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Introduction: On the Token Less Taken

In the past few decades, meme transmission, the social communication of small packages of information from individual to individual, has been evoked to explain phenomena as diverse as mate copying in fish (Dugatkin 2000) and the widespread belief in God (Dawkins 1989). In the political realm, legal scholar Jack Balkin (1998) has developed a substantial theory of ideology conceived of as a memetic process. However, there remain serious objections. Some find the connection between ideology and memetics to be tenuous at best (Charny 1999; Silbey 1999; Wolcher 1999), for example, while others express reservations about the very validity of the meme concept itself (Aunger 2001; Deacon 1999; Ehrlich 2000; Kingwell 1999; Tomlinson 2004). Despite such objections, I believe that more inspiration in the analysis of political ideology can be taken from memetics and other new approaches to the general study of cultural replication (Sperber 1996; Urban 2001; Richerson and Boyd 2005).
Admittedly, critics have long baulked at attempts to tame, tag, or stalk our ideas. Perhaps there simply can be no *real* science of ideas and their disembodied components. Maybe, as Kingwell (1990: 90) says, behind “meme-talk” is a “need that can be satisfied only at the cost of drastic diminution of the rich, textured story concerning what it is to be human.” Or, as other critics have noted more specifically, perhaps memetics is inadequate because “human desire and agency” gets removed when we think of ideas as gene-like replicators (Tomkinson 2004: 195). Certainly, there are deep roots to these skeptical views. They may even reflect an unease traceable to Napoleon’s well-known attacks on the *idéolgues* of his day. The *petit caporal* argued, for example, that the study of ideology was based on a “shadowy metaphysics” that ignored the feelings of the human heart and neglected the larger lessons of history (Rosen 1996: 171).

While there is merit in these concerns, to say that the form information takes can influence its likelihood of transmission does not necessarily remove agency from the equation. If one wants to understand the power of major ideological orientations—from the divine right of kings to fascism, from Marxist-Leninist-Mao Zedong Thought to the invisible hand of the marketplace—one must understand the power of simple forms. As designer Paul Rand nicely put it “simplicity and geometry are the language of timelessness and universality” (Rand 1996: 6).

The simple ideological units that I will explore here are keywords, invectives, short praises, pithy expressions, formulaic phrases, and slogans that distill crucial components of more complex ideological systems. Filtered through many minds, they “tend to be transformed through repetition until they are relatively easy to remember and transmit to others” (Balkin 1998: 81). I call these forms *political tokens* (or political
memes) because they seem to function as keys or signposts in a discourse of political justification. Rather than simply use an available term like “political slogan” or “political motif” for all such forms, a new term is justified for two main reasons. First, unlike slogan, the new term can be more inclusive of expressions of justification that arise in informal discourse and that slip into usage without any campaign orchestrated by elites. Second, the term motif is a bit too unclear because it can refer to general themes as well as minute narrative elements; the concept of political token should be used in the more restricted sense to mean an element of a larger ideological system or motif. While a particular token may be stretched out in thought to connect to a variety of more sweeping motifs, this needs to be demonstrated in each particular case.¹

The concept of ideology is also, of course, at least as contentious as that of the meme, if not more so, and people have been fighting about it for a longer time. All the literature that has accumulated since the development of Marxism, Mannheim’s sociology of knowledge, and Critical Theory must be taken into consideration in any in-depth theoretical analysis. However, here I can only say that I do not follow the sociologists of knowledge generally who use ideology as an all-inclusive term encompassing a people’s complete worldview nor Balkin (1998) in the position that it is necessary to ground the definition of ideology in a theory of justice. Rather, I prefer a more social-psychological approach that derives, ultimately, from Roger Bacon. If “ideology” is a useful term, then the utility is in that it helps us unravel how we all glory in the shadowy pathways of our own obfuscations. While Eric Wolf’s argument that the term “should be used restrictively, in that ‘ideologies’ suggest unified schemes or configurations developed to underwrite or manifest power” is most apt (Wolf 1999: 4), I
would add further that all claims to legitimacy are ideological. All beliefs, values, speech acts, practices, and material artifacts that function to justify our social policies are ideological, regardless of whether or not those policies could be considered just by some impartial recording angel of justice. Slogans, logos, clichés, and other types of political tokens seem to me to be minimalist forms of such ideological configurations.

**Pro-Confederate Ideology and Its Legitimating Tokens: How Old Times There Get Begotten**

By “pro-Confederate ideology” I refer to the set of arguments, creative forms, and political tokens used to justify southern secession, to vindicate the white southern cause in the war of 1861-1865, and to cast aspersions on the Reconstruction years afterwards. After the systematic aspects of this ideology are outlined in brief, the bulk of this paper will be devoted to detailing Confederate tokens and to demonstrating the viability of key ones over time. I argue that these key tokens are the basic elements of a powerful ideological system that can be traced from even before the 1860s until the present day. While I do not make the claim that they are predominate in the ideological mindsets of most “traditionally Southern” whites today, I do maintain that their manifestation in contemporary ritual events, memorials, film, Internet sites, books, and debates about state flags continues to demonstrate that they are far from being extinct.

With some notable exceptions (Smith 1972; Wyatt Brown 1982, Wyatt Brown 1997; Blight 2001; Goldfield 2002), historians examining the ideology of the separatist South have tended to confine their work to distinct time periods; with separate works on pre-Civil War thought; Civil War thought, and the thought of the post-Civil War period. For each of these periods, there has long been interest in three interrelated concerns. First,
historians of the antebellum period have been most interested in examining what motivated the South to secede. Second, the motivations of the Confederate soldier and of the civilian population in the South have been the focus of many of those interested in the thought of the war period. Finally, much of the literature of the post Civil War period has focused on describing the beliefs and practices of what has become known as “The Lost Cause.”

Historians have plowed through masses of evidence in the form of speeches, letters, documents, diaries, and memoirs to understand the motivations of secession and war. Particularly insightful recent works about the war period include works by James M. McPherson (1997), Drew Gilpin Faust’s (1988), and Anne S. Rubin (2005). For the post-war period, historians generally agree about the common ways that white southerners spoke and acted to vindicate their actions in the Confederacy. Nonetheless, there is some disagreement over how to best characterize Lost Cause thought as a sociological phenomenon. For Rollin G. Osterweis (1973) it was about the statement of a romanticized myth. Charles Reagan Wilson (1980) agrees that the discourse was mythic, but emphasizes the role of the clergy in creating something better seen as a Confederate “civil religion.” Gaines Foster (1987) thinks both the terms “myth” and “civil religion” are unclear, so he prefers to speak of a Confederate tradition that gradually lost its significance with time. Connelly and Bellows (1982) find it important to distinguish between the Lost Cause mentality of the war veterans and the mentality of latter generations of southerners who tried to live up to the veteran’s model of heroism and virtue. For Nolan (2000: 12), the Lost Cause is a legend, “an American version of great sagas like Beowulf and the Song of Roland,” that needs to be countered by a more
precise and accurate history even today. For David Blight (2001), what was most interesting about the Lost Cause was the way in which pro-Confederate and reconciliationist memories were actively fostered at the expense of an alternative emancipationist vision advocated by white abolitionists and African Americans.

As a system of thought, Confederate ideology was anything but simple. Early components included the following propositions.

(A) The United States Constitution made slavery a right, and that right could not be abrogated by the actions of some states over others.

(B) States had the constitutional right to secede from the Union if their rights as states were unfairly challenged.

(C) Slavery was divinely ordained and abolitionists were misguided fanatics.

During the lead up to the war and during the war itself, these positions continued to be held, but they were modified and expanded to include many other propositions such as the following ones.

(A) Confederates were not rebels because secession was a constitutional right.

(B) Confederates fought for liberty from tyranny, as had their forefathers who fought in the American Revolution.

(C) Confederates were patriots and heroes doing their duty to protect their homes, their women (expressed variously as wives, mothers, sisters, and sweethearts), and their families from invasion.

(D) The North was the aggressor in the invasion of the South.

(E) The Northern troops (Yankee forces) were a hybrid race of immigrants and mercenaries, less physically and morally pure than were Confederate
soldiers.

(F) The women of the South were loyal, brave, and noble champions of the Confederate cause, willing to sacrifice everything to insure its victory.

After the war, from the period of Radical Reconstruction until about 1890, additional parts of the story were added to include the beliefs that:

(A) Confederates were not defeated but were overwhelmed by the superior numbers and manufacturing capabilities of the North.

(B) Defeat was not a sign of wrong. From loss and suffering ultimately would emerge vindication.²

(C) The South had incomparable leadership. The examples of Robert E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, and Thomas J. “Stonewall” Jackson in particular offer models of life that all future generations should seek to emulate.

(D) The war could not have been motivated by slavery since most Southerners did not own slaves.

(E) The benevolent nature of slavery and the loyalty of blacks in the South were demonstrated by the fact that there was no major slave rebellion during the war.

(F) The Confederate dead were martyrs to a just cause who should never be forgotten.

(G) Confederates were dishonorably stripped of their rights during Reconstruction and forced to live under cruel and wicked Negro, Scalawag, and Carpetbagger domination.

(H) Blacks were misguided by Republicans and Yankee carpetbaggers to think they could be free and equal. The reality was that without slavery and the firm
control of whites, blacks were lazy, immoral, and dangerous.

After Reconstruction had given way to the Black Codes and Jim Crow, and the United States had experienced the Spanish-American War and World War I, the ideology was more amenable to reconciliation. Now the ideology included messages that:

(A) Both Yankees and Confederates fought bravely and honorably for their respective causes, and should be reconciled; and,

(B) Southerners had fought effectively for states rights and white supremacy, and could now be proud Americans as well as southerners.

A glance at any selection of Confederate speeches, songs, and poems from the war era gives a strong sense of the currency of these themes. Two fiery secessionist speeches made from the pulpit in New Orleans on the Thanksgiving of 1860 suggest how political tokens associating secession with justice could spread from prestigious leaders and be readily copied by the masses. W. T. Leacock, minister at Christ Church, urged his flock to support secession as a call of “honor and liberty” that would “secure our rights.” Anything less was doomed; it was “secession or slavery;” he preached. So, therefore, he shouted, “Let it be liberty or death!” Benjamin Morgan Palmer, a leading Presbyterian, had even more success in firing up the South with the sermon he delivered on that same day. In his candid defense of slavery and call to war, he offered up the memorable tokens that “freedom would be their [the slaves’] doom” and “not till the last man has fallen” … will the sword “drop from our hands” … (Quoted in Smith 1972: 175). And this rhetoric was not simply the result of spur of the moment passions; it was years in the brewing. A decade earlier, for example, the Presbyterian theologian J. H. Thornwell was already claiming that abolitionists represented everything that was bad, and slaveholders
everything that was good; they (the abolitionists) were “atheists, socialists, communists, red republicans, Jacobins” while we (the slaveholders) were “the friends of regulated order and regulated freedom” as well as the “defenders of Christianity” and “the progress of humanity” (Quoted in Cash 1941: 83). As for earlier variants of Thornwell’s view, one finds in the 1830s politicians and polemicists popularizing the simpler token that suggested northern abolitionists were all “fanatics.” On the one hand, Senator John C. Calhoun used the term to attack the signatories of anti-slavery petitions sent to Congress. On the other, the idea of fanaticism was stretched and expanded to encompass half the argument of an entire polemical defense of the South’s “peculiar institution,” retired Congressman William Drayton’s anonymously published 1836 book, The South Vindicated from the Treason and Fanaticism of the Northern Abolitionists.

As a fair sample of the justificatory rhetoric of politicians, consider what can be found in the speeches of Jefferson Davis. From his inaugural address delivered February 11, 1861, we find phrases like: “absence of wrong on our part;” “mankind will vindicate … our conduct;” “Let us invoke the God of our Fathers;” “War was forced upon us;” “wickedness of our aggressors;” and “honor and right and liberty and equality.” A year later, speaking in Richmond, he used such phrases as: “our rights were threatened;” “malignity and barbarity of the North;” “warfare over the domestic institutions of the Southern states;” “generous devotion to the noble cause;” and “the holy cause of constitutional liberty.” After Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation came into effect in January 1863, Davis told the Confederate Congress he was thankful to the “ Almighty Father, who has blessed our cause.” He then threatened U.S. commissioned officers with arrest for “exciting servile insurrection.” Furthermore, he argued, putting his own spin on
Palmer’s racist token “freedom is doom for the Negro,” because of such incitement “several millions of human beings of an inferior race, peaceful and contented laborers in their sphere, are doomed to extermination.” In late 1864, as the prospects of victory looked increasingly dim, Davis continued to harken back to old themes. In a speech delivered in Augusta Georgia, the familiar formulas were all there: “…repulse the vandal who is seeking our overthrow;” “our struggle is for inherited rights;” “the Yankee oppressor;” “God looks upon our cause as holy,” and “Would you see the fair daughters of the land given over to the brutality of the Yankees?” (Quoted from Rowland 1923: Vol. V. [50, 52, 53; 199, 201, 202; 397, 409]; Vol. VI. [357, 359, 358]).

Forms of political ritual and symbolism were also used to drive home the simplest of the ideological points of the new Confederacy. For example, Davis was inaugurated as president of the fully formed Confederacy in 1862 as he stood beneath the city’s monument to George Washington, and on Washington’s birthday. Besides Davis, Robert E. Lee, too, was regularly dubbed by journalists and ordinary citizens a “second Washington.” Historian Anne Sarah Rubin precisely catches the effectiveness of the formula when she states, “even a child could appreciate the significance of George Washington” (2005:19-20). Symbolic connections were also made to the American flag. When individual states left the Union, for example, it was common to wave the Bonnie Blue secession flag. The large central star and the blue background of this flag suggested the powerful image that a state’s star had just flown off the “Stars and Stripes” to stand now on its own. Later, the first Confederate flag, the red, white, and blue “Stars and Bars” was also designed to evoke the Stars and Stripes. More than just an image, the new flag took on more significance as it was displayed in emotionally charged ceremonies.
held throughout the South. Significantly, these flags were connected to Southern womanhood and home as if by sympathetic magic, as they often passed directly from the hands of the stalwart hometown seamstresses who had made them to the hands of the gallant officers who figured as their protectors (Bonner 2002).

Songs lyrics often make multiple motifs very succinct and memorable. Confederate war songs did their best to capture the ideological spirit of the times in a catchy way. For example, a James Piermont’s song of 1861 put it all on the line with the stark title “Conquer or Die,” although the lyrics make it clear that conquest is to be expected since “Our Captain is God.” This song was also typical in its disdain for the Yankee foe, calling him a “stern bigot Northman.” It went on to urge Southerners to follow the path of the revolutionary forefathers whose “blood was in our veins.” A quite differently titled tune, “The Cotton-Burners Song,” contains the pithy rhyme, “‘Tis for liberty we fight! / Homes! Religion! Right!” As for the Yankee, he was of a “serpent’s race / hissing hate and vile disgrace.” (Fagan 1892: 263, 214-15).

Songs are such potent carriers of political tokens they require considerable attention. Even a quick perusal of the titles written during the war gives you a nice sense of the ideological themes they evoked: “Battle Song of the Invaded;” …”A New Red, White, and Blue” [about the first official Confederate flag]; “Rebel is a Sacred Name;” “Duty and Defiance;” “Arise! Ye Sons of Free-born Sires!;” “Yankee Vandals;” “Stonewall’s Requiem;” and “The South, or I Love Thee the More.” In the lyrics of such songs, one can also find readily repeated the tokens and formulaic phrases of the ideology. Just to give a taste of their pervasiveness, for example, consider the way just two motifs are expressed over and over again: one, that “Yankees are evil,” and, two, that...
“We are fighting for a good cause.” Songs from the period tell us that Yankees are oppressors, haughty tyrants, despots, ruffians, thugs, vandals, knaves, thieves, pillagers, miscreants, dastards, a throng, despoilers, polluters of the land, dirty, Hessians, hell-hounds, dogs, hated foemen, among other unpleasant things (See Table 2, Motif A, Token 1.) In contrast, the “Glorious Cause” was defended as a fight for: home state, home, “our Southern freedom,” “home of the brave and the free;” “the land of the South,” the right “to not be enslaved,” “States Rights,” “Southern Rights,” “mother, sisters, wives,” and so on. (Quoted from Fagan 1892).

Ordinary soldiers and citizens penned many of these lyrics. And there were countless poems sent in to newspapers and the popular magazine the Southern Illustrated News that reiterated the same motifs. McPherson (1997) makes it clear that they were commonly expressed in the letters and diaries of the common Confederate soldier and Rubin (2005) shows how they pervaded the mentality of the Confederacy in general.

**Pro-Confederate Tokens through Time: Truth, Justice—in the Confederate Way**

*Southern War Songs*. Table 1 contains a list of pro-Confederate motifs and their frequency of expression in the songs from the collection published by Fagan (1892). Table 2 provides a sample of how these motifs can be broken down further into more specific tokens. Both tables show clearly that the pro-Confederates saw themselves as fighting a wicked enemy who were trampling on their rights and despoiling their homeland. In justifying their cause to themselves and their fellows, they repeated the most positive values of the day, and connected themselves to the virtues of the nation’s heritage. That there was hypocrisy in claiming to fight for freedom and honor and justice while holding masses of others in bondage hardly occurred to them, since few ever
acknowledged the full humanity of African Americans. And, as historian Richard E. Beringer and his colleagues have observed, there was a kind of cognitive dissonance in the Old South in which bondage of others could mean liberty for the self, and rebellion to maintain racial domination could mean a fight for rights. We who are “familiar with the true speak and double think of Orwellian language,” these historians note, “should have little difficulty seeing the reality behind the smoke screen of sincerely believed rationalizations” (Beringer et al. 1986: 281).³

What I again want to stress here is the persuasive power of simple declaratives, especially when they are piled one atop the other and repeated over and over again in so many different formats and venues. When all is said and done, with but few exceptions, the sample of motifs and tokens given in the tables reduce to a single ideological theme: we represent all that is good and right; they represent all that is bad and unjust. And, obviously, the pro-Confederates have not been alone in making this ultimate reduction. Indeed, a sustained discourse of such “us and them” thought appears to be the most dangerous, powerful, and seductive form of ideology that a group can devise.
Table 1. *Ideological Motifs in a Sample of Pro-Confederate War Songs*. Numbers refer to how many times each motif was referred to in the songs. Numbers are estimates not based on computer analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motif</th>
<th>Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Anti-Yankees (Northerners)</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Home/Homeland</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Gallantry, Bravery, Heroism, Manhood</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Freedom/Liberty</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Flags</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Martyrdom</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Womanhood</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Honor/Chivalry/Nobility</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. God/The Sacred</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Justice/Rights</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Glory/fame</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Mourning/grieving</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Unity/Solidarity</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Heritage/tradition</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Family</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Duty/Loyalty</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Slavery</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Tough Lot of the Soldier</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Emotion</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Overt Racism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Peace</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Virtue/Truth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. American Revolution/US Constitution</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Sample Motifs and Tokens in Pro-Confederate War Songs. Numbers in brackets refer to times given in lyrics. For a fuller list, see footnote 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motif A. Anti-Yankee (Northerners) [156]</th>
<th>Motif B. Home/Homeland [106]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Token 4. Invaders/intruders -- [14]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token 5. Deserving of death/vengeance [10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token 15. Yankee race/mongrel [2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motif C. Gallantry, Bravery, Heroism, Manhood [99]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Token 1. Brave/Gallant/Heroic Person [84]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token 2. Against Numerical Odds [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motif D. Freedom/Liberty [96]</th>
<th>Motif E. Flags [95]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Token 1. Of the South/State/Home [71]</td>
<td>E1. Confederate Flags [85]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token 3. Freedom or Death [8]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token 5. Flag of the Free/of Liberty [4]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token 6. Fight so as to Not Be Chained/Enslaved [3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Token 2. Dishonored [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token 3. Abolition Flag [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens 6-12 (Flag of Freedom; Sacred Flag; Not to be Forgotten; Proud; Honored; Gallant).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These tables illustrate the strong overlapping connection between the lyric motifs and the Confederate ideological positions outlined above. First, the frequencies suggest that the Confederates exchanged among themselves a wide variety of tokens that expressed both their anti-Yankee sentiments and their positive feelings about themselves. In the Civil War context, even single words like “liberty,” “tyranny” and “forefathers” were easily associated with the heritage of the American Revolution and the Constitution.
This sense was also captured by phrases like “children of the free,” “Sons of Liberty,” “Hessians [the mercenary allies of the British],” and “constitutional rights.” Second, the song lyrics show how some motifs were more readily modified and adapted than others. Some like “liberty or death” and “honor and liberty” were quite effective as they were and were reproduced without modification. Others, a calling to mind the hard lot of the soldier, for example, were not as easy to express. Slavery also could evoke ambiguous sentiments that were difficult to avoid. Although pro-slavery attitudes can be found in the lyrics, aside from a few mentions of the “happy slave” they were more obliquely than directly expressed. It was simply not very motivating to say that one was fighting for slavery. More productive was the anti-Yankee motif, which allowed for many creative expressions of insult. (Refer again to the 19 dehumanizing terms listed above that were used for Northerners. From Table 2 as a whole it is clear that this is far from an exhaustive list.) In looking at the anti-Yankee motif, one can also see how it was expanded during the war to include tokens previously reserved for abolitionists. Whereas before it was abolitionists who were called fanatics, during the war this term was applied to Northerners and northern troops more generally. Worse, a “Yankee” became a dehumanized enemy, equivalent to lice, demons, hellhounds, monsters, snakes, and polluters. The claim that Northerners were a distinct and impure racial type became more prominent as well.

Table 2 also shows different degrees of complexity within a token. For example, there are variant ways to express the same phrase. Under the motif of martyrdom (Motif F), for example, one finds: “freedom or death,” “death or freedom,” and “freedom or the grave.” These slight differences simply demonstrate what is common knowledge among
folklorists, that there is always going to be “multiple existence and variation” in lore that is broadcast in anyway independent of highly controlled production and exchange processes (Dundes 1999: 2-5). Another issue relates to degrees of specificity. Consider that the first token of Motif A contains 36 examples with very specific referents while the Token 16 has but one example.

Another thing to consider is the way in which the tokens in these songs rapidly are combined, mixed, and interconnected. A single phrase may express more than one token, and often does. Common formulaic phrases such as “Sons of the South” “Northern abolition vandals,” “glorious flag,” ‘glorious cause,” “right over might,” “death over dishonor,” and “God defend the right” evoke two or more ideological conceptions at once, and gain force through the connection. Thus, while these tokens are all typical examples of simple and pithy forms—forms easy to recognize, remember, and reproduce—they are large in associated meanings as well. Here, for fuller appreciation of the power of a simple phrase, one need locate them into appropriate cultural frames of reference. A token like “death over dishonor” or “God defend the right” would not spread widely without a richer set of cultural understandings of what death, honor, dishonor, God, and “the right” are all about.

If phrases can be compounds, this is even more the case for song stanzas. For a particularly good example, we can take lyrics from J.H. Woodcock’s token-rich “War Song.” One stanza contains these lines: “We are fighting for our mothers, our sisters, and our wives / For these, and our country’s rights / We’ll sacrifice our lives.” And, “To the Great God of Nations / Our sacred cause confide, / For we are fighting for our liberty / And He is on our side” (Fagan 1892: 123). I categorize the motifs and tokens of this
stanza as follows: Womanhood (mothers, sisters, wives); Rights (our country’s rights); Martyrdom (sacrifice our lives); God/The Sacred (sacred cause; God on our side); Freedom/Liberty. Others might have put this in other ways, but certainly there are fundamental things being said in these lines that multiple observers can agree upon.

*Remembering the Hunley.* The H.L. Hunley was a hand-cranked Confederate submarine that sank in Charleston harbor in 1864, after setting a charge that sank the Union blockade sloop, the U.S.S. Housatonic. As a consequence of this action, five federal sailors and the entire eight-man crew of the Hunley were lost. While the remains of the Housatonic were destroyed many years ago, the submarine, with the remains of its crew still inside, lay undisturbed until 1995, when underwater archaeologists located it and began the laborious task of recovery and analysis. This find and its commemoration provided a unique opportunity for modern day pro-Confederates to express their sentiments, especially as they anticipated participation in a burial ritual with full Confederate military honors. For once, Civil War reenactors as well as other Civil War commemorators could engage in something real, not merely a simulacrum of the past (although enthusiasts still play acted as if they were of the Civil War era). When the burial ceremonies were finally held, on a clear Saturday, April 17, 2004, several thousand were there to participate and to observe. The crowd gathered first beneath the old Confederate monument in Charleston’s White Point Gardens Park for a memorial service. Straining to get as close as possible to the speakers, the almost exclusively white audience gathered shoulder-to-shoulder around the podium and the eight flag-draped coffins that were arranged in a neat row below. The crowd, which spilled out along the adjoining road, included spectators in ordinary attire as well as some five thousand
reenactors lined up in their regiments, and several hundred pro-Confederate women dressed in period-appropriate black mourning dresses and veils. At the conclusion of the memorial service, the reenactors marched in parade to the cemetery where the crew’s remains were buried.

A Confederate reenactor emceed the memorial service; a priest made the opening prayer and read the homily. The first speech was made by the director of the Naval Historical Center, who in turn was followed by the president general of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and a representative of the Order of the Confederate Rose (both of whom were women wearing black hoop-skirt style mourning dresses). These remarks were followed by those given by leaders of the Military Order of the Stars and Bars and the Sons of Confederate Veterans (both of whom were men wearing Confederate military uniforms). After their comments, a poem called “The Men Who Served the Hunley” was read by a portly reenactor in uniform and a song called “Hunley Shine On” was song by another earnest middle-aged pro-Confederate. Finally, with this complete, the coffins, draped in the official Third Flag of the Confederacy, were carried by reenactors who, in military style, marched them to horse-drawn caissons. No U.S. flags were evident, either among those dressed in period costume or from the crowd of spectators, but there were hundreds of men, women, and children among the spectators who waved the more famous Confederate battle flag.

What were the tokens broadcast from the podium on this ritual occasion? Here is a sample: “gratitude for our Confederate ancestors,” “heroes of our forefathers,” “unrivaled bravery,” “the brave men have never been forgotten,” “ultimate sacrifice,” “noble sacrifice,” “willing to die so that freedom can live,” “defenders of principles,”
“defenders of their homes,” “defeated by superior force,” “died for a cause they believed in,” “Southern souls,” and “attacking tyrants.” The back of the memorial program also contained the pithy statement, “If the cause is great enough the cost is irrelevant.” Other common Confederate tokens were delivered at the cemetery service. There a South Carolina state senator spoke of the crew as a “band of brothers” who had finally completed their “long journey home.” He spoke further of pride in their bravery, their incredible sacrifice, and how they had “carried the weight of the city.” Furthermore, he said, their example serves as an inspirational legacy that will “inspire us to do such great works that we might also hear the Supreme Commander say ‘Well done!’” And what was this legacy but “…that freedom did not come easy for any generation of Americans, and for freedom to endure for generations to come faith and courage like that exhibited by the men of the Hunley must be made time and again until the end of time.” The connection to the old Confederate tokens should be obvious enough here, and I will leave it to the reader to determine exactly what they are.

Ever since Durkheim, social scientists have stressed that effective rituals promote social solidarity. A strong sense of unity was certainly evident in that park that Saturday in Charleston. However, backstage, behind the scenes, as scholars like Erving Goffman and Victor Turner have stressed, things are not always so harmonious. Some months before the funeral took place there had been a dispute among pro-Confederates that was serious enough to become public. The most contentious issue concerned the role of the U.S. flag. Initially, it had been planned by the members of the Hunley Commission that the American flag would appear with Confederate flags at the services. However, this possibility was strongly protested by those who believed that the U.S. flag was not
appropriate. In August 2003, an activist from Texas posted an on-line petition that asked that the U.S. flag be barred from all ceremonies (Hicks 2003). By the time of the funeral, more than 2,600 individuals had signed the petition, with more than 50 percent adding additional words of comment. These comments are what is of most interest here, for they are rich sources for today’s pro-Confederate thought. Therefore, as I have done with the Civil War era songs, I have subjected the comments attached to the petition to thematic analysis.

Of the people who attached comments to the petition, about 13 percent simply added that they agreed with the petition. (I would describe the petition’s main motifs as: dying for Confederate independence; devotion/sacrifice not to be forgotten; an example for others; honor; and the U.S.A. as eternal enemy.) About 19 percent of the commenters emphasized that it would be a dishonor or insult to the dead to have the American flag present, or that the American flag needed to be kept away in order to show proper honor, respect, or dignity. Table 3 shows a sample of other commonly expressed motifs and tokens. Except for the motif of “vindication/just cause” which combines motifs I and J of Table 2, these are all to be found in Table 2 as well. Indeed, it seems that all of the other motifs are to be found in the petition comments, but at a different frequency. (Those not found included K [glory/fame], L [mourning/grief], G [womanhood] and R [Tough Lot of the Soldier].) The vindication motif was of course present during the Civil War, particularly in the form of the Confederate motto “Deo Vindice,” but, as I will discuss later, it became more prominent after the Confederacy was defeated.
Table 3. Sample of Traditional Pro-Confederate Motifs and Tokens Expressed in the Hunley-Funeral Anti-American Flag Petition of 2003-2004.*

I. Gallantry, Bravery, Heroism, Manhood  (11%. Motif C in Table 1)

II. God/The Sacred  (9.5%. Motif I in Table 1)

III. Flags  (7.0%. Motif E in Table 1)
Sub-Motif: Anti-U.S. Flag (7.0 %)

IV. Martyrdom/Dying for their country  (7.0%. Motif F in Table 1)
Tokens: Sacrifice/Ultimate sacrifice (19). Died for country (3). Died for their beliefs. For a just cause. Liberty or death.

V. Anti-Yankee (Northerners)  (6.0%. Motif A in Table 1)

VI. Vindication/Just Cause  (6.0%. Combines Motif I and J of Table 1.)

VII. Freedom/Liberty  (2%. Motif D in Table 1)
Tokens: Freedom from the Union/Union rule/Yankee Empire/centralized government. Against tyranny [5]. Our freedom/freedom we have today/died for our freedom [3]. Of the South/or our southern people/or a free Southland [3]. Just Cause of freedom. Liberty or Death. Honor the dream of freedom. Battle Cry of Freedom. Dream of Freedom. For freedom of their homes.

*The percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number; numbers in brackets give the frequency of use. Only numbers for the most frequent tokens are shown.

New tokens reflective of our times are also found in the petition and some of the old ones appear to have dropped out. Most conspicuously absent is the motif of manhood and manliness as it was associated with valor in the past. It may also be significant that little or nothing is said about the suffering lot of the women these men may have left
behind. This is certainly related to the radically different ways that have developed over the decades of talking about gender.

Table 4 shows some of the newer tokens that were used by a small minority of the petitioners to critique contemporary America. These include tokens that decry the national government as socialist, imperialist or anti-Christian. (In judging sentiments here, it needs also be noted that the petition itself can be read as containing considerable anti-American sentiment in that it referred to the United States as the “eternal enemy” of the Hunley Crew.) The recently invented token “politically correct” and its variants was also invoked by a few of the petitioners to express their sentiments about the American flag, mostly in arguing that one should not be concerned about whether or not it was politically correct to have the American flag at the funeral. Finally, and perhaps surprisingly for those who are not familiar with contemporary pro-Confederate public discourse, Table 3 shows that there was surprisingly little openly racist sentiment expressed. At the same time, there is oblique reference here to a new neo-Confederate organization, the League of the South, which identifies white southerners not in racial terms but in terms of a purported “Anglo-Celtic” heritage. In addition to these new tokens, many petitioners expressed more modern sentiments in the form of traditional or modified tokens that now have new meanings in new contexts. These include such phrases as “Yankee imperialists,” “fascist Yankee empire,” and “tourists Yankees, and carpetbaggers keep away.” New meanings can also be attached to an old generic word like “tyrant” or an invective like “dictatorial Yankee” when the reference is clearly to the present. It is also interesting to consider that the petition was circulating in 2003 as the U.S.-led war in Iraq was beginning to get underway—when pro-Americanism in the
South was running very high—yet there were still those who were strongly maintaining deep anti-Northerner sentiments.

**Table 4. Sample of New and Modified Pro-Confederate Motifs and Tokens Expressed in the Hunley-Funeral Anti-American Flag Petition of 2003-2004.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Anti-Liberalism and Political Correctness</strong> (2%. New Motif.)</td>
<td>Sample Tokens: Do the right thing, not the PC thing. Stand up to PC. Stop appeasing the Liberal/Leftist/PC Crowd. Liberalism is socialism. We have had enough of PC insults. Forget the “PC” (political crap). Forget being politically correct. Let’s do the “Southern politically correct thing.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Racial/Ethnic Politics</strong> (0.05%. Modified motifs T and U of Table 1.)</td>
<td>Sample Tokens: Down with the NAACP. Tell the Yankees and Scalawags and the NAACP to leave us the hell alone. God Save the Anglo-Celtic South. Formation of the USA is one of the biggest mistakes of the white race. It’s ‘those people’s time for tolerance now!’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pro-Confederate ideology never existed in an ideological vacuum; certainly one reason for its elaboration is that it arose in response to direct challenges from abolitionists and the counter-ideology the Civil War north, and, later, the rhetoric of equal legal rights and opportunities for blacks. It is remarkable then, that pro-Confederate ideology could survive at all, even despite the radical changes in the South since the end of legal segregation. This is likely due to both the strength of traditional transmission and a neo-revival of old tokens through contemporary readings of old Confederate-era ideology. In either case, research by Cox (2003), Horwitz (1998), Goldfield (2002), Gallagher and Nolan (2000), Mills and Simpson (2003) makes it clear that pro-Confederate ideologues and organizations have done much work over the decades to keep these tokens active.

I can only briefly mention here that my casual search for motifs in a perusal of more than 100 post-Civil War memorial and reunion speeches as published in the
Southern Historical Society Papers from the 1870s to 1920 supports the notion of an active Confederate tradition that never acknowledged any moral failings, and only grudgingly accepted that, after all, it wasn’t so bad that slavery was over as long as white supremacy was still intact. (See Table 5.) In fact, for the post-war pro-Confederates, there was a renewed emphasis on the belief that what they had done was correct. Their positive views of their cause was further reinforced after the period of Reconstruction, when white supremacists had clearly won the battle for segregation and had thwarted attempts to build a genuinely non-racial democracy. As a result, what is new in the motifs of this time period is that they more openly reflect a white supremacist vision. Similarly, motifs of North/South reconciliation become popular only after race relations in the South are no longer a major national issue. (See also Blight 2001 on this point.)

Today, pro-Confederate organizations like the League of the South, have modernized their language to the extent that they appropriate some of the language of multiculturalism to talk about “Southern Celtic culture” and the preservation of a distinct heritage and way of life (See “Introduction” link at http://dixienet.org as well as Shanafelt [2003]). While the League of the South remains a fringe organization, the still widespread support in the white South for the Confederate battle flag and of a view of Confederate identity that interprets it as a matter of “heritage not hate” suggests that much about contemporary perspectives are but modern adaptations of traditional pro-Confederate memes.
Table 5. Sample of Pro-Confederate Motifs and Tokens Observed from Post-Civil War Memorial and Reunion Speeches as Published in the Southern Historical Society Papers (1870s - 1917). Numbers are estimates not based on computer analysis.

I. **Gallantry, Bravery, Heroism, Manhood** (66 occurrences noted. Motif C, Table 1.)

II. A. **Freedom/Liberty** (55 occurrences noted. Motif D, Table 1.)

II. B. **Honor/Chivalry/Nobility** (55 occurrences noted. Motif H, Table 1.)

III. **Right/rights/justice** (53 occurrences noted. Motif J, Table 1.)
   Sample Tokens: Right to secede/rebel. Right as they saw it. Constitutional Rights. Defense of...

IV. **Womanhood** (43. Motif G, Table 1.)
   Sample: Noble women of the South. True women of the South. Blessed southern women. Daughters of the South. Unselfish devotion.. Patriotic, unwavering women of the South. True women of the South.

V. **The Cause** (38. New Motif.)

VI. **Race/ethnicity/racism** (38. Motifs T and U, Table 1.)

VII. C. **Patriotism** (36. Modified from various others, Table 1.)

VIII. **Vindication /No Wrong Done** (35. New Motif.)
   Sample Tokens: Vindicate the truth/the motives. Southern cause vindicated. South was blameless. War was not rebellion. Soldiers were not traitors. South will conquer by crucifixion. Defeat meant victory.

IX. A. **Anti-Northerner** (32. Motif A, Table 1.)

IX. B. **Reconciliation** (32. New Motif.)
   Sample Tokens: Gallantry on both sides. Northern were magnanimous in victory. Patriotic brotherhood. Can love the Union now. No spirit of disloyalty to the present. Memory of our heroes belongs to America.

IX. C. **Slavery** (32. Motif Q, Table 1.)
   Sample Tokens: War was not for slavery. Faithful slaves. Kindest masters. Harsh but often kind. Was mild. Meant salvation. Was interwoven with war. South preferred grave to enslavement by the Union.

X. **Duty** (29. Motif P, Table 1.)
XI. Willingness to die / martyrdom (25. Motif F, Table 1.)


Conclusion: When We Love it or Leave it

In concluding, I want to offer a few comments about other political tokens from contemporary life. Consider tokens from the public culture of the contemporary United States such as “United We Stand,” “God Bless America,” “One Nation Under God,” “Proud to be Patriotic,” and “Support our Troops.” To varying degrees, they, like the political tokens of the Confederacy, exemplify formulaic ideas based on what could be called “essentially uncontestable concepts” (with apologies to the philosopher W. B. Gallie [1955-6] who coined the term “essentially-contested concept” with the opposite intention in mind). They are “uncontestable” because they are fundamentally not to be thought too deeply about. In saying them or broadcasting them in other forms one is affirming a commitment to the authority of an “us” whose unity comes from the ultimate authority beyond us. To challenge them is of course quite possible, but to do so is to break the illusion of unity that is necessary for their widespread transmission and reproduction. To challenge them is to take a stand that is unlikely to meet with debate; more likely is a move toward expulsion and shunning: “America, Love it or Leave it.”

On the other hand, one might argue that the effectiveness of any ideological message is rarely to be determined from the words alone. Here anthropologist Tanya Luhrmann’s (2004) work provides crucial insight into how a ritual exchange of tokens helps bond members of a community in an emotionally salient way, one that is in keeping
with individual agency. In the course of her participant observation with members of the Horizon Christian Fellowship in southern California, she came to understand how the mutual exchange of pithy expressions of faith helped solidify commitment and shared senses of faith. Although expressions like “God is moving,” “in-breathed,” “born again,” “witness,” “glory,” and “blessed” are common across English-speaking evangelical and fundamentalist churches, Luhrmann shows how they can be experienced in a deeply meaningful way by congregants. As she puts it, “The new congregant to Horizon becomes familiar with formulaic phrases like “walking with God” and part of what it means to be a Christian is to use those phrases in describing your daily life” (Luhrmann 2004: 521). Further, Luhrmann correctly stresses that these pithy phrases are embedded in a syntax of ritual speech, and that what they capture is as much physical and emotional experience as it is dogma. For example, when members of this congregation talk among themselves of “falling in love with Jesus” (or the Lord) the token is descriptive of a trancelike high that members interpret as the consequence of communing with the Holy Spirit in a particular way. Such an emotional working of words is easy to overlook when one is looking only at texts and phrases by themselves.7

Pro-Confederates today also have ample opportunity to experience the interplay of formulaic expression, inner emotion, and ritual performance. This is primarily through Civil War reenacting, memorial events, and political engagement in support of “heritage” issues such as the promotion of Confederate flag usage. However, these things themselves are isolated events whose meaning must be placed in the context of a people’s larger impulse to build an elaborate system to justify their large-scale social actions across time. This system building is an interactive process that is both creative and
reactive. It is creative at psychological, communicative, and cultural levels, but it is also a reactive response to events in history that are outside of both individual and cultural control. And it is both reactive and creatively responsive to models that represent alternatives and challenges to the system as a whole.
Notes

1. I want also to stress that the term token refers to what is publicly performed, not what is unconscious in someone’s mind. Still, something must be going on in the brains of individuals to explain the similar ways they express themselves in public, as well as the peculiar but still recognizable ways they do so uniquely. Robert Aunger (2002) has argued that a meme is best thought of as an aspect of the neuronal networks that operate in the brain. What we communicate, then, is not a meme itself but a signal emanating from a brain process. In making this distinction, Aunger avoids some of the problems critiqued by Tomlinson (2004) with respect to the work of Blackmore (1999), particularly problems that have to do with the difficulty of locating the boundary around a meme in speech. However, quite a lot of improvement in brain imaging is needed before Aunger’s claims about an “electric meme” can fairly be evaluated.

2. Probably the most famous contemporary example of a pro-Confederate token, one known to outsiders as well as insiders, is a phoenix motif: “The South will Rise Again.” Although the sentiment seems to have been present towards the end of the Civil War, the modern variant seems to have become widely known only thanks to Margaret Mitchell’s *Gone with the Wind*, where the irascible Rhett Butler redeems himself by returning both to his love Scarlett and to his faith in the South. His last line in the novel is: “As the South shall rise again, so shall our love for each other, and it will be even stronger than ever before.” (For an example of an early variant, consider the speech on “Women’s Devotion” made by General D. H. Maury at the 6th Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Society in 1878. Here he referred to “the cause, which borne down for a time, now rises again to honor all who sustained it” [*Southern Historical Society Papers*, Vol.}
6, p. 218]. The so-called poet laureate of the South, Father Abram Ryan, also wrote in that year a poem called “A Land in Ruins” that contains a phoenix motif with the line: “out of gloom future brightness is born.”) Of course, the “rise again” token also connects the Confederacy with the Christian message of resurrection. Indeed, in Matthew 27: 63 of the Latin Vulgate, Jesus says “post tres dies resurgam.” (After three days I shall rise again.) Interestingly enough, resurgam (meaning “I shall rise again”) is one of the in-group slogans of the modern Neo-Confederate movement, where it is frequently coupled with the motto from the Great Seal of the Confederacy, “Deo Vindice” (God will vindicate us). For an example, see http://www.confederatestatesofamerica.org.

3. In his work on the Nazi doctors of Auschwitz, psychologist Robert Jay Lifton called this splitting of the self in two, with two distinct moral realms, one for “us” and one for “them,” the psychology of doubling (Lifton 1986).

4. Tokens associated with the other motifs listed in Table 1 include the following:

Motif F. (Martyrdom) - die for south, conquer or die, victory or death, freedom or death, martyred sires; Motif G. (Womanhood) - loyal/patriotic ladies, suffering/sacrificing women, for wives, daughters, mothers, for maids/sweethearts, for mothers and sisters, for our women, brave woman rebel, South as queen; Motif H. (Honor/Chivalry/Nobility) - honor of the South/the Cause, death over dishonor, avoidance of dishonor/shame, noble cause; Motif I. (God/The Sacred) - God and right, God defend the right, God’s favor/on our side, God grant us victory, Godly rebel army, sacred war, sacred fight, heaven’s justice; Motif J. (Justice/Rights) - our rights, the right, Constitutional rights, states’ rights, Southern rights, the just, just cause; Motif K. (Glory/Fame) - glorious cause, glory of the South, fame and glory, fame that cannot die; Motif L. (Mourning/grieving) - for
individual person, heroic person, for nation, for cause; Motif M. (Unity/Solidarity) - Sons of the South; children of the South, national unity, land’s sons and daughters, band of brothers, all true Southrons, rise as one man; Motif N. (Heritage/tradition) - Our fathers’ homes, sons of the South, children of the free, sons of liberty, son of the brave, heritage left by sires, fathers were rebels; Motif O. (Family) - defend/fight for children, wives, grandsires, mother and father, darlings at home; Motif. P. (Duty/Loyalty) - fulfill one’s duty, loyal to home, the South, right, the cause; Motif Q. (Slavery) - North seeks to enslave southern whites, happy slave image, wild slave in service of North, slave as household member, Motif R. (Tough Lot of the Soldier) - common soldier’s lot, rich don’t fight; Motif S. (Emotion) - love, pride, hatred, vengeance, loneliness, fear, triumph; Motif T. (Race/ethnicity/racism) - blacks as sons of Ham, Southerners as Cavaliers, Yankees as “serpent race,” Blacks as inherent thieves, Negro equality as submission, South as where a black man is black, Negro as object of possession, Northern soldier fights for/steals the “nigger.” Note that human error is likely as the numbers are not based on computer analysis of word frequencies.

5. The petition was addressed to the Hunley Commission, CSS Hunley, and read:

   WHEREAS, the Commander and crew of the CSS Hunley fought and died for the sovereignty and independence of the Confederate States of America, and
   WHEREAS, their devotion and sacrifice for the Cause of Southern Independence must not be forgotten and should serve as an example for all Southerners from century to century, and
   WHEREAS, the solemn and sacred occasion of their burial, with all accompanying honors and ceremonies, should reflect their beliefs and their
loyalties, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that only the acknowledged national, naval, and battle flags of the Confederate States of America should be displayed and saluted at their burial and at all parades and ceremonies honoring them; and,

FURTHERMORE, and most specifically, be it resolved that the flag of their eternal enemy, the United States of America, must not and will not be displayed at any ceremonies preceding or during the burial of the Commander and the crew of the CSS Hunley.

6. One of the petition commentaries was written by a Frenchman who also accepted the common motifs of courage and respect for those willing to die for a cause they believed to be just: “Je suis un francais, je ne me prononcerais pas sur le fond de votre guerre civile, mais une chose est certaine j’admire le courage des différents équipages qui ont servis sur le submersible qui au mépris du danger ont sacrifié leurs vies pour un cause qui leur semblait juste.”

7. Tomkinson (2004), in writing about the phrase “failed businessman” that was repeated widely in the international press as a description of a coup leader in Fiji, found that it did not circulate on the island itself. He explained this difference as a consequence of the divergent cultural models held in Western capitalist-oriented societies and in Fiji concerning the nature of business and success. However, his suggestion that it is better to explain the phrase “failed businessman” in terms of Greg Urban’s (2001) theory of “metaculture” than it is in terms of memetics is not entirely convincing. For one thing one can fault Tomkinson with employing reasoning just as circular as that which he claims lies behind memetics: if memetics
explains one form of meme in terms of another, it seems that metacultural theory explains one form of culture in terms of another.

The advantage of Luhrmann’s approach is that she avoids both circularity and logocentrism by showing how formulaic phrases can operate at the same time to validate community perspectives, to state an individual interpretive stance, and to engage the individual in a meaningful affective experience.
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