street names, park names, and school names commemorating white supremacists. Similarly, a TEDN organizer once asked me to pass out copies of the Workers Voice (a Marxist paper published by

\textsuperscript{11} I discuss these challenges at length in Section 3.3.
another local grassroots organization, the New Orleans Worker’s Group) to people standing near
the Henry Clay monument in Lafayette Square. As I complied in each of these cases, I performed
the tasks of an organizer. That is not to say that I carried out all duties that a TEDN organizer
might, or that TEDN members explicitly recognized me as such. Rather, I assumed this
designation because of how people in the field related to and identified me as I performed some
of the duties that are regularly carried out by organizers.

TEDN organizers tend to have extra duties at marches, such as giving speeches at
monument stops, handing out papers, doing petition work, or even policing the marching ranks
to ensure that no marchers are harmed by counter-protester “knuckleheads” or cops. Organizers
also carry out most of the behind-the-scenes planning, organizing, and advocacy work for
marches, forums, city council meetings, and more. My only tasks were to pass out papers and ask
people to sign a petition at these events. However, while I fulfilled these duties, people spoke to
me as if I were an organizer. For example, during my initial trial as a petition worker, I stopped
and spoke with a young white couple, who looked to be in their mid-twenties, as we marched
down Camp Street. Both wore professional dress—the man had slicked hair and a dress suit and
the woman was wearing a Sunday dress. When I approached them, they appeared to be waiting
for the marchers to pass so they could cross. The man took the lead for most of the conversation,
and at one point he turned to me with a furrowed brow and asked, “Y’all want to take down
Andrew Jackson, too?” His placement of the second person plural pronoun, “y’all,” as he posed

12 Organizers distributed safety handouts to marchers at the beginning of each march. These handouts refer to
antagonizers in general, and counter-protesters and police in particular, as “knuckleheads.” Organizers used this
term in the context of listing safety protocols at the introductions of marches; however, I never heard this term used
outside of that context.
this question indicated that he included me among other members of the TEDN group. As such, he constructed my identity in that moment as a representative of TEDN, someone in-the-know about TEDN planning and decision-making. Furthermore, as I prepared to catch up with the rest of the group, now far out of sight, the man closed our conversation with, “I’m not going to sign this petition, but I am interested in this and I’m going to read up on it. I respect that you are so passionate about this.” That he referred to me as someone who is passionate about the cause signaled that he acknowledged my role as someone more involved than the average marcher or TEDN supporter. Several other passersby and bar patrons addressed me in a similar fashion.

Gee (2014, 150) refers to this process of identifying oneself and others through discursive interactions as “recognition work.” People also partake in recognition work when evaluating what forms of talk or behavior are appropriate for any given context. Therefore, in my interactions with passersby, such as the one on Camp Street, my talk and behavior were recognized as appropriate for an organizer protesting at a march.

Finally, my role as a researcher involved participating regularly in marches and other TEDN organized events, taking notes, asking TEDN organizers for their verbal consent regarding my field noting, communicating and editing my research proposal with organizers, and distributing forms to organizers, such as consent forms, project descriptions, and ethics reviews. As I have mentioned before, this role was not fixed or stable, and it often folded into the other roles described above.

My identity as a researcher presented some challenges, given that TEDN organizers were vocal about their distrust toward academics. For instance, in February 2018, as marchers clustered around the Bienville monument between Decatur and North St. Peters streets, Kenney
clenched his fist tightly around the handle of his megaphone. His voice erupted, “I don’t need to write a dissertation!! Look around you, white supremacists have left their blueprint on every corner.” He continued, “You don’t have to be a professor or an academic to care about these statues… You don’t need for professors or any other oppressor to tell you what’s right, because you can find that out on your own.” Here, the stressed tonality of his voice (e.g. in “dissertation!!”) was both meaningful and deliberate. Since his statement about dissertations immediately follows with a parallel between professors and oppressors, the relational context of these two roles frames his discourse as a critique of academia. His argument insists that one need merely to open their eyes and glance over their surroundings to discover that white supremacy persists in New Orleans “on every corner.” Thus, one need not be a professor (or even an LSU graduate student) to understand that racism is still very much alive and thriving. The critical stance that organizers took toward academics at these marches required me to reevaluate my position as a researcher and my relation to others in the field.

3.3. Jottings and Fieldnotes

My in-field jotting routines did not develop in a linear or streamlined fashion by any means, but with practice, I gradually learned some effective strategies. My position as a marcher made taking jottings extremely difficult, and my initial trials at sketching in-field jottings were often unsuccessful. This was due, in large part, to the physical limitations that I experienced in

---

13 As we will see in Section 5.8, Mayor Cantrell also uses the term, “care,” when discussing the monument issue. Here, it is possible that Kenney was making a critical commentary on Cantrell’s use of “care,” however, given the context of his discussion, I interpreted this excerpt to be primarily a criticism of academics as members of the oppressor class.
attempting to hold signs, march, and take notes simultaneously. These exercises in researcher gymnastics felt awkward to me and must have appeared so to those around me.

Beyond the clumsy nature of my mixed role as a marcher/researcher, there were also times when I felt insecure about writing jottings in the field when faced with TEDN’s critical stance toward academics. Though I was candid about my research with leading organizers, there were times when I felt unsure about how my notetaking was received by others. Would people think that I was a cop? A spy? A journalist? Were there some organizers who were more familiar with my position as a graduate student researcher than others? Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (2011, 36) aptly describe these anxieties, acknowledging that the ethnographer fears that “[p]articipants may now see her as someone whose primary interest lies in discovering their secrets and turning their most intimate and cherished experiences into objects of scientific inquiry.” Due to my anxiety-ridden-inner-monologues based on role insecurity, my first steps at taking in-field jottings faltered.

I initially responded to these gaps in my jottings by taking brisk notes as I returned to my car immediately after a march. If it was getting late (as several marches took place in the fall, and therefore ended after nightfall), I would write up fieldnotes from memory as soon as I returned home to Baton Rouge. I also attempted using a recording device to detail my observations verbally on my commutes home from New Orleans to Baton Rouge (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 2011, 40). However, the latter strategy also proved unfruitful. Since there are no lights in the cabin of my pick-up truck, I could not successfully (or safely) operate my recording device while driving.
My success with jotting notes grew with practice, normalization of my field experience, and with my shifting roles in the field. This was especially the case when I picked up the role of petition worker. As a petition worker, I was given a clip board and a pen for people to sign their names and provide contact information. I quickly learned that I could use the clipboard surface to scribble jotted notes on. Two things made this possible: (1) As a petition worker, I was no longer responsible for carrying signs, and (2) I used small folded scraps of paper to take notes on as we stopped at each monument. In one such case, I used the back of a 5x4” march safety handout issued by TEDN organizers at the beginning of the march. This strategy was doubly effective, because it allowed me to take detailed in-field jottings as well as collect textual data on TEDN safety protocols.

Finally, as I returned home to Baton Rouge, I began the fieldnote writing process (sometimes staying up to write until the early hours of the morning). In my fieldnotes, I documented bits of dialogue based on my memory of what occurred during my interactions with organizers and bystanders as well as from what I could write out from organizers’ speeches at monument stops. Where gaps interrupted my notes on speeches, I turned to videos that organizers posted on Facebook that night or the next day to capture their verbatim quotes. I also practiced selectively characterizing actors in the field (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 2011, 69-71), with preferential attention to organizers, counter-protesters, and some passersby with whom I shared dialogue.

3.4. The Coding Process and its Parallels with CDA Methods

Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (2011, 172-174) encourage ethnographers to use coding methods as a way of systematically ordering the researcher’s unwieldy fieldnote data, “reading line by line
through as many pages of fieldnotes as possible,” so that researchers can organize their full-length ethnographies using themes developed from their coded data. I primarily used the open and focused coding methods as described by Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (2011, 175-193). Open coding involves the researcher reading thoroughly through their fieldnotes and asking broad questions about the significance of the data or of the relations (e.g., similarities, differences, regularities, etc.) between the events or bits of discourse recorded in one set of fieldnotes and another. Throughout the open coding process, the researcher writes or types short, pithy phrases alongside their notes to describe the themes or patterns that they see reflected in the data (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw, 177-179). The focused coding process is like open coding, except by this point the researcher has already developed some “core themes” and is beginning to go back through the already coded fieldnotes to look for subcategories within these major themes (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw, 191). Ultimately, coding is supposed to aid the researcher in their theory building process as supported by the data set that they have collected.

This project provided my very first experience with coding fieldnotes, and so it was a learning curve. For example, I struggled with avoiding overly general codes (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 2011, 182). Since my coding process mostly consisted of open coding, I also struggled with making too many codes. I began coding fieldnotes by using the comment function in Microsoft Word. This strategy was somewhat effective, because it allowed me to highlight sections and type quickly. However, I found that I got lost easily in all the codes that I created. I later recoded these same fieldnotes by printing them out and then, line by line, I scribbled short, descriptive phrases in the margins. I found this strategy to be much more effective, given that limitations of space forced me to reduce my number of codes, and writing them by hand made
the codes stick in my memory more so than did typing them. My codes gradually became less unwieldy after forming multiple codebook drafts and recoding over my original codes.

This latter strategy shared strong similarities with my CDA methods. Like with coding, in doing CDA, I printed out texts for analysis and read through the entire document to get a general idea of what was happening in the text. Then I would return to the beginning of the text and read it again line-by-line, all the while marking the patterns and themes as they appeared in the text. Also like my experience with coding, I originally marked a wealth of patterns, only some of which were included in my analyses of each text. Therefore, both my coding and my CDA methods involved selective processes of interpretation whereby I chose to write about those patterns which appeared most salient in the texts and relevant to the issues covered in this study.

3.5. Methodological Challenges

Above, I have mentioned a few of the hurdles that I navigated in the field, leading me to develop a repertoire of alternative methodological strategies. Some other challenges that I experienced, however, were more difficult to manage. One such challenge was the distance that I had to travel to get to the field. This obstacle was compounded by the fact that marches normally began at 6pm on Thursdays, and, in the fall semester, my Thursday class did not end until 4:20pm. Therefore, I grew accustomed to always preparing myself with a full tank of gas and my fieldwork tools (i.e., pen, paper, voice recorder, forms for organizers, the proper marching attire, money to park, etc.) wherever I went. For every commute, I endured two sessions of intense traffic (one in Baton Rouge and one in New Orleans). On several occasions, the weather prohibited marches from occurring, and since TEDN reduced the frequency of marches to one action per month starting in June 2018, planning out fieldwork for the fall semester became a
daunting task. I could not have anticipated these patterns when scheduling my classes, nor was it appropriate for me to beg an early pardon from class every time I had to go to the field (although my professors graciously allowed it on several occasions).

Aside from challenges of going to the field, leaving the field also created issues. Since my jottings suffered in the earlier parts of my fieldwork, I was forced, in many cases, to wait until I returned home to begin writing full fieldnotes from memory. On my commutes home, I adhered to Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw’s (2011, 49-50) advice about not relating details of the day’s ethnographic occurrences to loved ones in order to preserve my writing experience as a “cathartic outpouring.” This strategy, however, provided for some prickly phone conversations with my wife, who simply wanted to know how my day went.

In shifting roles from a marcher to a petition worker, I experienced challenges of catching up with the crowd. Each time that I stopped to do petition work, the parade of marchers pressed on. There were several occasions when I could only hear marchers in the distance, well out of sight. In these moments I learned that petition work is a physically demanding job that requires organizers to run short distances regularly. The following fieldnote memo picks up just as I was closing a conversation about the petition with the young couple on Camp Street and it exemplifies the sort of exertion that I made to keep up with the crowd of marchers:

I thanked them both for their time and split, leaning forward as I darted in the direction that I guessed the march had gone. Swerving and swiveling around street lamps and poles, and dodging passersby on this busy street, I was breaking a serious sweat. My backpack plopped and smacked against my soaked back as I hurried down the street to catch up with the rest of the group.

Other organizers similarly exerted themselves in carrying out petition work. Therefore, as a petitioner I experienced first-hand just how exhausting this work can be.
I also struggled to catch some of the things that organizers said at monument stops due to my obligations of moving from person to person with the petition clipboard. Therefore, I was stretched between my obligations to write everything down and to contribute to the organization that I wrote about. Sometimes, I would privilege taking jottings over petitioning, and vice versa. Gaps in my jottings were later remedied by watching videos of the marches posted on Facebook.

On a positive note, petitioning allowed me to interact face-to-face with the audiences of TEDN, and thereby gain some insight on the broader public’s views about the monument debate. Peoples’ responses to the petitions were quite mixed. There were strong supporters of the movement, who came to TEDN marches on a regular basis. There were few people who had never heard of TEDN, or who were less knowledgeable about the issues surrounding monument removal, but who were generally supportive of the cause. Many bystanders with whom I spoke were tourists on family vacations, bachelorette parties, international trips from the U.K., and so on. As such, they were sometimes unsure or ambivalent about what contribution they could or should make on this local issue. Other people refused to sign the petition, sometimes displaying irritation with the protests. Others still were too intoxicated to consent to sign a petition, in which cases I told them that I would just catch them at the next march.

The petitioner role also gave me access to certain textual data. For example, I spent a great deal of time explaining TEDN’s petition to bystanders, and therefore committed TEDN’s mission statement to memory. Additionally, I observed the signs and banners that other TEDN marchers carried. For example, Figure 2 features a poster that I witnessed several organizers carrying at different marches. In the poster, Andrew Jackson’s last name is stamped out of Jackson Square and replaced with “Tubman.” The poster also features a partial picture of Harriet
Tubman’s face. Half of the oval is covered with text commanding readers to “Honor heroism, not hate!” Such a message positions Jackson as representing hate, and Tubman heroism.

![Figure 2. Tubman Square TEDN Poster. Photograph. New Orleans, L.A. March 25, 2018 (Credit: J. Bumgardner).](image)

It also clearly suggests that Jackson Square should be renamed for a true hero such as Tubman.

The message is clearly authorized by TEDN, as evinced by the hashtag, “#Take ‘Em Down NOLA.” Alternatively, the poster functions as a warning sign. That is, if Jackson represents hate, and Tubman heroism, then we must presently be complicit with honoring hate by allowing the square to remain as it is. All things considered, this poster suggests that TEDN is not only in favor of removing symbols of white supremacy, but also of creating new symbols in public spaces that represent heroism as defined by them. Posters and banners such as the one depicted
in Figure 2 allowed me to gain a better understanding of how TEDN organizers related to the
issue of monument removal and how they organized to dismantle racism in their city.

Finally, as a petitioner I built closer, reciprocal relationships with organizers. At different
points throughout the marches, I referred bystanders’ questions and my own questions about the
petitions to TEDN organizers. For instance, I asked TEDN organizer and elder Shelly if the
petition signatures were shared publicly and she confirmed that they were. I also asked if they
were shared at city council meetings, to which she could not provide a clear answer. In another
case, as I spoke with a bystander near the E.D. White monument at the front steps of the
Louisiana Supreme Court, he asked, “So, is there a list? Like of these monuments, or is it just
they keep going on and on with no end?” I responded that there is a map online that depicts some
of the monuments which TEDN are lobbying to remove. Immediately afterward, I referred this
question to Rachel. She shook her head and said, “The website map is old.” “Well, is there some
other source that you suggest I direct them to?” “Not really.” She went on to say that there are
lists of Confederate statues elsewhere on the internet, but she could not think of a specific site to
lead them to. In these interactions, I formed closer bonds with TEDN members while acting as a
mediator between bystanders and organizers. While I gathered qualitative data on bystanders’
perspectives about TEDN and monument removal in these interactions, I also modestly
contributed to TEDN’s cause by increasing their total number of petition signatures.
Chapter 4. Ethnographic Analysis

The following analysis focuses on grassroots discourse about monument removal, white supremacy, and inequality in New Orleans, Louisiana. Beyond simply recording what grassroots organizers were saying, I was interested in how they performed this discourse publicly. This analysis relates to my broader focus of political, academic, and grassroots discourse about monument removal in New Orleans. Below I elaborate on two major analytical themes that emerged from my fieldnote coding. In the coding process, I found other significant themes as well, however, I will only focus on two here: organization and building anti-racist systems to dismantle racist systems.

4.1. Organization

Organization was essential to TEDN members’ discourse about combatting white supremacy. In fact, one of the most popular chants at marches was, “How we gonna make New Orleans Rise? /Educate! Agitate! Organize!!” Attention to organization extended well beyond talk, however, to include how we joined together as a collective voice and performed our roles individually within spaces of protest. Moreover, organization relates to what TEDN leader Kendra called “practice for the revolution.”

14 Some of these included the uplift and grassroots socialization of black youth and making socio-historical connections between the past and present. Educating the public was yet another major theme that emerged from my coding process. Each of these themes overlap with other themes, for instance, when TEDN leaders and organizers planned parts of the Take ‘Em Down NOLA Rally & March (October 4, 2018) around children presenting speeches and posters they created to inform the public about the wealthy slave-owner Henry Clay and his relationship to present forms of racism. There is a statue dedicated to Henry Clay in Lafayette Square, New Orleans, Louisiana.

15 Regarding transcription conventions, in this thesis, I use forward slashes to denote call and response patterns, colon punctuation (e.g., “::”) to represent lengthened vowels, and italics to show vocal emphasis.

16 In this chapter, I explain the significance of this phrase as it relates to organization.
In the context of marching, TEDN leaders prioritized organization over numbers. Organizers stressed the importance of group solidarity even when faced with a low marcher turnout. For example, at the introduction of the “Take ‘Em Down NOLA Rally and March” on October 4, 2018, Kenney commented on the low numbers of marchers present, while emphasizing organization as essential to the cause. “Whether there’s one or one thousand, we’re going to turn it up to one thousand.” Thus, to Kenney and other organizers, raising our voices as a collective group to convey the message of TEDN took precedence; numbers were of far lesser concern.

The marches that I attended followed a definite organizational layout with a clear beginning and ending. During fall of 2018, TEDN scheduled “actions” (i.e., organized forms of public protest) for the third Thursday of every month. “We’re going to be consistent!” Kendra often said, reminding listeners that TEDN was to remain firm in their cause, and they did not plan on silencing themselves or being silenced any time soon. Only the occasional heavy thunderstorm obstructed our marches. Otherwise, we were consistent. In the following, I describe moments where organization is most visible in the typical flow of a TEDN march. My telling of these marches is typifying by nature; a more nuanced painting of each event in its entirety would complicate this image significantly.

TEDN marches normally begin with an announcement of the time and place the event will begin. Announcements for these events are normally posted to Facebook. On the day of the march, TEDN organizers and other marchers (some of whom are also members of other closely associated grassroots organizations) start arriving at a predetermined location (usually the Henry Clay monument in Lafayette Square) at around 6pm. Once a crowd of twenty or more coalesces,
Kendra calls through a red and white megaphone in true camp counselor fashion, “If you can hear me, clap once.” **Clap.** “Clap twice.” **Clap-Clap.** She asks us to form a semi-circle around the Henry Clay monument, then opens with a brief, but profound message of why we have come together to protest. For instance, standing at the base of the Henry Clay monument in Lafayette Square, Kendra orated the following introduction at the “Take Down White Supremacy Rally and March” on August 23rd, 2018:

As we go along this Take ‘Em Down NOLA journey—and for some of you this is your first time doing this—we’re going to be talking about a lot of things. And people are going to make it seem like this Take ‘Em Down NOLA conversation is anchored in Confederate monuments. But you need to understand what Take ‘Em Down NOLA is and why we exist. Take ‘Em Down NOLA exists for the purpose of removing *all* symbols to white supremacy from the landscape of New Orleans, as a *much necessary* part of the struggle toward *racial* and *economic* justice.

When finished, she calls up “my brother, Kenney,” and passes him the megaphone before he begins enumerating TEDN’s marching safety protocol. By this point, organizers have already distributed 5x4” rectangular sheets of paper (see Figure 3) detailing the marching safety guidelines to the crowd of marchers. Kenney reads the form aloud, occasionally shifting from this “read-speak” register to weave in his own poetic flare. For example, at the “Take ‘Em Down NOLA Rally and March” on October 4, 2018, in remembrance of Aretha Franklin who had passed away just two months prior, Kenney deviated from the words on the page in #5 (“R-E-S-P-E-C-T”) to add, “In honor of the *late* great, R-E-S-P-E-C-T…”
After all introduction speeches are through, Kendra asks us to line up into a marching formation. Like a drill sergeant, Kendra leads this militarized procession, building flanks one by one—usually into rows of four, although this number changed with the total number of marchers at each event—until the formation is complete. The following fieldnote excerpt from the “Take ‘Em Down NOLA Rally and March” on October 4, 2018 is exemplary of this process:

Kendra called for three adult volunteers to form a line facing her and hold the large yellow “Take ‘Em Down NOLA” banner. Then she asked for the children—most of them
Black fifth-grade students who attend schools in Orleans Parish—to form a center line perpendicular to the banner holding line. Finally, she asked for the rest of the adults to flank the children on either side. According to Kendra, this exercise was “practice for the revolution.”

Figure 4 provides a visual representation of these flank formations. Importantly, Kendra was not simply ordering us around. She and other leaders were adamant about maintaining order and organization as “practice for the revolution.” Similarly, at the introduction of the “Be About It” march on July 5, 2018, Kendra said the following as she prepared us to build a parade march formation:

Today we’re going to practice some drills. You know why? Because the Oppressor is always organized. So we need to be just as organized as the Oppressor.
She led with meticulous precision, instructing us to dress the ranks with each person standing at an arm’s length from the comrade to their left and right, as well as in front and behind.

Organizers’ mandates for keeping an organized march extended beyond these exercises and into the activity of marching itself. For example, at the “Take it to the Streets” rally and march on March 25, 2018, TEDN leader and elder Stewart prioritized organization even above moving forward from one monument station to the next. We had just left from the second stopping point, the John McDonogh statue in Lafayette Square, when Stewart brought us all to a halt. He directed us to redress the ranks to lines of four and reminded us that we needed to stay organized throughout the march. Once everyone lined up neatly, he led us forward with a staccato chant, “Rac-ism/Must go!/Rac-ism/Must go!/ When:::?/Now!/When:::?/Now!/White supremacy/Must go!/White supremacy/Must go!/When:::?/Now!/When:::?/Now!...”

After building parade march formations, we practiced call and response chants. Chant exercises carried a similar organizational weight to building flank formations. Through chanting exercises, we practiced raising our voices in unison so that every voice would ring together as we move through the streets. Therefore, just as marching in tight formations allowed us to move as one cohesive body, practicing chants prepared us to shout in one coherent voice.

TEDN leaders and organizers deliberately engaged in the maintenance of organization throughout each march. As we can see from Kendra’s rationale about building structured parade march formations, she valued organization as “practice for the revolution.” I never had the opportunity to interview Kendra formally or informally about what exactly she meant by “practice for the revolution.” However, given the contexts in which she repeated this phrase (e.g., in directing organized marching drills), I assume that she used this term to express the care
that marching participants must give to organization in order that TEDN would achieve their
goal of revolutionizing space by removing white supremacist symbols from the New Orleans
public landscape. Furthermore, leaders heeded organization over numbers, and even over
pressing forward with the marches, as Kenney and Stewart respectively demonstrated. Therefore,
the execution and maintenance of organized systems was key to the structure of TEDN marches
that I observed and participated in.

4.2. Building Anti-Racist Systems to Dismantle Racist Systems
The demolition of systems of white supremacy and inequality, as professed by organizers, is the
ultimate guiding principle for TEDN. In fact, the monuments were simply a medium for talking
about racial inequality and other forms of social inequality that persist in contemporary New
Orleans. These systems of inequality are deep-seated and extend far beyond the debate over
Confederate monuments. New Orleans was the largest slave market in the United States
(Landrieu 2018, 218). It is also the city where Homer Plessy was arrested and later convicted for
refusing to leave his seat in a “whites-only” railroad car. As the first city in the United States to
completely replace its public-school system with a deregulated and decentralized charter-school
system, New Orleans schools are almost entirely race-segregated (Parvis 2015, 281). The racial
segregation of New Orleans public school system has not always been fixed, however, for as
Woodward (2002, 24) points out, New Orleans public schools “were thoroughly and successfully
integrated until 1877.” Furthermore, Black youth are placed at an even greater disadvantage for
achieving educational success in New Orleans today when faced with overly selective student
admissions processes, excessive school closures and student transfers, and policies of strict
disciplinarity, which funnel black students into the juvenile justice system via racialized (and
classed) uses of detention, discipline, expulsions, and policing (Parvis 2015, 296, 304-305). At the state level, Louisiana’s Black unemployment rate is nearly twice that of white unemployment (Jones 2018). Furthermore, in Louisiana Black women suffer the worst pay gap in the country, “earning just 48 cents for every dollar earned by white, non-Hispanic men…” (Larino 2017). At nearly every march that I attended, Kendra reported that out of New Orleans’ proposed city budget of $647 million, “sixty-three percent goes to cops, jails and reactive measures, three percent goes to children and families, and one percent goes to job development.” These grim reports only represent the very tip of the disparity iceberg in New Orleans and the state of Louisiana.

Bonilla-Silva’s (1997, 469) “racialized social system” concept closely aligns with how members of TEDN discussed structures of racism in their city. 20th Century scholars commonly favored the “idealist conception of racism” (Bonilla-Silva 1997, 467), which treats racism as purely ideological—a set of hierarchical divisions within a society based on widespread beliefs of that social collective about innate biological human difference. By contrast, Bonilla-Silva (1997, 469) argues that racism is rooted in social structures, such that “economic, political, social, and ideological levels are partially structured by the placement of actors in racial categories or races.” Likewise, members of TEDN frequently spoke about racism as existing in the structures, systems, and institutions of everyday life in New Orleans. In the following fieldnote excerpt from the “Take ‘Em Down NOLA Rally and March” on October 4, 2018, I paraphrase Kendra as she explains to tourists how they are complicit in a system that disadvantages New Orleans hospitality workers—a portion of the New Orleans working class that predominantly consists of women of color:
As we made our way back to Congo Square, Kendra decried the horrible treatment and living conditions of hospitality workers in New Orleans. She spoke directly to tourists, reminding them that they spend billions of dollars in New Orleans day-in and day-out, and the hospitality workers that break their backs serving the tourist industry don’t even make a livable wage.

Standing near the statue of Jean-Baptiste Le Moyne de Bienville at the end of the “Take Down White Supremacy Rally and March” on August 23, 2018, Kenney described oppression as a system and asserted that the only way to combat oppression is to build anti-oppressive systems. Later, returning to the Bienville monument at “Take ‘Em Down NOLA Rally and March” on October 4, 2018, Kenney reminded his audience that “we are still living in an oppressive system and we still have oppressive symbols hanging over our heads.”

Rather than simply fixating on the removal of white supremacist and Confederate symbols alone, organizers stressed that the discussion about monument removal is only the first step in dismantling racist systems. In the following fieldnote excerpt from the beginning of the “Take ‘Em Down NOLA Rally and March” on October 4, 2018, Kendra underlined the importance of starting with the removal of racist monuments to combat racial and economic injustices:

Kendra stood before us wearing a yellow, black, red, and green patterned head scarf, large brightly colored earrings in the shape of Africa, and a dark shade of maroon red lipstick. “Take ‘Em Down NOLA is about the removal of all symbols to white supremacy as part of a much necessary struggle toward racial and economic justice,” she spoke and then paused momentarily. “People tend to forget that last part—‘as a much necessary struggle toward racial and economic justice.’”

Likewise, while stationed near the Bienville monument at the “Take it to the Streets” rally and march on March 25, 2018, Kenney asserted that the Bienville monument represents “the blueprint” for centuries of global oppression, exploitation, and colonization of Black, Brown, and
Indigenous peoples. He further stated that by tearing down these symbols, we have begun to “tap at the core of white supremacy.” Thus, although organizers did consider these symbols a major threat to the project of social and racial equality, they regarded the statues as only the first pebble in the foothills of our nation’s craggy mountain of inequality.

In each of these analytical themes, I have focused on patterns that featured prominently in New Orleans grassroots discourse about monument removal during my fieldwork. The bits of speech that I observed at TEDN marches, meetings, and other events and which I have documented in this study raise important questions about the debate over monument removal. For example, how do symbols relate to social systems that maintain and reproduce economic, social, and racial inequality in New Orleans and beyond? As I have shown here, TEDN members viewed the monuments that we protested as vital to white supremacy. In fact, Kenney described these symbols as part of the “blueprint” of racism, the architectural plans of inequality drafted by powerful white colonials and plantation owners centuries ago which have been copied and modified only slightly by so called color-blind, modern-day, white capitalists. Furthermore, Kendra broadened the scope of discussion about monument removal to include “all symbols to white supremacy as part of a much necessary struggle toward racial and economic justice.” How does TEDN’s focus on all white supremacist symbols differ from other popular discussions and debates about monument removal, such as among the political and academic elite of New Orleans? Moreover, how different is TEDN’s goal of removing monuments to work toward “racial and economic justice” from the aims expressed in elite discussions about the same topic? In Chapter 5, I attempt to address these questions by analyzing stretches of discourse belonging to members of New Orleans’ political and academic elite.
Chapter 5. Critical Discourse Analysis of Political and Academic Texts

The discourse studied in this chapter belongs to three elite figures: Tulane Professor Richard Marksbury, New Orleans Mayor LaToya Cantrell, and former New Orleans Mayor Mitch Landrieu. Each of these stretches of speech emerge from different text types. In Marksbury’s case, I transcribed and analyzed an excerpt of his biographic lecture about a Confederate General. In Mayor Cantrell’s case, I study an interview between her and a journalist from the alternative New Orleans weekly paper, the Gambit. Finally, in Mitch Landrieu’s case, I study his speech about Confederate monuments, specifically the written text form of the speech which was published in his book, In the Shadow of Statues (2018).

As mentioned in Chapter 2, I have attempted to locate the texts in this analysis within their relevant social contexts. Through my ethnographic fieldwork with TEDN, I learned that these three figures (among several other elites in the local area) were often problematized by TEDN organizers. Members of TEDN regularly expressed contempt for these elites through pejorative nicknames. For example, at several marches, when Kenney spoke critically of Landrieu, he would conclude his denouncements with, “Mitch please!” (modifying ‘b#### please,’ a derogatory phrase commonly used to express one’s feelings of annoyance or disbelief about another’s actions, speech, or ideas)\(^\text{17}\). TEDN organizers, including Kenney, resented the way that Landrieu took credit for removing the Confederate monuments when Black New Orleanians have been organizing for a long time to take the monuments down. In fact, on the front page of the April 2, 1993 issue of the Loyola Maroon (the daily paper of Loyola University

\(^{17}\) In Section 5.8, I introduce another nickname that TEDN organizers used to denote Mayor LaToya Cantrell.
in New Orleans), there is a picture of Reverend Avery Alexander and others protesting to remove the Liberty Place monument when it still stood at the foot of Canal Street (Hyman 1993, 1). At the “Finish the Job” forum on June 28, 2018, Kendra described Marksbury as a thorn in the side of TEDN and mocked the way “he always tries to go toe-to-toe with Kenney.” As it turned out, Marksbury and Kenney had both debated the monument issue at several of the same city council meetings. By “showing up” and listening to the concerns of TEDN organizers I was able to get a glimpse of their daily struggles against the power elite in New Orleans. Therefore, my decision to analyze these texts was largely determined by the things that I heard and saw at TEDN events.

Below, I use the CDA approach to study political and academic texts about monument removal in New Orleans. In Chapter 2, I alluded to discourse as a window into relations of conflict and inequality. I also drew on the CDA literature (namely, van Dijk 1993a) to explain how elites use discourse as a mechanism of self-interested power preservation. Following this theoretical lineage, I argued that elites take advantage of their ownership over economic, political, and mass media resources as well as a vast number of discourse strategies to tap into the “public mind” and control dominant narratives about issues of race and inequality. Here, I explore how elite discourse is operating in the context of debates about monument removal by focusing primarily on the discursive strategies that politicians and academics used.

5.1. Contextualizing the Marksbury Text

Here, I analyze my transcription of an excerpt of Marksbury’s lecture given as part of the St. Bernard History Series in New Orleans, Louisiana (Marksbury 2017). Marksbury presented his lecture, “History of P.G.T. Beauregard,” at Nunez Community College in Chalmette, Louisiana, on November 13, 2017. Throughout the lecture, Marksbury focused on the biography of
Confederate General P.G.T. Beauregard. However, Marksbury’s lecture was more than a storytelling; indeed, he was taking a stance (Du Bois 2007).

I first came across the text in an email forwarded by my graduate committee professor, Dr. Helen Regis, at Louisiana State University. The message explained that there was an upcoming fundraiser event led by Dr. Richard Marksbury and sponsored by the Monumental Task Committee (MTC) and the Beauregard Monument Association (BMA). There was also a flyer\(^\text{18}\) attached to this email which carried information about the date, time, location, and admission for this event. The funds collected at this event would be used to support filing a lawsuit against City Park for allowing New Orleans to confiscate the Beauregard statue from City Park grounds. Admission was to be twenty-five dollars per person (although additional donations were encouraged), and as the flyer emphasized, “All tax-deductible donations will go specifically to this vital effort.” Lastly, the email message contained an attached weblink to Marksbury’s lecture. Although each of these texts (the email, the flyer, and the video) are valuable data, I will attend primarily to the transcribed audio of the video lecture\(^\text{19}\) in this paper.

I divide Marksbury’s lecture into five segments as follows: (1) biography; (2) reading; (3) stance; (4) questions; and (5) recruitment. In the “biography” section, Marksbury provides information about the early life and education of Beauregard. I call section (2) the “reading” portion because Marksbury reads directly from federal documents containing Beauregard’s war diaries. In section (3), Marksbury switches registers from giving the history of Beauregard to

\(^\text{18}\) Readers will find this flyer in Appendix F of this paper.

\(^\text{19}\) The transcript of this lecture can be found in Appendix A of this paper. I refer to it regularly throughout this section, and I invite readers to view the entire transcript prior to viewing the analysis. I also welcome readers to follow the link posted there to view the full video footage of Marksbury’s lecture.
forming a persuasive argument against the monument removals. In section (4), audience members ask questions and express their personal knowledge about the history of Beauregard. The video footage focuses entirely on Marksbury throughout his speech, never showing a glimpse of his audience, though their voices are audible. The video and the webpage in which it is embedded carry sparse information about Marksbury’s audience aside from what we can infer from the topic, timing, and location of his lecture. What we do know is that the lecture was given at Nunez Community College in St. Bernard Parish, so perhaps his audience members consisted of a mixed group of students and community members from the local area. We also know that this lecture took place on November 13, 2017, just a few months after the four monuments were removed from the New Orleans public landscape. In addition to the lecture’s timing and location, we know that, given the lecture’s focus on P.G.T. Beauregard’s biography, the attending audience likely had some vested interest both in historic narratives about Beauregard and in debates concerning the Confederate monuments. Finally, in section (5), Marksbury mentions the lawsuit against City Park and invites his audience to join in the fundraiser event. Again, these segments are impositions of the researcher, emerging from my own process of selecting and interpreting what is significant in the lecture. As far as I am aware, neither Marksbury nor the videographer divided the lecture in this way. Below, I will pay special attention to section (3), which I have transcribed, and which appears in Appendix A.

It is important, from a CDA standpoint, to critically study the discourse of figures like Marksbury who constitute the “symbolic elite” (van Dijk 1993a, 47). As a white male educator at
a prestigious private Southern university and someone who has strong ties with political elites\textsuperscript{20}, Marksbury has direct access to certain political resources and indirect power over the “public mind” through his influence over students (i.e., potential elites) (van Dijk 1993a, 47). Given Marksbury’s influence over others and his access to various monetary\textsuperscript{21} and political resources, I argue that he represents one of many stakeholders in the maintenance and perpetuation of his elite power (and, consequently, of inequality) via discourse (van Dijk 1992, 88).

5.2. Defining Stance, Intertextuality, and Disfluency

Marksbury’s lecture provides rich examples of stance-taking, intertextuality, and disfluency. I selected these three themes to focus on here because they featured prominently in my line-by-line analysis of Marksbury’s speech\textsuperscript{22}. Therefore, I have applied three frameworks in the analysis of this text, namely Du Bois’ (2007, 163) “stance triangle,” Fairclough’s (2014, 95) concept of intertextuality, and Cutting’s (2013, 158-160) analysis of disfluency arising in spoken discourse. Together, these three frameworks guide my analysis of stance in Marksbury’s speech.

John W. Du Bois (2007, 139) states that “[s]tance has the power to assign value to objects of interest, to position social actors with respect to those objects, to calibrate alignment between stancetakers, and to invoke presupposed systems of sociocultural value.” Moreover, he defines stance as “an act of evaluation owned by a social actor” (Du Bois 2007, 173; emphasis in original). Du Bois’ definition highlights three major components of stance: action, evaluation,
and ownership. Stance involves inter-action in the sense that speakers perform stance utterances in dialogic sequences with one another (Du Bois 2007, 173). Essential to the stance act is the speaker’s evaluation of some object, which is recognizable to other participants. Stance evaluations involve a process of meaning-making, “whereby a stancetaker orients to an object of stance and characterizes it as having some specific quality or value” (Du Bois 2007, 143). Evaluation, however, is only one of several possibilities in the stance-making process. Two other aspects of stance are significant as well: positioning and alignment. Broadly defined, positioning has to do with how a speaker becomes socially situated with respect to the stance that they have made (Du Bois 2007, 143). Alignment, on the other hand, is “the act of calibrating the relationship between two stances, and by implication between two stancetakers” (Du Bois 2007, 144). Together, these three processes—evaluation, positioning, and alignment—constitute the three sides of Du Bois’ (2007, 163) stance triangle. Finally, stance involves ownership in the sense that interlocutors hold one another accountable for the things they say and the stances they thereby take. Therefore, speakers must take stances responsibly, or as Du Bois (2007, 173) states, “If you take it, you own it.”

It is important to note that people do not take stances in the abstract; rather, stances are always contextually embedded (Du Bois 2007, 146). According to Du Bois (2007, 146), there are three contextual components that are necessary to locate if one wishes to interpret any given stance. First, the analyst must answer the question, “who is responsible for taking this stance?” This figure is the stancetaker (Du Bois 2007, 146-147). Then she must ask, what is the target of

23 See Figure 5 below.
stance in this context (Du Bois 2007, 147)? For example, if a speaker says, “that stuff is great,”
the analyst and the interlocutor must find out what “that stuff” refers to (Du Bois 2007, 148).
Whatever constitutes “that stuff” equals the object of stance (Du Bois 2007, 148). Finally, the
analyst must distinguish what relevant stances the stancetaker is responding to, or the
counterstance (Du Bois 2007, 149). Without any one of these constituents, the analyst’s
interpretation of stance will be partial at best.

The next important concept here is intertextuality. Intertexts are any relevant texts or
voices which may be incorporated into the text at hand (Fairclough 2014, 95). Closely related is
the concept of dialogicality, or “the extent that a stancetaker’s words derive from, and further
engage with, the words of those who have spoken before…” (Du Bois 2007, 140). Fairclough
(2014, 97) adds that speakers report these intertexts in different ways throughout their speech,
and he distinguishes four types of intertextual reporting, which I detail below. According to
Vološinov (1986, 115; emphasis in original), “Reported speech is speech within speech,
utterance within utterance, and at the same time also speech about speech, utterance about
utterance.” Therefore, intertextuality, and by extension reported speech, is both dialogic and
metalingual.

The first of Fairclough’s (2014, 97) speech reporting types, direct reporting, operates just
as it sounds: one interlocutor quotes another’s speech, “purportedly the actual words used” (e.g.,
Sharon said, “Take out the trash, dammit!”). Second, indirect reporting is when a speaker reports
the distillate of another speaker’s talk (e.g. He said he’d take out the trash). Third of these, free
indirect reporting, is more commonly found in literary writing and falls somewhere between
direct and indirect reporting, often as the reporting of one’s internal thoughts or feelings (e.g.
Sharon was turning red-violet. *He should have taken out the trash already*). Finally, in narrative reporting of speech acts, speakers often report only the sort of speech act made by another speaker, without providing the content of said speech act (e.g. She issued a command).

Furthermore, a speaker may choose to non-specifically attribute the talk of another speaker (Fairclough 2014, 96). In such a case, a speaker incorporates the content of another speaker’s talk, but without referencing the other speaker, or only vaguely referencing them²⁴. Each of these reporting styles become even more important when, for instance, the analyst and/or interlocutor(s) are attempting to discern the counterstance of a stancetaker.

The final analytic concept that I will mention here, disfluency, appears in several places throughout Marksbury’s speech, sometimes in large clusters. Cutting (2013, 158-160) outlines an array of spoken discourse features which can lead to disfluency. In the following, I will draw on Cutting’s (2013) study to identify various spoken discourse features as they increase the disfluency of Marksbury’s lecture. Although Cutting (2013, 158-160) does not explicitly define disfluency, she implies that it relates to the general difficulty a reader or listener may experience when attempting to make sense of a text that contains any number of these spoken discourse features. Each of these concepts—stance, intertextuality, and disfluency—come together in my analysis of Marksbury’s lecture speech, illuminating the processes of stance formation that he and his interlocutors engage. In what follows, I will provide my analysis of a portion of Marksbury’s speech, drawing on each of these concepts for support.

²⁴ I provide examples of this non-specific attribution in Section 5.14. In these examples, I coin the term “vague referents” to describe the ambiguous identities to which speakers non-specifically attribute utterances.
5.3. Stance-building in Marksbury’s Lecture

Starting from Du Bois’ (2007, 146) claim that a stance can only be fully realized by “contextualizing the utterance,” I distinguish three context components—stancetaker, object of stance, and counterstance—in Marksbury’s lecture. First, as the speaker, and therefore, the person responsible for stance acts, Marksbury is the stancetaker. Throughout the lecture, he focuses on the following themes: Beauregard’s story (in part 1 of the lecture; see also lines d-j), his military leadership (in parts 1 and 2 of the lecture), his political platform (in part 2 of the lecture; see also lines g-i and ii-jj), and his “native-ness” or “creole-ness” (in part 1 of the lecture; see also line e and mm). I consider all of this to be concerned with Beauregard’s public memory (i.e., how Beauregard is remembered and why he is commemorated). It is this public memory that appears to be the target of Marksbury’s stance utterances. Therefore, I identify Beauregard’s public memory as the object of stance. Finally, we must consider what Marksbury is responding to, or the counterstance.

This third task presents some difficulty, given the implicit character of counterstance in Marksbury’s speech. I identified only one instance where Marksbury explicitly engages with the counterstance in the text (see line a), as he states, “And going down to taking down monuments.” The reference here is somewhat oblique. Nevertheless, his statement implies that he is responding to the recent monument removals that occurred in New Orleans. There are other instances where he implicitly mentions the monument removals, but listeners must bend their ears to hear them. For instance, in lines d-j of the text, he says, “And his story…deserves soome credit.” But one may feel inclined to question what exactly is this “credit” that Marksbury speaks of. The next line provides some clarification. In line k of the text, he follows up with “Maybe
just a little plaque or something out there.” However, Marksbury seems to undercut his full aims with this suggestion. The content of his fundraiser flyer certainly does not stop at plaques, but rather demands the re-erection of monuments, especially Beauregard’s. Furthermore, the purpose and title of his lecture, “History of P.G.T. Beauregard,” as well as the overall purpose of his fundraiser (to sue City Park for allowing the statue’s removal) suggest that Marksbury is asking for much more than “[m]aybe just a little plaque or something out there.” Therefore, in this context, talk in favor of monument removal represents the counterstance to which Marksbury is responding.

5.4. Reporting Intertext in Marksbury’s Lecture

Marksbury reports intertext on multiple occasions in his lecture. For example, in lines u-x of the text, Marksbury provides a narrative report of a speech act:

Notwithstanding, in federal court though. Some group submitted an abicus (sic.)—ap uh [not abus]—Whatever, uh, a brief [you know] that he had. And that wasn’t—>that really wasn’t true.

I classify this case as a narrative report of a speech act because Marksbury reports the kind of speech act (“Some group submitted an abicus”) without stating the content (i.e., what the “abicus” was about). Here he is referring to an amicus curiae brief. The mispronunciation of the target word and the jumbled nature of Marksbury’s phrasing exhibits disfluency, making the meaning of his utterance somewhat difficult to grasp. However, given the antecedent context of this utterance (lines l-t), we know that Marksbury is making a defense for P.G.T. Beauregard by

25 See Appendix F.

26 I address this point further in Section 5.6.
denying that he ever held slaves. Furthermore, we can see that Marksbury is choosing to non-specifically attribute this utterance (“Some group submitted an abicus”) (Fairclough 2014, 96). From the context that Marksbury provides, we cannot know exactly who “Some group” denotes, although we can assume that the group is in favor of replacing the monument. The combination of these elements in Marksbury’s lecture—including the narrative report of a speech act, the general ambiguity, the disfluency of his utterances, and his way of non-specifically attributing the act of submitting an amicus brief to “Some group”—conspires to present interpretive challenges for the reader. What is apparent from the text is that his narrative report of a speech act is operating to silence the fact that there actually was any worthy contrasting evidence against his claim that P.G.T. Beauregard never owned slaves. It is almost as if Marksbury is saying that “Some group” had evidence which contradicted his stated position, ‘but that’s neither here nor there.’

In another case, he combines narrative reporting and indirect reporting styles (see lines dd-hh). This utterance is informed by the context which he provides several lines prior (lines d-i) where he discusses Beauregard’s supposed liberal political platform following the Civil War. According to Marksbury, “When he [Beauregard] put that platform forward he got trashed in the South.” (lines y-z). The narrative report follows, then, when he says, “And he wrote a response—[his] response was fantastic…” (line dd). Here again, Marksbury is reporting the kind of speech act (“he wrote a response”) without immediately providing any content for that response. He does, however, take a highly positive stance on this reported speech act which he describes as “fantastic.” In doing so, he makes an evaluation on a stance object (i.e., Beauregard’s response to his critics), and thereby positions himself as admiring Beauregard’s writing competencies, finally
aligning himself with Beauregard (and, by extension, Beauregard’s supporters; see “The Stance Triangle” in [Du Bois 2007, 163]). Marksbury’s indirect report is in lines gg-hh, where he cites Beauregard as “[s]aying [you know] these are human beings we’re talking about. I mean, this is—isn’t where we are anymore.” Here, Marksbury is paraphrasing the written response that Beauregard made to his critics, rather than directly quoting him.

This entire utterance described above (in lines y-hh) qualifies as a stance act, especially when it is placed in the context of the rest of Marksbury’s speech. That Beauregard turned over a new leaf, so to speak, by taking on a liberal political platform after the Civil War (lines g-j); that he was an eloquent writer (lines ii-jj); that he was a supposed humanist (lines gg-hh); and that he was a clever West Point graduate and Civil War General27 are all pieces of evidence that Marksbury brings forth to present Beauregard in a positive light. To build this defense for Beauregard, Marksbury uses various forms of reported speech. In evaluating Beauregard’s actions following the Civil War as redeemable, and Beauregard himself as defensible, Marksbury positions himself as honoring Beauregard’s memory, and thus aligns himself with Beauregard and other pro-Beauregardians (Du Bois 2007, 163).

5.5. Viewing Marksbury’s Lecture through Du Bois’ Stance Triangle

In Figure 5 below, I demonstrate the process of stance formation that occurs in Marksbury’s lecture. In this triangle, stance goes both ways (i.e., between Marksbury and the audience). Du Bois (2007, 163; emphasis in original) summarizes the stance triangle as follows: “I evaluate something, and thereby position myself, and thereby align with you.” This is exactly what occurs

27 Marksbury focuses on this in the “biography” and “reading” segments of his lecture.
in Marksbury’s lecture. Marksbury evaluates his object of stance (i.e., Beauregard’s public memory) by saying that it is worth preserving (e.g. in lines d-j, “And his story…deserves soome credit”). As such, he positions himself as anti-removal in relation to the removal of Confederate monuments (e.g. in line a, “And going down to taking down monuments”).

Thus, he aligns with fellow pro-Beauregardians and pro-Confederates. In the “questions” segment of Marksbury’s lecture, members of Marksbury’s audience agree that Beauregard’s public memory is worthy of preservation. One audience member provides a lengthy narrative about Beauregard’s impact on the developments of the New Orleans trolley-car and another
audience member states his opinion that Beauregard’s association with the Louisiana lottery system is “interesting.” With each positive evaluation of Beauregard’s public memory, the audience members position themselves as anti-removal, thus aligning with Marksbury (and other pro-Beauregardians).

5.6. Mind running that by me again? Disfluency in Marksbury’s Lecture

In the following, I draw from Cutting’s (2013, 158-160) analysis of spoken discourse features as they relate to disfluency. Marksbury’s discussion of Beauregard is permeated by spoken discourse features that increase the disfluency of his message. The high degree of disfluency is surprising, given that Marksbury’s profession as a university professor presumably involves extensive public speaking. Although examples of disfluency abound here, I do not attend to them all. Rather, I focus on a few instances that represent regularities in the text.

In line 11, Marksbury persuades his audience that “[Beauregard] really was a special person.” There are three spoken discourse features which lead to disfluency in this instance. First, Marksbury uses repetition when he says, “He really was a—he really was a…” This spoken discourse feature seems straightforward; repetition occurs when speakers repeat a phrase two or more times consecutively before continuing with the remainder of their utterance. Following this repetition, he uses basic adjectives and general nouns to describe Beauregard as a “special person.” I identify similar patterns where Marksbury’s uses basic adjectives, general nouns, and general extenders in lines j-k to suggest that Beauregard “[d]eserves soooome credit” and “just a little plaque or something out there” (emphasis added). Each of these three spoken discourse features (i.e., basic adjectives, e.g., little; general nouns, e.g., something; and general extenders, e.g., some) can be summarized as “high-frequency” and “vague” or context-dependent
denotational devices commonly found in everyday language (Cutting 2013, 158). Consequently, Marksbury’s speech appears more colloquial than a conventional lecturing style.

Here and throughout the text, he does not embellish his lecturing style with flashy, multisyllabic, or scholarly jargon. We may consider that Marksbury is merely conscious of his audience. As I have mentioned above, it seems plausible that Marksbury is giving this lecture to a mixed audience of academics and non-academics. As such, he may not wish to appear snobbish and thereby lose his audience by inserting lengthy or overly complex lexical items in his voicing of this lecture. On the other hand, we should also consider that these same features lead to disfluency in Marksbury’s spoken discourse and may certainly present some interpretive challenges for his audience. This latter consideration (i.e., the presence of spoken discourse features in Marksbury’s speech which commonly lead to disfluency) contradicts the former (i.e., that Marksbury modified his speech to accommodate his audience).

The above examples, however, are mild in comparison to the disfluency that occurs from lines u-x. The following quote contains discourse markers1, basic adjectives2, general nouns3, recasting4, fillers and hedges5, general verbs6, and repetition7

*(Key: each disfluency feature listed above bears a superscript number that corresponds with their respective occurrence(s) in the text below [e.g., discourse markers1 → Notwithstanding1].)*

Notwithstanding1 in federal court though, some2 group3 submitted an abicus—ap4 uh5 [not abus4]—whatever1, uh5, a brief3 [you know5] that he had6. And that wasn’t—>that really wasn’t7 true.

---

28 Each of these spoken discourse features are defined in Cutting (2013, 158-160).
As we can see, this excerpt of Marksbury’s speech contains several chains of spoken discourse features which lead to disfluency. Earlier, I contextualized this utterance in relation to Marksbury’s defense of Beauregard, where he claims that Beauregard, himself, never owned a slave. Considering his consistent use of starts, stops, repeats, discourse markers, and context-dependent denotations, Marksbury’s ultimate message is rendered quite incomprehensible.

Upon closer inspection, we can see that Marksbury refers to an *amicus curiae* brief (“abicus—ap uh [not abus]—whatever, uh, a brief [you know] that he had.”) (lines v-w). “[T]hat he had” (line w) includes a general verb, “had,” which is “empty-semantically” and context-dependent (Cutting 2013, 158). Without a firm grasp of the prior context of Marksbury’s speech, it becomes exceedingly difficult to decipher what exactly he means by “some group submitted an abicus (sic.)…brief…*that he had*” (emphasis added). However, Marksbury’s declaration that Beauregard was never a slave-owner (lines m-t) is just the context that we need to make sense of the general verb in, “that he had.” (line w). Marksbury provides that, in contrast to his own claims, “some group submitted” an *amicus* brief in federal court which stated that Beauregard did, in fact, own slaves (“that he had”). This admission is quickly withdrawn, however, when Marksbury says (in line x), “And that wasn’t—*>that really wasn’t true.*” With this bald attribution of falsehood to an oppositional claim of Beauregard’s slave-holding past, Marksbury effectively waves away the possibility that Beauregard ever held slaves, as if there never was any *actual* evidence to prove otherwise. Marksbury never explains why this *amicus* brief “really wasn’t true”; the implication is that he is the expert, and we ought to just take his word for it.

How can we state with certainty that Marksbury’s audience received this lecture as disfluent? Perhaps if an audience member expressed confusion about one or more of
Marksbury’s propositions (e.g., if they said, ‘Would you mind repeating what you said about…I didn’t quite catch that.’), then the audience member’s question(s) would support my claim that Marksbury’s speech was disfluent. I did not identify any such example from the video recording of Marksbury’s lecture. Negative evidence does not, however, exclude the possibility that some audience members experienced confusion due to the disfluency in Marksbury’s speech.

Video and audio recordings (like transcriptions) are potentially deceptive bits of data which, if studied uncritically, may be taken at face-value as concrete representations of objective fact. These recordings, however, are interpretive and selective from the start since they present some aspects of a scene while neglecting other elements which may be expanded to infinity (Cook 1990, 1). Although Marksbury’s audience may have clearly understood each of his propositions, it is equally possible that audience members approached Marksbury with questions after the video camera stopped recording or even emailed him with questions days after the event (e.g., because they were shy; because they did not want their voice to appear on a recording; because they forgot their question; and an infinite list of other possibilities). Due to the finite characteristics of video recording technologies, I cannot ascertain whether audience members later approached Marksbury with questions about his meaning in particular utterances.

Therefore, I am primarily relying on Cutting’s (2013, 158-160) discussion of spoken discourse features to support what I interpret to be disfluency in Marksbury’s lecture. That said, Marksbury’s speech is brimming with spoken discourse features that are associated with disfluency. Therefore, I assume the likelihood that audience members similarly struggled to comprehend several of Marksbury’s utterances.
5.7. Discussion of Marksbury Lecture Analysis

In closing, I offer three main points. First, talk cannot be categorized simply as either formal or informal. Cutting (2013, 160) argues that, although previously thought to only occur in unplanned speech, disfluent features can be identified in all spoken discourse styles. Throughout Marksbury’s speech, he shifts between semi-planned, semi-scripted, and scripted spoken discourse styles (Cutting 2013, 156-157). All throughout his speech, Marksbury uses spoken discourse features which lead to disfluency.

Second, talk is dialogic and intertextual. Marksbury draws from a variety of intertexts in his lecture to support his stance concerning Beauregard and monument removal. These intertexts and Marksbury’s own speech are co-dependent. They work together to build a defense for P.G.T. Beauregard’s reputation and to make a persuasive argument against the removal of Confederate monuments (especially Beauregard’s statue). Therefore, both Marksbury and the intertext dialogically shape his argument in favor of re-erecting Beauregard’s statue.

Finally, talk is political. In this case, Marksbury’s lecture operates as a vehicle for his stance acts, and his audience appears to be persuaded by (and thus, aligned with) him. It is important to note here that the audience constitutes a part of the public sphere. As such, they hold some power to affect the public landscape (e.g., they may vote in favor of re-erecting monuments; donate funds to file a lawsuit against City Park; organize public actions in favor of monument re-erection; and distribute information by word of mouth and social media.

Conversely, audience members who disagree with Marksbury’s message may challenge his narrative by voting, donating money to other grassroots organizations, organizing public actions, and so on). Paraphrasing Habermas, Fairclough (2014, 95) calls the public sphere “a zone of
connection between social systems and the ‘lifeworld,’ the domain of everyday living, in which people can deliberate on matters of social and political concern as citizens and, in principle, influence policy decisions.” Therefore, Marksbury’s talk is political in the sense that it functions, at least in part, to influence the “public mind” (van Dijk 1993a, 45). Stance plays a fundamental role in this final point. Through stance acts, Marksbury aligns with his audience and opens the floor (in the “questions” section of his lecture) for the audience to take their stance on Beauregard’s public memory, and thereby position themselves as anti-removal, and thereby align with Marksbury (Du Bois 2007, 163).

5.8. Mayor Cantrell’s Interview as a Case Study of Indirection in Discourse

Here, I treat a Gambit journalist’s interview with New Orleans Mayor LaToya Cantrell as an instance of indirection in political discourse. I define indirection, roughly, as a dialogic encounter, whereby one or more speakers craft oblique or ambiguous utterances such that their interlocutors must sift through multiple potential meanings to arrive at the intended meaning. My definition, however, is limited in scope to the case study at hand. There are other perspectives of indirection that deserve further explanation.

Cantrell’s interview contains salient examples of indirection, especially where she uses the phrase, “those who care,” to characterize an all-white ad hoc Monument Relocation Committee (MRC). Cantrell’s use of indirect speech indicates that the topic of her interview involves “difficulty” or is potentially face-threatening, and therefore requires significant maneuvering (Obeng 1994, 42; Obeng 1997, 51-52). In recent years, the debate over Confederate monuments has become increasingly volatile and polarizing, even deadly, as discussed in the
introduction. As such, Mayor Cantrell is navigating an extremely touchy subject in this interview.

Some of readers of this interview have recognized Cantrell’s statements as ambiguous and have publicly addressed her indirection. As I observed at the “Finish the Job” forum on June 28, 2018, Cantrell’s stance on the issue of monument removal has even earned her the nickname of LaToya “Can’t-Tell” among members of TEDN. According to Kenney, Mayor Cantrell earned this nickname for “straddling the fence” and failing to clearly maintain her position on the matter. This nickname is significant because it indexes a public dialogue amongst the New Orleans activist community about the stances of local elites relative to monument removal debates. By fashioning critical nicknames for elites, like Cantrell, TEDN organizers express their reactions to and their grievances about the indirect discourse that elites use to disguise their positions in these disputes.

At that same forum (“Finish the Job”), TEDN leader Stewart called the mayor’s relationship with the MRC “a betrayal” and “a victory for white supremacy.” “As far as she is concerned,” he continued, “she wants to meet with people who care about the monuments…But, what does she mean by care?” Indeed, this very question led me to the present analysis. Stewart recognized that the Mayor’s use of “care” was indirect. His question (“what does she mean by care?”) presupposes that “care” may denote multiple distinct meanings. Stewart’s question, therefore, implies that Cantrell says more than she is ‘letting on’ when she uses the term “care” indirectly.

Finally, Cantrell’s indirection is also significant in that she aligns herself in relation to other social actors in this social milieu. By defining one very small and very white group of
people as those who are invested in this issue, what does the Mayor imply about who she is sharing her political influence with? On the other hand, what does her use of the term “care” imply about everyone else who holds an opinion on the matter? Furthermore, how should we interpret “care” in her responses? I aim to address these questions in the analysis below. For my analysis of the Mayor’s interview, I will focus on an excerpt of the text where she and the interviewer discuss her plans for the monuments that were removed in 2017. I will refer to this excerpt, located in Appendix B of this paper, throughout my analysis and I encourage readers to read the excerpt alongside my analysis.

5.9. Defining Indirection

Linguistic anthropologists and sociolinguists have theorized discursive indirection at great lengths. From their foundations, I sketch the following characteristics of indirection: ambiguous form, coded talk, active audience participation, stance, and strategy. Message form relates to “how something is said or, beyond that, staged.” (Brenneis 1986, 341). According to Brenneis (1987, 504-5), formal ambiguity is a primary characteristic of indirect speech. That is, speakers craft opaque or vague utterances, forcing audience members to sift through a multiplicity of potential, non-literal meanings that may, in fact, be contradictory. Brenneis (1986, 341) identifies the variety of indirection which relies on ambiguous form as “text-centered.” Fisher’s (1976) analysis of indirect speech in Barbados, what he calls “dropping remarks,” supports this emphasis on message form. Dropped remarks are strategic, “veiled” messages which speakers cleverly craft for an audience or audience member, especially in relation to a dispute of some kind (Fisher 1976, 227). In the case of Barbadian remark dropping, “ambiguity is not simply the accidental by-product of faulty communication, requiring corrective messages; ambiguity, rather,
is an integral part of the message form” (Fisher 1976, 238). The following example from Fisher (1976, 230) demonstrates how remark droppers strategically fashion ambiguous messages:

A young woman allowed it to be known around the village that she was hopeful of obtaining a long-term Canadian entrance visa. A neighborhood woman, with whom she had had several [heated arguments] over the years, announced within her hearing, “All dese people walkin’ ‘bout, braggin’ dat dey goin’ to Canada, but dey ain’t gone nowhere.”

The author of this dropped remark preserves the ambiguity of her message by framing the subject as “All these people” and by employing the third person plural pronoun “they.” As displayed in the example above, the woman’s use of third person plural pronouns was no accident. Rather, through this pronominal choice, she creates a social situation such that her remark is cancelable. That is, if the target overhearer (see below) of this message were to confront the remark dropper, the latter could simply deny that she was directing the message to the former at all. Therefore, ambiguity and plausible deniability are essential to dropped remarks, which represent a form of indirection.

Indirect messages often carry non-literal, sub-textual, and covert meanings (Brenneis 1986, 341) or codes. Codes refer to the metalingual function of everyday language whereby interlocutors replace taken-for-granted or unspoken social contexts with pithy descriptors. The metalingual aspect of codes is marked when one or more interlocutors express confusion or uncertainty about another interlocutor’s meaning behind an utterance, and thereby lead into a discussion about language (Jakobson 1960 [in Jaworski and Coupland 2014, 46]). For example, in Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets, Harry Potter learns about a swear word (“mudblood”) that his arch-nemesis, Draco Malfoy, uses to insult Hermione Granger (Rowling 1999, 115). An orphaned boy and a second-year student of magic who spent most of his young
life with non-magic humans, Harry is unfamiliar with the lexicon of the wizarding world. His friend, Ron Weasley, offers some clarification—"Mudblood’s a really foul name for someone who is Muggle-born—you know, non-magic parents" (Rowling 1999, 115). By explaining the coded term, “mudblood,” Ron informs Harry about the unspoken social hierarchy that partially structures everyday life in their magical society. Anticipating further confusion, Ron defines “Muggle-born” as those witches and wizards who are born by “non-magic parents” (Rowling 1999, 115). As demonstrated by this literary example, interlocutors use codes—often unknowingly—to convey information about unspoken or taken-for-granted social contexts in discourse. Therefore, indirect speech is *coded* in the sense that non-literal components of a speaker’s message signal interlocutors to “search for hidden meanings” (Brenneis 1986, 340).

In Brenneis’ (1987) studies of Caribbean and Fijian speech communities, he found that indirect speech was a pervasive and prized element of everyday talk. Although he acknowledged the ubiquity of indirection, he argued that the prevalence of indirection found in these regions relates to their common social structure, which he dubbed “embedded egalitarianism” (Brenneis 1987, 500). Embedded egalitarianism refers to societies “where egalitarian notions strongly inform local social life, but the face-to-face community is embedded within a larger stratified society” (Brenneis 1987, 500). According to Brenneis (1987, 499), “[t]alk in such communities rarely conveys explicitly what the speaker means; rather, listeners are left to draw their own conclusions and to respond as they will.” His observation conveys that (1) the social organization of a place influences the prevalence of indirection, and (2) that indirect talk invokes coded meanings, triggering audiences to engage in interpretive processes.
Audience participation is integral to the interpretation and construction of meaning in dialogue. As such, the requirements of indirection parallel those of a dialogue; that is, two or more people must be engaged to interact with one another and interpret each other’s utterances. For example, Morgan (2010, 285) notes that although a person may self-proclaim a “cool” status, such a proclamation carries little weight without the agreement of an audience. Similarly, Kiesling and Johnson (2010, 296) argue that meaning is neither determined by an “inherent grammar” nor by individuals, but rather by “the most likely interpretations” of a speech community. Duranti (1986, 243) encourages discourse analysts to approach discourse with a sensitivity to the “co-authorship” of audiences in processes of meaning production, “because every act of speaking is directed to and must be ratified by an audience.” In this way, speakers expect their audiences to have familiarity with the codes of indirection that they use. Of course, utterances may also be preserved (e.g., by voice recording) or reproduced (e.g., by other speakers) for later audiences to receive, interpret, and respond. These acts of preservation and reproduction allow for an utterance’s meaning to be determined by various audiences of a different time, place, and social orientation. Meaning, then, is co-constructed by all those engaged in dialogue, and even by those who may learn of these discursive encounters later.

Furthermore, talk is messy, full of starts, stops, stutters, stalls, and so on. To imagine dialogue as always occurring between an active speaker who imparts information to a passive listener is missing the point of a dialogue altogether. People conversationally construct meaning through innumerable possible acts, such as by nodding their head, blinking their eyes, blushing,
sighing, walking away, and more. None of these gestures involve speaking a single word, and yet they are all packed with meaning. Thus, to better grasp what is happening in a case of indirect speech, we must do away with binary conceptions of speaker/hearer relations. Brenneis (1986, 345) is critical of discourse analyses that treat audience members as passive recipients to active speakers. Rather, he argues that covert meanings draw audience members to actively engage in processes of interpretation. Therefore, researchers should approach language with an understanding that meanings are co-constructed by interlocutors in dialogue.

Audiences are not monolithic, but rather diverse groups of actors may be ensnared by indirect statements. Fisher (1976, 231-232) conceives of these interactions as triangular, whereby a “remark dropper” laterally casts their bait at a “sham receiver” (i.e., someone who may not be experiencing conflict with the speaker, and for whom the comment is not truly intended) while in the presence of a “target overhearer” (i.e., someone with whom the author of the message is experiencing conflict, and for whom the message is actually intended). In such an encounter, target overhearers—who supposedly know quite well that they are the target—are not necessarily free to respond at will. For, if the overhearer dares to retort, the remark dropper may counter with the Barbadian trope, “Whoever de cap (hat) fit, pull de string” (Fisher 1976, 234). A similar idiom goes, “If the shoe fits, wear it.”

Morgan (2010, 285) offers an even more complex view of audience as “witness.” Witnesses may or may not recognize a statement as indirect and they may choose to react to or ignore the utterance made. What matters is that “[audiences as witnesses] are prepared to interpret what someone means” (Morgan 2010, 285). Such was the case when Senator Joseph Biden and President George Bush separately complimented President Barack Obama for being
“articulate” (Morgan 2010, 287). Whereas critics fumed over the racist implicatures—that Black people are inarticulate, and that Obama is articulate for a Black guy—White House spokesman Tony Snow publicly defended Bush’s statement as being a well-intended, honest compliment (Morgan 2010, 287). Therefore, audience participation may vary depending on the social positioning of a witness and their ability to recognize some statement as indirect.

Brenneis (1986, 341) argues that, from the audience’s viewpoint, indirection “implies something about the speaker’s stance vis-à-vis his or her message.” 30 In other words, audience members can glean how and with whom a speaker aligns him- or herself in an indirect statement. Kiesling and Johnson (2010, 296) distinguish a variety of indirection which they call “stance indirection.” Speakers use stance indirection to variably align with their interlocutors, for example, by using conventionally distancing forms of speech to perform the exact opposite—sameness and solidarity. This form of indirection commonly appears in instances of bantering amongst fraternity brothers. For example, a fraternity brother may playfully cast insults at another brother when in the presence of a prospective brother (or “rushee”), to demonstrate the solidarity of their brotherhood (Kiesling and Johnson 2010, 303).

Scholars often describe indirection as a strategic speech act, generally involving politeness or impression management (or both). Morgan (2010, 285) defines indirection as a “predictable” and “indispensable” strategy for avoiding “hostile” or “taboo” topics of discussion. Similarly, Obeng (1994, 42; 1997, 52) refers to indirection as a politeness or face-saving strategy whereby speakers avoid “difficult” topics. Brenneis’ (1987, 499) describes indirection as a

---

30 For more on stance, see Du Bois 2007. Also, see my discussions of stance in Sections 5.2, 5.3, and 5.5.
strategic speech act that “may fulfill both personal intentions and societal needs.” Therefore, the concept of indirection as a strategy for maintaining politeness and avoiding face-threats is consistent throughout the literature.

5.10. “A victory for white supremacy”: Contextualizing Cantrell’s Interview

On May 7, 2018, LaToya Cantrell was inaugurated as the first African American female Mayor in the history of New Orleans (Litten 2018b). Near the end of May 2018, I learned about Mayor Cantrell’s engagements with the MRC, whose primary aim was to relocate three of the four contentious monuments (those of Confederate Generals Robert E. Lee and P.G.T. Beauregard and Confederate President Jefferson Davis) that had recently been removed from their pedestals in New Orleans (Litten 2018a). The MRC was comprised of an all-white group of seven constituents—Frank Stewart, Geary Mason, Mimi Owens, Richard Marksbury31, Charles Marsala, Pierre McGraw and Sally Reeves—each representing various historical societies and monument associations in New Orleans (DeBerry 2018; Litten 2018a). According to the Times-Picayune, the MRC meeting minutes obtained through a public records request show that, prior to her first day in office, Cantrell and the MRC had convened at least four times, and that the committee deliberately organized in secret (“The committee does not want the mayor to release the names of members of this committee…”) with no intention of including any additional or oppositional public input (“We unanimously believe that no new members should be added to the committee…”) (Litten 2018a).

31 Here we can see that Marksbury possesses not only “symbolic elite” power (van Dijk 1993a, 47), but also attains certain political and economic advantages through his associations with Cantrell and other MRC constituents. Also, we encountered Marksbury earlier in Sections 5.1-5.7.
Outraged by the Mayor’s ties with the MRC, TEDN organizers and other local activists planned a public forum to address Cantrell’s furtive dealings with the committee. The event, “Finish the Job,” took place at Café Istanbul in New Orleans on June 28, 2018. Mayor Cantrell was invited to attend this forum to speak on these issues alongside a handful of leading grassroots organizers in the New Orleans community; however, she never showed up. Organizers voiced their lack of surprise regarding Mayor Cantrell’s absence at the forum and criticized her relationship with the secret committee. As mentioned previously, this was the same event where Stewart called Cantrell’s engagements with the MRC a “victory for white supremacy” and asked the question, “But, what does she mean by ‘care’?” His question implies that Cantrell’s ambiguous use of the term, “care,” suggests a wide range of possible meanings. In the following analysis, I attempt to take a closer look at these conflicting relationships between people and between people and their utterances by deconstructing Mayor Cantrell’s indirect statements regarding “care.”

5.11. Who Cares? Deconstructing “Care” in Mayor Cantrell’s Interview

On April 2, 2018, a local alternative weekly newspaper, called the Gambit, interviewed Cantrell about her plans as the newly elected New Orleans Mayor (Allman 2018). The interview came just one month before Cantrell was inaugurated as New Orleans’ first Black female mayor. It is important to note that, this interview was transcribed and edited by journalist Kevin Allman of the Gambit, and therefore is not a verbatim recording of Mayor Cantrell’s responses. My transcription of this interview appears in Appendix B. A portion of the interview is dedicated to

32 In Section 5.8.
Mayor Cantrell’s plans for dealing with the Confederate monuments that were removed from New Orleans in 2017. In response to questions about the monuments, Mayor Cantrell makes oblique references to “people who care” about the monuments, stating that she wants to work with them to “develop a plan” (line 10). Throughout this segment of the interview, she refers to her collaborators once as “people that care about them” (line 7) once as “those who care about them” (line 27), twice as “people who care about them” (lines 10 and 17), and once as “people who care about them the most” (line 19). To be clear, “them” in each of these cases refers to displaced Confederate monuments. However, for some readers (such as the members of TEDN), two question may still linger: Who cares, exactly? And, what does the Mayor mean by “care”? I respond to these questions by critically analyzing cases in which the Mayor uses the term “care” to define a specific relation between a small enclave of all-white pro-Confederates and the four monuments that were removed from New Orleans in 2017.

My analysis begins with the interviewer’s first question regarding monuments. In response to the question, “What do you think should happen to the monuments?” (lines 4-5), Mayor Cantrell states (in lines 6-7), “I plan to work with the people that care about them.” She then offers an outline of the potential collaborators in this work (lines 7-11):

I’m going to work with the Monumental Task [Committee]. I’m going to work with the lieutenant governor. I’m going to work with Frank Stewart. They are going to put together a working group, and they will determine what that looks like. From there, develop a plan. I want the people who care about them to determine where they go.

Within this excerpt, and aside from wealthy New Orleans businessman, Frank Stewart, Mayor Cantrell does not reveal the names of anyone on the committee. Additionally, her use of the future tense here combined with other temporal signifiers implying futurity (such as “develop a
plan”) suggests that no one had made a concrete decision about these monuments at the time of speaking, and that everything was up in the air. Lastly, whereas Mayor Cantrell positions herself in first three sentences of this excerpt as directly engaged in this collaborative planning by using the first person singular pronoun (“I’m going to work with…”), she uses the third person plural pronoun in the second to last sentence to distance herself from this work (“They [Frank Stewart and the rest of the MRC] are going to put together a working group, and they [the working group] will determine what that looks like” [emphasis added]). It seems here that she will only “work with” this group of collaborators as far as it means giving them decision-making power over the re-erection of Confederate monuments.

Besides painting her collaborators as those who invest care in the monuments, she also uses third person plural pronouns to identify this group, including “they” (lines 9, 12, 13, 15, 26, and 28), “them” (lines 22 and 25), and “those” (line 27). Of notable interest is how she positions herself outside of this group. Not once does she use “we” or “us” to include herself among “those who care.” Rather, she consistently refers to herself in the first person singular (“I” or “me”) and to the “people who care” in the third person plural (“they”, “them”, “those”, etc.). Despite her pronominal choices, which imply a separation between herself and the people who care, she does take a clear stance of working with this group to “develop a plan” (lines 10 and 27-28).

Mayor Cantrell’s next statement (in lines 10-11) reveals what, exactly, this group of collaborators plan to do with the monuments: “I want the people who care about them to determine where they go.” Thus, according to the Mayor, the aim of this collective is to formulate plans and execute decisions concerning the relocation of these monuments. The Mayor also maintains a distanced relation to the decision-making process in this statement. Rather than
taking responsibility for the decision herself, she delegates this task to an indefinitely defined group of people.

In her next reference to this collaboration, I am drawn to the form of the message. Mayor Cantrell’s way of arranging her words leads readers to extract a rich set of extratextual and covert meanings (Brenneis 1986, 341) from this utterance:

Reverence, you know, matters. And I just think that the people who care about them—just like those who cared about taking them down, their voices were heard, and the statues came down—it should be the people who care about them the most deciding where they go (lines 16-19).

Mayor Cantrell takes a stance on the significance of these monuments by offering an evaluation; that is, “Reverence…matters.” With a sentiment both succinct and profound, the Mayor presupposes that the crux of the monument debate is about honoring historical figures (and not about racism or inequality, for example) and she builds a defense for people who wish to see these monuments re-erected, and thereby aligns herself with that group (Du Bois 2007, 163).

However, what is most salient about this utterance is her juxtaposition of “the people who care about them [monuments]” and “those who cared about taking them down” (lines 17-19). Cantrell’s tense usage is significant. When describing the people who Mayor Cantrell hopes to work with, she utters the present tense (“people who care” [lines 17 and 19, emphasis added]). In contrast, she uses the past perfect tense to classify people who oppose the monuments (“those who cared” [line 18, emphasis added]). Whereas the present tense suggests current and ongoing action, the perfect past tense signifies a finite and complete action that occurred once before. This tense variation, then, suggests that those in favor of the statues are currently actively engaged in caring about this problem, whereas their opponents have achieved satisfaction (“their
voices were heard, and the statues came down” [lines 18-19]) and have exited the conversation, no longer “caring” about the outcomes. Like in Labov’s (1972, 349) “minimax solution,” the Mayor squeezes a maximal meaning difference into a minimal shift in form (see also Sherzer 1987, 299). She does so by intricately modifying the morphology of “care” (i.e, by adding “d” to the end of “care” in “cared”), resulting in a tense difference, and by placing these two variations of “care” in close proximity to one another. Ultimately, the combination of her initial evaluation, variation in tense usage, and juxtaposition of those-who-[ongoingly]-care-about-the-monuments with those-who-[in the past]-cared-about-taking-them-down forms these two groups into a dichotomy, wherein the former care significantly about the monuments, while the latter only cared about them until their thirst for elimination of the monuments was quenched.

Cantrell’s final comment (in lines 27-28) to those invested in the monuments serves to summarize her previous claims: “So, my plan is to work with those who care about them and come up with a plan that I could support. And they will pay for it.” This statement shares two common themes with those above. First, Cantrell talks about her desire to give decision making power to people who she defines as caring for the monuments. Second, she positions herself as engaged in the collaborative effort (“my plan is to work with those who care” [emphasis added]) while also subtracting herself from the financial burdens (“they will pay for it” [emphasis added]). Thus, Mayor Cantrell performs a balancing act, walking the contradictory line between detached and collaborative engagement in the ambiguous act of determination.

5.12. Concerning Mayor Landrieu’s Speech about the Monuments

The final text that I have chosen for analysis is the written form of Mayor Mitch Landrieu’s speech about the removal of the three Confederate monuments and the Liberty Place obelisk
from the public landscape of New Orleans in 2017. The text, titled “Truth: Remarks on the Removal of Confederate Monuments in New Orleans,” is provided at the end of Landrieu’s (2018) book, In the Shadow of Statues: A White Southerner Confronts History. In his book, Landrieu (2018) narrates his and others’ journeys to getting the monuments removed, including details about his struggle to find a company with a crane that would agree to do the job, his own understandings and witnessing of racism in New Orleans from his childhood onward, and his conversations with friends, Wynton Marsalis and Terrence Blanchard. Each of these occurrences supposedly led to his enlightenment about the monuments and drove him to use his political influence to make the removal of the monuments a reality. Therefore, the speech that I analyze below is informed by Landrieu’s narrative struggle.

The speech text is not a verbatim representation of what Landrieu orated at Gallier Hall in New Orleans on Friday, May 19, 2017, but it is very close. As an additional disclaimer, the written text that I have selected does not permit me to include certain “paralinguistic cues” (Brown and Yule 1987, 4) (e.g., gesture, volume, intonation, pauses, breaths, and so on) in my analysis that would otherwise be available to the analyst studying a detailed transcript record of the speech as it was performed at Gallier Hall on May 19, 2017. I have chosen the written form of this text to analyze because I am more interested in the content of the text, especially its dialogic qualities, than the paralinguistic features of the spoken text. For the remainder of this chapter, I will refer to the present text analysis as “Landrieu’s written speech,” to distinguish it from that which he orated at Gallier Hall in New Orleans.

_____________________

33 Interested readers can view the entire orated version of the speech online at https://youtu.be/j81MkNgnXuY.
Mayor Mitch Landrieu’s speech about the four monuments removed in 2017 is highly intertextual. In many cases he reports the speech of others in a variety of formats. He especially makes use of direct, indirect, and narrative reports of speech acts. I am interested in how these reports operate in Landrieu’s speech and what the prominent effects of intertextuality are in this case.

While he creates a dialogue by drawing on other voices that either support or disagree with his propositions, Landrieu is also producing and performing different kinds of identities throughout his speech. According to Gee (2014, 144), multiple elements of discourse work together—such as intertextuality, prosody, a person’s dress, behavior, stance, and so on—to produce “socially situated identities.” These socially situated identities may be polyvocal, for example, when the president of the United States gives a speech while reading from a text authored by their speech writer (Gee 2014, 144). In such a case, two or more voices (those of the speech writers and that of the president) mesh together to form a singular complex of multiply situated identities. In fact, it is unclear whether Landrieu’s speech at Gallier Hall was written by himself, or by one or both of his speech writers, Sam Joel and Ryan Berni. Landrieu (2018, 211) acknowledges both speech writers for their efforts in authoring many of his speeches, but he does not clarify whether his written speech came as the result of his work alone or in collaboration with his speech writers. Therefore, we can assume the likelihood that this speech benefitted from Joel’s or Berni’s contributions, and therefore was inherently intertextual in its constitution.

34 I define these speech reporting types in Section 5.2.
All language, even the inner speech of an individual, is intertextual because individuals rely on the language of the speech communities that they belong to in order to understand phenomena (Vološinov 1986). “The individual consciousness is a social-ideological fact,” (Vološinov 1986, 12; emphasis in original), because that “[c]onsciousness takes shape and being in the material of signs created by an organized group in the process of its social intercourse” (Vološinov 1986, 13). Landrieu draws on the discourse of other social agents, displaced into his speech from their own spatio-temporal context, in order to produce a persuasive argument about monument removal. The language that Landrieu uses in this speech, therefore, is necessarily both social and intertextual.

Even beyond reporting the speech of others (whether explicitly or implicitly), Landrieu forms many of his utterances as a response or a denial, as though he anticipates the support or disagreement of his audience. As a result, he engages in dialogues with imaginary personalities. These segments of his speech flow seamlessly with the rest of the text and, therefore, may appear unmarked to readers at first glance. However, his patterning of assertions followed by denials suggest that he is indeed responding to assertions made “elsewhere” (Fairclough 2014, 96). To whom is he responding? Given that Landrieu does not name his interlocutors, he is likely not directing his messages to a specified individual or group. Rather, he is recognizing and anticipating the thoughts, concerns, grievances, and so forth of a certain type of socially situated identity (Gee 2014, 150). That is, being aware of the ongoing conversations and debates about Confederate iconography in local and national discourses, Landrieu prepares his utterances in anticipation of the different sides that people commonly take on the issue (Gee 2014, 143).
Fairclough (1992, 270) posits that intertextuality is meaningfully productive, given that present texts “transform prior texts and restructure existing conventions…to generate new ones.” That is, speakers incorporate not only the utterances of others into new speech contexts, but also the ways in which others frame those utterances grammatically and stylistically in order to create new meanings. Gee (2014, 143) similarly defines intertextuality as the “cross-reference [of] another text or type of text.” I argue that, through drawing on others’ utterances and placing them outside of their supposed original context, Landrieu informs these utterances with new meaning to support his own persuasive arguments about the monuments.

5.13. Finding Intertextuality in Mayor Landrieu’s Written Speech

Throughout Landrieu’s written speech, I found countless examples of intertextuality. Intertextuality takes many different forms in his speech, but two of the most prominent forms involved intertextual reporting (Fairclough 2014, 97; Vološinov 1986) and patterns of assertion and denial which imply that Landrieu is responding to counterarguments from “elsewhere” (Fairclough 2014, 96). I have provided the entire, line-by-line transcript of this speech in Appendix C of this paper, and I will refer to this transcript throughout my analysis. For the sake of space, I will not address every instance of intertextuality in this analysis. Rather, I will focus on a few excerpts which are representative of regularities in the text: intertextual reporting and assertion/denial pairings.

35 I define intertextuality in Section 5.2.
5.14. Intertextual Reporting in Landrieu’s Speech

I identified a total of twenty-three intertextual reporting instances in Landrieu’s written speech. Nine of these instances are direct reports; six are indirect reports; and eight are narrative reports of a speech act. In fourteen of the total reporting instances, Landrieu cites the speech of powerful and celebrated men, including Presidents George W. Bush, Barack Obama, and Abraham Lincoln, Nelson Mandela, Martin Luther King, Jr., Confederate Vice President Alexander Stephens, and New Orleans jazz artists Wynton Marsalis and Terrence Blanchard.

In the remaining nine instances, he reports the speech of what I term vague referents—that is, social agents who are granted ownership of some utterance(s) by another speaker, but whose identity the speaker only vaguely or ambiguously represents in the context of the reported speech. Fairclough (2014, 96) similarly observes this type of reporting in cases where speakers non-specifically attribute utterances to vaguely defined personalities (and, in fact, my term, “vague referents,” aligns quite well with Fairclough’s observation)36. Landrieu refers to such vague referents as “people” (in line 26), “those self-appointed defenders of history” (in line 32), “Another friend” (in line 101), “We” (in line 158-162), and more. Landrieu attributes authorship to each of these vague referents, which presents the analyst and other readers with the interpretive challenge of determining who said what. In a few of these cases, he uses the passive voice to denote a vague referent. For instance, Landrieu uses the passive voice when he says, “One story told. One story forgotten or maybe even purposefully ignored.” (in lines 90-91). He fails to state the subject in this utterance; nevertheless, a subject is implied given his use of the

36 I consider Fairclough’s identification of non-specific attribution in Ch. 5.2.
perfect past tense verbs, “told,” “forgotten,” and “ignored.” Whoever did the telling, the
forgetting, and the ignoring is not represented in an associated prepositional phrase with ‘by.’ As
such, readers who normally perceive phenomena as rooted in causalities (i.e., things happen
because subjects make them happen) are left searching the text for a subject.

The first instance of reported speech that (1) occurs in the text and (2) I will consider here
is an indirect report (in lines 26-27). Just prior to this indirect report, Landrieu explains that there
are certain lesser-told “truths” that “we must confront” about the history of New Orleans (line
19), including narratives of slavery, racialized violence, lynching, and the legalization of
segregationist policies (lines 20-25). In the indirect report that follows, Landrieu distinguishes
between his and others’ definition of history: “So when people say to me that the monuments in
question are history, well, what I just described is real history as well, and it is the searing truth.”
Here, Landrieu attributes ownership of the sentiment “that the monuments in question are
history” to the vague referent, “people.” The identities of these “people” remain unclear;
however, what is clear from the content of the text is that Landrieu’s stance on history is
oppositional to theirs. Given that Landrieu cites the speech of vague referents, and that he
summarizes their utterances rather than directly quoting them, he may not have a specific group
of people in mind here. Alternatively, there may be a specific group that holds those opinions
and he just chooses not to name them. Yet another possibility is that he is commenting on a part
of the dominant narrative about the Confederate monuments with which he disagrees.

A few lines later, Landrieu uses a narrative report of a speech act to again criticize people
who claim that the monuments possess historic value (lines 32-33). He states that, “for those
self-appointed defenders of history and the monuments, they are eerily silent on what amounts to
this historical malfeasance, a lie by omission.” The vague referents represented in this narrative report of a speech act are notable firstly because of what Landrieu implies by calling them “self-appointed defenders of history.” The former part of that characterization implies that these people have not received recognition by the larger New Orleans community or anyone else, for that matter, as guardians of history, but rather, that they have proclaimed the title for themselves. As such, the former (“self-appointed”) and latter (“defenders of history”) parts of that characterization contradict, and even negate, each other.

Also notable is Landrieu’s use of the third-person plural pronouns “those” and “they.” For most of his speech, Landrieu prefers the first-person plural pronouns “we,” “our,” and “us,” especially when celebrating the unity and diversity of New Orleans or making appeals for an even more unified city. By contrast, the third-person plural pronouns, “those” and “they,” appear sparingly in Landrieu’s speech, and when they do, they refer to a group of people with whom he fundamentally disagrees. Therefore, Landrieu uses these third-person plural pronouns to demonstrate epistemological distance between himself and those who support the maintenance of these monuments, and by extension between pro-monument supporters and the rest of New Orleans residents.

Lastly, note how Landrieu reports not the speech of “those self-appointed defenders of history,” but the lack thereof (“they are eerily silent…”). Again, his characterization of this group’s speech act is meaningful. That he describes their silence as eerie suggests that it is undue or out of place—that there is silence where there should not be.

The first instance of direct reporting in Landrieu’s written speech appears near this portion of the text where he introduces his argument, that the Confederate monuments represent
a “historical malfeasance, a lie by omission.” Landrieu cites the speech of President George W. Bush and contextualizes it by informing readers that Bush made this pronouncement at the National Museum of African American History and Culture. The direct report of Bush’s speech reads as follows (in lines 37-39):

As President George W. Bush said at the dedication ceremony for the National Museum of African American History and Culture, “A great nation does not hide its history. It faces its flaws and corrects them.”

The textual proximity and similarity in content of this direct report with Landrieu’s previous argument about the Lost Cause icons representing a deliberately falsified and partial historical narrative of the antebellum and Civil War past suggest that he uses Bush’s quote here to support his own argument.

Something quite interesting is happening, then, since Landrieu has repurposed Bush’s quote to do supportive work in a different context than which Bush originally delivered it at the National Museum of African American History and Culture (NMAAHC). The implication here is that, like Bush, Landrieu is encouraging New Orleanians, and even all Americans, to join him in the struggle to “[face our flaws and [correct] them” (line 39) by removing these Confederate monuments. However, for those who view the monuments as representative of their history, or as bearing some general historic value for all (even if it is complex, imperfect, and by no means agreeable with their present values or understandings of how things should be), they might argue that Landrieu has done just the opposite of what he claims. Furthermore, given that Landrieu has removed Bush’s speech from its original context to prop up his own argument, one might wonder what sort of argument Bush was making when he arrived at this statement. At the dedication of the NMAAHC, Bush authored this utterance in praise of the museum’s founding as it signified
the nation’s “commitment to truth” (NMAAHС 2016). (So far, their arguments do parallel one another, since Landrieu regularly urges his audience to engage with the “truth” throughout his own speech). As an institution that preserves historic artifacts of African Americans and employs people to interpret those objects for guests, Bush was stating the significance of the museum as it aligns with this “commitment to truth.” As such, Bush initially produced this statement endorsing the NMAAHС as an institution that preserves and interprets historic objects with this “commitment to truth” in mind. Landrieu, however, issues Bush’s statement to support his own project of Confederate monument removal. Herein lies a contradiction. Whereas Bush produced this utterance in support of the preservation of historic objects, Landrieu has repurposed the quote in support of the removal of New Orleans’ Confederate monuments, which some (though, not all) consider to be historic artifacts.

Landrieu reports the same quotation (again as a direct report), within the same speech, but places it in a different context than before. Just before this direct report, he celebrates the vitality and diversity of New Orleans culture. “And yet,” says Landrieu, “we still seem to find so many excuses for not doing the right thing…remember President Bush’s words, ‘A great nation does not hide its history. It faces its flaws and corrects them.’” (lines 155-157). Here again, Landrieu demonstrates how intertextual reporting can generate totally new meanings out of an utterance that has been displaced from its original context and then recontextualized by another speaker (Fairclough 1992, 270). Whereas in Landrieu’s first citation of Bush’s quote, he was using the utterance to support his refutation of the Lost Cause version of history, in the second citation of the same quote, Landrieu draws on Bush’s speech to suggest that he has, in fact, faced
our nation’s flaws by authorizing the removal of Confederate monuments, and thereby he has shown us how to “[do] the right thing.” (line 155).

In some instances, two or more reporting types appear conjoined where Landrieu reports the speech of another. For example, in lines 77-87, Landrieu draws on a speech that President Barack Obama gave in 2016 about a slave auction block. In reporting Obama’s speech, Landrieu positions Obama’s argument as parallel to or echoing his own. Throughout his speech, Landrieu argues that the monuments in question represent a partial history, if not an outright lie. Therefore, in the context of Landrieu’s speech, Obama’s utterance supports Landrieu’s central argument about the monuments.

First, Landrieu makes an indirect report (in lines 77-78) when he says, “Last year, President Barack Obama echoed these sentiments about the need to contextualize and remember all our history.” In this excerpt, Landrieu indirectly summarizes Obama’s speech without using direct quotations. Immediately following this indirect report, Landrieu makes a narrative report of a speech act when he says, “He recalled a piece of stone…” (in line 79). Here Landrieu states the sort of speech act that Obama performed—recollection—without providing the content of the speech act itself. He does, however, contextualize this speech act further (as shown in lines 79-81) by informing the reader that the stone was slave auction block. As it turns out, the dominant narrative about this artifact holds that two powerful white men, Andrew Jackson and Henry Clay, once spoke from the auction block in 1830. This story silences and practically erases the history of thousands of slaves that were bought and sold there. Finally, Landrieu makes a direct report of Obama’s speech about the slave auction block (in lines 82-87): 
President Obama said, “Consider what this artifact tells us about history…on a stone where day after day for years, men and women…bound and bought and sold and bid like cattle on a stone worn down by the tragedy of over a thousand bare feet. For a long time the only thing we considered important, the singular thing we once chose to commemorate as history with a plaque were the unmemorable speeches of two powerful men.”

In this excerpt, the direct report contains quotation marks which suggest that Landrieu is reporting Obama’s exact words. It also includes typographic ellipses, implying that Landrieu left out parts of Obama’s utterance which he deemed irrelevant. Landrieu clearly ascribes authorship of the quote to Obama when he says, “President Obama said…”

Importantly, Landrieu grounds his reports of Obama’s utterances in the context of his own argument. Prior to issuing these reports, he makes critical statements of historical “fact” about the Confederacy, the Cult of the Lost Cause, and the monuments associated with them. These statements of fact support his central argument that the four monuments being removed told “a false narrative of our history” (line 73). He also summarizes Obama’s utterance in his indirect report (“Last year, President Barack Obama echoed these sentiments about the need to contextualize and remember all our history.” [in lines 77-78]), rather than choosing to let Obama’s utterance speak for itself. Lastly, Landrieu’s characterization of Obama’s speech act as echoing his own sentiments implies that the utterance’s ownership does not belong entirely to Obama, but rather to both Obama and Landrieu. Such a characterization is confusing, especially since, chronologically speaking, Obama performed this speech act a year prior to Landrieu’s speech at Gallier Hall. In fact, Obama spoke about the slave auction stone a year prior to the monument removals in New Orleans. That Landrieu implies some personal ownership over Obama’s speech (which was about a slave auction block, not Confederate monuments) is disorienting. Landrieu uses each of these techniques mentioned above to position Obama’s
speech as supportive of his own argument. Thus, Landrieu demonstrates—as he did twice with Bush’s statement from the dedication of the NMAAHC—the symbolically generative element of intertextuality in his speech by taking Obama’s statement out of its original speech act context and placing it in a new context (Fairclough 1992, 270).

5.15. Assertions and Denials

I identified five instances of patterned assertions followed by denials (and vice versa) in Landrieu’s written speech. In this section of the analysis, I will focus on two of the most prominent examples. The first instance of this patterning that I consider (and coincidentally, the first instance which appears in the text) occurs within a portion of the speech punctuated by statements of historic fact. Landrieu informs his audience of the monuments’ association with the Cult of the Lost Cause, a movement which he claims had the singular explicit goal “through monuments and through other means—to rewrite history to hide the truth which is that the Confederacy was on the wrong side of humanity.” (lines 47-49). The first instance of patterned assertion and denial occurs just a few lines later:

It is self-evident that these men did not fight for the United States of America, they fought against it. They may have been warriors, but in this cause they were not patriots. These statues are not just stone and metal. They are not just innocent remembrances of a benign history. These monuments purposefully celebrate a fictional, sanitized Confederacy; ignoring the death, ignoring the enslavement, and the terror that it actually stood for (lines 53-59).

As we can see in the excerpt above, Landrieu composes his speech using predictable patterns of assertions followed by denials (or some variation of that motif). Two components of this excerpt are striking. First, note Landrieu’s use of the third person plural pronouns in “these men,” “they fought against it,” “They may have been warriors,” “they were not patriots”, and so
forth. Landrieu has established this theme elsewhere in his speech, as I have mentioned above\textsuperscript{37}, especially where he uses third person plural pronouns to highlight the epistemological distance between himself and others. To be sure, “these men” (in line 53) refers to Confederates. It then follows that Landrieu’s use of third person plural pronouns is not incidental but deliberate here as well. Third personal plural pronouns, in this case, operate as an ‘othering’ mechanism, widening the chasm that extends between ‘us’ and ‘them.’

Secondly, consider how the content of Landrieu’s assertions and denials relate to the ongoing public (and private) conversations and debates that so commonly play out in our society’s day-to-day discussions of slavery, historic and contemporary forms of racism, the South, the Civil War, the Confederacy, the Lost Cause, and the monuments. Each of these utterances represent the stances that people take in their discursive boundary mappings of the past: ‘who did what,’ ‘how they were (un)justified/(dis)honorable in their cause,’ ‘listen, this is our heritage,’ and ‘don’t go there, please—you’re crossing the line.’ Many of us are quite familiar with these stances and the ‘sides’ they are associated with. In fact, readers can probably imagine all sorts of arguments that Landrieu is countering here: ‘But, they were American soldiers protecting their home and rights.’ \textit{(Landrieu: “They may have been warriors, but in this cause they were not patriots.” [lines 54-55])}; ‘What’s the big deal anyway? They’re just statues.’ \textit{(Landrieu: “These statues are not just stone and metal.” [line 56])}; ‘You can’t just go around cherry-picking the parts of history that you like and chunking out the rest. If you remove those statues, you’re erasing an important part of our past!’ \textit{(Landrieu: “They are not just innocent

\textsuperscript{37} In Section 5.14.}
remembrances of a benign history. These monuments purposefully celebrate a fictional, sanitized Confederacy.” [lines 57-58])…Landrieu’s statements are riddled with conflict. The text makes this conflict visible, allowing readers to disassemble it, consume each shred of argument, ponder, savor, and scrutinize every juicy morsel, finally digesting the larger *dialogic* whole. In short, Landrieu is engaging in a dialogue with other voices “elsewhere” (Fairclough 2014, 96). Of course, not all voices are being represented here—many are either being ignored or muted—rather the voices displayed here are those which come into direct conflict with Landrieu’s own reasoning.

The second instance of paired assertions and denials that I consider happens several lines later in the text. This portion of the speech buttresses a succession of rhetorical questions, whereby Landrieu asks his audience to reflect on how they might explain to a young African American girl that the statue of Robert E. Lee is supposed to make her feel hopeful, inspired, or empowered (lines 104-109). He states that, “We all know the answer to these very simple questions” (line 110) and pleads for his audience to have conviction about “what is right and what we must do.” (line 113). It is within this context of Landrieu’s appeals for garnering communal reflexivity that he states the following:

So relocating these Confederate monuments is *not* about taking something away from someone else. This is *not* about politics, this is not about blame or retaliation. This is *not* a naïve quest to solve all our problems at once. This is, however, about showing the whole world that we as a city and as a people are able to acknowledge, understand, reconcile, and most importantly, choose a better future for ourselves, making straight what has been crooked and making right what was wrong (lines 117-124).

Like before, Landrieu forms his statements in predictable turns of assertion and denial. Also, just as in the previous case, each strand of his utterance relates to different stances that people take in
the broader dialogue at the local and even national level about the monuments, what and whom they represent, and what ought to be done with them. Landrieu is not unbiased in his reactions to these lines of argumentation. One of the most obvious things that occurs in both instances of assertion/denial pairing is that Landrieu himself takes various stances by making evaluations of some stance object in each statement, thereby aligning himself with certain sides of the monument debate. 38

What sets this second instance of assertion/denial pairs from the first is that in the first example Landrieu makes evaluations about people of the past (Confederates and members of the Cult of the Lost Cause) and monuments, whereas in the second case he shifts his focus to the people and concerns of the present. Rather than extending his criticism of the actions of dead Confederates and their supporters, he addresses the present grievances and complaints that people have about the monument removals, including accusations of self-serving politicking, retaliation, and delusions about monument removal as a fix-all solution (lines 117-120).

Both excerpts are intertextual because they are built on the derivatives of people’s everyday discussions about monuments, public space, history, heritage, racism, and much more. Therefore, Landrieu’s utterances are constituted by cross-references to other texts. This effect is more implicit than in intertextual reporting because Landrieu is not prefacing each assertion or denial with, “Some people say…” or “They said…” Rather, his statements anticipate the sides that people take. His readiness to assert or deny any detail about the monuments or the people

38 I define stance in Section 5.2. See also (DuBois 2007).
associated with them implies that he has participated in enough conversations and debates about the monuments to the point that he presumes a range of stock arguments that people will make.

5.16. Intertextuality and “Orientation to Difference” in Landrieu’s Speech

Intertextuality is a complex discursive phenomenon, and in some cases, it involves the compounding of numerous different strategies and techniques. Some such strategies may involve the use of presupposition, metaphor, implicature, and so forth. Each of these strategies are important to consider, however, they bear less relevance for this current study. Although I found examples of each of these strategies in Landrieu’s speech, I have primarily attended to the text as intertextually constituted, exploring some effects of intertextuality as they are rendered by this speech event.

Though Landrieu does provide some context about the speakers that he cites (such as the occasions, locations, and/or timeline in which these utterances were spoken), he fails to inform his readers about the particulars of each speaker’s argument. As such, Landrieu decontextualizes and recontextualizes texts of powerful men, detaching their statements from their in situ arguments to support his own position in the monument removal debate. In each of these cases, Landrieu extracts the speech of others to transform their meanings and fill their utterances with new information in a different speech act. Thus, Landrieu’s written speech demonstrates how intertextuality is a symbolically generative process (Fairclough 1992, 270).

In addition to creating new meanings with recycled texts, Landrieu is also forming a dialogue with different ‘sides’ that commonly appear in day-to-day discussions about the monuments as he does with assertions and denials (see Section 5.15 above). Gee (2014, 143) uses the term “Conversation” with a capital “C” to denote the major discursive themes of any
specific issue that has been discussed at length amongst a group of people as well as the sides that people take in those debates. “To know about these Conversations is to know about the various sides one can take in debates about these issues and what sorts of people are usually on each side” (Gee 2014, 143). These Conversations are apparent in Landrieu’s pairings of assertions and denials. In each of these pairings, Landrieu takes either an affirmative or negative stance on the different sides that people negotiate in everyday discussions about the monuments. In doing so, he variably aligns with people who either share his views, remain indifferent about them, or disagree.

A final point about degrees of difference deserves exploring here. Difference features prominently in Landrieu’s speech about the monuments. Time and time again, he sets one group apart from another and highlights the differences between them, whether in his pronoun usage (“we/us” vs. “they/them”), his affirmations and rejections of certain sides of the monument debate, or in his statements of historic fact about the travesties and transgressions that one group enacted on another. Fairclough (2014, 93) refers to these discursive patterns as “orientation to difference.” People orient to difference when they negotiate the meaning(s) of some thing or phenomenon, institute or reinforce certain norms or moralities of engagement, and/or exhibit power, especially power over others (Fairclough 2014, 93).

Fairclough (2014, 93) further explains how speakers either maximize or minimize difference by choosing between strategies of intertextuality and assumption. On one hand, texts that are intertextual expand difference by allowing opportunities for multiple interpretations of an utterance, whereas on the other, texts that rely on assumptions narrow difference by “assuming common ground” (Fairclough 2014, 93). The high degree of intertextuality that I have
identified in Landrieu’s written speech would suggest that Landrieu is primarily orienting to a high degree of difference. But what assumptions does Landrieu rely on to craft his persuasive argument about the removal of Confederate monuments? As I have noted in my analysis of Landrieu’s reported speech acts, rather than placing the utterances of Bush and Obama in the full argumentative context with which they belong, Landrieu instead simplifies each of their statements before introducing them to his audience and frames them as parallel to or even echoing his own sentiments. As such, Landrieu assumes a “common ground” with both former presidents which precludes any inherent contradiction or possibility for multiple interpretations of these reported utterances. Ironically, there is a tension here between the intertextuality of Landrieu’s reported speech acts and the underlying assumptions that he uses to frame and neatly pack other’s statements into his own persuasive argument. Therefore, Landrieu is constantly rolling the dial back and forth, opening up difference here and shutting it out there.
Chapter 6. Concluding Remarks

In each of my analyses, the target speakers have attempted to persuade audiences to align with their particular viewpoint regarding the monuments under question and what should happen to them. Marksbury argues that “one size doesn’t fit all” (Appendix A, line b). He insists that P.G.T. Beauregard was unlike many other Confederate leaders in that he supposedly led a liberal political platform that stressed racial equality after the end of the Civil War. He then uses this supposed fact among others to support his evaluation of Beauregard as defensible and someone worth honoring with monuments and plaques. Mayor Cantrell claims that “Reverence…matters” (Appendix B, lines 16-17), and therefore, what happens to the monuments should be up to the discretion of “those who care about them.” However, she ambiguously defines “care” in this context, and by extension, her reference to “those who care” is unclear as well. Landrieu argues that these monuments are neither full representations of New Orleans’ past nor the sort of symbols that New Orleanians should be placing “on a pedestal” (Appendix C, lines 127-129). TEDN organizers argue that these and other monuments are symbols of white supremacy and, in fact, that white supremacy provides the very blueprint for the social and physical landscape on which New Orleans is built. They chant “Four was never enough!!” and “We can’t get no satisfaction/ ‘Till we take down Andrew Jackson!!” to establish a public dialogue about the white supremacist monuments that remain standing. They do not stop at monuments, however, because for each monument that commemorates a Confederate general, a white supremacist militia uprising, a wealthy plantation owner, or a European colonial, there are streets, parks, schools, and other public buildings that bear the names of these same figures. Thus, TEDN demands the removal of “all symbols to white supremacy from the landscape of New Orleans, as a much necessary part of the struggle toward racial and economic justice,” in the words of Kendra.
Beyond taking stances on monument removal, each of these public voices also make use of a range of linguistic strategies. Some of these figures share the same strategies. For example, Marksbury and Landrieu both use intertextual reporting styles, producing similar effects. In both cases, the speakers draw on the discourse of others to validate their own argumentation or evaluations about some object of stance. Likewise, Cantrell and Landrieu strategically use pronouns to convey messages about inclusivity and exclusivity. In Cantrell’s case, she only uses first person singular pronouns (e.g., “I” and “me”) to describe herself and third person plural pronouns (e.g., “they” and “those”) to index the MRC and “those who care.” She, therefore, presents herself as outside of that group just as she talks about collaborating with them by giving them decision-making power and financial responsibility over the re-erection of Confederate monuments. Landrieu uses pronouns in his speech to form “us” vs. “them” dichotomies, whereby he polarizes himself (and all who align with him) against people who support the retention of Confederate monuments. Both speakers orient to difference (Fairclough 2014, 93) by using pronouns to construct binarily opposing relationships in the popular imagination.

On the other hand, some strategies are unique to certain speakers. The other speakers that I have presented here hardly use indirect speech and juxtaposition to the extent that Cantrell does. Her speech is rife with semantic ambiguity, especially regarding her definitions of “care,” “people who care,” and “those who cared.” The lack of clarity surrounding her use of “care” to describe the situation concerning monuments is problematic for some, as I have demonstrated in TEDN organizers’ reactions to her interview responses. Evidently, “care” can mean many different things depending on who is using the term and in what way. However, in this case, Cantrell designates an all-white committee comprised of only seven members as those who
continually invest care in the issue of Confederate monuments, and therefore argues that only they should be making the decisions about what happens to the statues.

Some of the cases presented here may not necessarily qualify as strategies in the strict sense of some deliberate action involving intention, planning, or the careful manipulation of language. Rather, these speech patterns merely allow the speaker to frame their argument in a certain way, presuming and dismissing other potentially significant information as invalid or irrelevant. For example, Marksbury’s speech includes myriad spoken discourse features that increase the disfluency of his lecture. This disfluency becomes especially important when he denies that Beauregard was a slave-owner. In this segment of his lecture (lines 1-x), he mispronounces *amicus curiae* brief as “abicus,” repeats phrases before completing them, and uses vague and context-dependent verbs, nouns, and adjectives. He also refers to “Some group” that ostensibly brought forth evidence which supported the view of Beauregard as a slave-owner, only to brush it off by saying, “that wasn’t—that really wasn’t true” (lines u-x). As the expert on matters related to Beauregard, Marksbury assumes that we will simply accept his word, which discounts any alternative viewpoint as untrue. Although I cannot confirm that Marksbury intentionally made his speech disfluent, in the context of this lecture, disfluency functions to maintain a positive image of Beauregard, despite evidence which otherwise supports the view of Beauregard as a slave-owner.

I argue that speakers’ influence over the “public mind” (van Dijk 1993a, 45) and dominant narratives is what is most at stake in each of these cases. All of the figures discussed here have attempted to persuade their audience of something—either that P.G.T. Beauregard wasn’t as bad as other Confederates (Marksbury); or that “the people who care” about the
monuments should decide what happens to them (Cantrell); or that the monuments are at best a partial truth, and at worst “historical malfeasance, a lie by omission” (Landrieu); or that white supremacy extends far beyond these four Confederate monuments under question, and far beyond symbols themselves, permeating the social fabric of our nation (TEDN). In every instance, these speakers are appealing to an audience about their respective viewpoints. They make evaluations about and position themselves relative to their object of stance, and thereby align themselves with their audience (Du Bois 2007, 163). These stance acts create opportunities for audiences to align with, ignore, scrutinize, and critique the narratives espoused by elites and grassroots organizers. The success of each speaker depends heavily on the receptivity of their audience; how they respond or remain silent; how they agree or disagree; and how they offer or refuse their consent. Thus, speakers, especially elites, strategically form their utterances to obtain the support and consent of their audience.

In fact, this is a major point of divergence separating the discursive work of grassroots organizers and that of the elite. Elites (especially white elites) have special access to resources, may they be rank, wealth, knowledge, military power, executive power, judiciary power, religious power, global relations, the power to surveil and imprison people, the power to enact physical and structural violence against others, and more. They control human minds, actions, and relations by controlling policy and the mediation of information (van Dijk 1993a, 44-45). TEDN organizers did not have access to these special resources. Many of them were working class, Black, hospitality workers, artists, primary or secondary school educators, making very little pay, yet toiling to survive and combat inequality. In the following excerpt from the “Finish the Job” forum on June 28, 2018, Kendra’s characterization of the daily struggles that she
experienced as a member of the Black working-class community in New Orleans drives this point home:

The streetlight is out on my street...there are potholes all over my street...You [elites] find the money when you want to.

Therefore, whereas grassroots organizers, politicians, and academics in this study all worked to garner the support of audience members, elite politicians and academics wielded significantly more power to obtain people’s consent and manage their dissent.

As previously mentioned in Section 5.7, audience members make up a slice of the whole public sphere who possess voting rights, rights to organize publicly, and, potentially, wealth and influence that they are willing to distribute to affect policy and change public landscapes. It is in the best interest of elites to use their political and symbolic clout to influence these members of the public who will, in turn, support them. In this way, elites preserve their power using discursive strategies to define the social situation in a manner that will attract the support of the public. Recall that Cantrell used a seemingly positive term, “care,” to support her rationale for giving decision-making power to the MRC. However, her use of “care”—which may, in many contexts, be associated with inclusion, healing, fostering care, and the like—in this context when used to define a small group of other (white) elites is exclusionary to those who may not care or even “those who cared” differently. This example accounts for one out of many that I identified in this study demonstrating how elites used discursive strategies to control dominant narratives about the monument issue and thus influence the “public mind” (van Dijk 1993a, 45).
Chapter 7. Limitations, Reflections, and Future Directions

In closing, I want to reflect on how my findings were informed by my experiences with grassroots organizers and the hybrid methodology that I chose for this study. Recall how, in Section 2.2, I stated that my alignment with TEDN’s perspective affected my decisions to analyze certain texts using the CDA method while excluding others. This holds true to the extent that I drew heavily from the CDA literature to analyze elite discourse while, on the other hand, I used ethnographic methods to interpret TEDN’s discourse. Several factors contributed to this methodological stance. TEDN organizers and other closely associated organizers regularly spoke about Landrieu, Marksbury, and Cantrell in terms of their high status and access to certain economic and symbolic resources. For example, one organizer at the Finish the Job forum on June 28, 2018 referred to Mayor Cantrell as a “member of the oppressor class.” Characterizations such as this, in addition to CDA definitions of elite power, most certainly influenced my decisions to approach the discourse of Cantrell, Marksbury, and Landrieu in search of power differentials. Furthermore, given that CDA is a top-down approach to the study of power and inequality structures manifest in discourse, I felt that such an approach would be more appropriately directed toward the study of discourse belonging to Landrieu, Cantrell, and Marksbury than that of TEDN.

On the other hand, ethnographic methods enabled me to present a more experiential interpretation of TEDN’s discursive work. My ethnographic fieldnotes became a space for me to reflect on the immense obstacles facing TEDN, when, for instance, the names of Bienville, Jackson, and McDonogh—just to name a few—manifest in street signs, park signs, schools, and businesses throughout New Orleans. Ethnographic writing also led me to realize the significance
of certain organizational practices and decolonial perspectives that constitute parts of the core of TEDN organizing. I want to emphasize here that in no way am I claiming to be the expert on the work that TEDN does—I was the amateur at these marches. However, ethnography did give me a better feel for the central tenets of TEDN’s work and the challenges that they have experienced.

Another point to consider is how my methods were very much part of a particular social situation. Certain social boundaries circumscribed my ability to study TEDN’s discourse that did not exist for the elites that I studied. As stated above\(^{39}\), TEDN organizers were extremely wary about working with academics, like myself, who did not emerge in their social network organically, but rather who came from external institutions with questions about their organization. This general feeling of reluctance was hardened by recent incidences of spying on their organization. In my conversations with organizers, they generally approved of me taking notes on public events but were not keen on me using other recording devices or on reproducing quotes from private discussions in my writing. I sensed that any use of audio or video recording equipment on my part would be taken as an intrusion and possibly a betrayal, so I avoided them entirely and instead relied on my fieldnote jottings, my memory, and on videos of the marches that I accessed through Facebook. Elite discourse, however, was more open to analysis since two of the excerpts that I studied (from Marksbury and Cantrell) were publicly accessible and Landrieu’s speech was made available to me through an interlibrary loan. My unlimited access to these resources was yet another reason why I chose the CDA approach to study elite discourse.

\(^{39}\) See Section 3.1.
Using a hybrid methodology also enabled me to address a weakness in CDA research—i.e., context. Blommaert (2001) and Bucholtz (2001) both consider the use, abuse, and otherwise negligence of social context a major concern for current and future CDA analysts as well as anthropologists, more generally. Both authors suggest that combinations of ethnographic methods and CDA will help to mitigate some problems related to missing (or misused) context (Blommaert 2001, 26; Bucholtz 2001, 169). Therefore, I adopted the hybrid methodology of ethnography and CDA as a way of addressing weak points in the literature.

To recap, the current study was mostly limited in terms of my access to certain discourse types and in my ability to work collaboratively with grassroots organizers. Due to the extremely busy schedules of TEDN members and their reluctance to work with white academics, I was unable to conduct in-depth interviews with them, and therefore, I have primarily relied on data collected through participant observation. Likewise, I had high hopes for co-designing a collaborative ethnographic project with TEDN, but due to these aforementioned limitations as well as the time constraints and intense demands of graduate studies, this collaboration never came to fruition. In future applications of this and other studies, I hope to engage in collaborative efforts with the people that I write for and about. Lastly, aside from the discourse data that I accessed via the internet and library resources, I failed to gather other forms of valuable data (such as interview data) from elites. Such data might provide profound insight in a top-down approach to the study of elite power. However, gaining access to this data might come with its own set of challenges, given the strong likelihood that elites would not consent to participating in a study which seeks to expose their power and access to special resources.
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Appendix A. Marksbury Lecture Transcript

I invite readers to follow the link below to view the full video footage of Marksbury’s lecture:

http://lahighered.org/sbhl07-pgtbeauregard.html

Key:

[] = quietly spoken    italics = spoken with emphasis

(?) = unclear   > = accelerated speed

— = self-interruptions    [12:34] = time stamp

sooo = words lengthened for a moment  (-) = decreased volume

/\ = raised intonation    (+) = increased volume

/\ = lowered intonation

Marksbury:

a. And going down to taking down monuments  [24:22]

b. You know, one size doesn’t fit all.

c. [You know] everybody has a different story

d. And his story

e. As a native son

f. And somebody that worked on the mint and the customs house
g. Who had a platform for total integration

h. In the school system

i. And on public transportation

j. Deserves soome credit

k. Maybe just a little plaque or something out there.

l. Um, I tried, notwithstanding, a lot of information going(?) the other way

m. I can’t find one instance

n. Anywhere

o. That he ever purchased or sold a slave.

p. Ever.

q. >He was in the military his whole life.

r. His wife had slaves.

s. [His] father had slaves.

t. But he hadn’t ever(?) purchased or sold one.

u. Notwithstanding, in federal court though

v. Some group submitted an abicus (sic.)—ap uh [not abus]—

w. Whatever, uh, a brief [you know] that he had

x. And that wasn’t— >that really wasn’t true. [25:17]

y. (+) When he put that platform forward

z. He got trashed throughout the South

aa. Dallas, Montgomery, Birmingham, Richmond—

bb. Newspapers just leveled him with

cc. “How could you do this?”
dd. And he wrote a response—[his] response was fantastic—

ee. To all the papers.

ff. And they published him.

gg. Saying [you know], these are human beings we’re talking about.

hh. I mean, this is—isn’t where we are anymore.

ii. Again, his writings, back then—

jj. We didn’t accomplish almost for a hundred years later.

kk. And if people would take the time to learn that

ll. He really was a—he really was a special person.

mm. (+) The other thing probably is, [he’s] the—

nn. probably—the most famous American Creole.

oo. Period

pp. Period.

qq. (-) So, there’s all kinds of reasons [you know] for honoring him

rr. Uh, [as this] would’ve been hard to find out

ss. But, that’s uh, that’s my limited knowledge of Beauregard. [End][26: 08]
Appendix B. Cantrell Interview Transcript

The following is an excerpt from the Gambit interview with Mayor LaToya Cantrell. The full interview can be accessed here:


1. [Interviewer] The present mayor is on a book tour talking race and the Confederate monuments. The issue of race has been around for centuries, but the monuments issue is one that Mayor Mitch Landrieu has admitted he is leaving unresolved in terms of what ultimately happens to the statues that have been removed. What do you think should happen to the monuments?

2. [Mayor LaToya Cantrell] The monuments that have been taken down, I plan to work with the people that care about them. I’m going to work with the Monumental Task [Committee]. I’m going to work with the lieutenant governor. I’m going to work with Frank Stewart. They are going to put together a working group, and they will determine what that looks like. From there, develop a plan. I want the people who care about them to determine where they go.

3. They are not going to be re-erected, in terms of the spaces where they came down. They understand that. But I want [monument supporters] to ultimately decide. And they have some thoughts about — I think it’s Jefferson Davis and one other — going to Greenwood Cemetery. ... That is where the [Confederate] soldiers are. And it makes sense that if they wanted to put those [leaders] with their soldiers, I think it just makes sense. Reverence, you know, matters. And I just think that the people who care about them — just like
18. those who cared about taking them down, their voices were heard, and the statues came  
19. down — it should be the people who care about them the most deciding where they go.  
20. [Interviewer] Does that include the Battle of Liberty Place monument?  
21. [Cantrell] I think that the consensus with that is that it will not be re-erected, based on  
22. what I'm hearing from them. And that was consensus.  
23. [Interviewer] That one has no champions?  
24. [Cantrell] Yeah. I mean, that was across the board. It didn't have any champions. It didn't.  
25. And it sounds like, from what I've talked with them about, it still doesn't have a  
26. champion. They are mostly concerned about (Robert E.) Lee, (P.G.T.) Beauregard and  
27. (Jefferson) Davis. So, my plan is to work with those who care about them and come up  
28. with a plan that I could support. And they will pay for it.  
29. [Interviewer] Beyond the monuments, there is always a question of race. How do you see  
30. race relations in the city right now, and what do you think you can do as mayor to  
31. improve them?  
32. [Cantrell] I plan to address the issue of race by addressing the issue of equity. We know  
33. that disproportionately, African-Americans in this city have been impacted, whether it's  
34. through wages, transferable wealth, access to jobs that pay. The disparity study was just  
35. completed, and it's pretty straightforward. It would be me using that document to address  
36. equity in this city. And I think if you do that, then everyone will win. I think by focusing  
37. on the people and the needs of this city, that is how I plan to deal with race. If you give  
38. people a fair shake, I think everyone wins — and that is all races.
Appendix C. Landrieu Speech Transcript

The following is the researcher’s transcription of Mayor Landrieu’s speech located in the final section of his book, *In the Shadow of Statues: A White Southerner Confronts History* (Landrieu 2018, 217-227).


2. Gallier Hall

3. Friday, May 19, 2017

4. *Text from the Speech*

5. Thank you for coming.

6. The soul of our beloved city is deeply rooted in a history that has evolved over thousands of years; rooted in a diverse people who have been here together every step of the way—for both good and for ill.

7. It is a history that holds in its heart the stories of the Native Americans—the Choctaw, Houma Nation, the Chitimacha.

8. Of Hernando de Soto, Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle, the Acadians, the Isleños, the enslaved people from Senegambia, Free People of Color, the Haitians, the Germans, both the empires of France and Spain. The Italians, the Irish, the Cubans, the South and Central Americans, the Vietnamese and so many more.

9. You see—New Orleans is truly a city of many nations, a melting pot, a bubbling cauldron of many cultures.

10. There is no other place quite like it in the world that so eloquently exemplifies the uniquely American motto: *e pluribus unum*—out of many we are one.
19. But there are also other truths about our city that we must confront.
20. New Orleans was America’s largest slave market: a port where hundreds of thousands
21. of souls were brought, sold, and shipped up the Mississippi River to lives of forced
22. labor, of misery, of rape, of torture.
23. America was the place where nearly 4,000 of our fellow citizens were lynched, 540
24. alone in Louisiana; where the courts enshrined “separate but equal”; where the
25. Freedom Riders coming to New Orleans were beaten to a bloody pulp.
26. So when people say to me that the monuments in question are history, well, what I
27. just described is real history as well, and it is the searing truth.
28. And it immediately begs the questions; why there are no slave ship monuments, no
29. prominent markers on public land to remember the lynchings or the slave blocks;
30. nothing to remember this long chapter of our lives; the pain, the sacrifice, the
31. shame…all of it happening on the soil of New Orleans.
32. So for those self-appointed defenders of history and the monuments, they are eerily
33. silent on what amounts to this historical malfeasance, a lie by omission.
34. There is a difference between remembrance of history and reverence of it.
35. For America and New Orleans, it has been a long, winding road, marked by great
36. tragedy and great triumph. But we cannot be afraid of our truth.
37. As President George W. Bush said at the dedication ceremony for the National
38. Museum of African American History and Culture, “A great nation does not hide its
39. history. It faces its flaws and corrects them.”
40. So today I want to speak about why we chose to remove these four monuments to the
41. Lost Cause of the Confederacy, but also how and why this process can move us
42. toward healing and understanding of each other.

43. So, let’s start with the facts.

44. The historic record is clear, the Robert E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, and P.G.T.

45. Beauregard statues were not erected just to honor these men, but as part of the

46. movement that became known as the Cult of the Lost Cause.

47. This “cult” had one goal—through monuments and through other means—to rewrite

48. history to hide the truth, which is that the Confederacy

49. was on the wrong side of humanity.

50. First erected over 166 years after the founding of our city and 19 years after the end

51. of the Civil War, the monuments that we took down were meant to rebrand the

52. history of our city and the ideals of a defeated Confederacy.

53. It is self-evident that these men did not fight for the United States of America,

54. they fought against it. They may have been warriors,

55. but in this cause they were not patriots.

56. These statues are not just stone and metal.

57. They are not just innocent remembrances of a benign history.

58. These monuments purposefully celebrate a fictional, sanitized Confederacy;

59. ignoring the death, ignoring the enslavement, and the terror that it actually stood for.

60. After the Civil War, these statues were a part of that terrorism as much as a burning

61. cross on someone’s lawn; they were erected purposefully to send a strong message to

62. all who walked in their shadows about who was still in charge in this city.

63. Should you have further doubt about the true goals of the Confederacy, in the very

64. weeks before the war broke out, the vice president of the Confederacy Alexander
65. Stephens made it clear that the Confederate cause was about maintaining slavery and white supremacy.

66. He said in his now famous “corner-stone speech” that the Confederacy’s “corner-stone rests upon the great truth, that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery—subordination to the superior race—is his natural and normal condition.

67. This, our new government, is the first, in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth.”

68. Now, with these shocking words still ringing in your ears…

69. I want to try to gently peel from your hands the grip on a false narrative of our history that I think weakens us, and make straight a wrong turn we made many years ago—so we can more closely connect with integrity to the founding principles of our nation and forge a clearer and straighter path toward a better city and a more perfect union.

70. Last year, President Barack Obama echoed these sentiments about the need to contextualize and remember all our history.

71. He recalled a piece of stone, a slave auction block engraved with a marker commemorating a single moment in 1830 when Andrew Jackson and Henry Clay stood and spoke from it.

72. President Obama said, “Consider what this artifact tells us about history…on a stone where day after day for years, men and women…bound and bought and sold and bid like cattle on a stone worn down by the tragedy of over a thousand bare feet. For a long time the only thing we considered important, the singular thing we once chose to commemorate as history with a plaque were the unmemorable speeches of two powerful men.”
88. A piece of stone—one stone.

89. Both stories were history.

90. One story told.

91. One story forgotten or maybe even purposefully ignored.

92. As clear as it is for me today…for a long time, even though I grew up in one of New Orleans’s most diverse neighborhoods, even with my family’s long, proud history of fighting for civil rights…I must have passed by those monuments a million times without giving them a second thought.

96. So I am not judging anybody, I am not judging people. We all take our own journey on race. I just hope people listen like I did when my dear friend Wynton Marsalis helped me see the truth.

99. He asked me to think about all the people who have left New Orleans because of our exclusionary attitudes.

100. Another friend asked me to consider these four monuments from the perspective of an African American mother or father trying to explain to their fifth-grade daughter who Robert E. Lee is and why he stands atop of our beautiful city.

104. Can you do it?

105. Can you look into that young girl’s eyes and convince her that Robert E. Lee is there to encourage her?

107. Do you think she will feel inspired and hopeful by that story?

108. Do these monuments help her see a future with limitless potential? Have you ever thought that if her potential is limited, yours and mine are, too?

110. We all know the answer to these very simple questions.
When you look into this child’s eyes is the moment when the searing truth comes into focus for us. This is the moment when we know what is right and what we must do. We can’t walk away from this truth. And I knew that taking down the monuments was going to be tough, but you elected me to do the right thing, not the easy thing, and this is what that looks like. So relocating these Confederate monuments is not about taking something away from someone else. This is not about politics, this is not about blame or retaliation. This is not a naïve quest to solve all our problems at once. This is, however, about showing the whole world that we as a city and as a people are able to acknowledge, understand, reconcile, and most importantly, choose a better future for ourselves, making straight what has been crooked and making right what was wrong. Otherwise, we will continue to pay a price with discord, with division, and yes, with violence. To literally put the Confederacy on a pedestal in our most prominent places of honor is an inaccurate recitation of our full past, it is an affront to our present, and it is a bad prescription for our future. History cannot be changed. It cannot be moved like a statue. What is done is done. The Civil War is over, and the Confederacy lost and we are better for it. Surely we are far enough removed from this dark time to acknowledge that the
cause of the Confederacy was wrong.

And in the second decade of the twenty-first century, asking African Americans—or anyone else—to drive by property that they own occupied by reverential statues of men who fought to destroy the country and deny that person’s humanity seems perverse and absurd.

Centuries-old wounds are still raw because they never healed right in the first place.

Here is the essential truth: We are better together than we are apart.

Indivisibility is our essence.

Isn’t this the gift that the people of New Orleans have given to the world?

We radiate beauty and grace in our food, in our music, in our architecture,

in our joy of life, in our celebration of death; in everything that we do.

We gave the world this funky thing called jazz, the most uniquely American art form that is developed across the ages from different cultures.

Think about second lines, think about Mardi Gras, think about muffaletta, think about the Saints, gumbo, red beans and rice.

By God, just think.

All we hold dear is created by throwing everything in the pot; creating, producing something better; everything a product of our historic diversity.

We are proof that out of many we are one—and better for it!

Out of many we are one—and we really do love it!

And yet, we still seem to find so many excuses for not doing the right thing.

Again, remember President Bush’s words, “A great nation does not hide its
history. It faces its flaws and corrects them.”

We forget, we deny how much we really depend on each other,

how much we need each other.

We justify our silence and inaction by manufacturing noble causes

that marinate in historical denial.

We still find a way to say “wait,” not so fast,

but like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said, “Wait has almost always meant never.”

We can’t wait any longer. We need to change. And we need to change now.

No more waiting. This is not just about statues,

this is about our attitudes and behavior as well.

If we take these statues down and don’t change to become a more open and

inclusive society this would have all been in vain.

While some have driven by these monuments every day and either revered their

beauty or failed to see them at all, many of our neighbors and

fellow Americans see them very clearly.

Many are painfully aware of the long shadows their presence casts;

not only literally but figuratively.

And they clearly receive the message that the Confederacy and

the Cult of the Lost Cause intended to deliver.

Earlier this week, as the Cult of the Lost Cause statue of P.G.T. Beauregard

came down, world-renowned musician Terence Blanchard stood watch,

his wife, Robin, and their two beautiful daughters at their side.

Terence went to a high school on the edge of City Park named after one of
180. America’s greatest heroes and patriots, John F. Kennedy.

181. But to get there he had to pass by this monument to a man

182. who fought to deny him his humanity.

183. He said, “I’ve never looked at them as a source of pride…it’s always made me

184. feel as if they were put there by people who don’t respect us.”

185. “This is something I never thought I’d see in my lifetime.

186. It’s a sign that the world is changing.”

187. Yes, Terence, it is and it is long overdue.

188. Now is the time to send a new message to the next generation of New Orleanians

189. who can follow in Terence and Robin’s remarkable footsteps.

190. A message about the future, about the next three hundred years and beyond; let us

191. not miss this opportunity, New Orleans,

192. and let us help the rest of the country do the same.

193. Because now is the time for choosing.

194. Now is the time to actually make this the city we always should have been,

195. had we gotten it right in the first place.

196. We should stop for a moment and ask ourselves—at this point in our history—

197. after Katrina, after Rita, after Ike, after Gustav, after the national recession,

198. after the BP oil catastrophe, and after the tornado—if presented with the

199. opportunity to build monuments that told our story or to curate these particular

200. spaces…would these monuments be what we want the world to see?

201. Is this really our story?

202. We have not erased history; we are becoming part of the city’s history by righting
the wrong image these monuments represent and crafting a better, more complete
future for all our children and for future generations.

And unlike when these Confederate monuments were first erected as symbols of
white supremacy, we now have a chance to create not only new symbols,
but to do it together, as one people.

In our blessed land we all come to the table of democracy as equals.

We have to reaffirm our commitment to a future where each citizen is guaranteed
the uniquely American gifts of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That is what really makes America great, and today it is more important than ever
to hold fast to these values and together say a self-evident truth
that out of many we are one.

That is why today we reclaim these spaces for the United States of America.

Because we are one nation, not two;
indivisible with liberty and justice for all…not some.

We all are part of one nation, all pledges allegiance to one flag,
the flag of the United States of America.

And New Orleanians are in…all of the way.

It is in this union and in this truth that real patriotism is rooted and flourishes.
Instead of revering a four-year, brief historical aberration that was called
the Confederacy, we can celebrate all three hundred years of our rich,
diverse history as a place named New Orleans and set the tone
for the next three hundred years.

After decades of public debate, of anger, of anxiety, of anticipation,
of humiliation, and of frustration.

After public hearings and approvals from three separate community-led commissions.

After two robust public hearings and a 6-1 vote by the duly elected New Orleans City Council.

After review by thirteen different federal and state judges.

The full weight of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government has been brought to bear and the monuments in accordance with the law have been removed.

So now is the time to come together and heal and focus on our larger task.

Not only building new symbols, but making this city a beautiful manifestation of what is possible and what we as a people can become.

Let us remember what the once exiled, imprisoned, and now universally loved Nelson Mandela said after the fall of apartheid.

“If the pain has often been unbearable and the revelations shocking to all of us, it is because they indeed bring us the beginnings of a common understanding of what happened and a steady restoration of the nation’s humanity.”

So before we part let us again state the truth clearly.

The Confederacy was on the wrong side of history and humanity. It sought to tear apart our nation and subjugate our fellow Americans to slavery.

This is the history we should never forget and one that we should never again put on a pedestal to be revered.

As a community, we must recognize the significance
249. of removing New Orleans’s Confederate monuments.
250. It is our acknowledgment that now is the time to take stock of,
251. and then move past, a painful part of our history.
252. Anything less would render generations of courageous struggle
253. and soul-searching a truly lost cause.
254. Anything less would fall short of the immortal words of our greatest president,
255. Abraham Lincoln, who with an open heart and clarity of purpose called on us
256. today to unite as one people when he said:
257. “With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right
258. as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in,
259. to bind up the nation’s wounds…to do all which may achieve and cherish
260. a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.”
261. Thank you.

[End]
Appendix D. TEDN Research Proposal

24th August 2018

Jude’s Thesis Research Proposal Letter

Dear Friends in TEDN,

First and foremost, I want to thank each of you for treating me with warm hospitality since our first meeting. As a reminder, I am the master’s student from the Geography and Anthropology Department at LSU who has been attending TEDN events and researching issues related to monuments for several months now. Additionally, since November 2017, I have been doing volunteer research for TEDN at the LSU and Tulane archives on figures such as Sophie B. Wright, Don Esteban Miro, and Don Almonaster y Rojas. I am currently working on a thesis project that involves a critical study of elite political, media, and academic talk about monument related issues, and I would love to collaborate with you in this research.

Each of you have worked tirelessly in the streets, at City Council meetings, and more to “educate, agitate, and organize” the New Orleans community and to rid the city of all symbols to white supremacy. Despite your honorable efforts, Mitch Landrieu has exploited your work to advance his own career, and Mayor Cantrell has even stooped to colluding with white supremacists in order reverse the gains that you and many others have toiled for. Some academics have also supported this elite discourse such as Tulane professor and Monumental Task Committee member, Richard Marksbury. Therefore, my project proposal is inherently critical of academic as well as other forms of elite discourse that wield the power to influence popular discussions about monuments, race, “heritage” and history, etc. These reflections have led me to the following research questions: What patterns of racist speech (e.g. denials of racism, euphemisms) emerge from current political, media, and academic talk concerning racist monuments? How might these patterns be influencing popular discourse on monuments? And how are New Orleans-based grassroots organizations participating in and/or countering this discourse? My aim for this thesis research is to co-produce a study with TEDN that critically analyzes current political, media, and academic talk about monuments and that captures the amazing struggle that you have undertaken to challenge this racist discourse. To accomplish this goal, I would like to collaborate with members of TEDN to:

• produce a code of ethics for this project,
• attend and participate in TEDN meetings and related events,
• write journal notes on our discussions, thoughts, and observations (these will be available for you to see at your request),
• conduct recorded interviews,
• and consult with you on my thesis writings.

I realize that many of you have very busy schedules, and that I am asking a lot from you. Therefore, I am open to all suggestions about modifying the level of involvement of each participant as they desire. I will be as flexible as possible to work around your schedules. I plan
to interview with each participant at least once. Each interview will be recorded, and I expect they will last between 1½ to 2 hours. Besides interviews, I want to consult with participants to ensure that I am accurately representing your words, thoughts, feelings, goals, etc. in written products of this research. Furthermore, I will practice anonymity (unless desired otherwise by participants themselves) in all shareable products and to protect any private, sensitive, or potentially harmful information about TEDN and/or individual organizers.

As a researcher, I am required to apply through my university’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) in order to carry out research involving people. Each IRB is different, but they generally exist to ensure that the proposed research will meet the ethical standards of that institution. The IRB of Louisiana State University requires that I ask each project participant to sign a consent form. This form contains a brief project description as well as my contact information, my supervisor’s contact information, and contacts for the IRB. I will keep the signed copies, and I will give you a copy to keep for yourself. If at any time a participant chooses to withdraw from this project, I will respect their wishes.

Finally, I want to give back to TEDN for contributing to this research. One possibility that I have considered is to co-create a written product other than my thesis (may it be a small book, poster, blog entry, pamphlet, etc.). Such a product could include results from this research. In examining my sphere of influence, I could also arrange to give a presentation (other than my thesis defense) before students and professors in the Geography and Anthropology Department at LSU on the outcomes of this research. In this presentation, I hope to demonstrate the need for academics to be critical of academic speech that supports oppressive systems, like those which maintain racist symbols. Again, please feel free to give me your thoughts or suggestions on any of this. Thank you for your time and considerations, and I look forward to your feedback.

Best wishes,

Jude Bumgardner
Appendix E. AAA Statement on Ethics Review

Reason for Review:

The purpose of the following review is to provide an accessible and condensed form of the current AAA (American Anthropological Association) Statement of Ethics (SOE), of which, I hope will offer some helpful guidance when collaboratively constructing our (i.e., TEDN and myself) own ethical boundaries for this thesis project.

From the AAA Ethics Blog (AAA Web Admin 2012):

This blog entry was submitted by the AAA web administration and offers generalized statements of ethics that are meant to be broadly accessible. In the following, I will list the general ethical statements, provide a brief overview of the statements, and provide my own input on the statements where necessary.

1) “Do No Harm”
   a. Anthropologists should not only avoid harm of any sort (e.g., bodily, materially, emotionally, etc.) to their collaborators and consultants, but they should also seriously consider any potential unintended and/or enduring consequences that the research may have on participants.
   b. The AAA takes this quite seriously, and extends this point in the following:
      i. “When [research] conflicts with other responsibilities, this primary obligation [i.e., to “do no harm”] can supersede the goal of seeking new knowledge and can lead to decisions to not undertake or to discontinue a project.”
      ii. In other words, if I or any other members of this project feel at any point that the project presents potential for harm to participants, we can collectively decide to terminate it.
   c. Importantly, I, as an anthropologist, should not have full power to decide what is in the best interests of everyone. That decision should come from open and honest discussions among all members involved in the research.
   d. My critiques:
      i. “Do no harm” should not exclude “Doing some good” for members involved in the research. I believe that it is my responsibility to conduct research that is ethical, beneficial, and relevant to the people that I study with, and if possible, provide some sort of compensation (e.g., through services, monetary, etc.) for their commitment to this research.
      ii. That compensation, of course, should come as the result of a collective decision from participants in the research.

2) “Be Open and Honest Regarding Your Work”
   a. Conducting ethical research requires my full commitment to transparency and honesty about the purpose, methods, outcomes, and sponsors of my proposed research.
   b. This statement extends to all parts of the research process, not just those mentioned above.
3) “Obtain Informed Consent and Necessary Permissions”
   a. Voluntary and fully informed consent of participants is essential to conducting ethical research.
   b. Consent is not a singular, irreversible moment, but is a process and a dialogue, and participants can choose to withdraw or renegotiate their consent at any point in time.
   c. On my part, this minimally involves clearly informing all participants of the purpose, methods, outcomes, sponsors, potential impacts, and any conceivable consequences of this research and keeping open lines of communication with participants at every step in the research process.

4) “Weigh Competing Ethical Obligations Due Collaborators and Affected Parties”
   a. Anthropologists often have to weigh out a number of ethical obligations to different parties (i.e., the participants/collaborators of their research, the institution they work for, their funding sponsors, etc.) which may directly come into conflict with one another.
   b. That said, anthropologists’ primary obligations should be to the participants/collaborators of their research.
   c. It is also essential for the anthropologist to make these different ethical obligations, and the potential implications of weighing those obligations, apparent to research participants/collaborators from the start.
   d. As a graduate student researcher, I have professional ethical obligations first and foremost to the participants of my research, then to the institution I work for and study at (Louisiana State University), and otherwise to the Institutional Review Board of LSU, which I had to apply through to continue with this research. I am not being funded by any grant, scholarship, or fellowship agencies currently for this research, and all funds that I have used thus far and plan to use are my own earnings. Otherwise, the equipment that I may need (e.g. audio-visual recording) for this research can be accessed through LSU and will not require my own funds.

5) “Make Your Results Accessible”
   a. Just as I have primary ethical obligations to participants of my research, I also have obligations to both research participants and to the public to make the results of my research accessible and available “in a timely manner.”
   b. This obligation, however, does not override my primary ethical obligation to research participants. That is, if there are certain restrictions, limitations, or modifications (e.g. using pseudonyms and other alterations) that participants wish for me to include in the products to protect the identity and/or safety of research participants, I will respect those wishes.
   c. Furthermore, how the products of this research will look largely depends on dialogue between all research participants (myself included).

6) “Protect and Preserve Your Records”
   a. I have an obligation to ensure that data and other materials created throughout this research process are protected and well preserved.
b. This includes journal notes, recordings, names and pseudonyms, and any “raw data” that might be considered private (e.g., something not said over a megaphone in a public space, but in personal conversation or interview).

c. In this case, as in all others, my primary obligation is to the research participants. That said, all research participants should know that my research advisor (professor at LSU) does not have access to my journal notes but does regularly read and comment on writings that come from those notes (i.e. rough sketch writings for my thesis).

7) “Maintain Respectful and Ethical Professional Relationships”
   a. This statement is rather straightforward—researchers should conduct themselves in a respectful and supportive manner, and they should avoid and report any and all abusive, exploitive, exclusionary, and otherwise harmful behaviors or activities between themselves and research collaborators, colleagues, etc.
Appendix F. MTC and BMA Fundraiser Flyer

Help us secure a permanent home for the historic monuments removed by the city of New Orleans

The Monumental Task Committee and The Beauregard Monument Association

Invite you to an important fundraiser on Sunday, January 14, 2018

Where: Rock ‘n’ Bowl 3000 S. Carrollton Avenue
When: 12:00 pm to 3:00 pm

Join the fun and support our efforts to have the monuments re-erected in Orleans Parish. The current priority is the PGT Beauregard statue, but other monuments are also in question. All tax-deductible donations will go specifically to this vital effort.

Your donation includes: Parking, Lunch Buffet, Bowling and Cash Bar. Come watch the NFL Playoff Games (maybe the Saints) on the large screen!

Suggested admission is $25 per person (but please feel free to donate more). Pay at the door or pay in advance via PayPal (www.paypal.com) by donating to the following email:
Beauregardmonumentassoc@gmail.com
Cannot attend? – Please make a donation!
If you are able to attend, please RSVP! It is important for us to get a head count

Questions? Email us at info@monumentaltask.org
Appendix G. IRB Approval

ACTION ON EXEMPTION APPROVAL REQUEST

TO: Jude Bergamini
Geography and Anthropology

FROM: Dennis Landin
Chair, Institutional Review Board

DATE: July 5, 2018

RE: IRB# E11113

TITLE: Monumental Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Political, Media, and Grassroots Talk About Monuments in New Orleans, Louisiana


Review Date: 7/5/2018

Approved X Disapproved

Approval Date: 7/5/2018 Approval Expiration Date: 7/4/2021

Exemption Category/Paragraph: 2a

Signed Consent Waived?: No

Re-review frequency: (three years unless otherwise stated)

LSU Proposal Number (if applicable):

Protocol Matches Scope of Work in Grant proposal: (if applicable)

By: Dennis Landin, Chairman

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING -

Continuing approval is CONDITIONAL on:

1. Adherence to the approved protocol, familiarity with, and adherence to the ethical standards of the Belmont Report, and LSU's Assurance of Compliance with DHHS regulations for the protection of human subjects*
2. Prior approval of a change in protocol, including revision of the consent documents or an increase in the number of subjects over that approved.
3. Obtaining renewed approval (or submittal of a termination report), prior to the approval expiration date, upon request by the IRB office (irrespective of when the project actually begins); notification of project termination.
4. Retention of documentation of informed consent and study records for at least 3 years after the study ends.
5. Continuing attention to the physical and psychological well-being and informed consent of the individual participants, including notification of new information that might affect consent.
6. A prompt report to the IRB of any adverse event affecting a participant potentially arising from the study.
8. SPECIAL NOTE: When emailing more than one recipient, make sure you use bcc. Approvals will automatically be closed by the IRB on the expiration date unless the PI requests a continuation.

* All investigators and support staff have access to copies of the Belmont Report, LSU's Assurance with DHHS, DHHS (45 CFR 46) and FDA regulations governing use of human subjects, and other relevant documents in print in this office or on our World Wide Web site at http://www.lsu.edu/irb
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Jude Bumgardner is a Louisiana native, anthropologist, musician, and fledgling writer. He studied anthropology at Louisiana State University, where he earned a Bachelor of Arts on May 13, 2016. A year later, he returned to Louisiana State University to earn a Master of Arts in anthropology. He plans to graduate in May of 2019 and is further pursuing a doctoral degree in anthropology. Jude is most interested in collaborative ethnographic engagements, discourse studies, and applied research that attempt to intervene in and mitigate systems of inequality. Furthermore, he wants to explore the relationship between anthropology and law and hopes to use anthropological research as a tool for making policy recommendations.