
THE PROCEEDINGS

of

**The South Carolina
Historical Association**

2013

Officers of the Association

President: Fritz Hamer, University of South Carolina Columbia

Vice President: Stefan Wiecki, Presbyterian College

Secretary: Michael Kohl, Clemson University

Treasurer: Amanda Mushal, The Citadel

Executive and Editorial Board members

Sarah Miller, University of South Carolina Salkehatchie (2013)

Paul Thompson, North Greenville University (2013)

Eric Emerson, South Carolina Department of Archives and History (2014)

Janet Hudson, University of South Carolina Extended University (2014)

Lewie Reese, Anderson University (2015)

Brenda Thompson-Schoolfield, Bob Jones University (2015)

Robert C. Figueira, Lander University, editor

Stephen Lowe, University of South Carolina Union, editor

THE PROCEEDINGS

of

**The South Carolina
Historical Association**

2013

Robert Figueira and Stephen Lowe

Editors

The South Carolina Historical Association
Department of History
The Citadel, Charleston, South Carolina
www.palmettohistory.org/scha/scha.htm
© South Carolina Historical Association

Editors' Notes

The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association is a refereed journal containing selected papers presented at the annual meeting. The editors and the other members of the Executive Board serve as the editorial committee, which is assisted by external reviewers chosen for their expertise. The opinions expressed in this journal represent the views only of the individual contributors; they do not reflect the views of the editors, other members of the editorial committee, or the South Carolina Historical Association. The South Carolina Historical Association asserts its copyright to the contents of this journal.

The editors are especially indebted to those colleagues who reviewed papers for publication. Their comments and suggestions have greatly improved the quality of the papers presented here. Reviewers for the 2013 volume were:

Allan Charles, University of South Carolina Union
Joel Cleland, Lander University
M. Ryan Floyd, Lander University
Carmen Harris, University of South Carolina Upstate
Tammy Ingram, College of Charleston
Sarah Miller, University of South Carolina Salkehatchie
Alice Taylor-Colbert, Lander University
H. Paul Thompson, North Greenville University
Kevin Witherspoon, Lander University

The editors wish to thank the authors whose papers are published here for their cooperation in revising their oral presentations and their written submissions. Finally, very special thanks must be accorded to Judy Andrews for copy preparation and copyediting. Her speedy, careful, and judicious work in this capacity has once again greatly enhanced this volume.

Contents

The Utah War and the <i>New York Times</i>	5
Kenneth L. Alford, Brigham Young University	
Managing the backlash: Senator Ernest F. “Fritz” Hollings and the Marshall and Fortas Supreme Court nominations	19
David Timothy Ballantyne, Cambridge University	
Thou Shalt Not Duel: Some Observations regarding the Impotency of Dueling Laws in South Carolina	29
Matthew A. Byron, Young Harris College	
An Lucht Siuill Palmetto	41
Christopher Crowley, University of South Carolina Upstate	
“A fertile brain at schemeing”: Eliza Lucas Pinckney and her Early Agricultural Experiments	57
Megan Hatfield, University of Miami	
Behind The Gates: An Interracial Perspective of Black and White Youth Memories of Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 1950s to 1970s	67
Katherine Jernigan, University of South Carolina Columbia	
Servant or Slave?: South Carolina’s Inherited Labor Dilemma	77
John J. Navin, Coastal Carolina University	
Revitalization in the “West End” of Greenville, 1987 to 2011	91
Nicholas Smit, Bob Jones University	
Membership	105
Minutes of the Eightieth Annual Meeting	107

The Utah War and the *New York Times*

Kenneth L. Alford

Between the Nullification Crisis of 1832 and South Carolina's secession in December 1860 lies an almost forgotten episode of internal military intervention that has been termed by some historians as "America's first civil war."¹ While popularly known as the Utah War or the Mormon Rebellion, the deployment of federal troops to Utah Territory in 1857–58 was designated by the federal government as the Utah Expedition.² In the spring of 1857 while Congress was adjourned, the newly inaugurated President James Buchanan received several reports of insurrection and rebellion in Utah Territory. Without Congress in session to question his actions, the president ordered soldiers to Utah in May 1857 and charged them to restore order and install new territorial officers. Buchanan made no public announcements regarding the Utah Expedition until the end of that year – a stance that caused uncertainty among many, and both distrust and confusion among the Mormons.³

The expedition force left Kansas for Utah in July 1857. Mormon militiamen harassed the army by burning grass and raiding army supply trains, but did not directly attack it,⁴ and the army was obliged to winter near Fort Bridger one hundred miles distant from Salt Lake City. Buchanan subsequently authorized Thomas L. Kane, a friend of the Mormons, and two government negotiators – Lazarus W. Powell, a senator-elect and ex-governor of Kentucky, and Benjamin McCulloch, a Texas ranger and future Confederate general who had rejected Buchanan's offer in May 1857 to serve as Utah's territorial governor – to visit Utah and obtain a peaceful conclusion to the tense situation.⁵ Alfred Cumming, Utah's newly appointed territorial governor, and Brigham Young, the Mormon prophet and leader who had been serving as territorial governor, reached a peaceful resolution in mid-1858. Cummings was received as the new governor and President Buchanan issued a blanket pardon for all alleged rebels. The expedition army passed peacefully through the Salt Lake Valley in June 1858 and established several military posts.

The context of these events involves several major historical topics: the impetus and purpose for the Mormon trek to Utah, the roots – both in beliefs and actions of Mormons and non-Mormons alike – for the strong antipathies present between the two groups since the 1830s, the detailed analysis of the Utah War, and the aftermath of the War, i.e., the steady decline in Utah's isolation from the rest of the nation. This study, however, has a far narrower remit. What could readers of the *New York Times* in

1857–58 have learned about the Utah War?⁶ How accurately could they have understood the associated military and political events? What recurring themes interested *Times* journalists? This study will address these questions within the context of a nineteenth-century journalism whose methodology too often did not require reliable corroboration of reported events.

Between 1 January 1857 and 31 December 1858, over twelve hundred articles in the *Times* mentioned Utah, Mormons, or the Utah Expedition – averaging almost two news stories every day. Readers of the *New York Times* should not have been surprised to learn that the army was being ordered to Utah. In the days prior to Buchanan's decision, newspaper articles with headlines such as "War with the Mormons," "The Mormon Outrages," "The Mormon Rebellion," and "Preparations in Utah for Resisting Federal Authority" appeared in the *Times*.⁷ Calls for military intervention in Utah became increasingly louder. A sample article from May 1857 illustrates the tone of those reports:

If there is any honest intention to send a force this Summer to vindicate the law at Salt Lake . . . if women are to be protected from forcible debauch and men from massacre, it certainly is high time that a force should be under orders for this distant service but there is not an hour to lose.⁸

Was Utah Territory in rebellion against the federal government? The confusion that plagued the *Times's* reporting of the Utah Expedition was evident from the beginning. A front page article published on 21 May 1857, for example, noted that "a large military force has been ordered for Utah, to take their position on the Government reserve, 40 miles south of Salt Lake City." Just five paragraphs later in the same article was an excerpt from Brigham Young's 31 March report in his other public capacity as the territory's Superintendent of Indian Affairs; there he commented that, "since my last report, we have had a time of peace, and, apparently, of great contentment."⁹

The Mormons and the Utah Expedition captured the popular imagination and were the focus of many popular news stories in the *Times* during 1857–58 – second in popularity only to stories regarding slavery and the Kansas territory.¹⁰ In fact, stories in the newspaper frequently mentioned Utah and Kansas within the same paragraph, as illustrated by a 29 January 1858 article that stated, "Utah and Kansas are presented as being both in rebellion against the Federal Government, and the President is determined to put them both down, – the one by force of arms and the other by admission into the Union!"¹¹ On 4 July 1857, the *Times* printed a "Speech of Hon. A. Lincoln, of Indiana [*sic*]" in which Lincoln responded to a speech by Senator Stephen A. Douglas. In his address, Lincoln discussed both slavery and the Mormons, but acknowledged the importance of the Utah question by opening his address "I begin with Utah"¹²

Today we expect instantaneous news; that was not the case in the 1850s. With no competition from radio, television or the Internet, newspapers reigned supreme in the mid-nineteenth century. Newspapers were the most immediate and surest source of local, national, and international news, but it was not uncommon for a month or more to elapse between an event and its subsequent publication.¹³ Information reached the readers of the *Times* in many ways. The *Times* seemed most proud of telegraphic news and frequently noted that the information was received from a telegraphic source.¹⁴ Newspapers regularly traded among themselves bundles of their previous editions in order to reprint articles of interest. Information was also received by mail, official military dispatch, and express riders. In the case of the Utah Expedition, express riders were frequently soldiers sent east from the body of the Utah Expedition carrying mail, reports, and supply requisitions. The *Times* received regular reports from war correspondents David A. Burr and James W. Simonton, who traveled with the Utah Expedition. Burr, the son of David H. Burr (the federally appointed surveyor general for Utah Territory, 1855–57), served as a contract surveyor in Utah prior to the Utah War and traveled west with the army during the summer of 1857; he submitted his dispatches as “A.B.C.” Simonton, who submitted his dispatches as “S.,” joined the army at Camp Scott (near present day Fort Bridger in southwest Wyoming) in late May 1858.¹⁵

On the masthead of every *Times* published since 1897 is the famous motto “All the News That’s Fit to Print.”¹⁶ A more appropriate motto during the Utah War might have been simply “All the News.” It was not uncommon for rumors, speculation, and editorial comments to appear intermingled within the same news story. In April 1857, for example, a month before the *Times* announced that the army was being sent to accompany Utah’s newly appointed territorial governor, it reported that the Mormons had “200,000 spies and agents scattered throughout the country. . . [and they are] in close alliance with 300,000 Indians upon our Western border.”¹⁷ These were clearly amazing claims – especially considering that in 1857 there were only 55,236 Mormons in the entire world and a large percentage lived in Great Britain.¹⁸

Other rumors led readers of the *Times* to believe that the army would have a difficult approach into Salt Lake City.¹⁹ Walls fifteen feet high were reportedly built around the city, and even though the city is located in a semi-arid region, it was supposedly “surrounded by a deep and wide moat.”²⁰ Some reports claimed that the Mormons possessed thirty artillery pieces, Greek fire, and had constructed a secret thirteen-mile passage through the canyons that was “completely covered over with a rock roof.”²¹ Additional stories claimed that the Mormons were “making great preparations for defending all the passes to the [Salt Lake] Valley,” as well as “manufacturing small cannon, with percussion locks and telescope sights.” Ballistic details for the mythical

cannons of “peculiar construction” claimed they could fire a two-pound cannon ball “a distance of a mile and a half, with as much certainty as our common rifles will at 120 yards.” All those reports were very inaccurate.²²

Many of the rumors reported in the *Times* told of army massacres at the hands of the Mormons. General William S. Harney – who was originally appointed to command the Utah Expedition but never actually marched with the army to Utah – supposedly lost 600 men to Mormon marauders in October 1857.²³ Colonel Albert Sidney Johnston reportedly lost 160 soldiers in December 1857 and an additional 180 men in January 1858 as well as “all the provisions, mules and horses.”²⁴ A “horrible rumor” from January 1858 related the fallacious story of 200 men in Lieutenant Colonel Philip St. George Cooke’s command being butchered, “a number taken prisoners, and all the officers hung.”²⁵ According to reports printed in May 1858, both Captain Anderson and a Mormon guerrilla party that reportedly attacked him lost three-fourths of their soldiers.²⁶ Colonel Johnston supposedly lost another 250 soldiers in May 1858, and afterwards the Mormons were said to have driven his army “before them for a distance of 150 miles.”²⁷ The reality was that a relatively few Mormon skirmishers had scattered army cattle and burned some supply wagons and grazing land.²⁸

On Christmas Day 1857, Thomas L. Kane, a non-Mormon but longtime friend of Brigham Young and the Latter-day Saints, met with Buchanan in the White House and volunteered his services as a negotiator to bring the Utah War to a peaceful conclusion. Kane wrote he was “determined to go [to Utah Territory], whether with his [Buchanan’s] approbation or not.”²⁹ Kane traveled to Utah through California, and rumors surrounding his trip were frequently reported by the *Times*. Kane was falsely characterized as a Mormon who had been “rebaptized and received his endowments [i.e., completed a Mormon religious ceremony], immediately upon his arrival at Salt Lake City from California.”³⁰ Readers of the *New York Times* were also informed that Kane was “not sent out by the President,”³¹ which, while technically true, conveyed a false impression. Buchanan approved Kane’s trip and his efforts to resolve the Utah War, but at Kane’s insistence he did not make Kane an official government representative.³²

It was all too common for the *Times*’s news reports about the Utah War to be published and then discredited. Follow-on news stories frequently noted that the original story was “erroneous,” “incorrectly stated,” “entirely false,” “discredited,” “not strictly correct,” based on “a sad lack of reliable information,” “a fabrication,” or “received with many grains of allowance.”³³ Utah’s physical distance from the eastern seaboard increased the difficulty in separating fact from fiction. Nevertheless, a May 1857 article noted that the “failure to receive . . . confirmation of the reports of violence, in no degree impairs [our] confidence in them,”³⁴ and a November 1857 report

suggested that “this news, if true, is doubly important.”³⁵ On the other hand, a January 1858 *Times* article noted that a

little common sense bestowed upon the Mormon question would not be out of place just now. Our people have been carried away by reports of massacres, murders and treason, and in their horror at these outrages, which have been contradicted as often as not, they have not paused to investigate their truth.³⁶

In general, it was difficult, if not impossible, for readers of the *Times* to verify the accuracy of the articles they read.

Besides erroneous reports regarding various alleged military disasters for the Utah Expedition, other recurrent themes appeared in the thousand-plus Utah War articles and stories in the *Times* during that two-year period: everyday anecdotes regarding the army’s trek westward, Brigham Young, Mormons and Mormonism, and assorted political questions. Correspondents embedded with the Utah Expedition ensured that *Times* readers were provided with frequent information about the army on the march. Many articles shared information about its condition and morale. Readers learned, for example, that it was so cold during the winter that “a bottle of sherry wine froze in a trunk.”³⁷ By January 1858 “nearly two-thirds of all the animals attached to the expedition had died,”³⁸ and inflation ran so high in the army camps that “a coat, which costs \$4 in the States, [costs] \$16, and everything else in like proportion.”³⁹ At Camp Scott, where the Expedition wintered during 1857–58 because Mormon militia had burned down Fort Bridger prior to their arrival, soldiers built

a theatre, and [it] will open with a concert on Saturday, and they intend to have dramatic representations once a week. . . . Daguerreotypes, photographs, ambrotypes, &c., are taken in first-rate style, and our friends at home will soon have the satisfaction of seeing us illustrated in our camp costume, with views of our camp fixings.⁴⁰

Some news was colorful, such as the report from Camp Scott that the “sale of all intoxicating drinks by suttlers or other persons is also positively prohibited. This order proves that the army is really straitened.”⁴¹ On another occasion the *Times* claimed that the meat the soldiers were eating was “the worst possible kind of tough bull, consisting of those misguided oxen who crossed the plains with teams this Summer, worn to the bone almost, and who were foolish enough not to die before they got here.”⁴² One reporter commented that

this country seems doomed to be visited by all the plagues of Egypt. It has been visited by the plagues of locusts and grasshoppers, and

now we are suffering under a plague of flies; never were poor mortal men so plagued and pestered as we are at this time by common house flies – they buzz and bite, and sting and crawl upon us from the first dawn of day to the last dim twilight of evening.⁴³

Some news was critical. A June 1857 article complained that the army fared worse on the plains than homesteaders and Mormon converts.

The emigration of last season, four-fifths of which consisted of women and children, started out in August, and made the entire trip on foot, hauling their bedding and provisions in hand-carts. If Uncle Sam's war men can't compete with women and children in their marches, and in ability to take care of themselves in a new and rude country, with all their advantages, appointments and ample means of transportation, surely they deserve the finger of scorn pointed at their puerile effeminacy.⁴⁴

Some news was touching and timeless, such as this report from the *New York Times* special correspondent who traveled with the army:

The mail from the States has at length reached us in our exile, and the brow of care and anxiety is relaxed, the fatigue of military discipline and exposure is forgotten . . . and all hearts are softened with thoughts of home, of absent friends. The faces of many brighten, and though the tear sparkles in the eye . . . and the countenance is almost distorted by the scarce-repressed emotion, which would burst the fetters with which it is bound in forced composure. It is a great event in our camp, this arrival of the mail.⁴⁵

Brigham Young did not generally fair well on the pages of the *Times*. He was called “the monster of iniquity,” a “theocratical despot,” “a selfish and sensual brigand,” an “audacious villain,” “the presiding genius,” “the Mahomet of the Great Salt Lake,” and similar epithets.⁴⁶ He was viewed as part king and part religious fanatic. “When he passes along the streets, which he sometimes does, every head is bowed, and perfumed handkerchiefs are waved by fair hands to herald his approach.”⁴⁷ *Times* readers were told that Young was

a man a little above the medium height, somewhat inclined to corpulency, with a dull, bullet-looking sort of a head, sandy complexion, and an exceedingly sensual-looking mouth. When walking in the wind he usually wears a great pair of green goggles. . . . He has a fine,

full clear voice, which may be heard by a large audience. His speech is rather fluent than otherwise, and his attitude and gestures quite oratorical. Its effect upon his listeners is marked and decided.⁴⁸

The Mormon practice of polygamy (actually polygyny), which dates from the beginnings of the church in the 1830s and was first publicly announced by Mormon apostle Orson Pratt in August 1852, increased the East's fascination with Young. Writers for the *Times* could never quite agree how many wives Young actually had; one report claimed ninety – “75 pale-faced women” and “he has now added to his harem 15 lovely looking Indian squaws.”⁴⁹ Whether they hated or admired Young, most writers seemed to recognize that “the whole issue of the Mormon rebellion depends upon the character of this remarkable person.”⁵⁰ Shortly before the army entered the Salt Lake Valley in summer 1858, the *Times* mocked Buchanan's policy by noting that “the Prophet, has not turned out as well as expected, and refuses to be a traitor.”⁵¹

Mormons were sometimes portrayed as members of “a ‘religious’ system which condenses into itself all the absurdities, usurpations, indecencies and villainies of the worst form of Paganism.”⁵² Mormonism was a “social ulcer” that “had assumed so malignant a form that longer forbearance of the knife is not to be tolerated” lest it “seriously compromise the character and endanger the tranquility of the country.”⁵³ Mormons were “steeped in mystery and sunken in mental powers”⁵⁴ and were “an active, enterprising people, [and] are all the more closely to be watched on that account.”⁵⁵ Individual Mormons reportedly were “semi-savage, have the habits and characteristics of the Indians, and can live as the Indians do.”⁵⁶ Many writers believed them guilty of “murders, arsons, robberies, and the forcible debauch of defenseless women perpetrated day after day.”⁵⁷ Their living conditions in Utah Territory were indicative of their debased nature, described in one *Times* report as

comfortless, and so far from inviting or favoring the commonest decency in living, actually forbid it, by rendering it impossible. Squalid poverty stares at us from every door and window. Not one woman in ten has a pair of shoes to her feet, their garments are of the coarsest material, and their children ragged, half naked, shockingly dirty, and rude as young Indians.⁵⁸

Mormons were considered devious foes who had prepared, it was claimed, all manner of devilish defenses to stop the army from entering the Salt Lake Valley. Canyon walls were reportedly mined, artificial dams were supposedly built to flood canyon roads and make them impassible, and sharpshooters were thought to lurk behind every rock.⁵⁹

Occasionally, however, sympathetic *Times* articles also appeared in print. One from June 1858 commented on “the move south” – a call from Brigham Young for Mormons to vacate northern Utah and move south prior to the army’s arrival.

Whatever our opinions may be of Mormon morals or Mormon manners, there can be no question that this voluntary and even cheerful abandonment by 40000 people of homes created by wonderful industry in the midst of trackless wastes, after years of hardship and persecution, is something, from which no one who has a particle of sympathy with pluck, fortitude and constancy, can withhold his admiration.⁶⁰

The reporter observed that “right or wrong, sincerity thus attested is not a thing to be sneered at. True or false, a faith to which so many men and women prove their loyalty by such sacrifices, is a force in the world.”

Many articles made it clear that national sentiment did not consider Utah Territory worthy of statehood and argued that some faults by Mormons required resolution by force of arms. One noted that the

general feeling of the people of the Union in all sections, and of all sects and parties, is so decidedly adverse to the Mormons, that the Government is not likely to be held to a very strict account for its acts towards them, even though they should be utterly exterminated, or driven from their present resting-place.⁶¹

Much of the debate regarding the purpose and cost of the Utah Expedition would sound familiar today: the mission was unclear and the cost was high. Then, as now, congressional representatives complained that there were “no backward tracks when our Government began to spend money.”⁶² During congressional debate, as reported in the *New York Times*, it was suggested that the cost of the Utah Expedition could have “paid the expenses of our entire ocean mail service for years” or purchased a transcontinental railroad.⁶³ By April 1858, readers of the *Times* learned there was “an increasing disposition in Congress to check further movements of the Utah Expedition.”⁶⁴ When President Buchanan sent his budget message to Congress in June 1858, it was reportedly met with loud laughter on the floor of the House of Representatives.⁶⁵

Surprisingly from our perspective today, the news story that did not receive much press attention during the Utah War was the terrible massacre of more than a hundred men, women, and children by Mormon settlers and Indians on 11 September 1857 at Mountain Meadows three hundred miles southwest of Salt Lake City.⁶⁶ The atrocity received some mention in the *Times* during the Utah War, but it was usually brief or incidental.⁶⁷ The paucity of reporting at that time is not startling, however, given the tragedy’s remote loca-

tion and the difficulty of receiving news from the West. To better understand the limited reporting that the massacre received, it is helpful to note that it was also ignored by both President Buchanan in his first annual message to Congress on 8 December 1857 and Brigham Young in his 15 December 1857 message to the Utah legislature.⁶⁸

In December 1857, a half-year after Buchanan ordered federal troops to march to Utah, the president finally broke his public silence on the Utah Expedition in his aforementioned first annual message to Congress. He noted that the

present condition of the Territory of Utah, when contrasted with what it was one year ago, is a subject for congratulation. It was then in a state of rebellion, and cost what it might, the character of the Government required that this rebellion should be suppressed and the Mormons compelled to yield obedience to the Constitution and the laws. . . . The whole wisdom and economy of sending sufficient reinforcements to Utah are established not only by the event, but in the opinion of those who, from their position and opportunities, are the most capable of forming a correct judgment.⁶⁹

Just six months later, during the same week, coincidentally, that now-General Johnston and the expedition army marched into the Salt Lake Valley, the *Times* published their editorial conclusions regarding the Utah War:

The Mormon war has been unquestionably a mass of blunders from beginning to end. It was begun without knowing whether the Mormons would submit without fighting or not. The troops were then set in motion in Autumn when they ought to have been set in motion in Spring. When they had suffered horribly, and lost their baggage-train in the snow, peace commissioners were thought of, and negotiations set on foot. . . . Governor Cumming was to have entered as a conqueror; he entered in perfect peace and quietness. He wrote home that all was right – General Johnston wrote home that all was wrong. He said he was *de facto* as well as *de jure* Governor of Utah – Johnston said he was a prisoner. The troops were sent to vindicate the supremacy of the United States and reduce the Mormons to subjection. They have not done so, and the Mormons have all disappeared. We marched forth to bring a smiling and populous territory under sway – we find ourselves, after spending twenty millions of dollars, in possession of a howling waste.⁷⁰

For the *Times*, the bottom line of the Utah War was that “whichever way we look at it, it is a great mass of stupid blunders.”⁷¹ In the previous week a *Times* reporter was

even more blunt: “an army was sent to chastise rebels, before it was clearly ascertained whether or not there were any rebels to chastise.”⁷²

Historians today often refer to the Utah Expedition as “Buchanan’s Blunder” and consider it to have been an expensive folly. *Times* readers in 1857–58 were regaled with plentiful information about the Utah War. A great deal of it, as we have seen, was inaccurate, sensationalist, and generally hostile to the Mormons. Although these readers remained only partially informed regarding the actual situation, they probably would not have disagreed with the current negative appraisal by historians of Buchanan’s general handling of the controversy. In that respect at least, and perhaps despite itself, the *Times* got something right.

NOTES

1. See David L. Bigler and Will Bagley, *The Mormon Rebellion: America’s First Civil War 1857–1858* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011).
2. Although popularly known as the Utah War, it was not a war in the traditional sense. There were no pitched battles and no casualties due to military combat. As historian William P. MacKinnon has pointed out, however, it was not a bloodless conflict. The largest death toll associated with the conflict occurred on 11 September 1857 at Mountain Meadows in the southern portion of Utah Territory when Mormon vigilantes and local Indians attacked a wagon train of settlers bound for California and killed over one hundred men, women, and children. The most thorough investigation of that tragedy is Ronald W. Walker, Richard E. Turley Jr., and Glen M. Leonard, *Massacre at Mountain Meadows: An American Tragedy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008). The Utah War was perhaps best summarized by *New York Herald* Special Correspondent Lemuel Fillmore’s published report on 19 July 1858 shortly after the end of the war: it “may thus be summarily historized: killed, none; wounded, none; fooled, everybody.” Perhaps the two most important effects of the Utah War were that it placed serious financial strain on the United States Treasury and found over one-fourth of the U.S. Army stationed in Utah Territory when the American Civil War began in 1861. See “The Utah Expedition,” *Message from the President of the United States, Transmitting Reports from the Secretaries of State, of War, of the Interior, and of the Attorney General, relative to the military expedition ordered into the Territory of Utah*, Ex. Doc. No. 71, 35th Congress, 1st Session (Washington, DC: House of Representatives, 1858).
3. This study will use the nickname “Mormon” for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (sometimes also abbreviated as LDS) and for members of that church.
4. For a discussion of these events see William P. MacKinnon, ed., *At Sword’s Point, Part I: A Documentary History of the Utah War to 1858*, vol. 10, *Kingdom in the West: The Mormons and the American Frontier* (Norman, OK: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 2008); Leroy Hafen, *Utah Expedition, 1857–1858: A Documentary Account* (Norman, OK: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1983); and Bigler and Bagley, *The Mormon Rebellion*.
5. Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of Utah* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1964), 531.
6. *The New-York Daily Times* began publishing on 18 September 1851; the word *Daily* was dropped from the title on Monday, 14 September 1857 – during the period of the Utah War. Throughout this study’s text, but generally not in the endnotes, the newspaper will be referred to as the *Times*. Utah War reports from Albert Gallatin Browne, Jr., who served as a war correspondent with the Utah Expedition for the

New York Herald, are also noteworthy and deserving of separate study; but this study will restrict itself to articles published in the *New York Times*.

7. “War with the Mormons,” *New York Daily Times*, 13 May 1857; “The Mormon Outrages,” *New York Daily Times*, 1 May 1857; “The Mormon Rebellion,” *New York Daily Times*, 11 May 1857; and “Preparations in Utah for Resisting Federal Authority,” *New York Daily Times*, 1 May 1857.

8. “Important from Utah – Daring Outrage of the Mormon Government,” *New York Daily Times*, 18 May 1857.

9. “Latest intelligence,” *New York Daily Times*, 21 May 1857.

10. During 1857–1858, there were at least 2,235 *New York Daily Times* and *New York Times* articles regarding Kansas and slavery.

11. “The Democracy and the Lecompton Constitution” *New York Times*, 29 January 1858. The idiosyncratic punctuation has been preserved.

12. “Speech of Hon. A. Lincoln, of Indiana [*sic*],” *New York Daily Times*, 4 July 1857.

13. The *New York Times* was published daily except Sundays. For two cents you could purchase eight large pages with tiny handset type. An annual subscription cost six dollars, and postage was thirty-nine cents every three months. Nineteenth century newspapers printed a wide variety of content. It was common in the 1850s for numerous news article sources to appear on the pages of the *New York Times* – sometimes within the same article. Readers found articles from correspondents, proclamations, official war department dispatches, military orders, letters from private citizens (including those not originally intended for publication), letters to the editor (both signed and anonymous), speeches, transcripts of congressional debates and hearings, summaries of presidential cabinet meetings, excerpts from novels, political editorials, and many other news sources. The *New York Times* also included a wide variety of advertisements and reviews of novels, books, plays, and lectures about Mormons, polygamy, Utah, and the Utah Expedition.

14. The *New York Times* had received telegraphic news from the newly established Associated Press since 1851. See Richard Schwarzlose, *Nation's Newsbrokers*, vol. 1, *The Formative Years: From Pretelegraph to 1865* (Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1989), 170.

15. See three works by William P. MacKinnon: “Epilogue to the Utah War: Impact and Legacy,” *Journal of Mormon History* 29 (Fall 2003): 224–25; “‘Lonely Bones’: Leadership and Utah War Violence,” *Journal of Mormon History* 33 (Spring 2007): 152–53; and *At Sword's Point, Part I*.

16. The *New York Times* masthead motto was added on 10 February 1897.

17. “News of the Day,” *New York Daily Times*, 21 April 1857.

18. “Church Statistics,” [LDS] *2012 Church Almanac* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 2012), 203.

19. Until 1868, Salt Lake City was officially named Great Salt Lake City.

20. “The Mormons,” *New York Times*, 28 September 1857.

21. “Latest Intelligence,” *New York Times*, 20 November 1857; “Mormonism – Disgusted ‘Saints,’” *New York Daily Times*, 5 August 1857; and “Letter from Salt Lake,” *New York Times*, 16 March 1858.

22. The Utah militia, popularly known as the Nauvoo Legion (named after Nauvoo, Illinois, where the Church was headquartered from 1839–1846), consisted of several thousand pioneer volunteers; the exact number of militiamen available for service is unknown. Weapons manufacture in Utah was modest and

was limited to small arms – rifles and pistols. Mormons built some protective rock walls at narrow points in Echo Canyon, the most direct mountain pass leading to the Salt Lake valley, but made no serious attempts to fortify the numerous other canyons through the Wasatch Mountains. The greatest Mormon military deficiency during the Utah War was gunpowder and bullets. There are several accounts, for example, of Mormons trying to smuggle in kegs of gunpowder with crockery and other household supplies shipped across the plains during the war. See MacKinnon, *At Swords Point, Part I*, 257–275; “The Mormons,” *New York Times*, 29 December 1857; “From Washington,” *New York Times*, 1 October 1857; and “From the Utah Army,” *New York Times*, 19 May 1858.

23. “The Mormons,” *New York Times*, 17 October 1857.

24. “The Utah Expedition,” *New York Times*, 14 December 1857 and “News of the Day,” *New York Times*, 8 January 1858.

25. “Horrible Rumor from the Plains,” *New York Times*, 8 January 1858.

26. “Latest by Telegraph,” *New York Times*, 5 May 1858.

27. “The Last News from Utah,” *New York Times*, 21 May 1858.

28. As there were no battles, there were no battle deaths in the strict sense – on either side – during the Utah War. William P. MacKinnon estimates that approximately 150 people died as a result of the Utah War, more than two-thirds of whom were killed at Mountain Meadows in September 1857. See William P. MacKinnon, “Loose in the Stacks: A Half Century with the Utah War and Its Legacy,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 40, no. 1 (2007): 43, 60.

29. Thomas L. Kane, “Concerning the Mormons and Pres. Buchanan,” July 1858, Kane Papers, American Philosophical Society, in MacKinnon, *At Sword’s Point, Part I*, 495.

30. “Important from Utah,” *New York Times*, 24 June 1858.

31. “The Mormon News – Opinion of One who has Lived There,” *New York Times*, 21 May 1858.

32. Kane, “Concerning the Mormons,” in MacKinnon, *At Sword’s Point, Part I*, 495. “I had to convince his [Buchanan’s] reason why I must refuse an appointment from him, by showing him how important it was that I could be warranted in assuring the Mormons that I was not a Government agent . . . In a letter he [Buchanan] wrote for me he stated this at my request.”

33. “Important from Utah,” *New York Times*, 9 June 1858; “The Last News from Utah,” *New York Times*, 21 May 1858; “Utah,” *New York Times*, 24 July 1858; “Important from Utah,” *New York Times*, 7 June 1858; “News of the Day,” *New York Times*, 9 January 1858; “Important from the Utah expedition,” 9 January 1858; and *New York Times*, “Latest by Telegraph,” 21 May 1858.

34. [No article title] *New York Daily Times*, 22 May 1857.

35. “Utah and the Union,” *New York Times*, 13 November 1857.

36. “Are the Mormons in Rebellion?,” *New York Times*, 23 January 1858.

37. “The Utah Expedition,” *New York Times*, 29 January 1858.

38. “Late and Important from the Utah Expedition,” *New York Times*, 16 January 1858.

39. “The Utah Expedition,” *New York Times*, 4 March 1858.

40. “The Passage of the Kansas Bill in the Senate,” *New York Times*, 25 March 1858. Daguerreotypes were the first commercial photographs; they created a positive image on a copper plate. An ambrotype is a photograph that creates a positive image on a piece of glass.

-
41. "The Mormon War," *New York Times*, 19 January 1858.
 42. "The Mormons," *New York Times*, 2 March 1858.
 43. "Interesting from Utah," *New York Times*, 20 September 1858.
 44. "Affairs at the National Capital," *New York Daily Times*, 1 June 1857.
 45. "From the Utah Army," *New York Times*, 7 April 1858.
 46. "The Diplomatic Service," *New York Daily Times*, 15 April 1857; "Important from Utah – Daring Outrage of the Mormon Government," *New York Daily Times*, 18 May 1857; "The Utah Expedition," *New York Times*, 24 November 1857; "Arrival of the Star of the West," *New York Times*, 5 October 1857; and "The Prophet Unveiled," *New York Times*, 2 March 1858.
 47. "The Mormons," *New York Times*, 21 December 1857.
 48. "Highly Important from Utah," *New York Times*, 30 July 1858. The "green goggles" mentioned are available for public viewing on the second floor of the LDS Church History Museum located at 45 North West Temple Street in Salt Lake City, Utah.
 49. "The Mormons," *New York Times*, 21 December 1857. Young ultimately had 55 or 56 wives. See Jeffery Ogden Johnson, "Determining and Defining 'Wife': The Brigham Young Households," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 20, no. 3 (Fall 1987) and Leonard J. Arrington, *Brigham Young: American Moses* (New York: Knopf, 1985).
 50. "The Latest News from Salt Lake – Intentions of the Mormons," *New York Times*, 15 January 1858.
 51. "The Mormon Exodus," *New York Times*, 17 June 1858. The quotation's idiosyncratic punctuation has been preserved.
 52. "What Shall We Do with the Mormons?," *New York Daily Times*, 21 April 1857.
 53. *Ibid.*, and "A Patriot Wanted," *New York Daily Times*, 29 May 1857.
 54. "Interesting from Utah," *New York Times*, 23 August 1858.
 55. "The Governorship of Utah," *New York Daily Times*, 30 March 1857.
 56. "Utah and the Mormons," *New York Times*, 15 May 1858.
 57. "The Salt Lake Infamy – What Should Be Done," *New York Daily Times*, 20 May 1857.
 58. "One Week Later from Utah," *New York Times*, 13 August 1858.
 59. "The Proposed New Territory of Arizona," *New York Times*, 10 March 1858.
 60. "The Mormon Exodus," *New York Times*, 17 June 1858.
 61. "Light Wanted on the Mormon Difficulty," *New York Times*, 28 January 1858. Concerns over granting statehood to Utah Territory remained after the Utah War. For an examination of Utah Territory statehood discussions during the Civil War, see Kenneth L. Alford, "Utah and the Civil War Press," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 80:1 (Winter 2012): 75–92.
 62. "XXXVth Congress . . . First Session," *New York Times*, 27 January 1858.
 63. "The Ocean Mail Service," *New York Times*, 7 May 1858; "The Pacific Railroad – Its Effects upon Commerce Christianity and Civilization," *New York Times*, 29 December 1858.
 64. "Latest Intelligence," *New York Times*, 7 April 1858.
 65. "Important from Washington," *New York Times*, 11 June 1858.
-

66. For a thorough examination of this tragedy, see Walker, Turley Jr., and Leonard, *Massacre at Mountain Meadows: An American Tragedy*. Numerous other works exist on the subject, e.g., David L. Bigler and Will Bagley, *Innocent Blood: Essential Narratives of the Mountain Meadows Massacre*, vol. 12, *Kingdom in the West: The Mormons and the American Frontier* (Norman, OK: The Arthur H. Clarke Company, 2008).

67. The earliest mention of the Mountain Meadows Massacre in the *New York Times* appears to be “Latest Intelligence,” *New York Times*, 20 November 1857. During the Utah War, the *New York Times* frequently received western news delivered by the *Star of the West* – the same ship that would several years later become the target of Confederate artillery fire in Charleston Harbor on 9 January 1861. See, for example, “Very Late from Utah,” *New York Times*, 15 December 1857 and “Arrival of the Star of the West” *New York Times*, 14 May 1858.

68. James Buchanan, “First Annual Message, December 8, 1857” in John Bassett Moore, ed., *The Works of James Buchanan, Comprising his Speeches, State Papers, and Private Correspondence*, vol. 10: 1856–1860 (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1910), 129–63. Brigham Young, “Governor’s Message to the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Utah,” *Deseret News*, 23 December 1857.

69. “President’s Message,” *New York Times*, 7 December 1858.

70. “Cruel Panegyrics of the Administration Press,” *New York Times*, 23 June 1858. Italics in original.

71. *Ibid.*

72. “The Mormon Exodus,” *New York Times*, 17 June 1858.

Managing the backlash: Senator Ernest F. “Fritz” Hollings and the Marshall and Fortas Supreme Court nominations

David Timothy Ballantyne

Fritz Hollings is widely remembered for his often progressive policies as governor and U.S. senator for South Carolina. In his final address as governor to the state’s General Assembly on 9 January 1963, he urged peaceful compliance with the court order to integrate Clemson College.¹ Later he worked closely with NAACP Field Secretary I. De-Quincey Newman to expose the extent of human deprivation in South Carolina through a series of “Hunger Tours” around some of the state’s most poverty-stricken communities.² By his second term, in a break from many of his southern colleagues in the U.S. Senate, Hollings was aggressively touting increased spending on the food stamp program and was heavily involved in environmental preservation efforts.³ In this paper, however, I examine a “conservative moment” in Hollings’ career: between November 1966 and November 1968, a period stretching from his unexpectedly narrow special election victory over the Republican Marshall Parker to his election – again over Parker – to a full six-year U.S. Senate term. By focusing on Hollings’ response to two Supreme Court nominations by President Lyndon Johnson, this study will probe the salience of the backlash against civil-rights legislation in southern politics in the late 1960s. The nominations of Thurgood Marshall and Abe Fortas clearly inflamed the passions of conservative southern white voters. Although Hollings opposed both nominees, the way he did so highlights how he sought to appease his conservative white constituents without totally alienating his black voter support. Hollings’ response to these nominations also demonstrates the slow movement by South Carolina Democrats towards embracing civil rights concerns at a time when black voters were becoming an essential part of the Democratic voting coalition.

This two-year period is also particularly helpful for examining the evolving influence of racial concerns in South Carolina politics and in southern politics in general. Crawford Cook, Hollings’ administrative assistant at the time, later asserted that “we never stopped campaigning even after that general election [in 1966],” and recalled that Hollings “campaign[ed] very aggressively the whole time” between 1966 and 1968.⁴ Hollings has repeatedly cited the observation of his early Senate mentor, Georgia’s Richard B. Russell, that “you’re given a six year term, the first two years to be a statesman, the second two years to be a politician, and the last two years to be a demagogue.”⁵ The period from 1966 to 1968, then, was Hollings’ “demagoguing” interval, even though the circumstances of the special election had rearranged the Georgia senator’s sequence of stages. Moreover, opinion polls conducted on Hollings’

behalf at this time confirmed that race remained a central concern among the South Carolina electorate. In a letter to *Greenville News* editor Wayne Freeman after the 1968 campaign, Hollings discussed this preoccupation with race and its connectedness with allegedly “coded” issues like “law and order” in the minds of voters. Having taken information from two different polling companies, Hollings revealed that “in both instances, the number one issue is race. This is disconcerting because a candidate would like to come and talk about jobs and opportunities, but politically he knows this falls on deaf ears, and, instead, he must talk about law and order.”⁶

The “law and order” subject was well recognized for its potential to relay racial “code” to voters. A Kraft poll conducted in November 1967 for Hollings’ re-election campaign noted that its discussion of race relations in South Carolina “could just as easily have been classified under the general heading of ‘Law and Order.’” Moreover, from the viewpoint of conservative white voters, “the demonstrator – and this includes anti-war demonstrators as well as civil rights demonstrators – is flaunting [*sic*] the law of the land, or at least what they think should be the law of the land.”⁷ At times the racially-charged nature of the “law and order” theme was obvious, as seen in the oblique reference to Martin Luther King Jr. in one of Hollings’ constituent newsletters from December 1967: “Most of the students and rights leaders who reject society feel like an arrest is a badge of an individual’s sincerity. . . . In fact, if you are real good at it, arrest and jail can bring a Nobel Prize.”⁸ Similarly, in another newsletter highlighting the perceived breakdown of “law and order,” Hollings alluded to the Orangeburg Massacre, where three black students had been shot and killed by state troopers at South Carolina State College in February 1968. The shootings marked the culmination of an altercation that had begun with black protests over the failure of a local bowling alley to admit black patrons. The newsletter, entitled “Clear Call for Law” read: “If you don’t like the way a bowling alley is operated, then your right under the law and your responsibility under the law is to cross the street to the Court House and obtain a blue paper and close it down. You have no right to put a brick through the window or burn it down.”⁹ The theme of “law and order,” and particularly the notion that the U.S. Supreme Court under Chief Justice Warren had created a permissive society where crime could thrive, figured prominently in the cases made by opponents of the Marshall and Fortas nominations.

Thurgood Marshall, the first African-American Supreme Court nominee, was nominated by President Johnson in June 1967 and was easily confirmed by a sixty-nine to eleven Senate vote on 30 August. Hollings had actually eaten breakfast and spoken with Marshall at Union Station in Washington D.C. many years previously (6 December 1952), shortly before the opening arguments of *Briggs v. Elliot*, which contested the constitutionality of Clarendon County’s racially segregated school system.¹⁰ Yet there was little doubt that the senator, soon to face re-election in a state that had given Barry Goldwater a landslide victory

in 1964, was now going to vote against Marshall. The votes against Marshall's confirmation closely correlated with the states that had voted for Goldwater: eight of the eleven senators voting against Marshall came from the five Deep South states that had gone Republican in 1964, the only states alongside Arizona to do so.¹¹ No senators from the Deep South voted for Marshall's confirmation: the remaining two senators from the region, John Stennis of Mississippi and Richard Russell of Georgia, both abstained from voting.¹² Hollings later noted how voting for Marshall was never a serious consideration: "Lyndon Johnson had run and he was going to put a black on the court and they had that in the campaign. . . . If you were for that, you might as well not run [in South Carolina] for re-election in '68."¹³

As Marshall had served as the NAACP's Special Counsel, it was unsurprising that Hollings' constituents who opposed his confirmation used similar strategies to those that had previously been used to discredit the NAACP, with Marshall's detractors often employing a combination of anti-communist and anti-black themes. A pamphlet published by the "Mothers' Crusade for Victory over Communism" exhibited both these themes well. It noted that Marshall had been an officer of the National Lawyers Guild, which was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944. Marshall had also submitted "a report denouncing lynching and discrimination," which had been adopted by the Guild's executive board.¹⁴ Numerous constituent letters opposing Marshall shared the concern that he would act against the perceived interests of the South once he was confirmed to the Supreme Court. One letter urged a vote against his confirmation, since "the entire world knows how he would vote if our South was involved."¹⁵ Another contended that "Mr. Marshall has shown by his past actions to be a strong supporter of so-called 'civil rights' at the expense of states' rights and Cons[t]itutional government. His appointment would tend to further weaken our Federal form of government and continue the extreme liberal trend of the Warren Court."¹⁶ A letter from E. B. Woodward captures the simplicity of Hollings' decision, should he want to be re-elected. He wrote: "You are in Washington to promote the interest of the majority of the people who sent you there and I assure you the majority are the conservatives." Moreover, "disregarding this condition will certainly mark your name as 'MUD'."¹⁷

Hollings' justification for his vote against Marshall drew on the issue of "judicial philosophy," a term often used euphemistically in reference to the Warren Court's perceived disregard of judicial precedent in its opinions, particularly the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision. Hollings echoed the line of argument used by the southern conservatives Ervin, Eastland, McClellan, and Thurmond on the Senate Judiciary Committee, who argued in a minority report on the Marshall nomination that Marshall would serve as another member in the Supreme Court's "judicial activist" majority. Hollings wrote to Marshall on 21 June 1967 and asked for written opinions on several recent five-to-four Supreme Court decisions that affected law enforcement and were

deemed by many conservatives to be indicative of judicial overreach, such as the *Miranda v. State of Arizona* case.¹⁸ Marshall later noted in his Senate confirmation hearings in July that he would be unable to offer his opinion on any matter he would be likely to rule upon, as to do so would require him to recuse himself from future cases heard once he became a sitting justice.¹⁹ Hollings' inquiry at this point was disingenuous, for his staff had already drafted a letter to concerned constituents by 20 June that noted that Marshall's testimony on these controversial opinions had already disqualified him as a nominee. Since this letter draft to constituents was written the day before Hollings sent the original letter to Marshall asking his judgment on these cases, it was clear that his negative vote was already decided.²⁰

Hollings' justification for rejecting Marshall as a nominee was far more temperate than the reasoning given by his conservative South Carolina counterpart, Strom Thurmond. In a speech on the Senate floor before the confirmation vote on 30 August, Thurmond not only attacked Marshall's judicial philosophy; after pursuing an arguably esoteric line of questioning over the drafting of the Constitution's thirteenth and fourteenth amendments during Marshall's confirmation hearings, he contended that Marshall was too ill-informed to be a Supreme Court justice. Thurmond even held that Marshall's successful record as a litigator before the Supreme Court could not be used as a basis for his confirmation, since the cases were "decided on bases other than a strict application of the law and the precedents."²¹ In contrast, Hollings said nothing about the nomination on the Senate floor, and simply voted "Nay."

The use of the ostensibly non-racial "judicial philosophy" argument allowed Hollings to defend his "No" vote to disaffected black citizens in South Carolina. African Americans had given Hollings some 97 percent of their votes in the 1966 general election and certainly had provided him with his margin of victory. Responding to a letter from Samuel Hudson, described by Hollings' secretary as "a responsible Negro with some political influence" and "highly thought of in Georgetown,"²² Hollings sought to square his rejection of Marshall with his supposed support of black advancement.²³ Hollings wrote that "the Court is legislating or acting like a Congress rather than determining the law as a Court must do. I would disapprove anyone bent on continuing this trend. . . . Mr. Marshall's cause is to write into Court decisions what he thinks the law should be rather than what it is. This is one of our greatest dangers."²⁴

Abe Fortas' nomination in June 1968 to replace Chief Justice Warren, a nomination that Hollings also opposed, brought about a far more controversial and protracted fight over confirmation in the Senate. The nomination was eventually withdrawn after a cloture vote on 1 October fell well short of the necessary two-thirds majority to cut off debate over the nomination. Seeing an opportunity to curb the perceived excesses of the Warren Court, conservative senators, chief among them being the Republicans Robert Griffin of Michigan and Strom Thurmond, vigorously opposed Fortas' nomination. In confirmation hearings held in July, Griffin contended that Fortas was a "lame duck"

appointment (since Johnson had already announced that he was not seeking re-election), decried Fortas' closeness to the president, and sought to filibuster the nomination.²⁵

Although he would eventually oppose Fortas' confirmation, Hollings had initially told presidential aides that he would support the nomination.²⁶ Upon the announcement of the Fortas nomination, however, Hollings received an enormous volume of correspondence on the matter, the vast majority of it negative. Constituents were aggrieved on a great range of issues: they railed against Fortas' alleged Communist ties, the apparent breakdown of law, efforts to impose regulations on gun ownership, Fortas' supposed permissiveness towards pornography, and, often in a more coded manner, the Supreme Court's recent decisions promoting racial equality. Several letters²⁷ were sent to Hollings that attached information from the "Liberty Lobby," a far-right organization whose executive secretary testified at the Fortas confirmation hearings against the "philosophy of 'permissiveness' on the right of the people to live in safety." He further claimed this right to be "far more precious to man than any of the 'rights' that have monopolized the attention of the Supreme Court and the Congress recently."²⁸ An examination of the pamphlets published by the Liberty Lobby (and sent to Hollings) reveals how the strands of anti-Communist, anti-crime, and anti-integrationist sentiment often converged in the opposition to the Fortas nomination. One such publication was "The Abe Fortas Record," which provides a twenty-point assault on the substance of Fortas' career. In addition to citing his alleged ties to subversive groups and his work on designing the "Durham Rule," which "has prevented conviction of killers and rapists," the pamphlet notes that Fortas "helped to write the 'Gesell Report' for the Defense Department, aimed at forcing off-base racial integration in housing, social life, etc., of U.S., servicemen."²⁹ Fortas believed that much of the opposition to his nomination was motivated by racial considerations. In a letter to Justice William O. Douglas after the nomination hearings ended, he wrote: "Primarily, the bitter response mirrors the opposition to what has happened with respect to the racial question and the general revolution of human dignity, reflected by our decisions in the field of criminal law, etc."³⁰

Faced with this feverish opposition to Fortas, Hollings first chose to split the difference politically. He would vote against Fortas' confirmation but would not join the Griffin filibuster, differentiating his position from Thurmond, who aggressively opposed the nomination from his position on the Senate Judiciary Committee. In form letters sent back to constituents in July, Hollings dismissed as a partisan subterfuge the claim that Lyndon Johnson was making a "lame duck" appointment: in fact, Hollings asserted, Johnson "not only has the right but the duty" to nominate a new Chief Justice.³¹ Nevertheless, on the Senate floor on 18 July, Hollings provided the "judicial philosophy" grounds for opposing Fortas, as he had given for his opposition

to Marshall's confirmation. He remarked: "I oppose the confirmation . . . because I cannot approve the Warren philosophy of the Supreme Court."³²

Even this position provoked vocal opposition in South Carolina. Several constituents wrote to Hollings to claim that his stance against Fortas was a meaningless one. Since there was little question that Fortas would receive a majority of votes from the Senate, the only way to prevent his confirmation was to filibuster against the nomination.³³ Likewise, Hollings' Republican opponent in the 1968 election, Marshall Parker, attacked the decision not to join the Griffin filibuster as "another case of Hollings talking out of both sides of his mouth."³⁴

Perhaps unsurprisingly, with Hollings facing re-election in November and the Fortas issue remaining explosive, Hollings altered his position in August. He announced that he would filibuster the Fortas nomination, but not for the same reasons given in the Griffin manifesto, which alleged that President Johnson should not make a "lame duck" court appointment. Rather, Hollings would filibuster because of Fortas' adherence to the Warren Court's alleged philosophy of judicial activism. In constituent correspondence, Hollings contended that "it is the Warren philosophy of the Supreme Court I oppose. On this issue I will filibuster until Christmas, if necessary. However, I will not join in any partisan filibuster which has been instituted for the aggrandizement of any political party during a presidential election year."³⁵ Hollings joined in the filibuster when the Fortas nomination reached the Senate floor on 25 September and subsequently voted against cloture on 1 October. The failure to achieve cloture effectively killed the nomination.

During both the Marshall and Fortas nomination processes, Hollings sought to establish some distance between himself and the state's more ardent conservatives and segregationists, even if the differences were only rhetorical. In response to the chairman of the Beaufort County Democratic Executive Committee, who had noted the "extremely luke-warm" attitude of blacks toward Hollings' re-election, Hollings highlighted both the distinction between his position and that of other South Carolina politicians and the difficulties he had in balancing white and black interests. He wrote: "Our strongest Democratic candidate, Mendel Rivers, curses these things [i.e., President Johnson's Supreme Court nominations] outright and supports the candidate of the other Party. I am squeezed in the middle and do my best."³⁶ The problem for African Americans in the state was that even as Hollings offered little difference publicly from South Carolina's stridently segregationist politicians on issues that concerned the black community, there was nowhere else to go. After all, they were not going to support the Republican Marshall Parker. Although he had some reputation as a racial moderate,³⁷ during the 1966 general election Parker had remarked that he wanted "no part of the Negro vote."³⁸ Hollings candidly acknowledged this much in his correspondence with Wayne Freeman after the 1968 election. He wrote: "The

Negro will apparently remain in the Democratic Party, but due to the antagonism of the Republican leadership. . . . Harry Dent described the bloc vote as “voting like a bunch of monkeys.” In short, unless the Republican attitude changes, the Negro has no place else to go but the Democratic Party.”³⁹

Hollings’ 1968 campaign certainly sought to minimize the public profile of his black support, an unsurprising strategy given that Hollings had been labelled with some success as the “bloc vote” candidate in 1966. In a document from November 1968 entitled “Reflections on the Election”, Hollings noted that he “did not go to the Manning dinner for Roy Wilkins,” and “kept the right enemies, like Mo[d]jeska Simkins and Billy Fleming,” who were both perceived as too radical by many in the white community.⁴⁰ Moreover, the Hollings campaign had lined up support from local black leaders before the senate race received more intense public scrutiny: “We had our meetings earlier during the relative cool of August with the brethren, particularly with the Alex Alford [an influential African American from Georgetown] who would be offended if you didn’t come.”⁴¹

Hollings did, however, achieve substantive improvements for his black constituents on issues that were not publicly prominent, notably in the fields of health and housing. For instance, he secured Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) funds to allow the establishment of the Food Stamp program in majority-black Williamsburg County in 1967 after the county’s all-white delegation had refused to appropriate the necessary monies to finance the scheme.⁴² He also persuaded the head of OEO, Sargent Shriver, to provide money to establish the Beaufort-Jasper Comprehensive Health Center, and he expedited approval of Housing and Urban Development federal grants for housing projects benefiting black constituents.⁴³

The movement away from segregationist politics, or at least a politics in which Hollings paid overwhelming deference to his white segregationist support, was slow in coming in the 1960s. Tellingly, Hollings was still referring to the “so-called Civil Rights Act of 1968” in constituent correspondence that year.⁴⁴ Even if Hollings had been inclined to confirm both of President Johnson’s Supreme Court nominees, it would have been impracticable politically: without the votes of conservative whites, Hollings could not have been re-elected in 1968. His record of securing funds for health and housing projects demonstrated that Hollings could be responsive to black interests at this time, though not on issues as publicly prominent or controversial as the Marshall and Fortas nominations. Finally, judging from Hollings’ actions after his re-election, notably his testimony in early 1969 to a Senate select committee on the extent of hunger in South Carolina, an extremely controversial topic, the six-year term Hollings won in 1968 provided him with the political freedom required to pursue a public policy agenda that would have been politically impossible had he approached it in the two-year term he had won in 1966.

NOTES

1. 9 January 1963, "Address by Governor Ernest F. Hollings to the General Assembly of South Carolina," Ernest F. Hollings Papers, South Carolina Political Collections, University of South Carolina, University Libraries, Columbia (hereafter HP), as found in "Fritz Hollings: In His Own Words," <http://digital.tcl.sc.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/how/id/291/rec/2> (accessed 6 August 2012).
2. Ernest F. Hollings, *The case against hunger: a demand for a national policy* (New York: Cowles Book Co., 1970), 24–29, 35–36.
3. For his food stamp policy, see 16 April 1969, "Hunger and Defense," HP, Box 82, "Press, Newsletters, 1967–1970." On environmental preservation, see [December 1971], "Report To The People from Fritz Hollings," HP, Box 82, "Press, Newsletters, 1971–1972."
4. Crawford Cook, interview with the author, 13 April 2012; printed with permission of interviewee.
5. Ernest F. Hollings, unpublished interview with George Terry, 10 December 1990, South Carolina Political Collections, University Libraries, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
6. 28 January 1969, Hollings to Wayne Freeman, HP, Box 618, "1968, Correspondence, Gen. (3 of 3)."
7. November 1967, John F. Kraft, Inc., "A Report of Voter Attitudes in South Carolina," HP, Box 619, "1968, Polls, General."
8. December 1967, "Crime Marches On," HP, Box 82, "Press, Newsletters, 1967–1970." Over a quarter of the newsletters sent by Hollings to his constituents in the 1967–68 congressional session railed against the perceived breakdown of the rule of law in the U.S. and publicized the measures Hollings had introduced to remedy the situation. These law-focused newsletters were only outnumbered by dispatches discussing the Vietnam War. See HP, Box 82, "Press, Newsletters, 1967–1970."
9. May 1968, "Clear Call for Law," HP, Box 82, "Press, Newsletters, 1967–1970."
10. Ernest F. Hollings, with Kirk Victor, *Making government work* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 31–32.
11. These five states were: South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana.
12. The following senators voted "Nay": Robert Byrd (WV); James Eastland (MS); Allen Ellender (LA); Sam Ervin (NC); Lister Hill (AL); Spessard Holland (FL); Ernest Hollings, (SC); Russell Long (LA); John Sparkman (AL); Herman Talmadge (GA); Strom Thurmond (SC).
13. Hollings, unpublished interview with George Terry, see n. 5 above.
14. Received 20 June 1967, "Thurgood Marshall," published by "Mothers' Crusade for Victory over Communism," HP, Box 105, "Topical, 90th, Judiciary, Judges, Selection and appointment, Supreme Court, Marshall, Thurgood."
15. 14 June 1967, G. A. White to Hollings, HP, Box 105, "Marshall."
16. 14 June 1967, Brian Cisco to Hollings, HP, Box 105, "Marshall."
17. Received 20 June 1967, E. B. Woodward to Hollings, HP, Box 105, "Marshall."
18. 21 June 1967, Hollings to Thurgood Marshall, HP, Box 105, "Marshall." Hollings asked for opinions on the following cases: *Miranda vs. State of Arizona*, *Walker vs. City of Birmingham*, *Reitman vs. Mulkey*, and *Berger vs. State of New York*.
19. Marshall remarked during his confirmations hearings that "any statement I make . . . would oblige me to disqualify myself in those cases, would it not?" See Michael D. Davis and Hunter R. Clark, *Thurgood Marshall: warrior at the bar, rebel on the bench* (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1994), 273. In Marshall's response to Hollings' letter of 21 June, he noted similarly that "should I become a member of the Court, I would of course be called upon to pass on similar issues to those decided in the cases you cite,

and indeed, to determine the application of those cases. Therefore, I think it would be improper for me to express specific agreement or disagreement with specific cases." See 27 June 1967, Marshall to Hollings, HP, Box 105, "Marshall."

20. See 20 June 1967, "DRAFT," "sj," HP, Box 105, "Marshall."

21. 30 August 1967, *Congressional Record – Senate*, 24649–53.

22. 10 August 1967, Memorandum [Betty Bargmann to Hollings], HP, Box 105, "Marshall."

23. In his letter, Hudson initially cited the fears of a disaffected black youth: "[The boy] is worried because your vote of 'NO' would make the senatorial delegation of South Carolina 100% against the progress of the Negro, and the Negro of South Carolina in particular . . . this boy is doubting your integrity, your honesty, and is placing you in the same category with all other racist[s]." See 6 August 1967, Samuel B. Hudson to Hollings, HP, Box 105, "Marshall."

24. 11 August 1967, Hollings to Samuel B. Hudson, HP, Box 105, "Marshall."

25. On 12 July 1967, Griffin announced: "Never before has there been such obvious political maneuvering to create a vacancy so that an outgoing President can fill it and thereby deny the opportunity to a new President about to be elected by the people." *Nominations of Abe Fortas And Homer Thornberry, Hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary United States Senate Ninetieth Congress, Second session . . . July 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, and 23, 1968* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), 46.

26. Laura Kalman, *Abe Fortas: A Biography* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990), 329 n. 61. Hollings was reported as one of twelve Democratic senators who agreed to support Fortas, according to White House aides.

27. See, for instance, "The Abe Fortas Record," attached to letter sent 13 July 1968, H. C. Johnson to Hollings; and also attached to letter sent 17 July 1968, George W. Dargan to Hollings, HP, Box 104, "90th, Judiciary, Judges, Selection and Appointment, Supreme Court, Fortas, Abe, Opposition, 1968 (1 of 7)." See also n.d., Liberty Lobby pamphlet "THERE ARE NO GUNS IN THIS HOUSE", HP, Box 104, "Fortas, Opposition, 1968 (2 of 7)."

28. *Nominations of Abe Fortas And Homer Thornberry*, 283–84. The Liberty Lobby witness was W. B. Hicks, Jr.

29. "The Abe Fortas Record," attached to letter sent 17 July 1968, Dargan to Hollings, HP, Box 104, "Fortas, Abe, Opposition, 1968 (1 of 7)." The Durham Rule provided an insanity defense for defendants if a jury decided that there was a causal relationship between a mental disease suffered by the defendant and the criminal act committed. The Gesell Report was produced by the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces in November 1964, of which Fortas was a member.

30. Kalman, *Abe Fortas*, 348.

31. 12 July 1968, Hollings to W. S. "Steve" Weston, Jr., HP, Box 104, "Fortas, Opposition, (1 of 7)."

32. 18 July 1968, *Congressional Record*, "Nomination of Justice Abe Fortas To Be Chief Justice of the United States; Speech of Hon. Ernest F. Hollings of South Carolina in the Senate of the United States, Thursday, July 18, 1968." HP, Box 104, "Fortas, Opposition, 1968 (3 of 7)."

33. See, for example, 3 July 1968, John C. Bond to Hollings, HP, Box 104, "Fortas, Opposition, 1968 (2 of 7)."

34. [July 1968] "Hollings' Stand Branded 'Farce,'" Lee Bandy, *State*, attached to letter received 24 July 1968, HP, Box 104, "Fortas, Opposition, 1968 (3 of 7)."

35. 7 August 1968, Hollings to John D. Attaway, Jr., HP, Box 104, "Fortas, Opposition, 1968 (5 of 7)."

36. 10 July 1968, Calhoun Thomas to Hollings. 15 July 1968, Hollings to Calhoun Thomas, HP, Box 104, "Fortas, Opposition, 1968 (1 of 7)."

37. As a state senator, Parker had pushed for the reopening of the state's park system on a racially-integrated basis. The state forestry commission had chosen to close the parks in the summer of 1963 rather than comply with a court order to integrate them. See Bruce H. Kalk, *The origins of the southern strategy: two-party competition in South Carolina, 1950–1972* (Lanham, MD, and Oxford: Lexington Books, 2001), 69; Stephen Lowe, "Grass roots and marble columns: civil rights, public accommodations and South Carolina federal courts, 1955–1966," *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association* (2000): 27–42, at 33.

38. For Parker's comment, see Philip G. Grose, *South Carolina at the brink: Robert McNair and the politics of civil rights* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 134. Parker also received the backing of the South Carolina Independents organization in 1966, which supported the Republican slate of candidates that year. A pamphlet produced by the group proclaimed: "We cannot afford to have our State Government in the hands of politicians elected by the Negro bloc vote," and also asserted that Parker "has promised to introduce legislation to repeal the hated 1965 Voting Rights Bill. This bill was designed solely to register illiterate Negroes to vote for LBJ and his cronies." See [1966] Pamphlet "distributed by the South Carolina independents, L. Maurice Bessinger, Chairman," HP, Box 612, "1966, General, 1966." In an oral history interview in 2002, Parker acknowledged that some of George Wallace's backers were "a strong part of my support" in 1966. However, Parker attributed his loss in 1966 in part to his refusal to run a more racially tinged campaign, against the advice of these Wallace supporters. See Marshall Parker, interview with Herbert J. Hartsook, 25 January 2002, South Carolina Political Collections, University Libraries, University of South Carolina, Columbia. This is also available at <http://library.sc.edu/scpc/parker.pdf> (accessed 28 August 2012).

39. 4 February 1969, Hollings to Wayne Freeman, HP, Box 618, "1968, Correspondence, Gen. (3 of 3)."

40. Simkins and Fleming were both economically independent African Americans who aggressively confronted South Carolina's segregated system of race relations in the 1950s and 1960s. For more on Fleming, see John W. White, *Managed compliance: white resistance and desegregation in South Carolina, 1950–1970* (Ph.D. diss., University of Florida, 2006), esp. 236, 301–302; for Simkins, see Barbara A. Woods, "Modjeska Simkins and the South Carolina Conference of the NAACP, 1939–1957," in Vicki L. Crawford, Jacqueline Anne Rouse, and Barbara Woods, ed., *Women in the Civil Rights movement: trailblazers and torchbearers, 1941–1965* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993), 99–120.

41. 7 November 1968, "Reflections on the Election," HP, Box 619, "1968, Reflections on Election."

42. See undated "Memorandum re: Williamsburg Food Stamp Program"; 1 June 1967, E. I. Lawrence to Hollings; 25 August 1967, E. I. Lawrence to Hollings, HP, Box 90, "Topical, 90th, Agriculture, FNS, Food Stamps."

43. Hollings, *Making government work*, 133. For an example of HUD grants benefiting the black community, see 29 October 1968, Donald A. Campbell, Jr. to Hollings, HP, Box 618, "1968, Correspondence, Gen. (1 of 3)." Campbell wrote to thank Hollings, whose office helped secure "the approval by HUD of the application made by the Trinity Methodist Church for [an] apartment project" in the Camden area; he noted that the church "has a membership of approximately 300 Negroes and these people will be the initial beneficiaries of this apartment complex."

44. See, for instance, 18 March 1968, Hollings to Leland F. Robertson, HP, Box 93, "Topical, 90th, Civil Rights Act of 1964, Compliance."

Thou Shalt Not Duel: Some Observations regarding the Impotency of Dueling Laws in South Carolina

Matthew A. Byron

In the early nineteenth century, large groups of legislators, preachers, and anti-dueling society members in the South began a campaign to eradicate the practice of dueling through state legislation. These laws provided strict punishment for participants ranging from hefty fines to imprisonment to the death penalty, but did little to slow the practice of dueling in South Carolina or in any other state. Men were able to kill one another in duels and not face prosecution. Legislators in South Carolina were unable for many years to create an effective legal deterrent that would discourage or perhaps even eradicate the practice. Despite the absence of such deterrent for most of the nineteenth century, dueling did end in South Carolina by the final two decades. This study looks at the frequency of dueling in South Carolina against the backdrop of laws prohibiting its practice. Thereby new approaches can be suggested for further research. The data suggest that although South Carolina authorities appeared willing to prosecute duelists in the late 1700s, as dueling became fashionable in the 1800s the effective prosecution of duelists all but disappeared. When new legislation was adopted specifically designed to end dueling, some duelists ignored the law, while others simply removed to another state or territory to conduct their hazardous affairs of honor. This continuation of dueling has led many scholars to argue that dueling laws of the era simply were ineffective against the practice.¹ In general terms, this is correct insofar as dueling persisted in the state for most of the century. However, if one looks at how and where duels were conducted following various legislative enactments, one learns that dueling in South Carolina was eventually pushed to the margins of tolerated behavior and eventually denied the public acceptance that duelists so desperately sought.

Dueling arrived in the British American colonies relatively early in their history. In 1619, the first recorded duel occurred in the Virginia colony when Captain William Eppes killed Captain Edward Stallinge.² Two years later a duel occurred in the recently settled region of Massachusetts.³ Three years later another duel occurred in Virginia between Captain Richard Stevens and George Harrison.⁴ Thus, it might have seemed that dueling was entrenching itself into early colonial society. Yet surprisingly, no duel was recorded over the course of the next ninety years in any of the thirteen American colonies that would subsequently form the United States.

In the early part of the eighteenth century, dueling returned sporadically in the years prior to the American Revolution.⁵ During that conflict, however, the practice became popular among the young officers in Washington's army. Between 1775 and 1783, forty-five recorded duels occurred. The need for anti-dueling laws may have seemed necessary, yet only a few states had such prior to 1800.⁶ None of the original southern states had specific laws pertaining to dueling prior to the nineteenth century.

In South Carolina the adoption of a special dueling law prior to the nineteenth century was, perhaps, unnecessary. In several instances, recorded duels occurred wherein at least one of the participants was prosecuted under South Carolina's criminal code. In 1771, Dr. John Haley shot and killed Peter De Lancy, the Deputy Postmaster for the Southern District.⁷ In the aftermath of the duel, Haley was charged under South Carolina's murder law. The jury, taking but "a few Minutes . . . brought in their Verdict, guilty of Manslaughter."⁸ Although convicted of manslaughter, Haley thereby evaded the more serious conviction of murder. In any event, because Haley received a royal pardon, he served no jail time.⁹

In 1785 a fatal duel again occurred in South Carolina that resulted in a charge and conviction of manslaughter. Major William Clay Snipes shot and killed Colonel Maurice Simons. Snipes was initially charged with murder; the charge, however, was subsequently reduced, and he was found guilty of manslaughter.¹⁰ A similar incident occurred two years later when Captain Holmes mortally wounded Gabriel Wall. The jury of inquest that followed the duel quickly found Holmes guilty of manslaughter.¹¹ In both cases it is unclear how the defendants were actually punished, if at all. Regardless of punishment, the fact that these duels resulted in both prosecution and conviction of the surviving duelist suggests that South Carolina's legal system was intent on prosecuting and punishing duelists. As historian S. Sidney Ulmer notes, these decisions "illustrate the more critical attitude of the later period" towards dueling.¹²

Thus it appears that the need for a new dueling law was not present in eighteenth-century South Carolina, for duelists there faced prosecution and were convicted, albeit the punishments in these three cases – uncertain in two cases and pardoned in the third – were less than those originally sought by authorities. Yet for as many duelists who faced prosecution, some avoided any legal repercussions from the practice. In 1785, for example, Daniel Huger wounded Charles Cotesworth Pinckney during a duel without subsequent legal repercussions.¹³ But it would be unwise to conclude from this instance that South Carolina's legal system only prosecuted duelists when a duel proved fatal. The following year, two more duels occurred in the state, one proving fatal. No prosecution was undertaken against the duelists in either instance. Ralph Isaacs mortally wounded Dr. Joseph Brown Ladd

near Charleston, while Ralph Izard wounded Dr. Thomas Tudor Tucker in a duel over political differences.¹⁴ In 1787 an unknown physician killed Nathaniel Abney in a duel in Union County.¹⁵ In the case of the Isaacs-Ladd duel, it was reported that after Dr. Ladd fired his pistol into the air, Isaacs fired and hit Ladd in the stomach. Upon learning of the location of the wound, Isaacs purportedly proclaimed that he had taken aim at Ladd's leg and not at his stomach. Perhaps this explanation was enough to satisfy authorities that Ladd's death was the result of an accident and did not constitute premeditated murder. In the case of Nathaniel Abney, the fact that the surviving duelist was "unknown" suggests one of two things. Perhaps the surviving duelist was truly unknown and authorities could not pursue legal action. Alternatively, the lack of a name could have resulted from a concerted effort by members of the community to prevent authorities from locating the surviving duelist. The first alternative – which would require that no one in Union County knew who the surviving duelist was – seem less likely. Either way, the inability to name Abney's killer prevented any prosecution.

Following the sudden outbreak of duels between 1785 and 1787, South Carolina witnessed only three more duels in the remaining years of the eighteenth century.¹⁶ Yet all resulted in fatalities and in none was there any subsequent legal action. Thus, it appears that enforcement of South Carolina's murder law in instances of dueling at this juncture was sporadic, and no clear legal response to dueling had been established. This situation would change in the early part of the nineteenth century, however, when dueling became quite fashionable not only in South Carolina, but throughout the United States.

The volatile election year of 1800 launched the United States into a new world of political rivalries. Amid this competition between Hamiltonians, Jeffersonians, and "in-betweeners" like Aaron Burr, the duel became the political weapon of choice of many prominent politicians. To illustrate this point, one only need look at the number of recorded duels that occurred in the first decade of the nineteenth century (1800 to 1809): 117 duels took place across the United States, 7 of them in South Carolina. For comparison, a total of 121 duels had taken place in the same area during 1700 to 1799.¹⁷ It was in the wake of this upsurge that serious anti-dueling movements sprang up around the country.

In 1802 both Tennessee and North Carolina passed dueling laws in the aftermath of duels involving famous participants. In Tennessee, future U.S. President Andrew Jackson and Tennessee Governor John Sevier met on the Kentucky border to settle their affair of honor. Although neither man was injured in the encounter, Sevier's high public profile – greater than Jackson's at the time – pushed Tennessee legislators to enact

a law that prohibited participants in a duel from holding public office.¹⁸ That same year, John Stanly dueled with North Carolina State Senator Richard Dobbs Spaight. The latter, who also had been a U.S. Representative from North Carolina, died from his wounds, while Stanly soon took Spaight's seat in the North Carolina Senate.¹⁹ The outrage over Spaight's death led directly to the passage of North Carolina's dueling law. This enactment, as would be the case with most subsequent dueling laws in the country, took much of its wording from anti-dueling legislation already in existence. In this instance, North Carolina's law was nearly identical to Tennessee's statute.

The passage of North Carolina's and Tennessee's dueling laws did not, however, immediately trigger a massive movement elsewhere to outlaw the practice. Instead, it was the 1804 duel wherein Aaron Burr killed Alexander Hamilton in Weehawken, New Jersey, that sparked national outrage. The death of a prominent national politician at the hands of the Vice-President of the United States produced an outcry from citizens, especially from the clergy, to legislate more effectively both on the federal and state level against the practice of dueling. Reverend Samuel Spring was most prominent among the clergy in this regard.

A graduate of Princeton and chaplain in the Continental Army during the American Revolution, Spring had developed in his ministry a strong following throughout the country.²⁰ So when he took the pulpit in Newburyport, Massachusetts, on 5 August 1804 (a month after Hamilton's death) to rail against the practice, many Americans took heed. The sermon, entitled "The Sixth Commandment Friendly to Virtue, Honor and Politeness. A Discourse, in Consequence of the Late Duel," focused much of its attention on the violation of the biblical commandment prohibiting murder.²¹ Refraining from passing personal judgment on Hamilton or Burr, Spring proclaimed that all duelists were murderers regardless of whether anyone was killed. The duelist, according to Spring, professes to fight in order to prove his honor by risking his life, not in order to kill his opponent. Thus, he "prefers death and worldly honor before life and worldly disgrace. He is therefore a murderer: he is a self murderer."²² Spring's sermon, and those by other clergymen in the following years, attempted to place the ideology and ritual of dueling on trial by appealing to Americans' disdain for senseless violence and, more importantly, their abhorrence of suicide. It is difficult to ascertain how successful this approach was. Clearly people listened to and read Spring's sermon or those of other like-minded clergy, but it cannot yet be concluded that these sermons were the most influential factor motivating legislators to enact anti-dueling laws. Nevertheless, the combination of outrage over Hamilton's death at the hands of Burr and the sustained attack on the practice of dueling by clergymen remained a potent one, even in the face of the large number of duels subsequently recorded in the next few years across the United States.²³

But what about South Carolina? Despite the creation of dueling laws in neighboring states in the early 1800s and the national outcry over Alexander Hamilton's death, the state was rather slow to enact its own dueling law. To be certain, there was one pretext available for South Carolinian legislators to encourage enactment of a dueling law in 1802 at the same time as Tennessee and North Carolina. In June of that year, the strained romantic relationship between South Carolinians George Izard and Ninette Peire led to a duel in New Jersey (opposite Philadelphia) between the former and the latter's brother. Both Izard – whose father had fought one of South Carolina's earlier duels in 1786 – and Ninette's brother were wounded, the former seriously.²⁴ But there is no recorded evidence that either man faced prosecution.²⁵ Seemingly an isolated event, the Izard-Peire duel attracted little or no attention in South Carolina despite the fact that a famous Charlestonian had been gravely wounded. Nor did it prompt any anti-dueling legislation in the Palmetto State.

Dueling resurfaced in South Carolina in 1806 when James McPherson and Emanuel De La Motta fought near the Washington Race Course in Charleston. It appears that neither man suffered injury or prosecution following the affair.²⁶ A duel in the following year and two more in 1808 could perhaps have been expected to provoke a public response, yet no legislative movement, nor did indeed any duels, for that matter, occur in the state during the next three and a half years.²⁷

In 1812 Dr. Philip Moser promoted the passage of the first anti-dueling law in South Carolina's history. Moser's Act, as it became known, placed harsh penalties on all participants of a duel. Anyone involved in the duel, regardless of degree of participation, "shall be imprisoned for twelve months, and shall severally forfeit and pay a fine of two thousand dollars, the one half thereof to be appropriated to the use of the State, the other half to the informer. . . ."²⁸ By offering a monetary incentive to informants, the law was designed both to inculcate a negative attitude towards dueling and a willing attitude towards suppressing the practice. Moser's Act also included a provision similar to that of Tennessee and North Carolina legislation, whereby the survivor of a fatal duel would be indicted under the state's murder law, which prescribed the death penalty upon conviction.²⁹

The effectiveness of Moser's Act is difficult to determine. When one simply looks at the number of duels in the immediate aftermath of its enactment, the Moser Act was perhaps momentarily successful because no duel was recorded in South Carolina until 1815, when two occurred. After 1815, no recorded duel took place in the state until 1822. If the two duels in 1815 are discarded as exceptional – one involved two members of the Army stationed in South Carolina and the other involved two men from North Carolina – then Moser's Act maybe had more of an impact than previously thought.³⁰

Yet such success, if any, was short-lived. Beginning in 1822, South Carolina averaged one duel per year for the next forty-four years.³¹ This is considerable when compared to the previous half-century. What is more striking, however, is that exactly one quarter of the duels between 1822 and 1866 were fought by non-South Carolinians. Thus, the Palmetto State not only hosted its own sons fighting duels, but also duelists from Georgia (six duels), North Carolina (two duels), and Alabama (two duels).³² From 1822 to 1838 a total of twenty-one duels occurred in the state.³³ The large number of duels in the period just noted perhaps even prompted the composition of an instruction manual on how to conduct a duel properly.

John Lyde Wilson's 1838 book – *The Code of Honor, or Rules for the Government of Principals and Seconds in Duelling* – doubtlessly facilitated the acceptability of dueling in South Carolina.³⁴ A duelist himself and governor of South Carolina from 1822 to 1824, Wilson provided a comprehensive guide book on how to conduct duels appropriately. *The Code of Honor* detailed what constituted an insult, what steps the aggrieved person could take to achieve satisfaction, and the roles each participant in the duel played. The publication of *The Code of Honor* essentially glorified dueling and arguably made it more popular than ever across the country.³⁵

From 1838 (the year *The Code of Honor* was published) to 1849, five duels were recorded in South Carolina, all involving state residents. In the volatile decade from 1850 to 1860, the state witnessed eleven duels and one instance whereby two South Carolinians ventured into North Carolina to settle their affair.³⁶ Another seven duels took place in the state during the 1860s, the time of a violent war and its often violent aftermath. The next decade, however, only recorded one duel in 1879.³⁷

On 5 July 1880, the most infamous duel in South Carolina history took place when Colonel E. B. C. Cash killed Colonel William Shannon at Dubosse's Bridge near Bishopville.³⁸ The Cash-Shannon duel stirred up animosity towards a practice that had, over the past decade, been rather dormant. Joining a larger national movement to crack-down on dueling, South Carolina authorities arrested Cash soon after the duel. He appeared before a Camden County judge and was bound over. Upon learning of Cash's peace bond, the Decatur (IL) *Daily Republican* noted, "When a full-blooded South Carolinian, of royal aristocratic blood, has to be habeas corpused out of jail, simply for killing another man in a duel, we begin to see that the world moves."³⁹ It certainly was news to the country that South Carolina might be enforcing its dueling law. Yet, it was only a fleeting moment. In his instructions to the jury at the end of Cash's trial for murder, the judge perhaps reflected local sentiment when he remarked, "[I]t was alleged that this duel was fair."⁴⁰ It was clear to the jury what the judge meant. Within a very short period of time, the jurors returned and acquitted Cash of murder.

In the time between this duel and the jury's acquittal, South Carolina legislators nevertheless revised the dueling code for the first time since 1812. The proposed new law garnered considerable attention throughout the country. The Decatur (IL) *Daily Republican* reported that

A STRINGENT anti-dueling bill has been introduced in the South Carolina Legislature. By its provisions a person killing another in a duel, or so wounding him that he dies within six months, is to suffer death, and a person carrying a challenge or being present at a duel is to be imprisoned in the penitentiary and fined.⁴¹

This bill became law in December 1880. Its threatened sanctions and a new determination to enforce such signaled a change in the attitude of South Carolinians. The aftermath of the Cash-Shannon duel proved that it was no longer acceptable to duel. Following that 1880 event, no further duels are recorded to have occurred in the state.⁴²

Much more research needs to be done on dueling in South Carolina. This study has made a start by enumerating the incidence and frequency of duels in the state since colonial times, by identifying legal consequences when known, by investigating nineteenth-century state legislation against dueling, and by noting briefly some cultural aspects regarding dueling as acceptable or unacceptable behavior.

The history of dueling is, of course, part of a larger inquiry into the role of violence in seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and nineteenth-century America.⁴³ Dueling itself has been the focus of extensive historical research, both general⁴⁴ and southern regional.⁴⁵ Only two studies hitherto have specifically addressed anti-dueling laws.⁴⁶ This writer's recent review⁴⁷ has argued in general that a combination of several factors led to the end of ritualized dueling in late nineteenth century America. First, the large amount of death and destruction caused by the American Civil War convinced Americans, especially southerners, that the needless loss of life through dueling was no longer to be tolerated. Secondly, a new generation of Americans came to prominence in the post-Civil War era that had little connection to or respect for the violent traditions of its ancestors in matters of honor. Finally, the crack-down on dueling by state authorities made it more dangerous for men to conduct properly ritualized duels, for too much evidence became now available for local courts to prosecute duelists. Instead, would-be duelists turned to "street duels" or "street fights," whereby they abandoned the customs of issuing a challenge and arranging a meeting place, and chose instead to approach and shoot their opponent in the street.

The three general conclusions made in the preceding paragraph now need to be tested for the Palmetto State in particular. We are still far from determining why duels

were important in nineteenth-century South Carolina, or why family and personal honor were deemed more important than obedience to the law.

NOTES

1. Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 351; Kenneth S. Greenberg, *Honor & Slavery: Lies, Duels, Noses, Masks, Dressing as a Woman, Gifts, Strangers, Humanitarianism, Death, Slave Rebellions, The Proslavery Argument, Baseball, Hunting, and Gambling in the Old South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 14; Jack K. Williams, *Dueling in the Old South: Vignettes of Social History* (College Station: Texas A&M Press, 1980), 60–71; John Hope Franklin, *The Militant South, 1800–1861* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 60–62; Joanne B. Freeman, *Affairs of Honor: National Politics in the New Republic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 178.
2. Archibald William Patterson, *Code Duello: With Special Reference to the State of Virginia* (Richmond: Richmond Press, 1927), 1–2.
3. In 1621 two servants, Edward Doty and Edward Leicester, fought. See the Bangor *Daily Whig and Courier*, 25 May 1844.
4. Both Harrison and Stephens were fatally wounded. See [n.a.], “Book Reviews,” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 1 (1894): 347n.7, and Philip Alexander Bruce, *Social Life of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* (Richmond: Whittet & Shepperson, 1907), 245.
5. Between 1700 and 1774, there were twenty-three recorded duels within the thirteen American colonies. See Matthew A. Byron, “Crime and Punishment?: The Impotency of Dueling Laws in the United States” (Ph.D. diss., University of Arkansas, 2009), Appendix.
6. Pennsylvania had a dueling law by the end of the 1680s, Massachusetts in 1719 and Kentucky in 1799.
7. De Lancy was the brother-in-law of Ralph Izard, another duelist in South Carolina. See notes 14 and 24 below for more information regarding the latter’s duel.
8. *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 21 November 1771.
9. On 4 November 1771 Haley pleaded for his “Majesty’s pardon” and was discharged with no further punishment when the pardon was granted. See *New-York Journal*, 21 November 1771.
10. Sabine erroneously dates the duel to 1786; see Lorenzo Sabine, *Notes on Duels and Duelling: Alphabetically Arranged with a Preliminary Historical Essay* (Boston: Crosby, Nichols, and Company, 1855), 279. See also *Charleston Evening Gazette*, 18 February 1786; John C. Meleney, *The Public Life of Aedanus Burke: Revolutionary Republican in Post-Revolutionary South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989), 251.
11. The conviction of Holmes may have had more to do with the ritual of the duel rather than its deadly outcome. According to S. Sidney Ulmer, “[U]rged on by a spectator,” both men agreed to fire a second shot which was “contrary to usual practice in such matters.” See S. Sidney Ulmer, “Some Eighteenth Century South Carolinians and the Duel,” *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 60, no. 1 (January 1959): 2.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Malcolm Bell, *Major Butler’s Legacy: Five Generations of a Slaveholding Family* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004), 526; Marvin R. Zahniser, *Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Founding Father* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1967), 51–56.

-
14. See notes 7 above and 24 below. Mark R. Jones, *Wicked Charleston: The Dark Side of the Holy City* (New York: The History Press, 2005), 109; Merrill Jensen, *The Documentary History of the First Federal Elections, 1788–1790* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1976), 1: 226.
15. William Dallas Bernard, *The John Bernard and Mary Abney Genealogy, Fluvanna County, Virginia* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1975), 3.
16. Alexander Inglis-William Allen Deas (1791); Daniel Wilson-Unknown duelist (1794); Thomas Sidney Reese-Mr. Michie (1798). Inglis, Wilson, and Reese were killed. Maeva Marcus, *The Documentary History of the Supreme Court of the United States, 1789–1800* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), 3:589n.22; Mabel L. Webber, “Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette,” *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* 22, no. 1 (January 1921): 90; and Annie Mims, *A Record of the Descendants of Isaac Ross and Jean Brown* (Jackson, MS: Consumers Stationery & Printing, 1911), 212–13.
17. See Byron, “Crime and Punishment?,” Appendix.
18. Stephen B. Weeks, “The Code in North Carolina,” *Magazine of American History* 26, no. 5 (December 1891): 448. It would be interesting to determine what factors – singly or in combination – were at work here. Was the intent to discourage dueling among socially elite men with political ambitions? Was the intent to avoid potential collusion by pro-dueling officeholders in the potential prosecution of duelists?
19. Weeks, “The Code in North Carolina,” 449.
20. While at Princeton, Spring was a classmate of Aaron Burr; during the American Revolution, he was present when Burr attempted to recover the body of General Montgomery. See George P. Fisher, et al., ed., *The New Englander* (New Haven: Thomas J. Stafford, 1866), 25: 369.
21. Samuel Spring, *The Sixth Commandment Friendly to Virtue, Honor and Politeness. A Discourse, in Consequence of the Late Duel, Addressed to the North Congregational Society of Newburyport: August 5, 1804* (Newburyport: E. W. Allen Press, 1804).
22. Spring, *The Sixth Commandment*, 15.
23. Between 1804 and 1812, seventy-nine duels occurred. The figures in Byron, “Crime and Punishment?,” Appendix, have now been updated by the author.
24. The author is unable to determine the brother’s name. For this duel, see Joseph G. Swift, *The Memoirs of Gen. Joseph Gardner Swift, LL.D., U.S.A., First Graduate of the United States Military Academy, West Point, Chief Engineer, U.S.A., From 1812 to 1818* (privately printed, 1890), 35. See n. 7 above for Izard’s father Ralph, who seriously wounded Dr. Thomas Tudor Tucker, a surgeon in the American Army during the Revolution. Their dispute centered on Tucker’s campaign to win a seat in the South Carolina legislature. Jensen, *The Documentary History of the First Federal Elections*, 1: 226.
25. George Izard would later become territorial governor of the Arkansas Territory, an appointment made in 1825 by President Monroe, thereby suggesting that his duel in 1802 was not a hindrance to his career. See Jeannie M. Whyne, et al., *Arkansas: A Narrative History* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2002), 102.
26. *New York Times*, 26 January 1913. The disparity between the dates of the duels and their report in the newspaper stems from the fact that the *Times* published omnibus lists of previous duels only on two separate occasions in 1824 and in 1913. See also notes 27 and 30 below.
27. In 1807, a man named Brailsford was killed in November by an unnamed duelist. In 1808, J. McMillan killed Dr. B. Powell, from Charleston, in October. That same year, J. Lesley killed Dr. Bushell. Lesley was from Georgia, Bushell resided in South Carolina. *Boston Recorder*, 24 April 1824.
-

-
28. Thomas Cooper, *The Statutes at Large of South Carolina* (Columbia: A. S. Johnston, 1839), 5:671. Moser was an active reformer in South Carolina who advocated for laws against murder. In addition to his anti-dueling legislation, he promoted a bill that would make any deliberate killing of a black man, free or enslaved, punishable by death without the benefit of clergy. The bill was enacted. See Williams, *Dueling in the Old South*, 66; Yates Snowden, ed., *History of South Carolina* (Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1920), 1:555.
29. Byron, "Crime and Punishment?," 20–78; Williams, *Dueling in the Old South*, 66.
30. Williams downplays the impact of Moser's Act; see *Dueling in the Old South*, 66. In May 1815 Captain Hamilton killed Captain E. D. Dick and J. Holmes killed Bela Williams Strong. For the former pair, see Congress, House of Representatives, Committee of Claims, [untitled], 20th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1828, H. Rept. 30. The latter pair were from North Carolina; see *Boston Recorder*, 24 April 1824.
31. Forty duels in all; see Byron, "Crime and Punishment?," Appendix. The figures have now been updated by the author.
32. From Georgia: Hepburn-Howard (1822), Mitchell-Beall (1825), Smyth-Thomas (1852), Russell-Griffin (1868), Brand-Morehead (1868), and Cresswell-Cresswell (1869). From North Carolina: Erwin-Baxter (1852) and Wilkings-Flanner (1856). From Alabama: Phillips-Moorefield (1857) and Pratter-Appleby (1857). See Byron, "Crime and Punishment?," Appendix.
33. Byron, "Crime and Punishment?," Appendix. The figures have now been updated by the author.
34. John Lyde Wilson, *The Code of Honor, or Rules for the Government of Principals and Seconds in Duelling* (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2006 reprint).
35. There are ongoing discussions whether *The Code of Honor* encouraged men to duel and whether it was written in response to many duels being fought using improper rules. In any event, the handbook gave an appearance of legitimacy to dueling. In the 1820s, the United States witnessed 76 duels, while in the 1830s there were 100 duels.
36. See Byron, "Crime and Punishment?," Appendix for the Keith-Dantzler duel (1852).
37. *Ibid.*, Appendix for the Shannon-Clarke duel.
38. Decatur *Daily Republican*, 7 July 1880.
39. *Ibid.*, 21 July 1880.
40. *Ibid.*, 25 June 1881.
41. *Ibid.*, 8 December 1880.
42. Two men, Gardner and Norris, from Edgefield, South Carolina, were arrested and bound over in February 1890. Decatur *Daily Republican*, 3 February 1890. After their release from the bond there is no record that they subsequently duelled.
43. Franklin, *The Militant South*; Jack K. Williams, *Vogues and Villainy: Crime and Retribution in Antebellum South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1959); Richard Maxwell Brown, *Strain of Violence: Historical Studies of American Violence and Vigilantism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975); Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*; Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Honor and Violence in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Maxwell Brown, *No Duty to Retreat: Violence and Values in American History and Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Greenberg, *Honor & Slavery*; Michael A. Bellesiles, ed. *Lethal Imagination: Violence and Brutality in American History* (New York: New York University Press, 1999).

44. John Gideon Millingen, *The History of Duelling: Including, Narratives of the Most Remarkable Personal Encounters that have Taken Place from the Earliest Period to the Present Time*, vol. 1 and 2 (London: Richard Bentley, 1841, 2005 reprint); Sabine, *Notes on Duels and Duelling*; Ben C. Truman, *The Field of Honor* (New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert, 1884); Ben C. Truman, *Duelling in America* (San Diego: Joseph Tabler Books, 1992 reprint); Don C. Seitz, *Famous American Duels: with Some Account of the Causes that led up to Them and the Men Engaged* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1929); John S. Kendall, "The Humors of the Duello," *The Louisiana Historical Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (April 1940): 445–70; William Oliver Stevens, *Pistols at Ten Paces: The Story of the Code of Honor in America* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940); Harnett T. Kane, *Gentlemen, Swords and Pistols* (New York: Bonanza Books, 1951); Hamilton Cochran, *Noted American Duels and Hostile Encounters* (Philadelphia: Chilton Books, 1963); John A. Atkinson, *Dueling Pistols: And Some of the Affairs They Settled* (London: Balding & Mansell, 1964); Robert Baldick, *The Duel: A History of Duelling* (London: The Hamlyn Publishing Group Limited, 1965, 1970 reprint); Guy A. Cardwell, "The Duel in the Old South: Crux of a Concept," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 66, no. 1 (Winter, 1967): 50–69; Williams, *Dueling in the Old South*; W. J. Rorabaugh, "The Political Duel in the Early Republic," *Journal of the Early Republic* 15, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 1–23; Joanne B. Freeman, "Duelling as Politics: Reinterpreting the Burr-Hamilton Duel," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 53, no. 2 (April 1996): 289–315; Joanne B. Freeman, *Affairs of Honor: National Politics in the New Republic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001); Thomas Fleming, *Duel: Alexander Hamilton, Aaron Burr, and the Future of America* (New York: Basic Books, 1999); Barbara Holland, *Gentlemen's Blood: A History of Duelling from Swords at Dawn to Pistols at Dusk* (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2003); Paul Kirchner, *Dueling with the Sword and Pistol: 400 Years of One-on-One Combat* (Boulder: Paladin Press, 2004).
45. Weeks, "The Code in North Carolina," 443–56; Thomas Gamble, *Savannah Duels & Duellists, 1733–1877* (Savannah: The Review Publishing and Printing Company, 1923, 1997 reprint); Robert Howison, "Duelling in Virginia," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 2nd ser., 4, no. 1 (October 1924): 317–244; Patterson, *Code Duello*; Stuart O. Landry, *Duelling in Old New Orleans* (New Orleans: Harmanson Publishing, 1950); Jack K. Williams, "The Code of Honor in Ante-Bellum South Carolina," *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 54, no. 3 (July 1953): 113–28; Herbert J. Doherty, Jr., "Code Duello in Florida," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 29, no. 4 (April 1954): 241–52; Peter A. Brannon, "Duelling in Alabama," *The Alabama Historical Quarterly* 17, no. 3 (Fall, 1955): 97–104; Winston J. Coleman, Jr., "The Code Duello in Ante-Bellum Kentucky," *Filson Club Historical Quarterly* 30 (April 1956): 125–40; Wilmuth S. Rutledge, "Duelling in Antebellum Mississippi," *The Journal of Mississippi History* 26, no. 3 (August 1964): 181–91; James E. Moss, *Duelling in Missouri History: the Age of Dirk Drawing and Pistol Snapping* (Kansas City: The Lowell Press, 1966); James F. Risher, Jr., *Interview with Honor: The Burr-Hamilton Duel* (Philadelphia: Dorrance & Company, 1975); James Michael Denham, "Duelling in Territorial Middle Florida" (M.A. thesis, Florida State University, 1983); Virginius Dabney, *Pistols & Pointed Pens: The Dueling Editors of Old Virginia* (Chapel Hill: Algonquin Books, 1987); Dick Steward, *Duels and the Roots of Violence in Missouri* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000); John Hammond Moore, *Carnival of Blood: Dueling, Lynching, and Murder in South Carolina, 1880–1892* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 2006).
46. C. A. Harwell Wells, "The End of the Affair? Anti-Dueling Laws and Social Norms in Antebellum America," *Vanderbilt Law Review* 54, no. 4 (2001): 1805–2001; Byron, "Crime and Punishment?"
47. Byron, "Crime and Punishment?," 155–86.

An Lucht Siuill Palmetto

Christopher Crowley

*When my life is ending
I'll say with my last breath
for loving and serving you my God
I have no regrets.*

Jim Carroll, Traveller Poet¹

*Men should be free to act upon their opinions – to carry these out in their lives
without hindrance, either physical or moral, from their fellow men...*

John Stuart Mill²

The disturbing security camera video recording of Madelyne Toogood thrashing her child in a Wal-Mart parking lot in Mishawaka, Indiana, on Friday, 13 September 2002, is etched forever in the memory of cyberspace. This video is available for viewing on countless news websites and on YouTube. When the authorities ran a check on the vehicle registration while investigating the case, they quickly discovered that the address on the registration was the address of record for literally dozens of vehicles. They were all owned by others. Slowly, it became evident to authorities that she was an Irish Traveller. Once the investigators had progressed in their examination of the case, they discovered that the Toogood car was not just one of dozens, but of hundreds registered to the same address. As they looked still further, the names on the other registrations, like Burk, Carroll, and Daley, began to resonate. They realized that they were all Irish Travellers.³ The Toogood case inadvertently focused an unwelcome, national spotlight on and raised many unwanted questions about this obscure and secretive ethnic group. Who are Travellers? Where did they come from and where do they live? Why have so few people ever heard of them before?

The secretive nature and the dread of media attention of Irish Travellers are responses to hard lessons learned through their shared history and common experiences. They have been burned, in their view, many times in the past by the media and by the “country people,” one of the many terms they use to refer to outsiders. The exact causes of their cultural isolation are complex, and their origins cannot be attributed to one particular event. Although the cultural isolation can be blamed on their clannish nature, it can also be tied to their lifestyle choices, responses to discrimination, and occupations. This isolation is also, in part, caused by the response of society to the unusual character

of the Traveller community. The dynamic that exists between the Traveller community and the general population is largely based on erroneous assumptions and disapproving opinions that each has formed of the other over time. Even though all prejudices have at their root some small basis in fact, the rest is born of ignorance, intolerance, and a lack of empathy. While the cultural seclusion of Travellers originated in Ireland because of their itinerant lifestyle, this insularity has evolved over the generations to become a choice that the Traveller community makes for itself. It would be relatively painless for a member of the Traveller community to assimilate into the general population simply because he or she is white, English-speaking, and ethnically similar to a large portion of the mainstream population. Remaining apart is a conscious decision that has become a central element of their culture. The choice is a preference which can be interpreted as collective, ethnic, and cultural self-protection.

Little has been written about the history of Irish Travellers prior to the twentieth century, and much of their history relies on oral tradition. "As in primitive cultures, it has been passed on by word of mouth from generation to generation, and there are many inconsistencies in the version that has survived," explained Jon Nordheimer of the *New York Times*.⁴ There are some assertions that Irish Travellers are the descendents of landed gentry removed from their land during the reign of Oliver Cromwell, thus beginning their itinerant lifestyle. This is a fable that highlights the problems linked to oral histories and also speaks to their veracity. More plausible is that the itinerant lifestyle of the vast majority of early Travellers can be traced to famine and the grinding poverty of ordinary Irish peasants. "While some Tinker families likely date to this period, . . . the Cromwellian Act of Settlement confined most of its attention on the removal of Catholic landlords and wealthier tenants, leaving the bulk of the population – craftsmen, small farmers and laborers – relatively undisturbed," according to anthropologists Sharon and George Gmelch.⁵

Dr. Michael Hayes makes clear why the confusion about Traveller history is understandable:

Irish Travellers have themselves no standard theory as to their origins. . . . Theories regarding these origins can be divided-roughly-into three schools of thought: Peasants driven from land by changing economic conditions, . . . Peasants who were forced onto the road . . . by social disgrace, . . . [and] native chiefs dispossessed by English colonial policies during colonization (e.g. Cromwell's clearance policies)." All of the histories concur, however, that the Traveller lifestyle can trace its origin to need and to poverty.⁶

This Irish-American ethnic group is linked, like their other Irish-American counterparts, to the periods of severe economic distress and famine that happened frequently in Irish

history, particularly in the nineteenth century, during which at least seven famines struck the country, including the Great Famine of 1845–48.⁷

The first Traveller thought to have immigrated to the United States was Joseph Carroll. He passed through immigration in Ellis Island, New York, sometime around 1840. After he cleared immigration, Carroll migrated north to Massachusetts and began trading in mules and horses. The mule and horse trade was a common Traveller occupation in Ireland, and as a result, Carroll possibly turned to what he knew. He seemingly enjoyed some success, and, because of it, he persuaded other Travellers to follow him to the New World.⁸ Many of his relatives and other Traveller families followed. Traveller numbers increased significantly in the United States by 1860, enough so that they divided into several groups.

The livestock trade required its purveyors to travel the countryside to service their markets.

It is generally agreed that the descendents of the original Irish [Traveller] immigrants broke up into several clans after the Civil War and spread throughout the South . . . [They] traveled with livestock, driving the mules and horses through the countryside, trading with farmers as they went. . . . Whole families traveled together in covered wagons and the families were always on the move.⁹

The Travellers who migrated to the southeastern states became known as the “Georgia boys.”¹⁰

Traveller wagons, drawn by draft horses, were distinctive but practical for their itinerant lifestyle. They were originally adopted in Ireland and later in the United States from wagons used by English Travellers. English and Scottish Travellers share the same itinerant lifestyle as their Irish Traveller counterparts. These wagons, adopted from the English group by both the Irish and Scottish Traveller communities, were commonly known as “barrel top wagons” because of their distinctive shape.¹¹ “At first only wealthier travelers, generally horse dealers, could afford them. But gradually wagons became widespread.”¹² These wagons served as transportation, home, and hearth for the Travellers in the U.K., Ireland, and the United States until well into the early twentieth century.

Adaptability has been a hallmark of the Traveller community and a product of its history. The twentieth century would see the end of the livestock trade and the end of the horse-drawn era. Horse and mule trading gave way to paint contracting, home repairs, and tool and equipment sales. The Traveller wagon was replaced by automobiles, tents, and camping trailers. Today, they stay in hotels when they are on the road. As roads became more common during the latter part of twentieth century, Travellers also began to be involved in the asphalt paving and asphalt seal coating businesses,

according to SLED senior agent Joe Livingston.¹³ Agent Livingston has been assigned by SLED to tracking the activities of the Traveller community for twenty-eight years and is considered one of the most knowledgeable experts in the nation on the Traveller community and lifestyle.

As groups of Irish Travellers migrated throughout the South, they established small communities in Texas, Tennessee, and South Carolina. The largest of the Traveller settlements in the United States in 2012 is Murphy Village, South Carolina, which is located near the border between South Carolina and Georgia northwest of Augusta, in Edgefield County. Established in 1967 by the Travellers at the urging of the Catholic diocese of Charleston, it was named in honor of Father Joseph Murphy, a priest much beloved by the Traveller community. Father Peter Clark, pastor of St. Edward Catholic Church from 1988 to 2002, explained, "In the winter time from November to May, they [the Irish Travellers] used to camp in tents near the intersection of what is now Interstate 20 and US Highway 25. I-20 was, at the time, a two lane road, and US 25 was unpaved."¹⁴ Suzanne Sims Derek, of *The Edgefield Citizen*, recalled that they camped in "a huge grove on the left [as you traveled south on US 25]."¹⁵ "Father Murphy went down there to convince them to move up to the small church and buy land," Father Clark said. He also said, "when they first arrived in Murphy Village they lived in tents."¹⁶

At the time, Father Joseph Murphy was pastor of Our Lady of Peace Catholic Church in Aiken. A native South Carolinian, Murphy was from a prominent Irish Catholic family in Charleston. "His interest in the Irish Travellers, I think, came from his Irish heritage," Father Clark said.¹⁷ He was the product of a very devout Irish Catholic family; in fact, his sister also chose a life of religious service. She became a nun in the order of Sisters of Charity, and she ultimately became the chief of the Mercy Order's St. Francis Hospital in Charleston. Father Clark explained, "After his service in Aiken and Murphy village, Father Murphy became the pastor of St. Mary's in Charleston; before retiring to Mount Pleasant, [South Carolina]."¹⁸ Father Murphy died on 11 August 1998.¹⁹

In the 1960s the Sand Hill region near the Georgia border with South Carolina was very sparsely populated, as it is today. The remote site and the moderate winter weather are likely what initially attracted the Traveller community to locate their campsite there. In present day Edgefield County, the population is only slightly more than twenty-nine thousand people.²⁰ The isolation and the relatively warm winter, however, were not the only motivations for the Travellers to establish a camp in South Carolina. They also saw the need to provide their children with a fundamental education. Father Peter Clark explained, "Initially they were here because they wanted their children to go to school. In the beginning they left their children at a Catholic school

in Sharon, Georgia, [about twenty miles away]. The school was run by an Irish order of nuns known as the Catholic Presentation Sisters. They would leave their children there while they were away. Many of the children were practically raised by the nuns.”²¹ This may seem ironic when considering the lack of focus on education within the Traveller culture, but the need for basic literacy skills was likely obvious to them by then.

As the community became more settled and prosperous, living conditions began to improve in Murphy Village. “At first, they bought [single wide] trailers. Sometimes they put three trailers on a lot. As they prospered single wide trailers gave way to double wides. In about 1980 they began building houses. . . . Later these became big houses,” explained Father Clark. The architecture is unlike anything in South Carolina. Large and extremely ornate houses built of pink and white brick are common. Tara Kaprowy of the London, Kentucky *Sentinel-Echo* described it when she wrote

[Father Murphy] encouraged the community to buy land and plant permanent roots . . . [Today,] they are [a community of] about 3000 people . . . [that] live in everything from double wide trailers to McMansions boasting stunning architectural detail. Regardless of the financial status of the owner nearly every yard has a statue of the Virgin Mary or baby Jesus and it.²²

As *Time* magazine describes it, “the Traveller life [and architecture are] a composite of old world and McWorld.”²³

US Highway 25 in Edgefield County, South Carolina, passes through rolling, scenic, if unremarkable, countryside of the Sand Hill region of central South Carolina. Murphy Village, with its large pink and white brick houses are a shock to the senses of the first time visitor. Every yard has a religious shrine. There are statues of Jesus, the Virgin Mary, and the Little Infant of Prague, among the proliferation of religious iconography there. There is also an abundance of expensive automobiles – Mercedes, BMWs, and Cadillacs.

When a visitor arrives at Murphy village it becomes obvious that St. Edward Catholic Church is the focal point of the entire community. Visitors will usually find Father Cheria Thalakulam, a native of India and a Carmelite priest who serves as pastor there, either in the parish office or saying mass across the street. As a visitor walks into the narthex of St. Edward’s, it is as though he or she is walking into a different world. There are no Traveller men there. All the women, including teenage girls, have elaborate hairstyles reminiscent of the 1960s. The visitor may notice a few harmless surreptitious or suspicious glances in their direction, which will seem to ask, “who are you?” and “why are you here?” If the visitor happens to be male, he will likely be the only man in the building with the exception of Father Cheria.

Simply by looking through photographs of the people of Murphy Village, it becomes evident that there are close familial ties among the people. The remarkable similarity of their features heralds how closely they are related. According to Joe Livingston, there are slightly more than 300 families (the Catholic Diocese of Charleston reported 597 families) in Murphy Village, yet there are only nine surnames: Sherlock, Riley, Carroll, Costello, McNally, Mulholland, O'Hara, Ryan, and Gorman. "The three larger groups are Sherlock, Riley, and Carroll. . . . What happened was back in the 1960s, when father Murphy wanted to come in and start the village, the diocese was having issues with close relatives marrying. The diocese brought in new families: the McNally's, O'Hara's, Mulholland's and the Gorman's."²⁴ When the Catholic Church expressed displeasure at the close relations, it is Livingston's understanding that the Travellers appealed to other Traveller communities in the United States to entice them to move to Murphy Village. The Toogood case sheds light on this effort. [Although she lived with the Travellers in Texas after marrying,] "Madelyne Gorman Toogood is a member of the Gorman family. She is a Gorman. The Gorman's were from [a Traveller community in] Maryland, [and later South Carolina]," Livingston said.²⁵

Considering the limited number of surnames, it is not surprising that many of the residents of Murphy Village share the same full name. This is extremely confusing for outsiders and makes finding an individual complicated. Lee Thompson of *Dateline NBC* said, "finding someone was next to impossible. There are few house numbers here and many cars carried no license plates. Almost everybody has similar names. We counted 24 Tommy Carroll's, 15 Pat Riley's, and 36 John Sherlock's."²⁶ There are likely hundreds more of each. The difficulty and confusion of finding an individual protects the Travellers from law enforcement, the IRS, the media, or any outsider for that matter. It is one brick in the wall of insularity surrounding and protecting the world of the Irish Traveller. Agent Livingston, with a sparkle in his eye and a wry smile, referred to it as "illusion and confusion."²⁷ Travellers are undoubtedly aware of this, and their use of it is not surprising. It is further evidence of their conscious attempts to maintain their separateness and protect their community from the outside world.

Among the Travellers, each Tommy Carroll, Pat Riley, or John Sherlock is given a unique name by which he will be known within the group throughout his life. Although this may avoid confusion among their group, it fosters it for outsiders. One Tommy Carroll may be linked to his mother and become "Kathleen's Tommy." Another may be given a unique nickname like "Tommy boy" or perhaps "Tommy hammer." *New York Times* reporter Jon Nordheimer describes it in this way: "To avoid confusion, a child's legal name is used only four times during his life-on certificates of birth, confirmation, wedding, and death. The child is given a nickname early in life and it becomes his de facto name. Hence

the village abounds with names like Popeye, Jabbers, and High Pockets.”²⁸ Nordheimer goes on to describe how the nickname is passed down to the recipient’s family: “One 19-year-old has been called Double O for the last six years, a result of the popularity of James Bond films. When he is married, his wife will be called Mrs. Double O and their children would be referred to Tom Double O and Mary Double O.”²⁹ Livingston also commented on the fact that this name has evolved to “Naught-Naught” and that other nicknames have appeared. Will Carroll became Will Snap and his grandson today is Johnny Snap, even though, legally, they are both Carroll’s. The name “Toogood” is a similar moniker.

Marriages within the Traveller community are arranged, and the courtship rituals begin as early as the age of five or six. During “First Weekend,” a Traveller holiday weekend that celebrates the return of the men to the village in the fall, elaborate gifts are exchanged between these children as a forerunner to possible betrothals. During the celebrations, very young girls dress elaborately and participate in very explicit and sexually suggestive dances that are well beyond their physical maturity and cognitive ability. It is the beginning of the courtship process.

Actual betrothals occur later, at age eleven or twelve, and are made official during the Valentine’s Day “auctions.” The future grooms are auctioned to the families of brides as a form of dowry, and the brides are usually close relatives. “The marriages are arranged and the grooms are essentially auctioned and join the wife’s family. He becomes, more or less, an indentured servant until the debt [or the dowry] is paid or the father-in-law dies,” explained Livingston. “Last year, one groom sold for \$1 million!”³⁰

While the marriage process of Travellers may seem strange to outsiders, it is another important element in the cloak of security that insulates them from the outside world. In their view, the Traveller marriage traditions leave little to chance. Their logic is that the favorable attributes of an earlier generation will be visited upon the young. If he or she comes from “a good family” then he or she will likely become a “good” member of their family, and so on. Also, as a matter of course and in the eye of the Traveller, the “best” families are often closely related. Arranged marriages are about money and wealth. Descent is matriarchal. Outcomes of the “auctions” are largely predetermined, and a large dowry is a good indication of the closeness of their blood relationship. “They like to keep the money close,” explained Agent Livingston. “Part of the objective of arranged marriages is to keep the money close to family and the marriages are arranged even before the bidding begins.”³¹

The church frowns on the practice of close marriages, but it has a difficult task controlling it.

Marrying close relatives, first or second cousins, is discouraged by the church, however the travel[l]ers do it anyway. Inter-marriage is a

product of their social insecurity. They're concerned about marrying outside of the group because of a self-defense mindset. They know what they're getting by marrying within the group,

explained Father Cherian, the pastor of St. Edward's. Anthropologist Jane Helleiner clarifies:

The most common reason offered by Travellers for arranged marriages was the avoidance of marriages with non-Travellers. Such marriages, I was told were extremely risky because there was no way of knowing whether your partner would be suitable until it's too late.

She also explains:

Travellers were themselves active in discouraging such [outsider] relationships. The parents and the sibling of one young traveler man responded to the discovery that he had a non-Traveller girlfriend by trying to break up the relationship by repeatedly threatening the young woman with violence and by telling her (incorrectly) that her boyfriend was already married and had a child. . . . The actions of the boy's family were motivated by the fear that if they got married the settled woman would eventually leave him.³²

The marriage customs and the clannish nature of the Travellers directly impact the choices that are made for the education of the young. While the Travellers recognize their need for basic education, Traveller children do not usually participate in formal education beyond the eighth grade. Like the Amish, the Traveller community disdains the value of continuing education even in twenty-first century America. Again, this choice is driven by the desire to protect the individual and the group from the outside world. Young boys and girls are removed from the public school system to prevent romantic attachments with outsiders from developing.

The age at which the children are withdrawn from school is concurrent with the mental and physical maturation of the typical child. Prepubescent children remain in school, but older children do not. Young boys begin their life on the road with their fathers, and the girls go home to work with their mothers. "Most Irish Travellers have no more than an eighth grade education. Some of them have worked successfully to pass the test for GED's."³³ Father Cherian also described his difficulty in convincing young boys and girls to pursue further education. "The boys are lured away from school by the money and the fancy automobiles. They have a lot more cash and material things than other [outsider] boys of the same age," Father Cherian said.³⁴ Parental support for more education simply does not exist in their culture. Very rarely an individual

will leave the community behind to pursue an education. "There was one [Traveller] who became a doctor graduated from Emory University medical school, but that is very rare," according to Livingston.³⁵

Periodicals, newspapers, books, and movies have focused much of their attention on the economic lives and criminal activity of the Traveller culture. While full time scam artists and criminals do exist in their community, they represent only a 10 to 15 percent minority, according to both Livingston and Father Cherian. This crime rate is in line with crime statistics for the general population. The crime rate in the United States in 2011, according to the FBI, was 13.07 percent.³⁶ "Illegal activity as a primary source of income is limited to only a few families, who are known collectively as 'Yonks.' They tend to be less economically successful than other Travellers."³⁷

The long history of press coverage of the Irish Travellers has been consistently unflattering. Negative articles about Travellers appear in the *New York Times* as early as 21 December 1881. The headlines read, "Two Swindlers Sentenced: the Men Who Fleeced John Henry Lambkin Sent to Prison." Readers learn that "Traveller detectives Reilly and O'Neill arrested Varnens and Mason, who were identified."³⁸ This article brings up an important question: does the existence of the special segment of the police force assigned to a particular race or ethnic group, such as "Traveller detectives," constitute discrimination against the ethnic group in question? It would follow that another question could also be asked as well: were other segments of the police department assigned to monitor another particular race or ethnic group?

The titles of other, more recent, articles bear witness to the exceptionally negative history that exists between the Irish Travellers and the media. For example, a few headlines read: "Inside the World of Irish Travellers: Mother Caught Beating Child on the Parking Lot Surveillance Camera is Member of Mysterious Group" (*NBC Dateline*, Lee Thompson, 2002), "Colony of Nomadic Irish Catholics Clings to a Strange Life in the South" (*New York Times*, Jon Nordheimer, 1970), and "Nomadic, Gaelic, and Now Ready for a Fight" (*New York Times*, James F Clarity, 1994). Finding an article or exposé on any positive aspect of the Traveller community and culture is virtually impossible.

Most members of the Traveller community live out their economic lives on the boundary between the lawful and the illegal.³⁹ Although they may not be directly involved in cons or scams, they pay few taxes, licenses, or fees. While the largest occupations are independent paint contracting, asphalt paving, and seal coating, the expected profitability in these careers would seem to contrast starkly with their opulent lifestyles. They specialize in providing lower quality, lower priced services, which are significantly less expensive than those of their non-Traveller competitors. Most of the transactions are done within the law. Agent Livingston made the point, however, that

many will occasionally take advantage of a vulnerable customer. "They will all cross the line when the opportunity expresses itself; taking advantage of dementia, gullibility of the victim," according to Livingston.

There is a consistent and demonstrated demand for the inexpensive, lower quality services that the Travellers provide, and they have many repeat customers. Agent Livingston explained that he spoke to a farmer in the Midwest and asked him why he was a repeat customer. The farmer explained that he would rather pay the Travellers to paint high structures such as grain silos and the like. The farmer also said that even though he knew that the quality of the paint job was lower, he would prefer them to do it rather than risk injury to himself or his employees. "They often have repeat customers and this creates a route or cycle for the year. The farmers realize that the paint job is only going to last a couple of years but it's okay with them."⁴⁰ The Traveller contractors, however, do not put themselves or their relatives at risk on the more dangerous parts of these jobs. They instead hire African-American laborers to travel with them on their circuits to do the dangerous work. According to agent Livingston, Travellers call them "guthies" and they are usually African-Americans from Edgefield, Aiken, North Augusta, or the surrounding area.

Life insurance policies are another important source of income for the Traveller community, and their purchase provides a good example of how the community lives in the border region between legality and crime. When it becomes known that a relative has become seriously ill and that death may be imminent, they will purchase multiple life insurance policies on that relative. They buy many small policies that do not require a physical for approval. Usually the death benefit is less than fifty thousand dollars. "When one of them dies they might get 40, 50 or even 100 death certificates," said agent Livingston. These policies usually require the disclosure of pre-existing conditions of the insured, but it is difficult to prove what the policy owner knew and when they knew it. "All they need are vulnerable insurance agents."⁴¹

The general economic activity of the Travellers reinforces their social isolation. This is despite the fact their business activity creates their greatest contact with outsiders – or "buffers" – and their African-American employees – or "guthies." Few Travellers, if any, have ordinary jobs or work outside the Traveller community. They either work independently or are employed by other Traveller families or relatives. The nature of business relationships, whether or not they exist within the world of the Traveller," are always in a sense somewhat adversarial. In the Traveller community, the outside world is always on the other side of all business equations, whether they involve selling to or buying from others.

Another important brick in the wall of cultural isolation that surrounds the Irish Traveller community is that they do not participate in any outside political activity.

“They have enough votes within the village to elect the County Councilman from their district, presumably one of their own, but they do not,” explains Father Cherian.⁴² The population of Edgefield County is 29,985, and the percentage of people who are white is 58.6 percent.⁴³ Consequently the population of Murphy Village, which is about 3000, is statistically significant in such a rural county.⁴⁴ This political apathy seems to run both ways. Reading the Edgefield County Chamber of Commerce website confirms this with its description of the county. It states: “Edgefield County consists of three small towns Edgefield, Johnston, and Trenton.”⁴⁵ There is no mention of Murphy Village, which admittedly is unincorporated, anywhere in the article. This is surprising, particularly when the populations of Edgefield Johnston and Trenton are 4360, 2337, and 291 respectively.⁴⁶ Despite having no political voice, the Traveller community represents more than 10 percent of the population of Edgefield County and 20 percent of the whites, which, by any reasonable measure, is significant.

Political participation by the males in the Traveller community is also made much more difficult by their extended absences during large parts of year. As a result of these absences, they participate in internal Traveller politics only intermittently. In any case, the Travellers exert very little political influence beyond their community. According to historian Michael Hayes,

related to the belief that travelers were an aloof and exclusive group, was the notion that they have their own political structure that operated externally to the politics of the host society. Travelers . . . were considered to be similarly “apolitical” regarding developments in settled society.⁴⁷

The Traveller community’s insularity is supported as well by its use of language. “Shelta” or “Cant” is a curious blend of slang and Gaelic and is often used with the intent of being only understood by members of the community. One expression is “Shay Joe,” which is the term they use for police officers. The Cant root for Shay is “Shean,” which means “dirty or country.”⁴⁸ Therefore the literal translation of Shay Joe is “country” (or outsider) Joe. Use of Cant is another tool the Traveller community uses to separate itself from the mainstream. Often, the intent of Cant is to disguise the meaning of what is being said from outsiders. Alick Wilson of the American folklore Society explained that “Cant” is not really Gaelic. He said that “[we] went over the words, trying to find some connection between the two languages. ‘Shelta,’ [or ‘Cant’], has, however, Gaelic and [English] slang words mixed up with it.” The Traveller language is actively used today by all Traveller communities, and its use serves as further evidence that the community sees itself as separate from the mainstream and that it chooses to remain that way.⁴⁹

While many aspects of the divide between the Traveller community and the main stream are caused by the choices its members make for themselves, some are not. The people of Murphy Village, particularly the women, are extraordinarily devout Catholics. Although Catholicism itself would not isolate an individual or group in the United States, the same cannot be said of South Carolina, particularly in Edgefield County. The statewide Catholic population is approximately three to five percent. However, in a rural county like Edgefield, within the voting public, which does not include Travellers, the numbers of Catholics are dramatically lower. According to the Office of Research and Planning of the Catholic Diocese of Charleston, there are two Catholic parishes in Edgefield County. The parish of St. Mary of the Immaculate Conception in Edgefield reported a population of 70 parishioners. St. Edward's in Murphy Village, however, has 597 households and a population of 1716 parishioners.⁵⁰ The contrast of culture, religion, and customs between Travellers and other South Carolinians living nearby naturally contributes considerably to their separate identity and the insularity of their community.

Although the division of the Traveller community from the settled Irish began because of abject poverty and need during 1800s, it is an ethnic group that has grown to embrace its unique culture, and it continues to do so today. The Traveller community does so on its own terms. During the early history of this ethnic group, its cultural and economic isolation were responses to discrimination and a lack of opportunity. In fact, these were logical choices given the poverty that its members sought to escape. They became unattached, unknown people traveling to rural towns, and they were virtual foreigners in their own land. These differences in circumstance and the fact that they were strangers naturally spawned suspicion from the settled population. Over time, and as their community lived in relative isolation from the Irish mainstream, they developed their own customs, traditions, and language. They were, and remain, like their settled Irish counterparts, a clannish people. An argument can be made that the natural communal nature of human beings is an instinct created by evolution to improve the ability to survive. In this way the Traveller community is, in some ways, no different from any other. Its members choose to remain a part of their community just as many settled peoples choose to remain part of theirs. Despite being a smaller, isolated community, its culture appears to be stable and successful. Apart from adjusting to modern technologies, it has changed little since its origins, and the community will likely continue to remain ethnically secluded from mainstream society.

Many of the important aspects of the Traveller community and culture embrace and maintain the members' insularity as an ethnic group. The choices that the Travellers make for their community are made because they have been proven successful over their three-hundred-year history. They choose every aspect of their lifestyle. They voluntarily

choose to limit the formal education of the young. They choose to remain itinerant. They choose to continue to arrange marriages of their children to close relatives even against the wishes of the Catholic Church. In the United States, they are afforded both the freedom to assimilate into the mainstream and the right of free association; they choose, however, to remain a small, close-knit, and insular community. This is not forced upon them, but it is a decision that they make in a life that they pursue on their own terms. They do so because it is part of their identity as a people. Father Peter Clark is perhaps the most enlightened observer when he says, “It is a mistake to assume that the way I was brought up was better. It is important to recognize that the values of cultures that seem simpler than ours are not necessarily inferior.”⁵¹

NOTES

1. Jim Carroll, “Poetic Prayers of an Irish Traveller” (Murphy Village South Carolina: St. Edward Catholic Church, date unknown), 21.
2. John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty and the Subjection of Women* (London: Penguin Books Limited 2006), 64.
3. Lea Thompson, “Inside the World of Irish Travelers,” *Dateline NBC* (New York, National Broadcasting Company 11 October 2002). http://www.rickcross.com/reference/irish_travelers/irish_travelers9.html (accessed 2 September 2011).
4. Jon Nordheimer, “Colony of Nomadic Irish Catholics Cling to Strange Life in South,” *New York Times*, 14 October 1970. <http://proxy.uscupstate.edu:2157pdqweb?index=8&did=78197772&sid=sid=1&Fmt=2&client=50911&RQT=309&VName=HNP> (accessed 1 September 2011).
5. Sharon and George Gmelch, “The Emergence of an Ethnic Group: the Irish Tinkers,” *Anthropological Quarterly*, 49 (4) <http://www.jstor.org/stable/331-6736> (accessed August 31). The term “Tinker” is a name that refers to Irish Travellers and reflects their occupation during the 18th and 19th centuries for the repair and manufacture of metal products such as cups, plates, and etc. The name originates from the “tinkling” sound their wares made as their wagon made its way.
6. Michael Hayes, *Irish Travelers: Representations and Realities* (Dublin, Ireland: Liffey Press, 2006), 11.
7. Gmelch and Gmelch, 231.
8. Father Cherian Thalakulam, interview by author, 4 October 2011.
9. Nordheimer.
10. Thompson, 11 October 2002.
11. Gmelch and Gmelch, 235.
12. *Ibid*, 235.
13. Senior Agent Joe Livingston of Columbia, South Carolina Law Enforcement Division, first interview by author, 11 October 2011.
14. Father Peter Clark, of Murphy Village South Carolina, pastor, St. Edward Catholic Church, 1988–2002, interview by author, 3 November 2011.

15. Suzanne Sims Derek, interview by author, 3 November 2011.
16. Clark, interview.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. *Charleston News and Courier*, "Deaths," 13 August 1998, <http://news.Google.com/newspapers?nid=RXC-vbDMdwC&dat=19980812&printsec=frontpage&chl=en> (accessed 18 November 2011).
20. US Census Bureau, *U.S. Census 2010: state and county quick facts*, <http://quickfacts.census.gov/gfd/45/45037.html> (accessed 7 November 2011).
21. Ibid.
22. Tara Kaprowy, "Irish Travellers: An Enigmatic Group", the (London, Kentucky) *Sentinel-Echo*, 6 February 2010, http://www.sentinel-echo.com/local/x_878592992/Irish-Travellers-an-enigmatic-group/print (accessed 20 October 2011).
23. Amanda Ripley, Mairead Carey, Daren Fonda. "Unwelcome Exposure," *Time*, 7 October, 2002, <http://www.time.com/time/printout/oh,8816,100381,00.html> (accessed 30 August, 2011).
24. Livingston, first interview by author, 11 October 2011.
25. Senior agent Joe Livingston of Columbia, South Carolina Law Enforcement Division, second interview by the author, 16 November 2011.
26. Thompson.
27. Livingston, first interview.
28. Nordheimer.
29. Ibid.
30. Livingston, first interview.
31. Ibid.
32. Jane Leslie Helleiner, *Irish Travellers: Racism and the Politics of Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 182.
33. Thalakulam, interview.
34. Ibid.
35. Livingston, first interview.
36. *United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of investigation, Crime in the United States 2010*, <http://www.FBI.gov/about-US/CJIS/UCR/crime> (accessed 25 October 2011).
37. Livingston, first interview.
38. *New York Times (1857 to 1992)*, 21 December 1881, <http://proquest.umi.com/pdqweb?=&sid=1&Fmt=2&client=50911&RQT=309&VName=HNP> (accessed 1 September 2011).
39. T. Foy Vernon, Michael OhAodha [Hayes] ed., *American Outsider: Stories from the Irish Traveller Diaspora*, (Newcastle, U.K., Cambridge Scholars Publishing 2007), 7.
40. Livingston, first interview.
41. Ibid.

42. Thalakulam, interview.
43. US Census Bureau, 2011.
44. Ripley et al, 7 October 2002.
45. Edgefield County Chamber of Commerce, <http://www.villageprofile.com/southcarolina/edgefield/> (accessed 7 November 2011).
46. US Census Bureau, 2011.
47. Michael Hayes, 208.
48. American Folklore Society, " 'Shelta', the Tinkers Talk," *The Journal of American Folklore* 3, no. 9 (April June 1980) 158, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/534206> (accessed 1 January 2011).
49. Ripley et al, 7 October 2002.
50. Jamie Zybrowski, Office of Research and Planning, Catholic Diocese of Charleston, interview by author, 12 December 2012.
51. Clark, interview.

“A fertile brain at schemeing”: Eliza Lucas Pinckney and her Early Agricultural Experiments

Megan Hatfield

Eliza Lucas Pinckney is arguably the most well-known South Carolinian woman of the colonial era. Thanks to the survival of numerous written sources by and about Pinckney, historians have been able to learn a great deal about her. She is best known today as the mother of two of the nation’s “founding fathers” and for her famous indigo experiments, which have been credited with making indigo an important cash crop in colonial South Carolina. These accomplishments have earned Pinckney high praise by historians as a “founding mother” and an “ingenious agriculturalist.”¹ However, these representations also often have led historians to view her as exceptional, thereby obscuring the ways in which she was in some respects a typical figure of her times.²

This paper challenges this perception of Pinckney as exceptional by re-examining a key facet of her life that led to this portrayal, namely, her agricultural experiments. Because of the notoriety that her indigo experiments acquired over time, most of the scholarship regarding Pinckney as an agriculturalist has looked primarily at her role in the production of indigo and her reasons for undertaking that project.³ On the one hand, some historians have argued that Pinckney desired to contribute to the economic well-being of South Carolina and persevered in her experiments against the social and gender conventions of her day.⁴ Others have argued that her experiments were motivated by family duty and a desire to demonstrate her gentility.⁵ While this study explores Pinckney’s motives, unlike most of the scholarship on this subject it will also examine a variety of her agricultural experiments, not just those involving indigo. Though Pinckney spent most of her life engaged in this work, this inquiry focuses only on her early adult life and the experiments she conducted while managing her father’s plantations in South Carolina between 1739 and 1744.⁶ Like Pinckney and her contemporaries, this study will consider agricultural experiments in broad terms and thus will address her experiments with plantation crops as well as her attempts to create a beautiful garden.⁷ Pinckney had a range of interrelated motivations for undertaking her various projects, including familial, business, and public concerns as well as a desire to demonstrate her gentility. This broader perspective not only helps to contextualize Pinckney’s indigo experiments, but also deepens our understanding of Pinckney and the world in which she lived.

In order to understand her agricultural experiments, they must first be situated within their broader cultural and transatlantic context and within the context of her

personal life. Because Pinckney raised two “founding fathers,” she is often understood as an American patriot and a revolutionary figure.⁸ Yet as recent works have pointed out, she spent the majority of her life inhabiting an Anglo-American imperial world and thinking of herself as an Englishwoman.⁹ Pinckney’s father, George Lucas, was a colonel in the British army who was stationed in Antigua. She was raised there until he sent her to England in the early 1730s to obtain an education suitable for an elite woman. Hence, when she arrived in South Carolina in 1738, she thought of herself not as an American, nor even as a South Carolinian, but rather as an Englishwoman away from but still very much connected to her mother country through the ties of empire.¹⁰

During Pinckney’s time in England, she would have been privy to the latest currents and fashions shaping the Anglo-Atlantic world. One of the most notable trends developing at this time was a deep fascination with the natural world and botany. The Enlightenment’s emphasis on man’s ability to reason in conjunction with the belief that the world operated according to natural laws meant that one could now study and understand the world as never before. Those exposed to Enlightenment thought now believed that careful scientific procedures like collecting, observing, and experimenting with natural artifacts and phenomena would result in knowledge that could be used to improve society. People were especially keen to learn about the many curiosities of the New World. This interest facilitated the development of transatlantic networks by individuals who shared an interest in botany and nature. As plants, seeds, and knowledge crisscrossed the Atlantic, it became increasingly popular to tour and create gardens filled with and inspired by New World plants. Plant life throughout the English Atlantic was not only admired for its practical uses, but also for the amusement it provided. Gardening, horticultural experimentation, and expressing an appreciation for nature all became genteel activities and markers of elite status. Botany was considered so important that it was even included in the education of elite boys and girls, making it a subject Pinckney would have learned in boarding school. Given this background, it is of little wonder that Pinckney recalled later in life that she was “very early fond of the vegetable world.”¹¹

After Pinckney arrived with her family in South Carolina, she was left in a position to put her education and fondness for nature to good use. Military duty called her father back to the Caribbean, and because Eliza’s mother was of a sickly disposition, he left sixteen-year-old Eliza in charge of his plantations and business interests in South Carolina. Although Pinckney may have been younger than other women with similar responsibilities, historians have shown that it was not unusual for women in British America to assume control temporarily over their family’s plantations, farms, and businesses in the absence of their male relatives.¹² Both ordinary free women and elite women in the southern colonies frequently assumed this role due to high mortal-

ity rates there and because many elite southern men were engaged in businesses and public offices which often required them to travel.¹³ The absence of Pinckney's father essentially made her a planter, giving her the status, authority, and responsibilities that such an identity entailed. As a daughter and steward over her father's properties in South Carolina, it was her duty both to be obedient and to make the plantations profitable. This gave Pinckney the opportunity to combine her personal interest in nature, gardening, and science with the larger business of plantation agriculture, allowing her "amusements," as she often called them, to acquire new significance as they became useful to her family and community.

During her stewardship, Pinckney experimented with a number of crops, including indigo, cotton, lucern, and ginger. But her efforts did not end with plantation agriculture narrowly defined; she also experimented with food preservation techniques, planted trees and orchards, and attempted to create new garden spaces. Some of Pinckney's projects were motivated in part by the practical need to learn the ways of her land and the South Carolina climate. Though historians once believed that southern planters presided over an antiquated and backward agricultural system that rejected the Enlightenment, modernity, and innovation, recent scholarship has demonstrated that this was not the case. Planters were active participants in the prevailing intellectual currents of their day; they experimented with new crops and methods on their plantations to increase efficiency, earn higher profits, and bolster their elite identity.¹⁴ In her first few years as plantation manager, Pinckney was clearly doing what other planters did – she tried to determine what to grow, when, and where. Indeed, her early letters to her father were filled with tales of crops spoiled by a frost or dwindling due to soil and growing conditions.¹⁵

Pinckney's efforts to learn how to be a successful planter simultaneously served the other goals driving her agricultural experiments, namely, the familial, business, and public concerns that figured largely in those latter projects. These three seemingly distinct motivations were often interconnected. Even though the Lucas properties in Antigua and South Carolina were separated by the Atlantic Ocean, they were intended to function as one plantation system. Pinckney played a critical role in integrating the Lucas plantations and her experiments with food preservation were directed to that end. Beyond helping to supply her father's sugar plantations on Antigua with the food necessary for survival, Pinckney also sought to make all Lucas plantations function more efficiently.¹⁶ In 1743, Pinckney listed provisions that she sent to her father, noting that she sent a keg "of eggs by way of experiment put up in salt; in case they answere, my scheme is to supply my fathers refining house in Antigua with Eggs from Carolina."¹⁷ Eggs were used in the process of refining sugar, so Pinckney seems to have understood that it would be advantageous for her father to use his own eggs rather than to buy

them from another source. Because plantation agriculture was the family business, her efforts to improve her father's business also constituted a form of duty to her family.

Historians have typically argued that Pinckney's indigo experiments were motivated either by a patriotic duty to help South Carolina's economy or by a sense of duty to her family.¹⁸ But these were not necessarily mutually exclusive. Pinckney certainly saw her indigo experiments as potentially useful to her family, her community, and even to the British Empire. Later in her life, she recalled that her father encouraged her indigo experiments because he believed those efforts might be of "public utility."¹⁹ Letters from the earlier period²⁰ show that she also believed this to be the case. Though on the one hand her experiments with indigo were at the behest of her father and therefore undertaken out of a sense of duty to him, she also was convinced that "indigo will prove a very valuable commodity in time" and urged her father to give her the supplies needed to make the crop successful.²¹ Even though she did not elaborate on how indigo might be "valuable," the term implies at least a belief that it would be economically profitable. And there is no reason to suppose that she expected her family alone to profit from indigo. In fact, she seems to have thought that they could reap greater profits if growing indigo became a community-wide effort. To that end, her family shared the indigo seeds that Lucas acquired with some of their neighbors.²² Although it was fashionable for elites to share plants and seeds with each other, their intentions in sharing the indigo seeds seem to stretch beyond simply demonstrating their gentility. They needed other members of their community to participate with them in creating a new trade and market, and they did just that. By the time that she and her neighbor Andrew Deveaux successfully cultivated their first crop of indigo, Pinckney wrote that the South Carolina colonial assembly already had legislation in effect to give a bounty on it.²³ Pinckney hoped that this would induce enough planters to take up indigo production so that they could collectively produce enough to "supply our Mother Country with a manufacture for which she has so great a demand, and which she is now supplyd with from the French Collonys." Pinckney recognized that the British Empire was losing "many thousand pounds" to the French in acquiring indigo, and understood that promoting the indigo trade between England and her colonies would benefit both.²⁴

Pinckney's experiments with planting oak trees and a fig orchard further illustrate the intertwining of familial, business, and public concerns. She conceived of her oak plantation and fig orchard as business endeavors that would benefit her family and community. When Pinckney was in the midst of executing these projects, she noted to her close friend Mary Bartlett that she was "so busey in providing for posterity I hardly allow my self time to eat or sleep."²⁵ Pinckney intended her fig orchard and oak plantation to provide for posterity in more ways than one. While she expected to

increase the value of her family estate by drying and exporting the figs, her motives for undertaking her oak plantation were different.²⁶ Pinckney informed Bartlett of the following plan for her “large” plantation of oak trees: “I design many years hence when oaks are more valueable than they are now – which you know they will be when we come to build fleets. I intend, I say 2 thirds of the produce of my oaks for a charity.”²⁷ She thus intended this business venture to help improve the lives of people in her community not only through her donation to a charity, but also by contributing to the political and military well-being of the colony. The public concerns that are evident in Pinckney’s experiments with the oak plantation and indigo show that she also used her experiments to demonstrate her gentility and claim her membership among the colonial elite. One of the key ways in which the South Carolina gentry claimed their position atop the social hierarchy was by devoting themselves to serving the public good, and Pinckney’s experiments clearly demonstrated that she adhered to this code of elite responsibilities and duties.

But gentility involved demonstration and pleasure as well as responsibility, as Pinckney’s plans for her cedar grove indicate. In contrast to her other projects, Pinckney’s cedar grove was designed purely as space of pleasure. Like her contemporaries, Pinckney was influenced by new ideas about gardening, and she wanted to put them into practice. Writing to Mary Bartlett, she explained that the concept for her garden intermixed the “solemnity” of the cedar trees with the “cheerfulness and pleasures of spring, for it shall be filled with all kind of flowers, as well as wild garden flowers.”²⁸ The fact that Pinckney was interested in wild flowers shows that she was attuned to the latest fashions in gardening, as the English were only just beginning to move away from formal gardens to more “wild” designs that reflected an appreciation for a rugged nature.²⁹

In that same letter, Pinckney further identified herself with that transatlantic movement and elite society by expressing her opinion on the first book of Virgil’s *Georgics*.³⁰ Education in the classics was an indicator of elite status, so simply reading and commenting on this text would have been a performance of gentility for her. But reading the *Georgics*, a didactic poem on agriculture steeped in pastoral imagery, also allowed her to express an appreciation for nature similar to Virgil’s. She even attempted to emulate the “fine soft language” of Virgil in hope that it would convince Bartlett to visit her in the country. She described for Bartlett the “beauties of pure nature unassisted by art,” writing phrases such as “the young mirtle joyning its fragrance to that of the golden jesamin hue perfumes all the woods.”³¹ That Pinckney chose to articulate her gentility in this way is of no small significance. Scholars have devoted much attention to the ways that elite southern men were anxious to assert their gentility and Englishness by pursuing high intellectual activities, but as Pinckney demonstrates,

elite southern women also were concerned to fit within English models of gentility, including learning the classics.³²

Like most historical figures, Eliza Pinckney was clearly a complex person whose actions must be understood within the personal and broader context of her life and times. Situating her agricultural experiments within the context of the transatlantic fascination with the natural world and her personal experience as an elite woman and a steward for her father's estate enables us to see Pinckney less as an exception and more as a person whose experiences reveal much about her world, particularly about the gender norms of her society and the experiences of elite South Carolinian women. Although many popular works present Pinckney as defying gender conventions in pursuing her experiments with indigo, it was not her gender – when narrowly defined – that her peers objected to, if and when they objected to her behavior at all. Instead, it was her age that concerned them. They seemed to believe that Pinckney's youth should be spent enjoying the “amusements suitable to her time of life” as a young unmarried elite woman, which might have included visiting and partaking in Charles Town's lively social scene.³³ One neighbor expressed concern that Pinckney's demanding schedule of business and reading would make her “look old” before her time and prevent her from finding a suitable marriage partner. It would not have been problematic for a more mature and married woman to act in this way, but it was problematic that she engaged in these activities at a time when she should have been finding a husband.³⁴

Pinckney and her contemporaries clearly expected women to be capable plantation managers whose skills, education, and even their entrepreneurial spirit could contribute to the well being of their family and society.³⁵ This is most evident in the two letters she wrote to Mary Bartlett regarding her oak plantation and fig orchard. There she imagined what Bartlett's aunt and uncle, Elizabeth and Charles Pinckney, might say about her endeavors. She considered her fig orchard a “useful amusement” that would confirm Charles' opinion that she had “a fertile brain at schemeing.”³⁶ Similarly, Eliza predicted that Elizabeth would see her oak plantation as evidence that she was a “good girl.”³⁷ Eliza's insinuation that her agricultural experiments would lead her to be praised as a “good girl” for her “usefulness” and “fertile brain” complicates scholarly discussion about how gender ideals governed elite southern women's lives. Whereas physically laboring in the fields might not be appropriate for a gentlewoman, laboring with her intellect, her “fertile brain,” was perfectly acceptable. This is no small matter. Women were, of course, praised for the fecundity of their wombs, but that Pinckney thought she would be praised for the fertility of her mind suggests that, at least from her perspective, women could be valued for their intellectual and creative abilities, which could be put to use for the benefit of the family business.

In this mid-eighteenth-century world, elite women were not yet the southern belles of the antebellum era, but nor were they the frontierswomen of the seventeenth century who worked alongside their husbands and slaves in the fields.³⁸ This was a transitional period where women still performed essential functions in the family economy, though the ways in which they might contribute to it were narrowing. Young Eliza Pinckney successfully negotiated that line with her agricultural experiments because they were a genteel hobby that could be made useful. Far from challenging conventions of gender, Pinckney showed that her experiments enhanced her womanhood. It is for that reason that Pinckney was right not to fear for her marriage prospects. Just as she succeeded in making her first marketable batch of indigo, Pinckney also found herself a husband. It was at that time that Charles Pinckney lost his first wife Elizabeth. Apparently he must have been convinced that Eliza's experiments made her more than just a "good girl" – they also made her a prospective good wife. A mere four months after the death of Elizabeth, he married Eliza and accepted her first crop of indigo, to use Eliza's words, as "the fruit of my industry."³⁹

NOTES

1. Cokie Roberts included Eliza Pinckney in her study of the women who influenced the Founding Fathers, deeming those women the "Founding Mothers" of the United States; see Cokie Roberts, *Founding Mothers: The Women Who Raised Our Nation* (New York: William Morrow, 2004), especially 1–12. See also Julia Cherry Spruill, *Women's Life and Work in the Southern Colonies* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1998), 308–11.
2. There is a vast literature, both academic and non-academic, which treats Eliza Pinckney as exceptional. The following works are just a few examples: Jeannette Frances Bowers, "'How uncommon a life I have mett with': The Life of Eliza Lucas Pinckney" (M.A. thesis, San Diego State University, 1990); Roberts, *Founding Mothers*, 11; Spruill, *Women's Life and Work*, 308–11; Frances Leigh Williams, *Plantation Patriot: A Biography of Eliza Lucas Pinckney* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1967); Nancy Woloch, *Women and the American Experience*, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984), 63. Not all historians have treated Pinckney as exceptional, something that is evident in the numerous monographs on various subjects that draw on Pinckney's writings to shed light on a variety of issues, such as gender or religion in colonial South Carolina and women's interest in science or the classics. Examples include: Lorri Glover, *All Our Relations: Blood Ties and Emotional Bonds among the early South Carolina Gentry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000); Louis P. Nelson, *The Beauty of Holiness: Anglicanism and Architecture in Colonial South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008); Susan Scott Parrish, *American Curiosity: Cultures of Natural History in the Colonial British Atlantic World*, Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Caroline Winterer, *The Mirror of Antiquity: American Women and the Classical Tradition, 1750–1900* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007). Nonetheless, when Pinckney herself is the focus, she typically is portrayed as exceptional.
3. For a perspective challenging Pinckney's importance in the successful cultivation of indigo in South Carolina, see David Coon, "Eliza Lucas Pinckney and the Reintroduction of Indigo Culture in South Carolina," *The Journal of Southern History* 42, no. 1 (1976): 61–76.

4. This interpretation of Pinckney's agricultural activities and motivations is based on two assumptions about women's place in the social and gender hierarchy. First, in a patriarchal slave-society like South Carolina, there was a strict division of labor in which black women performed manual labor while elite white women were left to enjoy a life of leisure and perform managerial functions in the household economy. Second, while elite white women in the South were expected to be educated so as to be pleasant conversationalists, they were not valued for their intellectual capabilities and received an education inferior to elite white men in the colonies as well as elite women in England. According to this interpretation, Pinckney's experiments violated this gender code because as an elite white woman she was not expected to be involved in plantation agriculture, let alone set her sights on lofty ambitions such as improving South Carolina and the British Empire's economy. Furthermore, her experiments and the knowledge derived from them proved her formidable intellectual abilities. For more on the social and gender code of the white colonial elite, see Kathleen Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Cynthia Kennedy, *Braided Relations, Entwined Lives: The Women of Charleston's Urban Slave Society* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2005); and Winterer, *The Mirror of Antiquity*, 14–15. For this interpretation of Pinckney's agricultural experiments, see Bowers, "'How uncommon a life I have mett with'; Gary L. Hewitt, "Eliza Lucas Pinckney: Vegetables and Virtue," in Nancy L Rhoden and Ian K. Steele, ed., *The Human Tradition in the American Revolution* (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 2000), 44; Sarah Metcalfe, "Eliza Lucas Pinckney: The Cultivation of Knowledge and Indigo" (M.A. thesis, Claremont Graduate University, 2002); Roberts, *Founding Mothers*, 4–7.
5. See Darcy R. Fryer, "The Mind of Eliza Pinckney: An Eighteenth-Century Woman's Construction of Herself," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 99, no. 3 (July 1998): 228–30.
6. Eliza was unmarried for the period under study here and used her maiden name, Lucas; but I have chosen to refer to her by her married name, "Pinckney," as it is the name most often associated with her. I only use her first name for emphasis or when doing otherwise is likely to confuse the reader.
7. For more on the connection between gardening and plantation agriculture, see Andrea Wulf, *Founding Gardeners: The Revolutionary Generation, Nature, and the Shaping of the American Nation* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2011).
8. See Roberts, *Founding Mothers*; Woloch, *Women and the American Experience*.
9. See Sam S. Baskett, "Eliza Lucas Pinckney: Portrait of an Eighteenth Century American" in *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 72, no. 4 (October 1971): 207–19; Fryer, "The Mind of Eliza Pinckney."
10. For a fuller biographical treatment of Pinckney's life, see *The Letterbook of Eliza Lucas Pinckney, 1739–1762*, ed. Elise Pinckney (Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 1997). For more on Pinckney's early life, see Harriet Simons Williams, "Eliza Lucas and her Family: Before the Letterbook," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 99, no. 3 (July 1998): 259–79.
11. For more on the development of the transatlantic interest in botany, science, and nature, see Ann Leighton, *American Gardens in the Eighteenth Century: "For Use or for Delight"* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986), 103, 110, 247–49; Susan Scott Parrish, *American Curiosity*; Andrea Wulf, *The Brother Gardeners: Botany, Empire, and the Birth of an Obsession* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2009); Wulf, *Founding Gardeners*. For more on women and natural science, see Wulf, *The Brother Gardeners*, 224. For Pinckney's educational experience in particular, see Williams, "Eliza Lucas and her Family," 266–67. Eliza

Lucas Pinckney to Charles Cotesworth Pinckney (hereafter abbreviated ELP and CCP), 10 September 1785, Charleston Library Society, Letters to Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Ms. 125.

12. Laurel Thatcher Ulrich's seminal work *Good Wives* argued that women could act as "deputy husbands" and temporarily assume their husbands' duties in their absence, including running the family business. I prefer to use the term "steward" in Pinckney's case. It signifies the same authority and duties that a deputy husband assumed, but takes into account the fact that Pinckney was not a wife in this circumstance. See Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, *Good Wives: Image and Reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England, 1650–1750* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982).

13. For more on eighteenth-century South Carolinian women as deputy husbands and their economic roles, see Cara Anzilotti, *In the Affairs of the World: Women, Patriarchy, and Power in Colonial South Carolina* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2002); Darcy R. Fryer, "In Pursuit of Their Interest: Community Oversight of Economic and Family Life among the South Carolina Lowcountry Gentry, c. 1730–1789" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2001); Lorri Glover, *All Our Relations*.

14. On innovative planters, see Joyce Chaplin, *An Anxious Pursuit: Agricultural Innovation and Modernity in the Lower South*, Omohundro Institute for Early American History and Culture (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).

15. For examples of these experiments, see Eliza Lucas Pinckney to George Lucas (hereafter abbreviated GL), July 1740, *Letterbook* 8; ELP to GL, 4 June 1741, *Letterbook* 15–17; ELP to GL, January 1742, *Letterbook* 25.

16. Pinckney frequently sent provisions to her father in Antigua. Lucas clearly expected his South Carolina plantations to be able to supply food and other necessities to his Antiguan properties, enabling him to devote more attention to growing sugar. This mirrors the larger trade relationship between the North American colonies and the Caribbean; see Richard S. Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624–1713*, Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000). For examples of Pinckney sending supplies to her father, see ELP to GL, 4 June 1741, *Letterbook*, 15–16; ELP to GL, June 1741, *Letterbook*, 17.

17. ELP to GL, 3 February 1743, *Letterbook*, 58.

18. For examples of works portraying Pinckney as motivated by a sense of patriotic duty, see Gary L. Hewitt, "Eliza Lucas Pinckney," 44; Roberts, *Founding Mothers*, 4–7. For the alternative perspective, see Fryer, *The Mind of Eliza Pinckney*, 217–27.

19. ELP to CCP, 10 September 1785, Charleston Library Society, Letters to Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Ms. 125.

20. See notes 21 and 24 below.

21. ELP to GL, 4 June 1741, *Letterbook*, 15–17. See also: ELP to GL, 1744, South Carolina Historical Society, Pinckney Family Papers, Caroline Pinckney Seabrook, copy of ELP *Letterbook*.

22. *Ibid*; ELP to Mary Bartlett (hereafter abbreviated MB), circa March 1742, *Letterbook*, 28.

23. The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly briefly noted that an act was passed to encourage the production of "Silk and other Manufactures" on 19 May 1744 in the midst of the economic crisis precipitated by the War of Jenkin's Ear; it was hoped thereby that planters would reduce their dependency on rice and diversify the economy. For more on the economic crisis, see Chaplin, *An Anxious Pursuit*, chapter six. The act was published in fuller detail in the *South Carolina Gazette* on 1 April 1745 in an

article Charles Pinckney wrote under the pseudonym "Agricola." See J. H. Easterby, ed., *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, February 20, 1744–May 25, 1745* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1955), 5:202; "Indigo," *South Carolina Gazette*, 1 April 1745. For more on Charles Pinckney's writings to encourage indigo production, see Coon, "Eliza Lucas Pinckney and the Reintroduction of Indigo Culture," 71–75.

24. ELP to GL, 1744, South Carolina Historical Society, Pinckney Family Papers, Caroline Pinckney Seabrook, copy of ELP *Letterbook*. An excerpt from this letter is also quoted in Harriott Horry Ravenel, *Eliza Pinckney* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896), 104–6.

25. ELP to MB, 1742, *Letterbook*, 38–39.

26. ELP to MB, 1742, *Letterbook*, 34–35.

27. Unfortunately Pinckney did not specify which charity her project would support. ELP to MB, 1742, *Letterbook*, 38–39.

28. ELP to MB, 1742, *Letterbook*, 35–37.

29. Leighton, *American Gardens in the Eighteenth Century*, 376; Thomas P. Slaughter, *The Natures of John and William Bartram* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996), 185, 243–48; Wulf, *The Brother Gardeners*, chapter thirteen, especially 232.

30. ELP to MB, 1742, *Letterbook*, 35–37.

31. *Ibid.*, 36.

32. For more on elite southerners' deep-seated need to assert their gentility and Englishness, see Kathleen Brown, *Good Wives*; Chaplin, *An Anxious Pursuit*. For more on women and classicism in America, see Caroline Winterer, *The Mirror of Antiquity*.

33. ELP to MB, 1742, *Letterbook*, 38–39.

34. ELP to MB, circa March to April, 1742, *Letterbook*, 33.

35. See Anzilotti, *In the Affairs of the World*, chapter four, especially 128–29; Fryer, *In Pursuit of their Interests*, chapter three, especially 104–20; Glover, *All Our Relations*, 95.

36. ELP to MB, 1742, *Letterbook*, 34–35.

37. ELP to MB, 1742, *Letterbook*, 38–39.

38. Historians debate the extent to which elite antebellum women's lives adhered to the ideology of the southern belle. Nonetheless, Drew Faust's work shows that by the time of the Civil War elite women were ill equipped to manage plantations on their own; see Drew Gilpin Faust, *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996). Frontier and backcountry conditions have been seen by historians as breaking down a strict gendered division of labor, often requiring women to perform the same work as men or slaves; see Brown, *Good Wives*, 83–88 and Ben Marsh, *Georgia's Frontier Women: Female Fortunes in a Southern Colony* (Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 2007), 5, 38–53.

39. ELP to CCP, 10 September 1785, Charleston Library Society, Letters to Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Ms. 125.

Behind The Gates: An Interracial Perspective of Black and White Youth Memories of Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 1950s–1970s

Katherine Jernigan

Originally built as a military secret, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, was a secure community for government employees working to separate uranium for the atomic bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima, Japan, on 6 August 1945.¹ The town was established as part of the war effort in an isolated area in East Tennessee, slightly west of Knoxville. The vast majority of residents during the war were from outside Tennessee, a trend that continued for several decades after World War II. This article explores the experiences of youth in Oak Ridge from the 1950s through the 1970s. As the first generation growing up in Cold War era Oak Ridge, the memories of these individuals speak to the larger reality of the negotiations of race during that period. Based on interviews with blacks and whites who lived in the town, this article discusses their recollections of racial inequalities and social change in the creation of Oak Ridge's municipal policies.

From the beginning of the town's formation, blacks lived in a separate community known first as Gamble Valley, and later as Scarboro.² Racial lines were drawn between Scarboro and the rest of Oak Ridge, as in most southern communities at the time: black citizens had separate stores for shopping, their own community center, and usually did not have equal access to facilities elsewhere in Oak Ridge. African American Archie Lee recalled that when his family moved to the town in 1953 from Mississippi, Oak Ridge was "very much segregated still."³ Paul Sylvester Early White, a black employee at the national laboratory in Oak Ridge, noted that "segregation of public facilities was much like any other southern town," despite being touted as a "model city" by white inhabitants.⁴ As a young African American woman in Oak Ridge in the early 1940s, R. L. Ayers recalled that public accommodations in Oak Ridge were segregated, including water fountains and restrooms. The only restaurants open to blacks were in Gamble Valley. Gamble Valley was "not a part of Oak Ridge . . . until we started trying to integrate."⁵ While Oak Ridge was a federal project, a fact that should have precluded legal discrimination on the basis of race, there were clear indications of *de facto* segregation throughout the community.

During World War II, the requirement for Oak Ridge to have equal opportunities for blacks and whites necessitated the allocation of equal funds for separate facilities (including housing and schools). The equality of funding, however, must be questioned when considering the early history of housing for African Americans and

the schools in Oak Ridge. Several individuals, black and white, described a system of vast racial discrepancies when discussing the available housing during the 1940s and 1950s. Depending on the number of family members, whites were given the choice of houses of varying sizes, or, if they were single, they lived in dormitories. The most common form of housing for African Americans was the hutment, a square building crudely built in sixteen feet by sixteen feet dimensions. Each housed four individuals and had a small coal stove in the center and no windows.⁶

Oak Ridge's founders apparently only had enough money for one school system and decided that an integrated school system in Tennessee in the 1940s would threaten the secrecy of the Manhattan Project. Only one school system was built – for whites. When recruiting whites, officials told them to bring their families. However, when hiring blacks (largely from Mississippi, Georgia, and Alabama) officials stipulated that they be single with no children.⁷ R. L. Ayers recalled that “there was no such thing as family life” in the town during this period.⁸ Without African American families, officials reasoned, Oak Ridge would not need another school system. While there may not have been enough money allocated for two separate school systems, the reasoning that only a white school system was affordable seems too convenient an explanation. Considering how much money was being spent on Oak Ridge, it seems illogical to assume that a request for additional funds for education would have been dismissed.

Ironically, despite efforts by officials to keep Oak Ridge a community of white families, its postwar years saw the growth of black families.⁹ As the Scarboro community grew, black children were first bused eleven miles outside Oak Ridge to Clinton city schools and then twenty-three miles to Knoxville through 1946. This temporary solution was at best a half-hearted effort on the part of town officials to force the problem away. In 1950, responding to the problem of educating black children, several white residents organized a group of certified teachers and volunteer instructors for a newly formed Scarboro High School within Oak Ridge.¹⁰ Many of these volunteers were scientists from the national laboratory and their wives. These individuals taught black students in Scarboro for five years until Oak Ridge High School began to desegregate.¹¹

The Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) oversaw the management of Oak Ridge from 1952 until 1959, when the town was incorporated into a Tennessee municipality. Waldo Cohn, a white member of Oak Ridge's Town Council (the advisory board to the AEC), proposed as chairman to integrate Oak Ridge's schools in 1953, following President Eisenhower's order to desegregate military bases.¹² His actions led to “angry citizens” demanding a recall election for his appointment. After they succeeded in forcing him to step down from his position as chairman, Cohn did not run again.¹³ Although some

residents were willing to accept token integration when it was implemented in 1955, a vocal minority clearly opposed racial change. When interviewed in 1959 regarding the AEC's upcoming turnover of the city's municipality to residents and the complete integration of the high school, Acting City Manager L.B. Shallcross defended the limited integration when he said, "The Army built it [the town] that way. The Negroes moved over there and the white people moved over here. That's the way it's been."¹⁴

Token integration in Oak Ridge began in the fall of 1955, following the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision. The process continued until the town's newly created Board of Education closed the Scarboro schools at the start of the 1967–68 school year, signaling the achievement of full integration.¹⁵ Oak Ridge's white schools, controlled by the AEC at the time, were not considered public and were actually desegregated a year before any of the state's public schools. Although Tennessee's response to the *Brown* decision was mild by regional standards, there was open resistance to racial integration during the 1957 legislative session, which mirrored the "Massive Resistance" espoused by many southern politicians at the time. Legislators passed a manifesto of protest at the *Brown* decision, in addition to laws impeding the work of the NAACP in the state.¹⁶ There was violent resistance to school integration in nearby Clinton, which witnessed riots, small bombings, and the beating of a Baptist minister who had escorted twelve new black students into Clinton High School; the most serious incident was the bombing of the high school on 5 October 1958. The FBI investigated the event, but never found enough material to build a criminal case.¹⁷

Larry Gipson, a member of the first integrated class to complete all four years in Oak Ridge High School when he graduated in 1959, recalled that he (and the other black students) were "lucky [if they had] another black student in [their] class." It was difficult to make friends in his classes because he was not able to spend time with his classmates outside school; the local hangout for youth, the Wildcat Den, was not open to blacks, nor were many restaurants in the city, and he was not able to play sports as a member of the school teams nor join clubs.¹⁸ Willie Golden and Archie Lee also experienced discrimination in school activities in the mid-1960s and late-1950s respectively. Golden was the first black student to play basketball at the high school and the first black basketball captain for the team. By the time he graduated in 1966, he had become the first black basketball player to play in the Tennessee state basketball tournament. Although he was recognized within Oak Ridge for his athletic achievements, he still faced animosity from other regional teams that Oak Ridge played.¹⁹

Archie Lee "found some difficulty in the beginning" adjusting to the high school, but the principal's position that overt racism would not be tolerated comforted him. However, what "overt" racism actually constituted must have been defined narrowly,

given that Lee endured having spitballs thrown in his direction, students wearing jackets embroidered with the Confederate flag taunting him, and students placing tacks in his seat. Despite all this, Lee described himself as “fairly popular” in high school. Although he did not believe whites and blacks became friends while he was there, he felt his experience was a positive one overall. He told of a school trip he took with his otherwise all-white physics class to Huntsville, Alabama, to visit the Redstone Arsenal. On the way back from the arsenal, the class stopped at a restaurant in Alabama, but upon being told by the proprietors that they would not serve them as long as Lee was in their group, the entire class walked out to find another place to eat.²⁰

Just as the schools were going through this racial transition, similar changes were occurring throughout the town in restaurants, churches, and businesses. While the white residents of Oak Ridge tend to remember less than black community members, it is clear that significant changes took place during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. African American community leader Nelson Stephens recalled that “Oak Ridge had some resistance but it wasn’t the level of evil” as in other places.²¹ In an apparently positive step towards equality, the Oak Ridge Community Relations Council, comprising a bi-racial group of citizens interested in improving race relations in the town, was founded in the early 1950s.²² One of the council’s white participants recalled the following about the group’s intentions: “We decided we’d better educate ourselves [and others about racial inequality] . . . surely if people knew what was going on, they would be agreeable to changing it.”²³ The council was involved in the final stage of the desegregation of the Oak Ridge schools in 1967. It reviewed the situation and fielded questions and concerns from residents about the proposed bussing system that would incorporate the last group of black students from Scarboro into the school system.²⁴

An Oak Ridge laundromat was the site of frequent racial protests in the 1950s. Nelson Stephens, whose wife Kathleen was the president of the local chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), recalled one of the many incidents that took place there. Kathleen and her friends were washing their laundry when some white men entered and threw the women’s clothes out onto the street. The following evening, Nelson and members of the local CORE chapter joined Kathleen and the other women at the laundromat. Not long after, they were met by a group of white youths with guns who sought to intimidate them, but no violence resulted. CORE also protested at the laundromat when a local group of the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) went there to wash their robes. Nelson, Kathleen, and their CORE friends stood outside the laundromat praying and singing while the KKK members remained inside.²⁵

Restaurants and other businesses were common sites for protests during this period, and establishments in Oak Ridge were no different. One white Nashville

reporter of the period postulated that eating establishments often witnessed interracial activism because “there is something sacramental about eating together.”²⁶ The management of the popular Davis Brothers Cafeteria in downtown Oak Ridge refused to let blacks eat inside, yet it employed blacks as waiters.²⁷ In reaction to this position, many wealthier white families like that of Kitty Wilcox Soldano refused to eat there. For other white families, the decision not to patronize the restaurant was an economic one; they simply ate at home for the majority of meals because it was cheaper.²⁸ R. L. Ayers recalled going to the cafeteria once to make a statement about the restaurant’s well-known refusal to serve blacks, despite its willingness to employ them.²⁹ “Me and Minnie Thompson sat there and every three minutes the waitress would pass by and say is everything alright. They did serve us, but I was afraid [for our safety].”³⁰ Dave Eissenberg worked at the national laboratory from 1952 to 1991, and he remembered demonstrations by whites in front of the restaurant urging its integration. “After integration, I don’t remember a lot of blacks eating in Davis Brothers, but the point was made that they could.”³¹ Other restaurants had similar service policies. Nelson Stephens remembered going inside the Snow White restaurant for a burger with a British friend; they were dragged outside and refused service.³² Ayers remembered going into the Snow White for service, but was served only after going to the back door at the proprietor’s insistence.³³

Archie Lee participated in some of the earliest sit-ins in Oak Ridge in the early 1950s by sitting at the counter of a local ice cream shop. It was a popular hangout for white youth in the town, but blacks were not allowed to eat there (they were served as long as they took the food outside). Lee recalled how he and friends would sit at the counter until the last possible minute, before running out when police arrived to arrest them.³⁴ Nancy Smith, a white graduate of the high school in 1968, described a similar incident from the mid-fifties. Entering a local ice cream shop, she saw a black girl about her age sitting at the counter alone, not being served. Smith, although quite young at this time, recognized the inequality of the situation, and sat down next to the girl and ordered them both ice cream floats.³⁵

Dave Eissenberg remembered an effort by a group of barbers in Oak Ridge to refuse service to blacks and how citizens defused this plan. The barbers claimed not to have the knowledge to cut the hair of blacks; a group of white citizens saw this as an attempt to hide their refusal to serve blacks under a flimsy pretense. To “call the barbers’ bluff,” the group found a barber from outside Oak Ridge and convinced him to move to the town and work near one of the major shopping centers downtown, Jackson Square. They proceeded to sell coupons throughout the community redeemable for one haircut at this man’s barbershop. This scheme convinced white barbers

to remember how to cut African American hair!³⁶ Demonstrating a strong opposition to racial exclusion by white community members, the barbershop initiative clearly improved race relations in the town.

The Skyway Drive-In Movie Theatre was a popular spot for white families to spend evenings. Like many businesses in Oak Ridge, it was segregated in the late 1950s. Nelson Stephens remembered how, as a member of CORE, he and others would often go to the theater and wait simultaneously in both ticket lines to hold up white patrons. Once when they decided to do this after a high school basketball game, the traffic from the theater and the nearby high school was so congested that the police were called in to help disperse the traffic jam.³⁷ Another African American, Kelly King, recounted that he and his friends would often watch the movies on the hill behind the Skyway Drive-In, because they were denied admission based on their race. Once, “a group of us were brave and walked in the back of the theater, got a box of popcorn and walked out. We had several people looking at us and we ran. We were pretty courageous that [day].”³⁸

Mozelle Bell, who arrived in Oak Ridge in 1948 as an adult, recalled an incident at the bowling alley in Grove Center, a shopping center in town. In the early 1950s, “a big dispute” occurred when a biracial team of women who worked together at the national laboratory attempted to enter the league. Bell was a white participant in one of the member teams. When the biracial team was denied the right to play, Bell refused to play in her team that year.³⁹ In the 1950s Nelson Stephens joined the bowling league in the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies where he worked, and when he was told by some of his white colleagues that he would not be allowed to bowl, the AEC stepped in and cut the funding they normally provided for the institute’s league, thereby supporting Nelson’s right to participate in company events as an African American.⁴⁰

The differences perceived by residents often fell along not race but class lines. Some white interviewees described the subject of race as nonexistent. One stated that because students were “divided by academic achievement” in classes, “they [black students] were just sort of invisible to us.”⁴¹ Kitty Wilcox Soldano described her time growing up white in Oak Ridge as one in a community having “no ‘old money’, no ‘new wealth’.”⁴² Similarly, Dave Miller recalled his experience as a white youth as having “very little difference” between children in 1950s Oak Ridge. “Every adult in Oak Ridge that wanted a job had one. Every kid had lunch money, a bicycle, and clean clothes. Looking around the room at school, you couldn’t tell the Lab Director’s child from the soda jerk’s kid. *And it didn’t matter.*”⁴³ For Miller, differences in social class did not exist between whites, but he focused on equalities he saw in material possessions and jobs.

Blacks (and a few whites) had few illusions about the difference in job prospects according to race. Even though Elizabeth Peelle was white, she saw blacks working mostly as janitors and maids in the Oak Ridge Community Relations Council.⁴⁴ Archie Lee stated that in Oak Ridge during the early 1950s, blacks “either dug a ditch or swept a floor.”⁴⁵ R. L. Ayers came to Oak Ridge in 1943 after working as a soda jerk in Mississippi as a fourteen-year-old. When she heard about the opportunities for blacks in Oak Ridge, she and a cousin quickly left for the town because “you could make money here . . . ‘cause see, we wasn’t making any money where we was living.” She found employment at the laboratory washing dishes in the cafeteria and working in the infirmary.⁴⁶ Ayers’ experience of obtaining employment in Oak Ridge reveals better job prospects for blacks compared with other areas of the South, but employment opportunities were still far from equal.

While Oak Ridge was certainly distinct from other southern towns during the period, it had a difficult path to racial equality that, in many respects, mirrors the changes occurring in cities throughout the region. Although neighborhoods in Oak Ridge remained segregated, shopping districts and downtown areas were seen as opportune venues for racial protest to gain a foothold for change in the post Jim Crow era. The town *was* unusual for both the size of white establishment support for efforts for racial equality and the early instances of sit-ins in the community. Nevertheless, as was the case in countless other communities across the nation, efforts to change the racial status quo were met with resistance. Civil rights activity, although central to the memories of black youth in the town, was widely unrecognized and unacknowledged by white interviewees. These separate recollections indicate that the civil rights experience has yet to be fully reconciled in Oak Ridge, as it does in many communities in the United States.

NOTES

1. Charles W. Johnson and Charles O. Jackson, *City Behind A Fence: Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 1942–1946* (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1981).
2. R. L. Ayers stated that the area acquired the name “Gamble Valley” because the Atomic Energy Commission purchased the land from a local man named Johnny Gamble. R. L. Ayers, interview by Keith McDaniel, Center for Oak Ridge Oral History, Oak Ridge Public Library, 13March 2012.
3. Archie Lee, telephone interview with the author, 29 December 2011.
4. Paul Sylvester Early White, oral history with Rose Weaver, 5 January 2010. As these observations were made by African Americans relating to racial segregation, it should be noted that they were not reinforced in this case study with responses from white residents describing similar restrictions for black residents. That said, this only points to oral history methodology and does not imply that these recollections are incorrect. This work endeavors to use memories from participants to delve into the experiences of individuals in Oak Ridge, not to use the accounts to confirm observations or to certify assumptions.

5. Ayers, interviewed by Rose Weaver, winter 2006. In an earlier interview, Mrs. Ayers said that her name "R. L." came from her mother wanting a boy whom she would name "Robert Lee." When R. L. arrived as a girl, they simply shortened her name to initials. R. L. Ayers, interviewed by Mitch Jerald, National Educational Technology Solutions LLC (NETS), Center for Oak Ridge Oral History, Oak Ridge Public Library, 21 September 2005.
6. Elizabeth Peelle, interviewed by Keith McDaniel, Center for Oak Ridge Oral History, Oak Ridge Public Library, 23 February 2010.
7. Will Minter, telephone interview with the author, 30 December 2011. Peelle, interview. This was confirmed in McDaniel's interview of Mrs. Ayers and his interview of Elizabeth Peelle. An examination of the AEC archives relating to Oak Ridge in Atlanta, Georgia would very likely be able to corroborate this information.
8. Ayers, interview by McDaniel.
9. Minter, interview. The town transitioned from being run by the Army Corps of Engineers to leadership by the Atomic Energy Commission in 1952.
10. These residents were led by Robert and Ida Coveyou.
11. Michael Coveyou, email to the author, November 28, 2011.
12. *Carson v. Roane-Anderson Co.* 342 U.S. 232 (1952). Johnson and Jackson. *City Behind A Fence*. Ken Morrell, "The Equation at Oak Ridge," *Southern Education Report*, Vol. 3, No. 7, March 1968: 15. 1 September 1999, Nick Ravo, "Obituary of Dr. Waldo Cohn," *The New York Times*.
13. Dave Eissenberg, email to the author, 17 November 2011.
14. Tom Flake, "Federal Control To End At Oak Ridge," *Southern School News*, Vol. 6, No. 1, July 195: 1. For more information on the history of early Oak Ridge schools, see Ray D. Smith's "Historically Speaking" column in *The Oak Ridger*, particularly his articles published 4 and 21 November 2006 and 15 September 2009. The series in 2006 was entitled, "Education in Oak Ridge- Pre-Oak Ridge and Early-Oak Ridge Schools, Parts 1 and 2" and the article from 2009 was entitled, "Oak Ridge schools—a rich history, a promising future."
15. Morrell, "The Equation at Oak Ridge."
16. *Ibid.*, 143–44.
17. 4 October 1988, "School Bombing 30 Years Ago Helped Town Heal Wounds," *New York Times*.
18. Larry Gipson, telephone interview with the author, 28 December 2011.
19. Lee, interview. Willie Golden, telephone interview with the author, 28 December 2011.
20. Lee, interview. The Redstone Arsenal in Huntsville, Alabama made Huntsville a southern town with large amounts of federal funding and influence during this period, like Oak Ridge.
21. Nelson Stephens, oral history with the author, 29 December 2011.
22. Ayers, oral history by Weaver. Michael Coveyou, Facebook correspondence with the author, 11 January 2012.
23. Peelle, interview.
24. Morrell, "The Equation at Oak Ridge," 15

-
25. Stephens, oral history.
 26. Reporter in Kelly Miller Smith, "Chapter 1: Shame and Glory," in "The Pursuit of a Dream," VUSC-KMS, Box 28, Folder 7, 18.
 27. Eleanor Hubbell Coffey, email to the author, 14 November 2011.
 28. Kitty Wilcox Soldano, email to the author, 29 April 2011. Nancy Craven Fears, email to the author, 28 November 2011.
 29. Kelly King, interview with Rose Weaver, summer 2009.
 30. Ayers, oral history by Weaver.
 31. Eissenberg, email.
 32. Stephens, oral history.
 33. Ayers, oral history by Weaver.
 34. Lee, interview. Other restaurants in Oak Ridge that did not serve blacks during this time were the Oak Terrace Dining Hall, run by Roscoe Stevens in Grove Center, and McCrory's, a national five and dime store chain. Peelle, interview.
 35. Nancy Smith, telephone interview with the author, October 2011. While Lee and Smith did not recall the name of the ice cream shops where these sit-ins occurred, it is possible that they took place at the same shop.
 36. Eissenberg, email.
 37. Stephens, oral history.
 38. King, interview.
 39. Mozelle Bell, email to the author, 12 December 2011.
 40. Stephens, oral history.
 41. Jane Ann Jett Wheeler (quoted), Gage Frye Woods, Anne Ergen DeLozier, Tollie Moore DeGraw, Ellen Gardiner Morgan, and Viola Ergen, interview with the author, 12 November 2011. For more on the invisibility of race, see Wei Sun, *Minority Invisibility: An Asian American Experience* (University Press of America, 2007) and Ralph Ellison, *Invisible Man* (multiple editions).
 42. Kitty Wilcox Soldano, email to the author, 5 April 2011.
 43. Dave Miller, email to the author, 16 March 2011.
 44. Peelle, interview.
 45. Lee, interview.
 46. Ayers, interview by McDaniel.

Servant or Slave?: South Carolina's Inherited Labor Dilemma

John J. Navin

As historian Jack Greene and a host of other scholars have demonstrated, South Carolina can trace its origins to the “Barbados culture hearth.”¹ Part of that inheritance was the transition from servant labor to slave labor that marked the rise of the plantation complex on Barbados. That change, initiated in the 1640s and largely accomplished by 1680, suggests that sugar planters had by then developed a clear preference for slave labor. Given the importance of Barbadian emigrants in settling South Carolina, it follows that a predilection for African workers must have transferred to the Carolina Lowcountry from the colony's inception. A closer look at the labor situation in seventeenth-century Barbados and colonial Carolina, however, raises questions about such assumptions.

Barbados

In 1781 Thomas Jefferson noted: “In a warm climate, no man will labour for himself who can make another labour for him.”² When the first boatload of English settlers arrived at the island of Barbados in 1627, the idea of reaping the profits from another's labor was hardly new, for landowning gentry had been doing it for centuries. Despite political disorder and economic setbacks – such as Barbados' reputation for producing inferior tobacco – new settlers flocked to the island. In little more than a decade, only one-fifth of Barbados' one hundred six thousand acres remained unclaimed; by 1640 the population had climbed to fourteen thousand.³ By mid-century the inhabitants of Barbados could be divided into three major groups: whites who had come to the island willingly, whites who had been transported to the island against their will, and enslaved Africans.

Those individuals who came to Barbados willingly saw the island as a place of opportunity. At first, many were simple yeoman farmers looking for a fresh start. They benefited from early headright policies⁴ and throughout the 1630s and 1640s attempted to generate income through the planting of tobacco, ginger, cotton and indigo. Other whites were artisans or freemen who received wages for their labor. But in the 1630s and 1640s, the majority of voluntary immigrants were servants who committed themselves to years of labor in return for their passage and the promise of “freedom dues.”⁵ Unfortunately, many of these servants encountered disappointment and ill-treatment in Barbados, which kindled a spirit of discontent within their ranks that would last for decades. Not surprisingly, forced labor and intolerable living conditions generated not just discontent, but outright resistance and sporadic violence.

In 1634 a group of desperate servants resolved to kill their masters and sail away. As was usually the case, the plot failed, so the island's disgruntled labor force resorted to other forms of retaliation and planters took greater precautions for their own safety.⁶

In the 1640s and 1650s, Barbados also became a jail without walls for thousands of whites transported to the island against their will. These included prisoners of war, banished political and religious dissidents, convicts, orphans, "rogues, thieves, whores and idle persons" deported by local authorities.⁷ The importation of such people at times became a form of quasi-slavery, for many of those who arrived as a result of military and political conflicts in England, Scotland, and Ireland had their indentures sold in Barbados at auction. English slave traders sometimes found it more profitable to purchase indentured men, women, and children in Bristol for four pounds and sell them in Barbados for ten to thirty-five pounds rather than compete with the Dutch in the African trade.⁸ Many people in seaside communities in the British Isles were kidnapped outright – "Barbadosed" in contemporary parlance – by unscrupulous traders. As many as fifty thousand Irish were deported to Barbados and Bermuda in what one historian has termed an "ethnic cleansing" of the land.⁹

By 1640 Barbadian white servants had already developed an unsavory reputation for intoxication, thievery, lewdness, and sloth. The arrival of thousands more white prisoners and outcasts in the 1640s and 1650s only exacerbated the problems associated with the servant underclass. By 1647 the collective suffering of the island's servants had "grown to a great height" and a group of conspirators plotted to "fall upon their Masters, and cut all their throats and by that means make themselves not only freemen but Masters of the Island."¹⁰ The scheme failed, but by mid-century many planters had grown weary of the problems fostered by drunken, lazy, uncooperative, and hostile servants. Some of the latter were just a nuisance; others posed a real threat to their masters.

Given the high cost of African slaves in the first half of the seventeenth century and the likelihood that they might die within a matter of months in Barbados on account of diseases, especially yellow fever, and of the rigors of chattel slavery, white indentured servants in these years seemed the wiser choice despite the problems they caused.¹¹ The cost of passage for a servant was only six to seven pounds, so planters could recover their investment in just two years; every year of service beginning with the third was pure profit.¹² A servant's untimely demise, should it come, had limited financial ramifications: he or she was a short-term investment, not a purchase for life. These were among the reasons that the majority of Barbadian planters continued to rely on servants as their principal and apparently preferred source of labor throughout the 1630s.¹³

That was soon to change. In his 2006 monograph, Russell Menard argues convincingly that slavery was expanding rapidly prior to the island's sugar boom that began in the mid-1640s.¹⁴ But there can be no doubt that sugar and slavery grew in tandem on Barbados and

elsewhere in the West Indies. In 1645 George Downing, cousin of Governor John Winthrop of Massachusetts, noted that Barbadians had purchased no less than a thousand Africans that year and “the more they buy, the better able they are to buy, for in a year and a half they will earn (with God’s blessing) as much as they cost.”¹⁵ Another contemporary observed that most Barbados’ gentry had “100 or 2 or 3 [hundred] slave apes who they command as they please.” He added, “They sell them from one to the other as we do sheep.”¹⁶ By 1655 the number of enslaved Africans climbed to 20,000, nearly equal to the white population.¹⁷

Some planters were well ahead of the curve in the transition to an enslaved labor force. Menard estimates that in 1643, the year of Barbados’ first sugar crop, there were already six thousand Africans on the island. One reason to purchase slaves despite their higher cost was the steadily deteriorating relationship between the planters and servants on Barbados. Susan Dwyer Amussen calls attention to the breach of faith that occurred when Barbadian planters ignored the reciprocity that traditionally accompanied the master-servant relationship in England.¹⁸ Many individuals had indentured themselves voluntarily, but the conditions they encountered on the island meant their servitude had to be “maintained by the systematic application of legally sanctioned force and violence.”¹⁹ Of course, the brutal subjugation of Scots, Irish, and Englishmen was problematic since even servants were entitled to certain rights under common law. Colonial courts and assemblies could intervene on a servant’s behalf, and occasionally did so. Thus masters sometimes had to restrain themselves or face possible legal consequences.

Faced with the resistance that emanated from servants’ sense of rights, both inherent and contractual, and with the need to act within legal bounds when motivating or correcting individuals, some planters undoubtedly preferred workers who could be routinely exploited and punished without restraint. Enslaved Africans fit that bill. They lacked the rights that British servants claimed. They could be compelled to work at whatever pace the master or overseers set or face the consequences. Slaves had to settle for whatever food, clothing and shelter were dispensed, no matter how inadequate. Courts and lawmakers were unlikely to intervene on their behalf. African slaves lacked solidarity, at least at the outset, and had no indentures that limited their terms of service. In short, some planters were probably willing to pay more for workers over whom they had absolute power. And as Lord Acton famously observed: “Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.”²⁰ In 1654 Father Antoine Biet observed the extreme measures that Barbadian planters used to control their black workers:

They treat their Negro slaves with a great deal of severity. If some go beyond the limits of the plantation on a Sunday they are given fifty blows with a cudgel.... If they commit some other slightly more serious

offense they are beaten to excess, sometimes up to the point of applying a firebrand all over their bodies which makes them shriek with despair.²¹

Biet was “horrified” by the scars on the body of one female slave. On another occasion he felt compelled to intercede on behalf of a black laborer who had stolen a pig. The overseer had the thief placed in irons and whipped by fellow slaves daily for a week, after which he cut off one of his ears, roasted it, and forced him to eat it. He planned to do the same to the slave’s nose and other ear but the clergyman “pleaded so well with the overseer that the Negro was freed from his torment.” Biet acknowledged that “one must keep these kinds of people obedient,” but maintained that “it is inhuman to treat them with, so much harshness.”²² Tyranny of this kind had its consequences. In 1659 a major slave uprising was narrowly averted and Barbadian planters once again felt endangered, this time not only by their white servants.²³ In his account of Barbados written in the 1650s, Richard Ligon noted that the planters built strongly fortified houses with “Bulwarks and Bastions” to defend themselves in case there should be “any uproar or commotion in the island, either by the Christian servants, or Negro slaves.”²⁴

Some Barbadian planters switched to slave labor reluctantly.²⁵ Hilary Beckles has shown that many small and middling landowners continued to purchase indentured servants even after they had shifted from tobacco, indigo and cotton to sugar. But the island’s largest planters, “perceiving a future supply crisis in the servant market[,] opted for the consistency of slave labor in spite of its higher marginal cost.”²⁶ Because significant capital was necessary to purchase slaves in quantity, the changeover from white to black laborers was a gradual process and many plantations had bi-racial workforces for quite some time. In fact, during the 1640s and 1650s when indentured servants and enslaved Africans were arriving at the island in large numbers, many planters intermittently purchased both white and black laborers.

Given the rebellious nature of many indentured servants and the growing population of potentially dangerous African slaves, planters looked for some way to ensure their own collective safety. The solution they derived – one that would be replicated by Barbadians who migrated to other slaveholding colonies – was to mollify white laborers with certain concessions and protections. This included assigning white servants to specialized roles in the sugar works or as artisans because planters feared that demeaning fieldwork and oppressive discipline might provoke retaliation from that group. Meanwhile, the Barbados Assembly resolved to exert greater control of the black majority through intimidation, ongoing scrutiny, and brute force.²⁷ Despite these measures, the continued importation of slaves and the outmigration of whites who had completed their indentures or sold their land to larger planters resulted in a shift in the racial composition of the island, with enslaved Africans and their descendants accounting for a majority from about 1660 onward.²⁸ Natural increase contributed slightly to the black

majority; the life of a slave on a sugar plantation was so dreadful, however, that deaths would outnumber births throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.²⁹

In the 1660s Barbadian planters had to deal with falling prices for their sugar, restrictions imposed by the Navigation Acts, soil exhaustion, crop failures, deforestation, high mortality, a dramatic reduction in the supply of indentured servants, and the dangers concomitant with an increasing black majority. Those problems, combined with dire predictions and the lack of available land, steered disgruntled planters and landless freemen – many of them former servants – toward other shores, most notably England, Jamaica, Virginia, New England, and the new colony called Carolina.³⁰

Carolina

Detailed information regarding the first months of settlement in the Charleston area is sparse. However, given our knowledge of what went on in Barbados in prior decades, we have a window into the experience and likely mindset of those Barbadian white colonists who traded that distant island for the North American mainland.³¹ First and foremost, the settlers from Barbados would have felt that commercial agriculture was the key to prosperity. Large landholdings promised large profits, but only if the soil could be put to productive use. In Carolina, planters would need to find one or more staple crops and workers to plant, tend and harvest them.

In Barbados, the growing dependence on African labor had fostered a black majority a full decade before Carolina was settled; by 1670 the ratio was approaching 2:1. This had been a matter of great concern for many whites, especially in the wake of the 1659 plot to overthrow white rule. Racial paranoia would become even more widespread when a “Grand Conspiracy of the Negroes” was narrowly averted on Barbados in 1675.³² When they departed for Carolina, Barbadians carried those fears and prejudices with them; few would have wanted to duplicate the island’s demographic crisis in their new setting. Even though they had not hesitated to purchase Africans in the past, former Barbadians had also come to value white servants as a safeguard against non-white workers and external threats. The proximity of thousands of Native Americans and the Spanish presence in nearby Florida both argued for the ongoing recruitment of white colonists, free and unfree. Of course, for Carolina’s founders the most compelling reasons to import workers, regardless of color, were the headrights they garnered and the work they could assign to others rather than perform themselves.³³

With the advantage of hindsight, we now know that South Carolina was destined to be one of just two states that had a black majority at the time of the Civil War. To what degree was that racial composition inevitable? By capitalizing on whatever white

servants they could acquire, whatever white freemen they could afford to employ, whatever Indians they could hire, and on their own sweat and toil, Carolinians could have steered a different course. They could have turned their backs on the Barbadian plantation model that depended on slave labor. The 1670s comprised a moment of historical contingency for Carolina, one in which freedom dues, wages, and barter could have paved the way for commercial agriculture in a free labor market. The earliest settlers, exporters of low-grade tobacco, deerskins, cattle, timber, and wood products such as barrel staves, could have made different choices. Because they had not yet identified a lucrative cash crop, the colonists need not have resorted to slave labor at the outset. They still had the opportunity to establish a model in which workers were fairly compensated and planters garnered profits in a more humane and moderate fashion. But settling for less profit was anathema to Carolina's leading men, especially those intimately connected with the West Indian plantation system. Research has shown that immigrants from Barbados who owned substantial acreage in Carolina were responsible for the importation of the majority of Africans who arrived in the first few years.³⁴ They knew the keys to riches on Barbados were land and slaves and they were not inclined to deviate from that proven course, despite its perceived inherent perils. Thus slaves were present in the colony from the outset; a decade after its founding, the settlement housed an estimated one thousand whites and two hundred blacks.³⁵ In the 1690s the emergence of rice as a highly profitable crop virtually guaranteed that the use of enslaved Africans would not only continue, but see dramatic growth. By 1708 blacks constituted a majority in the Carolinas.³⁶

One could argue that the immense profits reaped by future generations from the sale of rice, indigo, and cotton meant that Carolina was preordained to rely on slave labor, but that implies that Carolina slaveowners themselves lacked freedom of choice. On Barbados there were no apologists for the gross exploitation of workers in the name of profits, but we should not assume that the unbridled greed that characterized sugar barons in the West Indies was inevitable in Carolina. Russell Menard argues that neither the Africanization of slavery (as opposed to Indian slavery) nor its entrenchment in the Carolina Lowcountry was inevitable. He notes that Carolinians had "several options in recruiting and organizing a work force," including free workers, indentured servants, Indian slaves, and blacks from the West Indies and Africa. Menard maintains that the blacks were "commodities in a stable, large-scale, international labor market that made them victims of choice in the rapidly expanding plantation colonies of European America."³⁷

For their part, the Lord Proprietors did nothing to inhibit the adoption of slavery in the new colony; in fact, they did just the opposite, ensuring prospective settlers both that the importation of slaves would entitle the owner to the same headrights as the importation of servants and that every freemen would wield "absolute power and authority" over his

slaves.³⁸ The Proprietors even instructed Andrew Percival, owner of a plantation south of the Charleston settlement, to initiate a trade for African slaves with the Spaniards in Florida.³⁹

In 1674, thanks to an alliance brokered by Dr. Henry Woodward, the Westo Indians began to raid inland tribes and supply captives to the new colony. The Westo may have penetrated as far as Natchez territory along the Mississippi in their quest for Indian slaves to trade with Charleston settlers.⁴⁰ Suddenly the Carolinians had access to a seemingly limitless source of laborers arriving not in ships from Barbados, but on foot from the interior. The captives taken in war were, according to Carolina's Grand Council, "willing to work in this Country, or to be transported from hence." The Council thus maintained that Carolinians were enslaving no one against their wishes and were meeting the Proprietors' order that "no Indian upon any occasion or pretense whatsoever is to be made a Slave, or without his own consent be carried out of Carolina."⁴¹

Carolinians soon conducted a thriving business in the sale of Indian slaves to sugar planters in the West Indies. On occasion, they even sold captive Native Americans to New England Puritans. Louis Roper attributes Carolina's participation in the Indian slave trade and the practice of inciting wars among Native Americans to the influence of Sir John Yeamans and other Barbadian emigrants. He maintains that even before the colony was planted, Yeamans may have envisioned the North American mainland as a new source for slaves for sugar planters.⁴² Given the readiness with which they plunged Southeastern Indians into West Indian slavery, it is hard to imagine that colonists would not have drawn on the same labor pool for their own needs. The practice of hiring Native Americans quickly gave way to purchasing and enslaving them. Even before rice became a major crop, Carolinians were relying on enslaved Africans and Indians to labor on their behalf. In just a matter of decades the colony had become the focal point of the slave trade on the North American mainland.

Russell Menard has pointed out that many colonial societies that eventually became dependent on African slaves did so only after an initial period of reliance on white indentured servants or Native Americans.⁴³ The Barbadian emigrants to Carolina were ahead of that curve. In 1680 Governor Atkins of Barbados noted that "since people have found out the convenience and cheapness of slave labour they no longer keep white men, who formerly did all the work on the plantations."⁴⁴ For more than three decades, Carolinians contributed to the growing population of unfree workers on Barbados via the Indian slave trade. Their ongoing communication with West Indian sugar planters and continued immigration from the West Indies ensured the transmission of ideas and practices to the fledgling colony. In his 1682 publication, *An Account of the Province of Carolina*, Samuel Wilson noted that many planters in the colony who were "single and have never a Servant" had made great profit by raising

and selling hogs, by which means “they get wherewithal to build them more convenient Houses, and to purchase Servants, and Negro-slaves.”⁴⁵ In a rhetorical question posed for his readers, Wilson provided a telling glimpse into the mindset of Carolina planters then and in the future:

But a rational man will certainly inquire, When I have Land, what shall I doe with it? What Comoditys shall I be able to produce that will yield me mony in other Countrys, that I may be inabled to buy Negro slaves (without which a Planter can never do any great matter. . . .⁴⁶

At the turn of the century Thomas Nairne would say of Carolina that “there are many who settle without any Slaves at all, but labour themselves,”⁴⁷ but the Barbadian emigrants who came to be known as the “Goose Creek Men” were not among them. Beginning in the mid-1690s, the transition from deerskins, cattle, and other exports to rice production caused exponential growth in the demand for fieldworkers. Indian slavery would crest just before the Yamasee War (1715 to 1718) and then peter out, but the colony’s reliance on slave labor was a *fait accompli* by that time.⁴⁸ Following the Barbadian model, South Carolinians came to rely almost exclusively on African slaves who by mid-century would outnumber the whites by a 2:1 margin. As a result, the same fears that haunted Barbados sugar planters came to occupy the minds of white Carolinians. Like their counterparts in the West Indies, the latter desperately sought to attract enough whites to maintain numerical superiority over the Africans they imported and their progeny. Failing that, they resorted to extreme measures to keep blacks in a state of absolute powerlessness. For better or worse, South Carolinians remained part of the Barbadian culture hearth – a labor model that led to great profits for a few and misery, hardship, and death for a great many others. Plantation slavery in the Carolinas would be not only the wellspring of the great planters’ rise to economic, political, and social prominence, but also the cause of their eventual downfall at the hands of outside forces.

NOTES

1. Jack P. Greene, “Colonial South Carolina and the Caribbean Connection,” *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 88, no. 4 (October, 1987): 192–93.
2. Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, Query XVIII, in Paul L. Ford, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1892–99), 4:232.
3. John J. McCusker and Russell R. Menard, *The Economy of British America, 1607–1789 with Supplementary Bibliography* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 153.
4. A “headright” was a grant of land used to encourage settlement and to reward the importation of laborers by early colonists. On Barbados, a total of 771 grants placed 67,929 acres (80 percent of the island) in private

hands between 1627 and 1638; these figures do not include ten thousand additional acres granted to a syndicate of London merchants. Much of the land was allocated by headright at the rate of ten acres for each dependent white servant – the so-called “ten-acre men” needed for militia purposes. See Richard B. Sheridan, *Sugar and Slavery: An Economic History of the British West Indies, 1623–1775* (Kingston, JA: Canoe Press, 1974), 83; and Michael Craton, “Property and propriety: Land tenure and slave property in the creation of a British West Indian plantocracy, 1612–1740,” in John Brewer and Susan Staves, ed., *Early Modern Conceptions of Property* (London: Routledge, 1996), 523–4, n.20. Land-rich colonies in the American south offered early colonists even larger headrights, typically fifty acres for themselves and an additional fifty acres for each family member or servant that accompanied them. Carolina’s proprietors used headright grants to control settlement by linking the size of a grant to the number of dependents (free, slave, and indentured) capable of cultivating it. See S. Max Edelson, *Plantation Enterprise in Colonial South Carolina* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 94.

5. Hilary Beckles, *White Servitude and Black Slavery in Barbados 1627–1715* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989), 5. “Freedom dues” were awarded to servants who completed their terms of service. They varied by time and place, but often included clothing, tools or firearms, and, in some cases, grants of land. Because of the intense competition for land in Barbados, servants did not receive land as part of their freedom dues after the introduction of sugar in the 1640s.

6. In 1634 settlers headed for the new colony of Maryland made anchor at Barbados and found the planters “all in arms.” The servants had “conspired to kill their masters and make themselves free, and then handsomely take the first ship that came, and so go to sea.” A servant revealed the plot and it was foiled. See “A Briefe Relation of the Voyage Unto Maryland by Father Andrew White,” in C. C. Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633–1684* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1910), 34. An even more dangerous and widespread revolt in which servants aimed to take over the island occurred in 1647; eighteen were executed in its aftermath. See Richard Ligon, *A True History and Exact History of the Island of Barbados*, ed. Karen Ordahl Kupperman (London, 1657; reprinted Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2011), 22.

7. Abbot Emerson Smith, *Colonists in Bondage: White Servitude and Convict Labor in America, 1607–1776* (Gloucester MA: Peter Smith, 1965), 136–74.

8. Sean O’Callaghan, *To Hell or Barbados: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ireland* (Dingle, Co. Kerry, Ireland: Brandon, 2000), 86. The transport of human cargo from the British Isles to Barbados gave traders the added advantage of returning to England with sugar as their cargo.

9. *Ibid.*, 9.

10. Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, ed. Kupperman, 96.

11. Skin color and cultural markers (especially language) linked white servants and their masters, though these commonalities were often overshadowed by differences in socioeconomic status, nationality, and religion. This was especially the case in Barbados in the 1640s and 1650s as a planter elite emerged and the servant population was increasingly composed of Irish Catholics. Peter Wood maintains that in Carolina, “custom, language, and religion naturally made Europeans prefer to have other Europeans working with and under them.” See Peter Wood, *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1974), 40. This is speculative, ignoring many differences that separated rather than united laborers and masters. Moreover, the fact that servants in Barbados (and later, Virginia) rose up against their masters and the fairly rapid Africanization of the workforce on Barbados and in the American South raise serious questions about Wood’s statement.

12. Beckles, *White Servitude and Black Slavery*, 2.

13. Richard Ligon observed on several occasions that Barbadian planters worked servants harder than slaves

because the labor of the former was only available for the term of their indentures. See Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, ed. Kupperman, 21.

14. Menard offers a “rough guess” that “at least one thousand slaves arrived on the island during the 1630s” and that there were about six thousand slaves in Barbados in 1643 when sugar was just beginning to emerge as a commercially important crop. See Russell R. Menard, *Sweet Negotiations: Sugar, Slavery, and Plantation Agriculture in Early Barbados* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006), 30–31.

15. Sir George Downing to John Winthrop, Jr., 26 August 1645, in “Winthrop Papers,” *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections*, 4th ser., 6 (1863): 536. According to Leigh Hunt, Barbados planters “found it impossible to manage the cultivation of sugar by white people in so hot a climate,” and the example of Portuguese sugar plantations in Brazil “gave birth to the negro slave trade.” See *Leigh Hunt’s London Journal* 1, no. 29 (October 15, 1834): 227.

16. “Extracts from Henry Whistler’s Journal of the West India Expedition,” in C. H. Firth, ed., *The Narrative of General Venables* (Camden Society, 1900), 146.

17. Richard S. Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624–1713* (New York: Norton, 1973), 87.

18. Susan Dwyer Amussen, *Caribbean Exchanges: Slavery and the Transformation of English Society, 1640–1700* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 128.

19. Beckles, *White Servitude and Black Slavery*, 5.

20. Lord Acton, Letter to Bishop Mandell Creighton, 5 April 1887, in John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, *Historical Essays and Studies*, ed. John Neville Figgis and Reginald Vere Laurence (London: Macmillan, 1907), Appendix, http://oll.libertyfund.org/?option=com_staticxt&staticfile=show.php%3Ftitle=2254&chapter=212809&layout=html&Itemid=27 (accessed 7 January 2013).

21. Jerome S. Handler, ed., “Father Antoine Biet’s Visit to Barbados in 1654,” *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society*, 32 (1967): 66–67.

22. *Ibid.*, 67. The quotation’s original punctuation is retained.

23. According to reports in several London periodicals, the leader of the conspiracy was an African alleged to have been a prince in his own country. Following his execution, white patrols hunted down “stragglers” and conducted searches for spears, lances, clubs and knives. See Carla Gardina Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640–1661* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2004), 203.

24. Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, ed. Kupperman, 75; Sir Henry Colt, “The Voyage of Sir Henry Colt Knight to the Ilands of the Antilles . . .,” in Vincent T. Harlow, ed., *Colonising Expeditions to the West Indies and Guiana, 1623–1667*, Publications of the Hakluyt Society, 2nd ser., 56 (London, 1925), 54–102; and Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 69.

25. In describing the shift from servants to slaves on Barbados and in mainland colonies, many historians have focused on supply and demand. In its briefest possible form, the argument simply holds that from the middle of the seventeenth century onward, there were not enough indentured servants to meet the needs of planters in the Caribbean and on the mainland. The African slave trade provided an alternative source of laborers, costly at first but increasingly economical as the supply of servants dwindled and the volume of slave imports increased. This argument ignores some planters’ apparent predilection for African slaves even prior to Barbados’ sugar boom; Russell Menard’s analysis of slave importations prior to 1643 points to factors other than supply and demand. I maintain that two important incentives were Africans’

perceived lack of rights and genuine lack of legal protection (in contrast to the rights and protection afforded servants). South Carolinians dealt with these same issues (as well as economic factors) when choosing between servants and slaves. In his 1712 promotional pamphlet about South Carolina, John Norris made a point of saying that “as for Servants receiving from their Masters undeserved Correction, the Laws of the Country doth protect them.” John Norris, *Profitable Advice for Rich and Poor* (London: 1712), in Jack P. Greene, ed., *Selling in a New World: Two Colonial South Carolina Promotional Pamphlets* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989), 94.

26. Beckles, *White Servitude and Black Slavery*, 121.

27. In 1661 this strategy was articulated via two pieces of legislation, one of which would be a landmark in the history of racial oppression. *An Act for the good Governing of Servants and Ordaining the rights between Master and Servants* ensured the continued subordination of white indentured servants, but placed limits on the type and extent of punishments that a master could employ. It also established minimum allotments of food and clothing for servants and gave them the right to appeal in the courts if they were mistreated. The penalty for running away was reduced and servants accused of serious crimes became entitled to trial by jury. While calling on masters to take a “continual strict course” in dealing with “unruliness, obstinacy and refractiveness,” the Act placated some servants by making a clear distinction between indentured servitude and outright slavery. The second piece of legislation passed in 1661, *An Act for the better ordering and governing of Negroes* (often referred to as the “Barbados Slave Act”), had far different ends. Rather than improve conditions for the island’s twenty-seven thousand slaves, the Act provided legal mechanisms to facilitate the continued exploitation of Barbados’ black population. Revised and expanded in 1676, 1682 and 1688, the 1661 Act equated slaves with “goods and Chattels” and gave masters total authority over their slaves, including the right to punish them as they saw fit. It served as the model for similar legislation passed in Jamaica, Antigua and South Carolina. See Richard Hall, Mss. Laws of Barbados, CO 30/1, no. 30, Public Records Office, cited in Beckles, *White Servitude and Black Slavery in Barbados 1627–1715*, 80n.1; Robin Blackburn, *The Making of New World Slavery: from the Baroque to the Modern, 1492–1800* (London: Verso, 1998), 249–50; Hilary Beckles, “From Land to Sea: Runaway Barbados Slaves and Servants, 1630–1700,” in Gad J. Heuman, ed., *Out of the House of Bondage: Runaways, Resistance and Marronage in Africa* (New York: Routledge, 1986), 84–85; McCusker and Menard, *The Economy of British America, 1607–1789*, 153; and “Barbados Act for the better ordering and governing of Negroes,” 27 September 1661, Barbados MSS Laws, 1645–1682, C.O. 30/2/16–26, cited in Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 238.

28. David Galenson, *White Servitude in Colonial America: An Economic Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 4.

29. Between 1708 and 1735, Barbadians imported eighty-five thousand slaves. Due to the extremely high mortality on the island, the net increase in slaves at the end of that period was only four thousand. A 1757 publication, *An Account of the European Settlements in America*, estimated that five thousand slaves needed to be imported annually to sustain Barbados’ population of eighty thousand slaves. Information compiled by Griffith Hughes, a Barbadian cleric, revealed that “the whole term of a negro life may be said to be there but sixteen years!” See Anthony Benezet, *Some Historical Account of Guinea: With an inquiry into the rise and progress of the slave trade* (London: J. Phillips, 1788), 78. Anticipating that 3 to 5 percent of his slaves would perish each year, Colonel Henry Drax offered to replace “those that shall be deceased” or to simply provide “a yearly recruit of 10 or 15.” See Peter Thompson, ed., “Henry Drax’s Instructions on the Management of a Seventeenth-Century Barbadian Sugar Plantation,” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 66, no. 3 (July, 2009): 585. A fellow planter placed slave mortality at a slightly higher rate; he estimated that a workforce

consisting of one hundred Africans would cease to exist in less than two decades unless replacements were purchased on an ongoing basis. See Edward Littleton, *The groans of the plantations, or, A true account of their grievous and extreme sufferings by the heavy impositions upon sugar and other hardships relating more particularly to the island of Barbados* (London: Printed by M. Clark, 1689), 6, 18, quoted in Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 323. The prevailing attitude that blacks were expendable led to even greater abuse; working a slave to death was an option open to planters who cared far more about profits than about notions of humanity.

30. Based on Gov. Jonathan Atkins' list of emigrants who departed in 1679, cited in April Lee Hatfield, *Atlantic Virginia: Intercolonial Relations in the Seventeenth Century* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 143.

31. These insights are not meant to represent the attitudes of colonists who migrated directly from Britain, though some of the discussion that follows may pertain at least in part to their views, their ambitions, and their treatment of entrepreneurship, servants, and slaves.

32. The 1675 plot was "miraculously discovered" when a domestic slave informed her mistress that upon a pre-arranged signal "in the dead time of the night," slaves all over the island were to set fire to the cane fields and cut the throats of their masters. According to one account, the blacks were to kill all whites "within a fortnight" except for the "fairest and handsomest women" who would be "converted to their own use." Seventeen slaves implicated in the plot were seized and hastily arraigned; eleven were beheaded and the remaining six were burned alive. In accordance with the planters' strategy of intimidation, the bodies of the beheaded conspirators were dragged through the streets and then burned alongside those unfortunates who were set to the stake. Five other slaves hanged themselves rather than face similar punishments. As the investigation and arraignments continued, twenty-five more blacks were executed for their role in the conspiracy. According to the governor's subsequent report, the scheme was three years in the making and had been "cunningly and clandestinely" communicated "over most of the plantations." See *Great Newes From the Barbados. Or, a True and Faithful Account of the Grand Conspiracy of the Negroes Against the English* (London, 1676), 9–12, quoted in Handler, "Slave Revolts and Conspiracies," 14–16.

33. Having been informed that "there are many hundreds of noble families and well experienced planters that are ready to move speedily thither, with Negroes and servants," the proprietors offered a generous headright of 150 acres to every freeman who entered the colony before 25 March 1670. In addition, the latter were to receive 150 acres for every adult male servant they brought and 100 acres for every female servant or male servant under 16. See Smith, *White Servitude in Colonial South Carolina*, 3, 11. The proprietors were especially interested in attracting Barbadians whose experience as colonists engaged in commercial agriculture and overseas trade networks could prove valuable in the new settlement. But the transition to slave labor in Barbados' sugar fields meant that most planters by 1670 were not in a position to bring large numbers of white servants to Carolina. Anxious to capitalize on Carolina's generous headright policy, the Barbadians inquired whether the same 150-acre and 100-acre allocations would apply to slaves. They claimed that their sugar plantations "have beene made and upheld by Negroes and without constant supplies of them cannot subsist." See William L. Saunders, ed., *The Colonial Records of North Carolina*, 10 vols. (Raleigh, 1886–90), 1:150, quoted in Wood, *Black Majority*, 17. The proprietors, several of whom were involved in the slave trade, responded affirmatively, eager to recruit the islanders and undoubtedly convinced that Africans beneath the lash could generate profits as well as (if not better than) white laborers. The result, as Peter Wood has pointed out, was an increase in the number of Africans in early Carolina, though in terms of headrights Barbadian planters had equal incentive to bring white servants, had they owned them in comparable numbers. See Wood, *Black Majority*, 20.

34. Of the sixty or so grantees who arrived between 1670 and 1675, most had at least one or two servants to tend their several hundred acres; during that period land was claimed by planters for the importation of about two hundred servants overall. See *Warrants for Lands in South Carolina*, A.S. Salley, ed., 1:1–125 cited in Abbot E. Smith, *Colonists in Bondage*, 331. The only mention of slaves or “negroes” in the early land grant records occur beside the names of Simon Berringer (who received 3,000 acres), Lady Margaret Yeamans (1,950 acres), William Sayle (2,350 acres), Mrs. Dorcas Smith (610 acres), Francis Boulton (600 acres), and a handful of lesser planters such as William Thomas (270 acres), Mrs. Joan Carner (270 acres), and Capt. Richard Conant (150 acres). The designation of “servant” may well have included some enslaved Africans, but it appears that large planters accustomed to using slave labor on Barbados were far more inclined to do so in Carolina than their humbler fellow colonists. See Table II, “Land-Grant Records of Early Carolina – with servants noted” in Warren B. Smith, *White Servitude in Colonial South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1961), 12–16. In his seminal work, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1975), historian Edmund Morgan notes (304–5) that in colonial Virginia, men with only a small sum to invest were likely to buy servants rather than slaves, who cost more; as late as 1699 the House of Burgesses observed that the servants who worked for “the poorer sort” of planters were still “for the most part Christian.”

35. A census compiled in 1708 by Richard Beresford, agent for South Carolina, reported that the colony was evenly divided between whites and blacks, each of whom comprised 42.5 percent of the its inhabitants. Enslaved Indians accounted for the other 15 percent. The white population included only 120 servants – sixty men and sixty women. See Smith, *White Servitude in Colonial South Carolina*, 128.

36. Wood, *Black Majority*, 143.

37. Russell Menard, “The Africanization of the Lowcountry Labor Force, 1670–1730,” in Winthrop D. Jordan and Sheila L. Skemp, ed., *Race and Family in the Colonial South* (Jackson MS: University Press of Mississippi, 1987), 84–103.

38. John Locke, *The Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina, March 1, 1669*, in *The Statutes at Large of South Carolina*, ed. Thomas Cooper and David James McCord (Columbia: A.S. Johnston, 1836), 1:55.

39. William S. Pollitzer, *The Gullah People and Their African Heritage* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2005), 40.

40. Allan Gally, *The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670–1717* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 50, 53–56. Woodward, a London surgeon, accompanied Robert Sanford during his reconnaissance mission of the South Carolina coast in 1666. When Sanford departed, Woodward opted to remain with the Indians at Port Royal and learned their language and customs. He was seized by the Spanish and imprisoned at St. Augustine until the English pirate William Searle attacked the city in 1668. Returning to Carolina in 1670, Woodward contracted with five Carolina proprietors to oversee the deerskin trade on which they retained a monopoly in return for 20 percent of the profits. He is accounted by many to be the first English settler in Carolina and reportedly spoke five Indian languages. See Helen C. Rountree, “The Mother of Necessity: Carolina, the Creek Indians, and the Making of a New Order in the American Southeast, 1670–1763,” in Robbie Ethridge and Charles Hudson, ed., *The Transformation of the Southeastern Indians, 1540–1760* (Jackson MS: University Press of Mississippi, 2008), 87.

41. Council meeting, 10 December, 1675, in A.S. Salley, ed., *Journal of the Grand Council of South Carolina, August 25, 1671– June 24, 1680* (Columbia: Historical Commission of South Carolina, 1907), 80, cited in Gally, *Indian Slave Trade*, 49.

42. Louis Roper, *Conceiving Carolina: Proprietors, Planters, and Plots, 1662–1779* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 45.

43. Menard, *Sweet Negotiations*, 31.

44. Vincent T. Harlow, *A History of Barbados, 1625–1685* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926; reprint 1969), 309, quoted in Wood, *Black Majority*, 46. In 1688 Henry Erskine (3rd Lord Cadross) of Charleston Neck, South Carolina, informed Edmund White of London that “negroes were more desirable than English servants & such you may have enough of from Barbadoes . . . the negroes will be the better after they have been ashore for some time and their work will be worth their keeping . . . they are capable of learning anything & I find when they are kindly used & have their belly full of victuals & clothes, they are the truest servants.” See “Edmund White of London to Joseph Morton in South Carolina, Feb. 29, 1688,” in *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* 30 (1929), 1–5, in Wood, *Black Majority*, Appendix A.

45. Samuel Wilson, *An Account of the Province of Carolina* (London: Printed by G. Larkin for Francis Smith, 1682) in Alexander S. Salley, Jr., ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina, 1650–1708* (New York, 1911), 167. Wilson noted (172) that because of the “mildness of the winter,” enslaved Africans could “thrive and stand much better, than in any of the more Northern Collonys, and require less clothes.”

46. *Ibid.*, 174.

47. Thomas Nairne, *A Letter from South Carolina . . . Together with the Manner and necessary Charges of Settling a Plantation there, and the Annual Profit it will produce* (London: Printed for A. Baldwin, 1710), 52. In 1712 John Norris said a profitable plantation could be established with fifteen Indian women to work in the field and three more to work as cooks. However, “an Indian Man or Woman may cost 18 or 20 Pound, but a good Negro is worth twice that Sum” because “a Man’s slave will, by his Labor, pay for his first Cost in about four Years at most, besides his Maintenance, so, the Remainder of his Life, you have his Labor as free Gain.” See Norris, *Profitable Advice*, in Greene, ed., *Selling in a New World*, 77–107.

48. The Indian slave trade gained momentum in South Carolina throughout the 1680s and 1690s. The greatest influx of Indian slaves took place in the first decade of the eighteenth century, due in large part to Governor James Moore’s slave raids against St. Augustine and the Apalachee missions in 1702 to 1704. In 1708 enslaved Indians accounted for roughly 25 percent of the slave population in South Carolina; most worked side by side with African slaves on Lowcountry plantations. In 1715, on the eve of the Yamasee War, about one-quarter of all South Carolina households owned some Indian slaves. See William L. Ramsey, *The Yamasee War: A Study of Culture, Economy and Conflict in the Colonial South* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008), 34–37. The Yamasee war killed nearly an entire generation of Indian slave traders and crippled the commerce in deerskins and Indians slaves for years thereafter. The market for enslaved Carolina Indians evaporated in the New England and mid-Atlantic colonies, and South Carolina planters thereafter exhibited a clear preference for African slaves (though two thousand Native Americans still worked on South Carolina plantations in 1724). See Christina Snyder, *Slavery in Indian Country: The Changing Face of Captivity in Early America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 76–78.

Revitalization in the “West End” of Greenville, 1987 to 2011

Nicholas Smit

The revitalization of the West End in Greenville, South Carolina, was characterized by both persistence and a vision for change. Although the area had been prosperous during the first half of the twentieth century, following World War II it fell into a period of desolation. Only beginning in the early 1980s did public and private revitalization efforts create a new downtown arts and entertainment district in the West End.

From the beginning, Greenville developed along both the east and west sides of the Reedy River. In May 1784, when Cherokee territory was opened for sale, Colonel Thomas Brandon purchased four hundred acres stretching across both banks of the river. This land became the future City of Greenville. By November 1815 Vardry McBee was the primary landholder.¹ The Reedy River divided Greenville into halves, with the river falls as the centerpiece of the city. The east side grew around the courthouse, the west side along Main, Pendleton, and Augusta Streets; but the heart of the city remained Reedy River Falls, “a favorite gathering place for Greenvillians.”²

On the west side of the river, at the top of the falls, McBee constructed a large corn mill. Twelve years later he added a stone gristmill, then a sawmill and a stone quarry near the bottom of the falls, the start of what would become a thriving commercial center. To the east of the river, at the corner of Main and Avenue Streets, McBee built a general store that also served as a town meeting hall.³ When McBee subdivided his property, residents moved into the area, building stores and homes. Roads running to Augusta and Pendleton allowed nearby farmers to bring produce for sale.

In 1852 Furman University moved from Winnsboro, South Carolina, to fifty acres purchased from McBee on the bluffs of the river. Classes commenced two years later, following construction and the hiring of five professors. Because there were no dormitories, students rented rooms from the nearby residents, bringing further growth. In 1853 the arrival of the Greenville and Columbia Railroad encouraged additional commercial expansion to the area that was increasingly referred to as the “West End.”⁴

Although prosperity stalled during the Civil War and early Reconstruction, the mid-1870s brought an increase in cotton prices and a resurgence of development as textile mills moved into the West End, creating the “Textile Crescent.”⁵ By 1890 the

West End, originally defined as the land west and south of the Reedy to White Horse Road, had established an identity independent from the rest of Greenville. Churches such as Second Presbyterian and Allen Temple A.M.E. were founded, so that West Enders could worship in their section of town. Clyde and Hovey's fine dry goods store, with its large upstairs meeting hall, provided a popular gathering place. The American Bank, Chicora Women's College, and a public high school provided for the financial and educational needs of residents. As a result of new growth, competing development stimulated a rivalry between East Enders and West Enders that extended into the early 1900s.⁶ By the 1920s, although the center of textile manufacturing had begun to shift to West Greenville – an area beyond and slightly north of the West End – the West End itself promoted new commercial and industrial activity such as bottling companies, automotive dealerships, and repair shops.

Yet with the arrival of the Depression and World War II stores closed and residents moved away, creating a space for warehouses and light industry. Industrial development further stagnated following World War II, and the separate identity of the area disappeared, and, with it, the term "West End."⁷ Furthermore, with the emergence of faster transportation and superhighways, commerce left downtown.⁸ In 1958 Furman University moved to a new location outside Greenville, taking its economic benefits with it. By 1959 the extension of Church Street and later Academy Street also significantly decreased the number of people traveling through the West End by altering the route used to enter the downtown area.⁹ With innovations like supermarkets, "business parks," the "motor mile" on Laurens Road, upscale subdivisions such as Sugar Creek, Pebble Creek, and Thornblade, and the creation of malls such as McAlister Square Mall and Haywood Mall, Greenvillians had fewer reasons to go downtown. Downtown businesses such as J.C. Penney, S.H. Kress, McGee and Brothers, and Meyers-Arnold closed or relocated.¹⁰

By the 1970s and early 1980s, warehouses and light industry dominated the West End. Abandoned buildings fell into disrepair; crime and prostitution gradually became more visible.¹¹ Sewers and industrial waste filled the Reedy River, polluting the city's historic centerpiece.¹² In 1983 one landmark, Greenville General Hospital, was closed and was replaced by another – the Relax Inn, a motel best known for its crime and drug dealing.¹³

Beginning in the 1930s, a movement to reconnect with historic communities and restore a "sense of neighborhood identity" had begun in several American cities. Later, legislation such as the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (which created the National Register of Historic Places) and the Tax Reform Act of 1976 established guidelines and financial benefits for preserving historic buildings and provided the first

step toward revitalization.¹⁴ During the later decades of the twentieth century, the movement united preservationists and capitalists in promoting urban redevelopment through the use of methods like the Main Street Program and Maritime Preservation.¹⁵

In the late 1970s, as urban renewal began in Greenville, city developers hired Lawrence Halprin to design a new downtown streetscape that inaugurated a three-decade process of revitalization. The Hyatt Regency Hotel, opened in 1982, encouraged restoration along North Main Street in the uptown business district, where the city implemented street and landscape designs to improve aesthetics. Later renovations to the Poinsett Hotel, the old Courthouse, and the old Bank of Commerce Building, as well as the opening of the Peace Center for the Performing Arts, pushed redevelopment to the doorstep of the West End.¹⁶

Residents and community groups led early West End revitalization efforts. In 1967 the journey toward rebirth began with the Carolina Foothills Garden Club's construction of a public park at the base of the Reedy River Falls, which had been hidden by the Camperdown Bridge, built in 1960. A long stone staircase led from South Main down into the garden. Although initial support was limited, the society also restored Falls Cottage, an 1897 historic building south of Camperdown Way. In 1980 the Traxler Building, Greenville's old Coach Factory, was given a major renovation, which turned it into first-class office space.¹⁷ During the 1980s private investors like Blake Praytor and Ed Durham of D & B Glass, Erwin Maddrey of Woodside Mills, and Bob Jenkins of Legal Services Co. of Western Carolina renovated existing properties for their businesses.¹⁸

In 1987 local residents and business owners created the West End Association, which proved to be the catalyst in providing direction for revitalization efforts. The Association sought to partner with the city in sponsoring further development and improving the aesthetic appeal of the area.¹⁹ Similar organizations had proved successful at building public support in other cities, yet unlike other community groups, the West End Association did not wait for city leadership and was proactive in attempting to build momentum for a large-scale revitalization.²⁰ That same year, prompted by local businesses, the City of Greenville created a Tax Increment Finance (TIF) district, a financial method used in other such projects, to provide funds for urban renewal programs in the West End.²¹ The city established the TIF district to extend roughly to the blocks surrounding South Main, Pendleton, Rhett, and Augusta Streets.²²

In 1989 the city hired Land Design/Research Inc., which proposed aesthetic improvements and the creation of a farmer's market in the West End, a multipurpose building intended to spark revitalization and create an interest in private redevelopment.²³ City planners hoped that a market, acting as an "anchor of activity," would serve

as the catalyst for future restoration.²⁴ In spite of initial support, private investment was minimal, and city planners understood that the public still viewed downtown as ending at South Main and Broad Street. Few ventured into the West End.²⁵ The district had to create a more welcoming environment to end the common perception that it was dangerous and crime ridden.²⁶

City officials assigned a Special Operations Response Team (SORT) as well as a police substation to the West End, and a full-time community patrol officer worked directly with local business owners in a successful effort to reduce crime. The West End Association used organization funds to purchase bicycles and bulletproof vests for the officers.²⁷ With the appearance of three officers, rotating day and night shifts, lounges closed and drug dealing and prostitution virtually disappeared.²⁸ Nevertheless, though crime had significantly declined by the late 1990s, public perception of the area remained unchanged.

In the early 1990s, following the suggestion made by Land Design/Research Inc., the city proposed streetscape improvements that stretched from the Poinsett Hotel to the intersection at Augusta and South Main Streets to encourage a more pedestrian-friendly environment. In 1991, after long deliberation, the city took jurisdiction of South Main from the State Highway Commission to create a two-lane, pedestrian-friendly street. In 1992, with the use of federal and TIF moneys, the two-year project to improve streets, bury utility lines, add street lighting, and incorporate landscaping was completed. These improvements greatly increased visual appeal and foot-traffic in the West End.²⁹

At the same time, following the model for revitalization, West Enders sought the creation of a historic district. In February 1993 the West End Commercial District was placed on the National Register of Historic Places, creating Greenville's largest historic district. The designation not only provided federal tax credits to be used for renovation, but also allowed the historic identity of the West End to reemerge by establishing architectural and restoration guidelines.³⁰

In the mid-1990s South Main Street was essentially a road to nowhere; although the city had invested money to begin visual improvements, boarded-up buildings lined South Main and Pendleton Streets.³¹ By 1994 the city secured property and finalized plans to create the proposed West End Farmer's Market. Construction of the \$4.1 million phased project lasted from mid-1994 to June 1995 and encompassed three adjacent brick buildings donated by Caldwell Harper, a forty-five thousand-square-foot property located at the intersection of South Main and Augusta streets.³² The property had previously housed the old Cotton Alliance Warehouse and a bowling alley. Designers conscientiously restored the historic façade, providing a model for other

restoration projects. At the rear of the building, architect Allen Freeman designed a connected tower to act as a focal point and direct attention from South Main Street to the building.³³ Businesses such as Kudzu, The Milltown Emporium, and Smoke on the Water opened and thrived in the Market.

Nevertheless, although the West End Market encouraged private restoration, the Market itself was unsuccessful, failing to make the impact on the private sector that the city had anticipated.³⁴ Furthermore, as the city created value, anticipation of future improvements caused prices to skyrocket, deterring prospective entrepreneurs.³⁵ Until the late 1990s and early 2000s, the community grew sluggishly. Yet some businesses saw the potential. Minor restoration projects included the arrival of new tenants in the West End Market, the opening of The Cook's Station South Main, and Caldwell Harper's renovation of an additional warehouse on South Main and The Spa at West End at the intersection of South Main and Pendleton. Despite these efforts, many more buildings remained abandoned, and the outmoded perception of crime continued.³⁶

In September 1999 the South Carolina Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities opened on a portion of what had been the old Furman University campus. The 158,000-square-foot complex served as a competitive high school for talented students statewide.³⁷ Architect Scott Johnston of Freeman & Major endeavored to blend the school into the landscape and direct attention to Reedy River Falls. Along with the Children's Theater and the Warehouse Theater, the Governor's School provided a boost to the area and reestablished a connection between the West End and the arts.³⁸ Furthermore, the presence of the school raised awareness of the need to remove the Camperdown Bridge and create Falls Park.³⁹

Previous attempts to remove the Camperdown Bridge to reveal the once iconic thirty-five-foot Reedy River Falls had faced staunch opposition. By the 1960s some citizens regretted that one of Greenville's most historic sites remained hidden. As late as the 1990s, Mayor Knox White believed most Greenvillians had never seen the falls, and that, in ignorance, they opposed removing the bridge because they feared traffic and commerce would be hindered and the West End financially ruined.⁴⁰ Public opinion viewed the Camperdown Bridge as a convenient access point to the West End as well as a "perfectly good bridge." In 1997 a national consulting firm advised that removing the bridge was "not a viable option," an opinion seconded by the city. But by 1999 Mayor White successfully campaigned to "Free the Falls," and with support of the Garden Club, he built momentum for removing the bridge. By May 2002, after obtaining jurisdiction from the State Highway Department, the Camperdown Bridge was torn down "slice by slice," providing a clear view of the river for the first time in forty-two years.⁴¹

Beginning in the 1980s, various plans recognized the potential of the space below the falls to unite the city with the Reedy River corridor.⁴² Finally, by the end of 2001 with architect Andrea Mains' master plan in hand, the city hired Arbor Engineering, Inc. to implement a conceptual plan for the historic falls.⁴³ Working closely with city planners and a citizen committee, Arbor pieced together a design that envisioned walking paths through a five-leveled park, an outside amphitheater, garden spaces, a multi-use structure adjacent to the Traxler building, and a pedestrian bridge across the river.⁴⁴

A lack of money and public support delayed construction of the pedestrian bridge.⁴⁵ Following passage of a \$20 million bond issue, the city hired architect Miguel Rosales to design the structure, which he imagined as a unique curving cantilevered suspension bridge, "light, delicate, floating on top of the river" to allow the waterfall to remain "the star of the show."⁴⁶ City planners thought he expressed their idea perfectly and were sold on the design.⁴⁷ A German firm, Schlaich Bergermann, engineered the 346-foot-long pedestrian bridge – dubbed the Liberty Bridge – at a cost of \$4.5 million.⁴⁸

By late 2002, with the final girder removed from the old Camperdown Bridge, construction crews began the \$13.4 million transformation of Falls Park. The large multi-purpose facility featured storage space, a restaurant – The Overlook Grill – and a public pavilion, capped with a "fabric, tent-like roof."⁴⁹ Two outside amphitheaters, designed for performances like "Shakespeare in the Park," nestled at the base of the Garden Club's original historic park. Eleven tiered gardens, winding pathways, and picnic areas spread over the twenty-acre site seamlessly connected by landscape architect Tom Keith and achieved in a fashion to frame the falls and bridge.⁵⁰ Portions of red clay bricks that had been part of Vardry McBee's original mill to the west of the river and foundation of the Camperdown Mill on the north bank provided Greenvillians a glimpse of their city's past.⁵¹ In September 2004, after two years of construction, the walls came down, and the public flowed into the park through the West Plaza entrance from South Main, the future location of Bryan Hunt's sculpture "Falls Lake Falls."⁵² The city had created a "smashing success."⁵³

The creation of Falls Park sparked immediate large-scale private growth in the West End.⁵⁴ RiverPlace was the first among many private projects. Like Falls Park, a plan to reconnect with the historic heart of the city along the river corridor from Willard Street to South Main had been conceptualized and discussed years earlier with few results.⁵⁵ Yet in 2002 Cooper Carry, an architecture firm based in Atlanta and hired by Hughes Investments, designed a mixed-use development to provide additional access points to the river and bring pedestrian flow to new green-spaces, expanding the potential for future growth.⁵⁶

By early 2004, following the city's legal battle and later acquisition and demolition of several buildings along South Main to the corner of Camperdown Way, construction

began on the city's \$11.5 million underground parking garage.⁵⁷ Under the leadership of visionaries Bob and Phil Hughes of Hughes Investments, developers constructed four adjacent buildings, featuring 10 luxury condominiums with views of the river, 36 mid-priced condominiums, a 115-unit Hampton Inn & Suites, and eighty-seven thousand-square-feet of office and retail space.⁵⁸ In addition a multi-story man-made waterfall and fountain was designed to act as the center of RiverPlace development and connect public traffic along the corridor to the Peace Center's outside amphitheater on the opposite bank.⁵⁹ By the end of 2005 RiverHouse, 155 RiverPlace, Hampton Inn & Suites, and numerous shops, restaurants, and businesses had opened their doors.⁶⁰

In 2007 Hughes constructed The Terrace, a ninety-eight-thousand-square-foot building featuring twenty-seven condominiums as well as office and retail space built on top of an extended portion of the city's underground garage and overlooking the man-made waterfall. In 2011 Hughes acquired two warehouses on the opposite side of Camperdown Way and constructed RiverWalk, featuring forty-four luxury apartments and retail space.⁶¹ As RiverPlace grew, revitalization spread to the area surrounding Camperdown Way, with further development intended for residential spaces and office parks, which would extend growth along the Reedy, past River and Academy Streets.⁶²

Falls Park and RiverPlace instigated a major change, shifting the heart of the city from Bergamo Plaza to the West End.⁶³ The effects of revitalization traveled all the way down South Main. In early 2004 the West End Association succeeded in having the portion of Pendleton Street to the intersection with Vardry renamed South Main Street. The city improved roads, lighting, and landscaping, and the name change also had a positive psychological effect. "Pendleton Street" had suggested drugs and prostitution. Changing its name helped integrate this historic section of the street into the redeveloping West End.⁶⁴

While work was underway on Falls Park, city planners explored the possibility of relocating a baseball stadium to the new South Main Street. Since 1984 the Greenville Braves had played at Municipal Stadium on Mauldin Road.⁶⁵ In June 2003 City Council proposed buying five acres at the intersection of Green and Pendleton streets to be used for a downtown stadium, replacing the aging Municipal Stadium.⁶⁶ The site, owned by the Greenville School District, included an abandoned lumberyard and warehouse and fifteen residences.⁶⁷ The city intended to develop the area as a mix-use complex, creating jobs and business as well as bringing new residents into the West End and stretching the revitalization into nearby neighborhoods.⁶⁸ As Falls Park and RiverPlace had anchored development at one end of South Main, so, too, might a stadium provide a spark at the opposite end.⁶⁹

The West End Association expressed support but other residents, including members of Allen Temple A.M.E. Church and the Greenville High School PTA, vehemently opposed a stadium along South Main. Some thought the stadium would inhibit revitalization by producing a structure that would overshadow the Allen Temple and create noise, parking problems, and displaced residents.⁷⁰ Furthermore many parents and administrators of Greenville High School felt that the district was being forced to give up valuable school property. As in the case of the Falls Park project, city and West End Association representatives clocked countless hours addressing the concerns of local residents. In December 2003, after a meeting lasting until two in the morning, city officials and school representatives reached an agreement by a seven-to-five vote. The city exchanged the desired property for a 3.6-acre tract of land contiguous to the rear of Greenville High School.⁷¹

A series of events brought the single-A Capital City Bombers, an affiliate of the Boston Red Sox, from Columbia to Greenville, and city developers hired Architect Tim Shellenberger of DLR Group to design the new stadium.⁷² In May 2005 EMJ Corporation began construction of the \$15.5 million stadium using five hundred thousand bricks salvaged from area mills and built the façade “as low as possible . . . in some places like a one-story building” to blend into the community.⁷³ The stadium featured seating fourteen rows deep in the main area with a green metal canopy covering ten rows of seating, a picnic pavilion, children’s play area, and concession stands. The stadium also included eighteen suites, each seating eighteen people. The re-named Greenville Drive played its first game at the new West End Field on 6 April 2006.⁷⁴ Over the next year the Drive spent an additional \$1.5 million in enhancements to the stadium, and at the start of the 2008 season its name was changed to Fluor Field.⁷⁵

The stadium changed the landscape “both physically and perceptually” and created “a sense of camaraderie for the community.”⁷⁶ The city spent roughly \$3.5 million on streetscape and aesthetic improvements along South Main, Vardry, Bradshaw, and South Markley Streets. Just as the creation of the West End Market had helped to reduce crime, so, too, did the development of the stadium and surrounding shops. Businesses like Smoke on the Water and The Spa at West End saw increased traffic, and public perception of the area improved. In the end even parking proved to be a non-issue, with most people parking at County Square and walking the two blocks to the stadium or riding the free shuttle. Local businesses also made money by charging for the use of their parking lots.⁷⁷

The stadium likewise fostered additional private revitalization and investment. Tad Mallory, owner of the West End Coffee Co., constructed a new, brick building across from the stadium on South Markley Street.⁷⁸ David Glenn and Tom Croft de-

veloped the Fieldhouse on South Main, a large salvaged-brick structure adjacent to the left field wall of the stadium designed for both residential and business spaces.⁷⁹ Zen, developed as a special events venue, moved into an abandoned warehouse.⁸⁰ Clark Patterson Lee, a professional design firm, renovated and moved into the 1882 Ferguson and Miller cotton warehouse. Other investors purchased abandoned or vacant properties intended for future development along South Main and Augusta streets.

In 2011 a partnership between the Salvation Army and the Ray and Joan Kroc Corps opened the Kroc Community Center and Gibbs Court tennis complex along Westfield Street. The Kroc Center provided a twenty-acre state-of-the-art recreational and worship facility. Nearby the A. J. Whittenberg Elementary School opened in mid-2011 with a special emphasis on engineering.⁸¹ In addition, Greenville received a \$1.8 million grant to develop a park near the Kroc Center and the elementary school to foster restoration of the low to moderate-income residential areas.⁸²

Revitalization of the West End transformed the area. In 2008 the West End was honored by the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism with the Governor's Cup Award for the "bold vision" and successful redevelopment of the area.⁸³ By 2011 there was not a single boarded up building along South Main. The Relax Inn had been torn down. "Special Emphasis Neighborhoods" around the West End were included in new master plans for restoration. Improvements to the West End also brought great economic benefit, with well over one-hundred-million dollars in private development following the creation of Falls Park.⁸⁴ Movements like "The Far West End" sought to capitalize on the success of the redevelopment by continuing efforts into West Greenville.⁸⁵

Nevertheless, while revitalization of the West End reflected the basic restoration strategies of other American downtowns, in many ways Greenville's history of revitalization was unique. From the 1950s to the 1980s, many cities bulldozed abandoned buildings and began economic redevelopment with few historic structures. West Enders, though, had a vision for historic preservation and prevented the demolition of older buildings. By the time large-scale restoration began in the 1990s, buildings, streetscapes, and landscaping were already in place.⁸⁶ Furthermore, the support of Mayor White, strong city leadership, and financial resources combined to create a positive environment in which revitalization efforts could flourish. By the end of 2011 the West End was known as the arts and entertainment district of Greenville, emerging as "one of liveliest commercial and residential neighborhoods" and becoming a destination in the historic heart of Greenville.⁸⁷

NOTES

1. Judith T. Bainbridge, *Historic Greenville: The Story of Greenville & Greenville County* (San Antonio: Historical Publishing Network, 2008), 5–17.

2. Bainbridge, *Greenville's West End* (Greenville: Furman University, n.d.), vi–vii; Knox White, “A Message from the Mayor,” *The Greenville News*, 17 September 2004.
3. Bainbridge, *Historic Greenville*, 17–18; Bainbridge, *Greenville's West End*, 2.
4. Judith Bainbridge, interview by author, Greenville, SC, 7 September 2011; Bainbridge, *Greenville's West End*, 2.
5. Bainbridge, *Greenville's West End*, 4–8, 20–25, 33.
6. *Ibid.* vi, 20–23, 34–36.
7. *Ibid.* vi, 20–21, 42–46; Judith Bainbridge to author, 13 October 2011.
8. Robert M. Fogelson, *Downtown: Its Rise and Fall, 1880–1950* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 1–8.
9. Bainbridge interview.
10. Archie Vernon Huff Jr., *Greenville: The History of the City and County in the South Carolina Piedmont* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 394–95. Bainbridge, *Historic Greenville*, 85.
11. Bainbridge interview.
12. Knox White, “A Message from the Mayor,” *Falls Park on the Reedy: Keepsake Section – A Supplement to the Greenville News*, 17 September 2004.
13. “West End on verge of returning to prosperity,” *Greenville News*, 8 January 2006.
14. William J. Murtagh, *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America* (New York: Sterling Publishing Co., 1990), 103–4, 112.
15. Murtagh, *Keeping Time*, 113–14; John M. Levy, *Contemporary Urban Planning*, 4th ed. (Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1997), 61.
16. Bainbridge, *Historic Greenville*, 79–80; White interview.
17. Bainbridge, “Peek at the past with Camperdown bridge gone,” *Greenville News*, n.d.; Jason Smit, interview by author, Greenville, SC, 1 November 2011.
18. Bainbridge, *West End*, 54–56.
19. South Carolina Secretary of State, “West End Association, The,” *Business Filings*, <http://www.scsos.com/index.asp?n=18&p=4&s=18&corporateid=11637> (accessed 22 October 2011); “By Laws of the West End Association,” published manuscript, in possession of West End Association office.
20. Mary D. Hirsch, interview by author, Greenville, SC, 30 September 2011.
21. Larry Marks, “The Evolving Use of TIF,” *Development Strategies Review*, (Summer 2005): 4–5; “City of Greenville Tax Increment Finance Districts,” published manuscript, in possession of City of Greenville Economic Development Office.
22. As defined by the West End Association, the West End encompasses the area from Camperdown Way to the north, Reedy River along Howe Street on the east, Vardry Street and North Markley to the south, and Westfield Street to West McBee Avenue to the west. “By Laws,” in possession of West End Association office. “By Laws,” in possession of West End Association office.
23. Toby Moore, “Study calls for market as part of Westend revitalization,” *Greenville News*, 7 March 1989.
24. David Winfrey, “Westend plan to cost estimated \$3.8 million,” *Greenville News*, 20 April 1989.
25. White interview.

-
26. Donna Isbell, "Public market key to reviving city's Westend," *Greenville News*, 31 May 1989.
 27. "West End Association Achievements & Milestones," published document, in possession of West End Association office.
 28. Dale Perry, "The West End on way back to prosperity," *Greenville News*, 6 July 1999; "'Dodge City' image changing slowly to more peaceful one," *Greenville News*, 13 September 1989; "Intense police efforts dampen crime," *Greenville News*, 13 September 1989.
 29. Isbell, "Westend sees redevelopment light," *Greenville News*, 18 July 1990; Aliah D. Wright, "Plan takes big step forward," *Greenville News*, 26 October 1991; Perry, "Westend beautification project construction to start next month," *Greenville News*, 24 January 1992.
 30. "Westend group to survey historic buildings," *Greenville News*, 11 October 1989; "Westend finally gets 'historic' label," *Greenville News*, 2 February 1993; Perry, "The West End on way back to prosperity," *Greenville News*, 6 August 1999.
 31. White interview. Nancy Whitworth, interview by author, Greenville, S.C., 26 October 2011.
 32. "Westend Market finally opens," *Greenville News*, 3 June 1995.
 33. Allen Freeman, interview by author, Greenville, SC, 5 October 2011.
 34. White interview; Whitworth interview.
 35. Ben Szobody, "West End renaissance slows," *Greenville News*, 21 April 2002.
 36. Whitworth interview.
 37. Ed O'Donoghue, "West End revival," *Greenville News*, 21 June 1998.
 38. Perry, "The West end on way back to prosperity," *Greenville News*, 6 July 1999.
 39. White interview.
 40. *Ibid*; "Falls Park on the Reedy ready to welcome guests," *Falls Park on the Reedy*, 17 September 2004.
 41. White interview; "Peek at the past with Camperdown bridge gone," *Greenville News*, 6 September 2011; "For 40 years, Camperdown Bridge was source of controversy," *Falls Park on the Reedy*, 17 September 2004.
 42. Rudolph Bell, "European trip offers clues to Reedy River plans," *Greenville News*, 29 October 2000.
 43. "Contract between Arbor Engineering and City of Greenville for Falls Park," published document, in possession of Arbor Engineering; "Landscaping becoming big business, important amenity," unidentifiable newspaper clipping, n.d. in possession of Arbor Engineering; Tom Keith, interview by author, Greenville, S.C., 28 October 2011.
 44. White interview; Christina Fisher, "Reedy River Falls Historic Park," *Construction* (March 2004): 4–6.
 45. Keith interview; White interview.
 46. Richard Walton, "Camperdown bridge coming down in July," *Greenville News*, 10 June 2002; Keith interview; White interview.
 47. White interview; Gary Hyndman, "Architect presents pedestrian bridge design, Camperdown Bridge demolition set for summer," *The Greenville Journal*, 22–28 February 2002.
 48. White interview; Falls Park: Greenville South Carolina, "Liberty Bridge," *City of Greenville*, <http://www.fallspark.com/LibertyBridge.aspx> (accessed 9 November 2011).

49. Fisher, "Reedy River Falls Historic Park," 4–6.
50. Smit interview; "Falls Park on the Reedy ready to welcome guests," *Falls Park on the Reedy*; White interview.
51. "Remains of old industry can be seen," *Greenville News*, 6 November 2002.
52. "Sculpture commissioned for entrance to Falls Park," *Falls Park on the Reedy*, 17 September 2004.
53. "IBC 2005 Bridge Awards," *IBC*, (2005): 22–23; Julie Howle, "Fantastic Falls Park," *Greenville News*, n.d.; "Falls Park on the Reedy ready to welcome guests," *Falls Park on the Reedy*.
54. White interview.
55. Keith interview. Phil Hughes, interview by author, Greenville, S.C., 15 November 2011.
56. Gary Hyndman, "City announces plans for South Main river entrance," *The Greenville Journal*, 3–9 October 2003; Richard Breen, "Designer: Disputed property best for park connection," *Greenville Journal*, 20–26 June 2003; Hughes interview; Keith interview.
57. In late 2002 the city sought to secure ownership of three older buildings along South Main to Camperdown Way owned by Billy Mitchell, Jeanette Surratt, and Verne Cassaday, properties adjacent to a dilapidated building owned by Bob Hughes. Although property owners refused to sell, city officials sought to secure ownership by condemning the properties and pursuing eminent domain, prompting Billy Mitchell, in early 2003, to sue the city and announce his candidacy for city mayor. In 2004 the court ruled in favor of the city, allowing it to procure the three properties, but the court ordered fair compensation to be paid. By 2006 a jury reached a decision in which Mitchell received \$1.8 million and Verne Cassaday \$975,000, amounts four times what the buildings had been assessed at. Boyanoski, "Plans await action on current buildings," *Greenville News*, n.d.; "Downtown property owner to run for mayor," *WYFF4.com*, <http://www.wyff4.com/t/2223472/detail.html> (accessed 20 November 2011); "City debating whether to appeal eminent domain decision," *WYFF4.com*, <http://www.wyff4.com/news/7163652/detail.html> (accessed 20 November 2011); "\$65 million development coming to downtown Greenville," *WYFF4.com*, <http://www.riverplacesc.com/news/04-04-Carolina-Channel.php> (accessed 20 November 2011). "RiverPlace 1 & 2a Development Sheet," published document, in possession of Economic and Development Office.
58. Tyler Morgan, "River Place rolling along," "unidentifiable newspaper source in possession of Arbor Engineering, n.d.; Hughes interview; "RiverPlace 1 & 2a Development Sheet," published document, in possession of Economic and Development Office.
59. Morgan, "River Place rolling along;" Hughes interview.
60. "RiverPlace 1 & 2a Development Sheet."
61. *Ibid*; "RiverWalk @ RiverPlace," Hughes, <http://www.hughesinvestments.com/riverwalkriverplace.php> (accessed 10 November 2011); Hughes interview.
62. Hughes interview.
63. Hyndman, "City announces plans for South Main river entrance."
64. White interview; Whitworth interview; John Boyanoski, "The lure of the West grows," *Greenville News*, 19 April 2004.
65. Boyanoski, "Prospects for stadium 'positive'," *Greenville News*, 11 August 2003.
66. Boyanoski, "Braves manager wants more data on stadium plan," *Greenville News*, 18 June 2003; Boyanoski, "District makes pitch for ballpark land," *Greenville News*, 17 December 2003.

-
67. Boyanoski, "District makes pitch for ballpark land"; White interview.
68. White interview. Boyanoski, "Prospects for stadium 'positive'."
69. *Ibid.*
70. Anna B. Brutzman "Neighbors say 'no' to ballpark," *Greenville News*, 29 October 2004; Ishmael Tate, "Church rejects baseball stadium in its back yard," *Greenville News*, 22 October 2003; Tad Mallory, interview by author, Greenville, S.C., 26 October 2011.
71. White interview; Boyanoski, "District makes pitch for ballpark land"; Boyanoski, "Prospects for stadium 'positive.'"
72. Lorando D. Lockhart, "Winter toil puts stadium on track for its April debut," *Greenville News*, 7 February 2006; Howle, "Fans turn out to back new team," *Greenville News*, 15 April 2005; Howle, "Stadium plans on fast track," *Greenville News*, n.d.; Willie T. Smith III, "Beginning of end for G-Braves," *Greenville News*, 16 April 2004.
73. White interview; Howle, "Fans should be enjoying new digs next season, officials say," *Greenville News*, 16 September 2005; Howle, "Stadium plans on fast track," *Greenville News*, n.d.; Howle, "Groundbreaking set today at downtown stadium site," *Greenville News*, n.d.; Howle, "West End residents see stadium as boon to area," *Greenville News*, 25 May 2005.
74. Howle, "Fans should be enjoying new digs next season, official says;" Ed McGranahan, "First Pitch: 7:05 p.m. West End Field – Drive vs. Catfish," *Greenville News*, 6 April 2006; "West End Field/Fieldhouse Development Sheet," published document, in possession of Economic and Development Office; Jeanne Brooks, "Team name strikes out with fans," *Greenville News*, 17 November 2005.
75. Fluor Field, "History of Fluor Field at the West End," *The Greenville Drive* <http://web.minorleaguebaseball.com> (accessed 9 November 2011).
76. Mallory interview; Howle, "Fans turn out," *Greenville News*, 15 April 2005.
77. Lorando D. Lockhart, "Learning to live with baseball," *Greenville News*, 22 May 2006.
78. Ashley Fletch, "Stadium planners work . . .," *Greenville News*, 8 December 2005.
79. "West End Field/Fieldhouse Development Sheet," published document, in possession of Greenville's Economic Development office; Rudolph Bell, "Stadium wave," *Greenville News*, 5 March 2006.
80. Joel Van Dyke, interview by author, Greenville, S.C., 5 October 2011.
81. Smit interview; "About," *Ray and Joan Kroc Community Center*, <http://krocgreenville.org/about/> (accessed 20 November 2011).
82. Liz Segrist, "Westside Story," *GSA Business*, 7 November 2011.
83. "West End revival gets deserved award," *Greenville News*, 20 February 2008.
84. "West End revival gets deserved award."
85. "Announcing the Far West End," *Greenville's Far West End* <http://thefarwestend.com> (accessed 9 November 2011).
86. Keith interview.
87. Bainbridge, *Greenville's West End*, 58.

Membership

The South Carolina Historical Association is an organization that furthers the teaching and understanding of history. The only requirement for membership is an interest in, and a love for, history. Members include students, high school teachers, college professors, librarians, archivists, and history buffs. At the annual meeting papers on European, British, United States, Southern, and, of course, South Carolina history are routinely presented. Moreover, sessions on politics, military, race and gender issues, the teaching of history, and so forth are standard. Annual meetings provide an excellent opportunity for initial critical review of graduate student work, for the presentation of a paper by non-academicians, and, of course, for papers by those currently teaching history.

By joining the South Carolina Historical Association members receive *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*, a refereed journal. Papers presented at the annual meeting may be published in the journal either *in toto* or in abstract form. Members are notified of the annual meeting and have the right to attend and/or to submit a proposal for a paper to be presented there (costs of lunch and registration for the meeting are extra).

Membership runs from 1 January to 31 December. Student members are those who are currently enrolled in school. Regular members are those who are currently employed or are actively seeking employment. Life members are ten-year members of the organization who have retired. To renew or join, please complete and return the form below, along with your check, to: Amanda Mushal, Department of History, The Citadel, 171 Moultrie Street, Charleston, SC 29409 (amanda.mushal@citadel.edu)

	Membership category (check one):
Name (please print)	<input type="checkbox"/> Student (\$10)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Regular (\$20)
Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Life member
	Membership status (check one):
City, state, and zip code	<input type="checkbox"/> Renewal
	<input type="checkbox"/> New
Phone/Fax	
E-mail address	Area(s) of interest

Minutes of the Eightieth Annual Meeting

3 March 2012

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES AND HISTORY

9:00 - 10:15 AM

Panel 1 – Civil War: Technological Impact vs. Honor and Values

Chair and Commentator: Eric Emerson, Director, SC Department of Archives and History

- “Instant Text Messages of the 1860s: President Lincoln’s Office and the Origins of Modern War Signals Communication,” David S. Clark, DeKalb Co. Public Schools, Atlanta
- “‘He Ordered the First Gun Fired & He Resigned First’: James Chesnut, Southern Honor, and Emotion,” Anna Koivusalo, University of Helsinki graduate student
- “Onward Christian Soldiers:” Religious Popular Print and Combat Motivation in the Army of the Confederacy, 1863–1865,” Andrew P. Davis, College of Charleston graduate student

Panel 2 – Twentieth-century South Carolina: Architecture and Society

Chair and commentator: Jerre Threatt, City Planner, City of Columbia

- “The Effects of the Brutalist Architectural Style on the Addition of the Blatt and Brown Buildings and the Reorganization of the Capitol Complex on the State House Grounds,” Devair Jeffries, USC Columbia graduate student
- “The History of the Revitalization in the ‘West End’ of Greenville: 1987-2011,” Nicholas Smit, Bob Jones University graduate
- “Low Country Macrocosm: Charleston in the 1920s,” Del A. Maticic, USC Columbia undergraduate student

Panel 3 – Eighteenth-century Life in South Carolina

Chair and commentator: Brenda Schoolfield, Bob Jones University

- “Francis Marion and the Snow’s Island Community,” Steven Smith, USC Columbia
- “‘A fertile brain at schemeing’: Eliza Lucas Pinckney and her Agricultural Experiments,” Megan Hatfield, University of Miami graduate student,

- “Eliza Pinckney and Harriott Horry Online: A Preview of the Possibilities,” Connie Schulz, USC-Columbia and Mary Sherrer, USC Columbia

10:25 - 11:40 AM

Panel 4 – Social History of the Upstate: From Race, Science and Religion

Chair: Carol Loar, USC Upstate

Commentator: Kathy Cann, Spartanburg Methodist College

- “ ‘May the Lord Keep Down Hard Feelings:’ The Woodrow Evolution Controversy and the 1884 Presbyterian Synod of South Carolina,” Rob McCormick, USC Upstate
- “Reidville Academies and their brief impact on the Upstate Education, 1857 to 1900,” Timothy P. Grady, USC Upstate

Panel 5 – Twentieth-century Social Change After 1945: Southern Responses

Chair and commentator: Kerry Taylor, The Citadel

- “ ‘Before you can be a statesman, you must be elected’: Sen. Ernest F. Hollings and the Marshall and Fortas Supreme Court nominations,” David T. Ballantyne, Cambridge University, UK graduate student
- “ ‘For our American form of Government’: SC Women in the Massive Resistance,” Rebecca Brueckmann, Free University of Berlin, Germany graduate student
- “The Land of Sunshine: Past and Present State of Tourism on US 1, Florida,” Liz Murphy Thomas, Florida MFA photographer

Panel 6 – New Resources for Historians

- “New Resources for Historians: South Carolina Digital Newspaper Program”: Santi Thompson, USC Columbia; Virginia Pierce, USC Columbia; Craig Keeney, USC Columbia

11:50 AM - 12:30 PM

LUNCH

12:40 - 1:15 PM

KEYNOTE ADDRESS: JANET HUDSON, USC – EXTENDED UNIVERSITY

“White Supremacy Shapes Progressive-Era Reforms: Democracy at Work in South Carolina”

1:15 - 1:40 PM

BUSINESS MEETING

President Paul Thompson called the meeting to order at 1:15 PM.

The minutes of the 12 March 2011 annual meeting at the College of Charleston were approved.

President Thompson thanked Fritz Hamer and Amanda Mushal for their work on organizing this conference. He also thanked Eric Emerson as Director of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History for the gracious hosting of the meeting. Eric in turn asked that Cynthia Banks-Smith of the SCDAH staff be recognized for her work on the meeting's local arrangements and service to the SCHA. The students who manned the registration desk, Ester Hutchinson, Ethan Burnie, and Anna Hoxie, were thanked.

Amanda Mushal presented the Treasurer's report indicating that although CD interest rates have dropped this year, we have \$7,183.75 in our checking account, \$3,015.55 in the Hollis Prize account, and \$9,270.55 in our savings! *Proceedings* CD.

Sarah Miller asked members to friend the Association's Facebook page.

Andy Meyers made the following motion which was seconded by Robert Figueira:

“The officers and members of the South Carolina Historical Association are concerned about the severe cuts suffered by the SC Department of Archives and History over the last decade. As the center for the depository and preservation of South Carolina's significant documentary history from its first settlement in Charleston in 1670 to the Twenty-first century, these important records not only have historical significance for our state but importance to our nation's history. To name just a few, this agency houses and preserves such important national records as the SC Ordinance of Secession (1860), SC Ordinance of Nullification (1832), and one of the few remaining original state copies of the Bill of Rights (1791). Nonetheless during the last decade this state agency has suffered untold cuts to its dedicated staff and therefore its important services to the state and its citizens. With a staff now numbering twenty-seven from a high of 126, we respectfully request that the legislature carefully review the difficult conditions to which this agency has been reduced and start restoring its lost state funding in the new fiscal year so that it can begin to return to adequately serve the state and nation. It is paramount to the continuing mission of the SC Department of Archives and History to adequately preserve, store and make accessible to the public these valuable records of our history that a new effort now be implemented by the legislature to appropriate additional funds to this agency to hire professional staff in

records management, conservation, and preservation to properly serve the citizens of South Carolina.” Motion passed unanimously.

The following individuals were nominated for office:

- President – Fritz Hamer, USC Caroliniana Library
- Vice President – Stefan Wiecki, Presbyterian College
- Secretary – Michael Kohl, Clemson University Libraries
- Treasurer – Amanda Mushal, The Citadel
- New Board members:
 - Lewie Reese, Anderson University
 - Paul Thompson, North Greenville University
 - Brenda Thompson-Schoolfield, Bob Jones University

Nominees were elected by acclamation.

At Large board members continuing to serve:

- Eric Emerson, South Carolina Department of Archives and History
- Janet Hudson, USC Extended University
- Sarah Miller, USC Salkehatchie

President Thompson turned the gavel over to President Hamer, who again thanked Eric Emerson and Brenda Banks-Smith for hosting the meeting as well as Andy Meyers for making the motion about the SCHA. He announced that the 2013 meeting will be in Clinton at Presbyterian College on 2 March.

Business meeting concluded at 1:40 PM

1:45 - 3 PM

Panel 7 – African Americans and their Contributions in the Twentieth century: at Home and Abroad

Chair and commentator: Wanda Hendricks, USC Columbia

- “Will the real Robert Shaw Wilkinson (1865–1932) please stand up? The Role of Primary sources in debunking the myth surrounding one of South Carolina’s Leading Black educators,” Jean L. Weingarh, USC Columbia
- “‘Back to Africa’: Black American Athletes as Diplomats in Africa during the Cold War,” Kevin Witherspoon, Lander University
- “Behind the Gates: An Interracial Perspective of Black and White Youth Memories of Oak Ridge, TN, 1950s–1970s,” Kate Jernigan, USC Columbia undergraduate

Panel 8 – Early Twentieth-century America: Social and Foreign Affairs

Chair and commentator: Patrick Connelly, Montreat College

- “Historical Precedent and Woodrow Wilson’s Neutrality Policy in 1914-15,” M. Ryan Floyd, Lander University
- “Commodifying Literacy: Will Lou Gray and the Politics of Progress, 1919- 1930,” Mary Mac Ogden, Asheville Buncombe Technical College
- “Booker T. Washington and his business philosophy and practice,” Michael Boston, Brockport State College

Panel 9 – Conflict and Resistance: Inside and Outside the United States

Chair and commentator: Tandy McConnell, Columbia College

- “Tsar Iwaylo (1277- 1280): The Story of “Braveheart” of Bulgaria,” George Kovatchev, independent scholar
- “The Utah War and the *New York Times*,” Kenneth L. Alford, Brigham Young University
- “Pentecostalism and Peasant Draft Resistance in Matiguas during the Nicaraguan Contra War,” Arthur Takahashi, Winthrop graduate student

3:10 - 4:25 PM

Panel 10 – Nineteenth-century Society and Values: South Carolina Before 1861

Chair and commentator: Allen Stokes, Director, South Caroliniana Library

- “Family Tragedy: Sinking of the Steam Packet *Pulaski*, June 1838,” Vennie Dees Moore, independent scholar
- “Thou Shalt Not Duel: The Impotency of Dueling Laws in South Carolina,” Matthew A. Byron, Young Harris College
- “From Shop Door to Piazza Screen: The Architecture of an Emerging Southern Middle Class,” Amanda Mushal, The Citadel

Panel 11 – South Carolina Upcountry Research from Undergraduate Seminar, USC Upstate

Chair: Andy Myers, USC Upstate

Commentator: Thomas “Rob” Hart, UNC Wilmington

- “An Lucht Siuill Palmetto – The Palmetto Walking People,” Chris Crowley, USC Upstate undergraduate

- “Baseball, Liquor, and Barbeque: Textile League Baseball and Shoeless Joe’s Cultural Impact on Upstate South Carolina,” Monica Sullens, USC Upstate undergraduate

Panel 12 – Slavery and its Post-war Legacy

Chair and Commentator: Paul Thompson, North Greenville University

- “Servant or Slave?: South Carolina’s Inherited Labor Dilemma,” John J. Navin, Coastal Carolina University
- “The ‘Gangrene’ of Slave Society: The Importance of Marronage in the Study of Slavery and Resistance in North America,” J. Brent Morris, USC Aiken

A Notice to Contributors Concerning Style

The editorial committee invites submission of manuscripts from authors of papers presented at the annual meeting. On the recommendation of reviewers and editors, manuscripts may be published in *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*.

In general, manuscripts should not exceed 4500 words (about eighteen double-spaced pages) including endnotes. As soon as possible after the annual meeting, authors should submit two paper copies and one electronic copy to the editors for review. The electronic copy should be submitted as an e-mail attachment in Word for Windows or WordPerfect for Windows format. E-mail addresses for the editors follow this note. The electronic text should be flush left and double-spaced, with as little special formatting as possible. Do not paginate the electronic version of the paper. All copies should use 12-point type in the Times New Roman font. Place your name and affiliation, along with both electronic and postal contact information, on a separate page. The title of the paper should be at the top of the first page of the text, in bold type. Please use margins of one inch throughout your paper and space only once between sentences. Indent five spaces without quotation marks all quotations five or more lines in length.

Documentation should be provided in endnotes, not at the foot of each page. At the end of the text of your paper double-space, then type the word "NOTES" centered between the margins. List endnotes in Arabic numerical sequence, each number followed by a period and space, and then the text of the endnote. Endnotes should be flush left and single-spaced. If your word-processing program demands the raised footnote numeral, it will be acceptable. Foreign words and titles of books or journals should be italicized. For the rest, *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association* adheres in matters of general usage to the *The Chicago Manual of Style*.

Editors:

Robert Figueira, Lander University, figueira@lander.edu

Stephen Lowe, University of South Carolina Union, lowesh@mailbox.sc.edu

Brenda Thompson-Schoolfield, Bob Jones University, Bschoolf@bju.edu

