
THE PROCEEDINGS

of

**The South Carolina
Historical Association**

2010

THE PROCEEDINGS

of

**The South Carolina
Historical Association**

2010

Robert Figueira and Stephen Lowe

Editors

The South Carolina Historical Association
South Carolina Department of Archives and History
Columbia, South Carolina

www.palmettohistory.org/scha/scha.htm

© South Carolina Historical Association

Officers of the Association

President: Andrew Myers, University of South Carolina Upstate

Vice President: Kevin Witherspoon, Lander University

Secretary: Lars Seiler, Spring Valley High School

Treasurer: Rodger Stroup, South Carolina Department of
Archives and History (emeritus)

Executive and Editorial Board Members

J. Tracy Power, South Carolina Department of Archives and History (2010)

W. Eric Emerson, Charleston Library Society (2011)

Vernon Burton, Coastal Carolina University (2012)

Robert C. Figueira, Lander University, editor

Stephen Lowe, University of South Carolina Union, editor

Membership Application

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. At the annual meeting papers on European, Asian, U.S., Southern, and South Carolina history are routinely presented. Papers presented at the annual meeting may be published in *The Proceedings*, a refereed journal.

Membership benefits include: a subscription to *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*, notification of the annual meeting, the right to submit a proposal for a paper for presentation at the annual meeting, the *SCHA Newsletter*, and the annual membership roster of the Association.

SCHA membership is from 1 January to 31 December. Student members must currently be enrolled in school. Regular members are those who are employed or are actively seeking employment. Life members are ten-year members of the organization who have retired. To renew or join, please return this application with your check to: Rodger Stroup, Treasurer SCHA, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 8301 Parklane Road, Columbia SC 29223
Telephone: (803) 896-6185; Fax: (803) 896-6186; E-mail: stroup@scdah.state.sc.us

Name and title (please print)

Address

City, state, and zip code

Phone/Institutional affiliation

E-mail address

Membership category (check one):

- Student (\$10)
- Regular (\$20)
- Life member

Membership status (check one):

- Renewal
- New

Area(s) of interest

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 co-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 2010 volume were:

Joel Cleland, Lander University (emeritus)
Avery Fouts, University of South Carolina Union
Anita Gustafson, Presbyterian College
Carmen V. Harris, University of South Carolina Upstate
Richard Heiser, Presbyterian College
Tom Pitts, Lander University
W. Scott Poole, College of Charleston
William Ramsey, Lander University
Jessica Stern, California State University, Fullerton

The editors wish to thank the authors whose papers are published here for their cooperation in revising their oral presentations and their written submissions. As has been the case often in the past, the assistance of Rodger Stroup and the South Carolina Department of Archives and History has been crucial in the production of this volume. 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 Age of Lincoln: Then and Now.	7
<i>Orville Vernon Burton, Coastal Carolina University</i>	
Painting What Cannot Be Painted: Pieter Brueghel’s Silent Opinion.	23
<i>David Basinger, Bob Jones University</i>	
To “Vomit his Fury and Malice”: English Fears and Spanish Influences in the Exploration and Establishment of Carolina through 1670	31
<i>Timothy P. Grady, University of South Carolina Upstate</i>	
Origins and Development of College Football in South Carolina, 1889-1930	43
<i>Fritz Hamer, South Carolina State Museum</i>	
Beaufort and Louvain: Public Reaction to Library Destruction during the American Civil War and the World Wars.	57
<i>Roger K. Hux, Francis Marion University</i>	
“A Little Learning is a Dangerous Thing”: Attitudes Toward Popular Literacy in Sixteenth-Century England.	67
<i>Carol A. Loar, University of South Carolina Upstate</i>	
Confessionalization and the Creedal Tradition.	79
<i>Lincoln Mullen, Brandeis University</i>	
“We Are Marching to Zion”: Zion Church and the Distinctive Work of Presbyterian Slave Missionaries in Charleston, South Carolina, 1849–1874	91
<i>Otis Westbrook Pickett, University of Mississippi</i>	
“Educational Opportunities for African Americans in the South Carolina Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-1942”.	105
<i>Robert Waller, Clemson University, Emeritus</i>	
Minutes of the Seventy-seventh Annual Meeting.	117

The Age of Lincoln: Then and Now

Orville Vernon Burton

You are forewarned that you are listening to the interpretation of an academic whose judgment led him to study the American South and teach at the University of Illinois for thirty-four years, became a Lincoln scholar, and now teaches at Coastal Carolina University in South Carolina.

Before talking about my book, *The Age of Lincoln*, I would like to suggest you take a look at a website (<http://TheAgeofLincoln.com>) where I have tried marrying the Internet with the book providing more extensive notes and discussions. The website also has Internet links to many of the sources in the notes. I was inspired to include the primary documents upon which *The Age of Lincoln's* interpretation is based when Dr. James McPherson, my thesis advisor (who was, as usual, gracious enough to read the manuscript), questioned me on my interpretation of Jefferson Davis' response to the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. I argue very differently than most historians who make the case that Jefferson Davis expressed regret about Lincoln's assassination. In my response to Jim McPherson, I photocopied the testimony of Lewis F. Bates, at whose home in Charlotte, North Carolina, Davis was staying on 19 April when he learned of Booth's success. Bates testified in May 1865 at the trial of the Lincoln murder conspirators that Davis loosely quoted from Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, "if it were to be done at all, it were better that it were well done."—meaning that the conspirators should have completed their goal of also killing Vice President Andrew Johnson, Secretary of State William Seward, and War Secretary Edwin Stanton. Since Jim had not seen this testimony, I decided to put all sources that were available in the public domain on the website. The AgeofLincoln.com website contains excerpts from the book, extensive documentation, historiographical discussions, explorations of where I agree and disagree with other historians, sources, a discussion board, instruction regarding how to email me, and the assurance that I will respond! I want the website to be useful to teachers so that they can help students learn historical thinking, particularly how historians, or at least one historian, frame historical problems, how historians use evidence, and how historians produce a historical narrative. I hope the website makes this process as transparent as possible. I also have hopes that the website will engage an expanding generation of younger folks at home on the Internet. Perhaps it will stimulate interest in learning the joys of reading a book.

Already Lincoln is the most written about American and, on the world scene, is behind only Jesus and Shakespeare; if the number of books I have been asked to

review on Lincoln in the last two years is an indication, Shakespeare has concern for his second place ranking. Thus, I am often asked, what is different about my book, *The Age of Lincoln? The Age of Lincoln* is comprehensive and interpretive, and I cannot cover everything. But I thought you might enjoy hearing about five topics where I have made what are either new arguments or done something different than most scholars of the Civil War era. Thus, while I will not be able to develop these areas in any detail, I hope it will give you something to think about. And I would like to conclude with some remarks relevant to race and today.

First, I was interested in Lincoln's legacy, and in an answer to a question, I will rephrase from one of President Bill Clinton's more infamous lines. Rather than worrying what the meaning of "is" is, I am interested in what the meaning of "us" is. Lincoln is about us, who we are. In the 13 April 2009 edition of *Newsweek*, editor Jon Meacham argued that Americans "value individual freedom and free (or largely free) enterprise. . . . The foundational documents are the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution." Without acknowledging it, Meacham was explaining why Americans will always be interested in Lincoln.

Lincoln proclaimed early in 1865 that the Emancipation Proclamation was "the central act of my administration and the great event of the nineteenth century." But I disagree. Instead it was Lincoln's understanding of liberty that became the greatest legacy of the age. He revolutionized personal freedom in the United States. He assured that the principle of personal liberty was protected by law, even incorporated into the Constitution. Thus Lincoln elevated the Founding Fathers' (and Andrew Jackson's) more restricted vision to a universal one. Basically, Lincoln inserted our mission statement, the Declaration of Independence, into our rule book, the Constitution of the United States.

Liberty and freedom are the interpretative centerpiece, the theses of *The Age of Lincoln*. Told as a story of freedoms and liberty rather than of the enslaved's emancipation, the nineteenth century makes greater sense. If we place emancipation as one point on a long continuum of freedoms and unfreedom, we can see where emancipation fits without the right to a meaningful vote. A meaningful vote helps define citizenship and belonging in a democracy, and it did in the young republic in 1793, 1865 and 1867, 1895, 1965, and today.

In *Liberty and Freedom*, David Hackett Fischer found five hundred ideas (not definitions, but ideas) of liberty and freedom. His book includes a section of nearly two hundred pages on many different ideas of liberty and freedom in the era of the Civil War—differences by region, ethnicity, religion, race, class, gender, age, and generation. Thus, both Union and Confederate soldiers understood the war as a war about

freedom and liberty, but they defined those terms differently. What freedom meant to an enslaved person on a plantation in South Carolina was, of course, quite different from what freedom meant for the slave holder, or for an overseer. But freedom was also different for a young woman or twelve-year-old boy working in a shoe factory sewing the soles on shoes in the Northeast or for a yeoman farmer in Mississippi or Indiana.

Lincoln often spoke about the differences between two antagonistic groups who “declare for liberty.” Some, he said, used the word liberty to mean that each man could “do as he pleases with himself, and the product of his labor.” Others held the word liberty to mean “for some men to do as they please with other men, and the product of other men’s labor.” He proffered a parable to nail the point. “The shepherd drives the wolf from the sheep’s throat,” he said, “for which the sheep thanks the shepherd as a liberator, while the wolf denounces him for the same act as a destroyer of liberty, especially as the sheep is a black one.”

Secondly, the development of liberty and democracy has to be understood in the context of the growth of capitalism and what unrestrained capitalism and extremes of wealth meant for tenuous democracy in the emerging republic. I had taught Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* for nearly thirty years, and when I reread it while writing *The Age of Lincoln*, I realized that *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* was not just an indictment of slavery, but was also an indictment of greed within a growing system of American capitalism. (Stowe was not an abolitionist, but, like Lincoln, was a colonizationist.) Intellectuals expressed great anxiety over unbridled capitalism, especially over the resultant increasing wealth of a few. The growing disparity in wealth made some wonder if the young republic founded on principles of equality and liberty, however imperfectly implemented, could survive. Increased immigration of different sorts of people, many not evangelical Protestants, most of whom worked for wages and were not property owners, was another concern. The pursuit of Mammon at the expense of all else became a major theme of the literature and a concern of intellectuals. They worried that pursuit of wealth would come at the expense of a virtuous citizenship and concern for country. In 1852 Wendell Phillips addressed a Massachusetts anti-slavery society. “Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty—power is ever stealing from the many to the few . . . only by unintermitted agitation can a people be kept sufficiently awake to principle not to let liberty be smothered in material prosperity.” Would the expansion of the electorate to include the propertyless and those beholden to others for their income destroy the republic? Certainly major world powers, all monarchies, wanted the United States to fail.

Thirdly, I center religion in *The Age of Lincoln*. I argue that Lincoln was not only the greatest president, but also the greatest theologian of the nineteenth century. In order to understand secession, and to understand how men thought about dying

in the Civil War, and women thought about sending their men off to die, as well as to understand the nineteenth century, one has to understand how religion was interwoven into the culture and thinking.

The Age of Lincoln opens with the Gettysburg address, Lincoln's benediction. The first chapter begins with Baptist minister William Miller on 22 October 1844. The Millerites fully expected the return of Jesus Christ to earth that day. But when Jesus did not come, they went back into society and with a different kind of faith tried to make the United States into God's Kingdom to help bring on the millennium. Evangelist, abolitionist, and president of Oberlin College, Charles Grandison Finney argued that the "great business of the church is to reform the world—to put away every kind of sin." Christians, he believed, were "bound to exert their influence to secure a legislation that is in accordance with the law of God." The Age of Lincoln was a time of millennialism: the radical belief that Americans, God's chosen people, could expedite the reign of Christ on earth by living piously and remaking society according to God's will.

Just as today, in the nineteenth century religious fanaticism in both North and South strongly influenced events. In order to perfect the society of the United States, reformers attacked various evils that they saw: temperance societies attacked alcohol consumption, women demanded rights, prison and school reforms. Utopian societies endorsing no sex, or lots of sex, or simply eating Graham crackers splattered across the United States like a shotgun pattern as reformers strove to eradicate evil. But eventually, most reform efforts in the North lined up to declare slavery as the single greatest evil in the country. Abolitionism, while still a small minority position in the North, rose to prominence in the late 1850s. Many northerners believed if the United States was to be a society ordained by God, and was to become the utopia that would bring on the millennium, the evil of slavery had to be eradicated.

Reform movements, except for abolitionism, were also active, though much less so, in the South. And many slave-owners believed that patriarchal plantation society, such as they imagined (imagined is the key word) the South to be, based on slavery with its ordered hierarchy, was the utopia and ordained by God. They argued that slavery was fit not just for the South, not just for African Americans, but for all societies and all workers. And thus slavery would help bring on the millennium.

Religious fanatics, both North and South, were sure they understood God's will, and all thought they were obeying it. If you think you are doing God's will, you are unwilling to compromise.

Lincoln had a very different understanding of God than most of his contemporaries. While everyone else knew God's will, Lincoln knew that we cannot understand God's will. Although he came to see himself as a part of God's plan for human history,

he could not be certain what God's will was. Even with the outcome determined, Lincoln would still qualify, "If God now wills. . . ." Lincoln never proclaimed something God's will, it is always in the subjunctive, "If..." This is even reflected in the great second inaugural address about slavery and God's will. A similar sentence in the 4 April 1864 letter from Lincoln to Albert Hodges is one of the epigrams for *The Age of Lincoln*: "If God now wills the removal of a great wrong, and wills also that we of the North as well as you of the South, shall pay fairly for our complicity in that wrong, impartial history will find therein new cause to attest and revere the justice and goodness of God."

Lincoln read the Bible in the Jewish tradition of reading the Old Testament, understanding God and people in a corporate sense, not the individual salvation of the dominant Protestant evangelicals grown out of the second Great Awakening. Interestingly, this corporate understanding of God using His people to work out His will in History is also the African American theological perspective.

Thus while the Civil War caused a theological crisis for both white Northerners and Southerners, it did not for African Americans. The Civil War and the early developments of Reconstruction were the fulfilling of God's plan to free his people from slavery in the United States and to punish those Pharaohs of the South. It all made sense from this theological perspective.

Fourthly, I emphasize the importance of seeing Abraham Lincoln as the Southerner he was, and how that influenced history and particularly the Civil War and then America itself. This is perhaps one of the most controversial arguments in the book. But I do feel good about one thing, this argument has helped reconcile Northerners and Confederates. Yankees did not like that I said Lincoln was a Southerner and now I discover, neither do many white Southerners! At last they have united to direct their anger toward me!

I have ready an hour's talk on Lincoln as a Southerner, but very quickly let me cut to why this is important. Lincoln's southern habits went beyond turns of speech, food favorites, storytelling, literary references, preference for plump southern belles, or indulgent child rearing practices. Critical to his life's decisions and to his handling of the crisis to come was Lincoln's understanding of and respect for southern honor. This projection of Lincoln as a Southerner is more than a simple mind game; Lincoln's very yeoman southernness contributed to his defense of the Union against a cabal of slave-holding oligarchs. For Lincoln it was more than just the preservation of the Union. It was also a matter of honor. As he told a committee of the Young Men's Christian Association (22 April 1861) from Baltimore trying to persuade him to let the South go, "You would have me break my oath and surrender the Government without a blow. There is no Washington in that—no Jackson in that—no manhood nor honor in that."

Although scholars have argued that Lincoln did not understand the South, he thought he knew the white South. He believed the South was very much more than just plantations, that there were many yeomen and non-slave owning Southerners like himself. He did not think non-slaveholding white Southerners would fight for slavery. He has been criticized for this as historians point to the Civil War and say that Lincoln was wrong. But Lincoln defined the war as preserving the union, not about slavery. If he had defined the issue as one of slavery, he might very well have been right about white non-slaveholding Southerners not fighting. But he also would not have been able to raise a corporal's guard from the North to fight to end slavery.

Finally, I have never accepted the separation of Reconstruction from the Civil War, or the traditional dating for the end of Reconstruction. We have bookended American History so that the Civil War closes out one era of our history and Reconstruction begins the next period or second half of American History. And yet, Reconstruction is part and parcel of the Civil War. I also disagree with the traditional timing of the end of Reconstruction. Historians usually argue that Reconstruction ends with the withdrawal of federal troops from the former Confederate states in 1877, but that is not how the people saw it or lived their lives at the time. Moreover, the gains of freedom during Reconstruction were not legally undone till sanctioned by the Supreme Court in *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896 and by the former Confederate state constitutions of the 1890s and early-twentieth century. The Age of Lincoln coincides with a millennialist impulse in politics, one I see ending with the 1896 presidential third party campaign of the Populists, the last political party to advocate for African American rights and equality based on Lincoln's rule of law until the modern Civil Rights Movement.

At stake during the Civil War was the very existence of the United States. The bloodiest war in our history, the Civil War also posed in a crucial way what clearly became persistent themes in American history, the character of the nation, and the fate of African Americans (read large the place of minorities and different sorts of people in a democracy, the very meaning of pluralism). Consequently, scholars have been vitally interested in the Civil War, searching out clues therein for the identity of America. But we may have been looking in the wrong place. If the identity of America is in the Civil War, the meaning of America and what we become and how we do things is found in Reconstruction.

It matters profoundly when a period of history is said to begin and end, a professional historian's truism particularly evident when discussing America's nineteenth century. To blend all the strands of nineteenth-century history and present it as a piece, *The Age of Lincoln* uses Abraham Lincoln as a fulcrum to put together the story of sectional conflict, Civil War, and Reconstruction. The formation of Lincoln's ideas before the Civil War, his leadership and development of his thinking during the Civil

War, and how those *ideas played out*, for good and bad in the years following the Civil War into our own modern America, sets the organization of this story.

The Civil War itself inspired both intense hatred and extraordinary idealism, especially in race relations. Nowhere is our lack of understanding of the importance of chronology so evident as in the four years of the Civil War itself. We have flattened out and compressed the Civil War, so that we distort the actual war and what happened, and how that influenced the postwar years. The very nature of the war itself changes in those dramatic four years. Our Civil War was anything but civil; it became a war of hatred. Initially few understood what the war would really become. Southerners were fond of boasting that they would drink all the blood spilled or mop it up with their handkerchief. The South talks a lot about blood, but not the North. Lincoln does refer to blood, but much more in religious terms of communion, and, of course, he is a Southerner. Young men wanted to get in on the glory before the fighting was over. But as the war continued, with more deadly and horrible weaponry that made the Civil War the first modern war, and as more and more people died, became disfigured and psychologically scarred, the very nature of the war changed.

Especially from the South and from the Midwest, companies were composed from neighborhoods, communities, towns, and counties where brothers, uncles, cousins, best friends, fathers and sons fought side by side, making for great unit cohesion. But after the first years of the war, Confederate and Union soldiers write about how a brother or friend is killed by the enemy and their lust for revenge. "They killed my best friend and I can't wait to kill some of them!" The war becomes, as all wars are inevitably destined, a war of hatred.

Perhaps the most celebrated Civil War image is of "Happy Appomattox," where federal troops salute the immaculate Virginian Robert E. Lee or the Union forces under Little Roundtop hero and Maine's General Joshua Chamberlain salute Georgia's John B. Gordon and his men at the surrender of arms. While this is true, it is also true that other Union troops jeered and spit at Lee. And, of course, Lee had countermanded Jefferson Davis's orders to keep on fighting, to have the troops become guerrillas, and thus some Confederate leaders refused to surrender with Lee and led their troops out of Appomattox to continue the fight, which they did for more than a decade after the war ended. It was indeed a Civil War in the South where neighbor fought neighbor, whites against black and some white Republicans. The North called not only for the hanging of Jefferson Davis, but of Robert E. Lee as well. The war had become one of hatred, the only result of a sustained war with so much killing. Edmund Wilson in *Patriotic Gore* (1962) explained that we have a very thin veneer on civil societies and that war strips that veneer away.

Reconstruction has to be understood as part of the long Civil War. During Reconstruction, some former Confederate generals led terrorist groups manned with many former Confederate soldiers. But I also found men who were too young to fight in the Civil War, but who fought in these terrorist paramilitary groups even as late as 1876 and 1878 and even applied for their state's Confederate Civil War pensions. They understood their actions and Reconstruction to be part of the Civil War.

Yet it is important to remember that most whites in the South were not part of these counterrevolutionary terrorist organizations like the Ku Klux Klan, the most familiar. The tragedy was that most good people just did nothing and did not stand up for a bedrock of Lincoln's philosophy, that is, the rule of law. But that should not obscure just how many white Southerners actually fought for the Union in the Civil War. One of my favorite illustrations in the book (you can view at the website) is titled "White Southerners Who Commanded Union Troops" with Lincoln in the center. The most radical of the Generals is John C. Fremont, "The Pathfinder" who was the first Republican candidate for president. Fremont was born in Savannah, Georgia, reared in Charleston, South Carolina, graduated the College of Charleston. When you consider the number of white Southerners who fought for the Union, every Confederate state except South Carolina had a regiment that fought for the Union; South Carolina Unionists joined North Carolina, Tennessee, and Georgia Union regiments. Together with the number of southern African Americans who fought for the Union, the numbers add up. And if one includes those cultural Southerners from Kentucky, Missouri, southern Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, one sees that there was a southern Civil War as the numbers begin to reach parity.

Although we are finally moving away from the *Gone with the Wind* and *Birth of a Nation* mythology about the antebellum period and slavery, in the popular culture the view of an over-reaching and doomed Reconstruction still predominates. When in 1969 I studied the Civil War with Jim McPherson at Princeton, historians were not talking about contingency in the Civil War, and somehow the Confederacy was made more noble by having struggled against overwhelming odds in a war it could not have won. With Vietnam, that view has changed. Historians now grant contingency to the Civil War, arguing that there were moments and times that the Confederacy could have won.

For example, I open the second military history chapter (seven), "A Giant Holocaust of Death," with Jefferson Davis's 1864 replacement of General Joe Johnston with John Bell Hood. Hood was incredibly brave, like Monty Python's knight in the *Holy Grail* who keeps getting cut to pieces, but keeps advancing. As Lee said, Hood was too much the lion and not enough the fox. I argue that Lincoln believed that he would have lost the 1864 election except for Sherman's taking Atlanta and subsequent March

to the Sea, and we would have a different outcome on slavery and a different America. Johnston, like Longstreet, understood that one made the enemy come to them. When Sherman faced Johnston after a disastrous frontal attack, he began flanking movements. As one Illinois soldier wrote, "Sherman will never go to hell, he will outflank the devil yet." But Hood, for his part, took the offense, and Atlanta was lost.

I am often asked what would have happened if Lincoln had not been killed. My personal favorite example of contingency is Civil War hero Robert Smalls (one of many persons whose stories I follow throughout the book). In 1862 Lincoln met for over an hour with Smalls, and he asked Smalls why he risked his life to steal the vessel *The Planter* from the Confederacy in Charleston Harbor and deliver it to the Union. Small's one word answer was "freedom," which dovetailed with Lincoln's own new birth of freedom as he would express it the next year in his Gettysburg address. Robert Smalls campaigned for Lincoln's re-election in 1864 and greatly admired and respected the president. Smalls was one of several African Americans whom Lincoln had met while he was president and who helped Lincoln advance in his thinking regarding race.

When Abraham Lincoln was invited to participate in raising the United States flag over Fort Sumter, 14 April 1865, four years to the day the flag had been struck, he was advised and convinced that it would be too dangerous for him to travel to South Carolina. Ironically, Lincoln would have been on *The Planter* with Robert Smalls. I am convinced that because Smalls and bodyguards would have been protective of the president in South Carolina, Lincoln would not have been killed on 14 April if he had been at Fort Sumter instead of at Ford's Theater. When Robert Smalls heard the news of Booth's assassination of Lincoln, the former slave exclaimed, "Lord have mercy on us all."

Historians have not been willing to grant contingency to the story of Reconstruction. My interpretation of Reconstruction highlights its successes as an interracial democracy on the local level, where new grass-roots alliances flourished. I document a number of southern whites who went against the grain and actually supported interracial democracy during Reconstruction. These include a number of former Confederate heroes and prominent white Southerners who supported Black Rights, including South Carolina-born James Longstreet, Beauregard (who remained a Democrat), John Mosby (The Gray Ghost of TV fame when I was a boy), and Virginia Governor Henry Wise (who had hanged John Brown). Wise's son, also a former Confederate officer, became one of the great Civil Rights attorneys of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. I have tried to reframe Reconstruction, and ask why, if Reconstruction was such a failure, did southern whites have to use terrorism, fraud, and violence to overthrow an interracial legal government?

We have not studied Reconstruction in the North as we should have. Many northern states also rewrote their constitutions during Reconstruction. The Civil War

and Lincoln in particular inspired idealism in the North, just as it did in the South, and this is nowhere more evident than in the Midwest, which had been extraordinarily racist before the Civil War. There were two kinds of southern immigrants into southern Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, and Missouri: those like Thomas Lincoln who hated slavery and left the South to get away from slavery, and an even larger number who hated African Americans and were trying to get away from black people. Illinois almost voted to be a slave state; and while there was no slavery there, a person could be indentured for ninety-nine years. Free blacks could not settle in Illinois, and of course could not vote or serve on juries, for example. Lincoln was embarrassed during the Civil War by some of the racist legislation from his home state. His legacy challenges and changes this racism. Not all of the idealism dies out. When the Civil Rights cases of 1883 struck down the Civil Rights Act of 1875, and the Supreme Court ruled in *Hurtado v. California* in 1884 that the Fourteenth Amendment did not guarantee enforcement of the Bill of Rights, states led by the Midwest passed their own state civil rights statutes: Iowa and Ohio 1884; Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Nebraska 1885, Pennsylvania 1889. We have always explained the Great Migration of African Americans because of economics, but I believe it was also because of Illinois' and other Midwestern and Northeastern state civil rights statutes that guaranteed equal rights and the vote, even if they often were not actually practiced. Black leaders could use Lincoln's rule of law to advance that goal of equal treatment.

I am often asked about the great interest the reading public has in the Civil War. And there will always be an interest, but I have noticed that the general public now finds themselves much more interested in early American history. It is easier to deal with the Founding Fathers and concepts of revolution and independence than with the Age of Lincoln.

The Age of Lincoln has left us with troublesome questions that we do not want to face. Questions of race tear at the fabric of our supposedly egalitarian society, at our system of justice and law and order. As Attorney General Eric Holder reminded us in what became a controversial statement, "In things racial we have always been, and I believe continue to be, in too many ways essentially a nation of cowards."

Just as the Civil War cannot be separated from Reconstruction any more than the sectional conflict and events that resulted in conflict can be separated from Lincoln and the war, I will step out on a limb and argue that the election of President Barack Obama cannot be separated from the Civil War, Lincoln, and Reconstruction.

Some see Obama's election, or more correctly, they argue that the election of a black man, is the fulfillment of Lincoln, the completion of Reconstruction and the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments. Some argue that race as a distinct problem in American life has been resolved by Obama. I was asked by NPR to comment on this for the North Carolina Voting Rights case, *Bartlett v. Strickland*, that came down 9 March 2009 from the Supreme Court with its standard 5-4 decision.

The Chicago Tribune also asked on 15 March, "Does the election of a black president mean racism is no longer a factor in American politics? And are civil rights laws outdated in the age of Obama?" The article, discussing legal briefs filed in the North Carolina and Texas Supreme Court cases, reported that "Obama's election heralds the emergence of a colorblind society in which special legal safeguards for minorities are no longer required." Plaintiffs in the important Texas case would undo the important section five pre-clearance of the Voting Rights Act. The *Tribune* erroneously reported that the Georgia governor filed another suit challenging the Voting Rights Act, but actually the governor filed an amicus brief to the Texas case.

On the other side, civil rights advocates have presented state-by-state data that shows persistent racial polarization in the Deep South and elsewhere. We need to remember that when the former Confederate states undermined the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments after Reconstruction, the too brief experiment in interracial democracy ended; it took the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act of 1964 and 1965 to re-establish those rights.

Steven Colbert, in the *Colbert Report* television show broadcast on 16 March 2009, said that rewriting history is a good thing because we can make it better. He facetiously recommends that now that an African American is president, we can say that slavery never existed. Although done in humor, there are indications that in the court of popular opinion, as well as with some justices on the Supreme Court, this is to some degree happening.

Writing and rewriting history reminds me of an interesting playwright. Pulitzer prize winner, Tony award winner, and recipient of a MacArthur genius grant, African American Suzan-Lori Parks is fascinated by the story of Lincoln, or to be more specific, by the death of Lincoln. While some in the African American community do not care for her work because of her use of stereotypes, two of her plays have stunned me. In her 1993 *The America Play*, Parks offers us a story about "the passage of time" and "the crossing of space." She writes about a grave digger, the son of grave diggers, digging the huge "Hole of History." History summoned this digger like a memory, and in his big hole, he made a theme park where he reconstructed history.

The digger's favorite reconstruction was of Abraham Lincoln. Tall and thin, he resembles Lincoln, and when he puts on a fake wart, people pronounce him and Lincoln to be "in virtual twinship." Someone told him that he "played Lincoln so

well that he ought to be shot,” and after that his money-making endeavor was to sit still while a paying customer chose a blank/toy pistol and shot him in the back of the head. They would then shout “Thus to the tyrants!” or “The South is avenged!” Or other assorted remarks such as Robert E. Lee’s last words, “Strike the tents!”

One of her insights into Lincoln was the idea of uncertainty amid a grander, millennial, almost mystical, vision of freedom, when Lincoln “didn’t know if the war was right, when it could be said he didn’t always know which side he was on, not because he was a stupid man but because it was sometimes not two different sides at all but one great side surging toward something beyond either Northern or Southern.”

In *Topdog/Underdog* (2002), for which she received the Pulitzer, Parks again wrote about the death of Lincoln. She says, “In the play’s first act we watch a black man who has fashioned a career for himself: he sits in an arcade impersonating Abraham Lincoln and letting people come and play at shooting him dead—like John Wilkes Booth shot our sixteenth president in 1865 during a performance at Ford’s Theatre.” This man is not the entrepreneur of the earlier work; he works for a white man, and he has to wear white-face on the job, echoing the minstrel shows where whites wore black face. While this character takes pride in doing a good job, there remains a pull toward an earlier time in his life when he was a con man throwing cards in Three-Card Monte. This character’s father had named him Lincoln. As a joke, the father named the younger brother Booth. I will not tell you how the play ends.

Parks reminds us of how Americans identify with Lincoln in different ways, how so many of us, and especially historians, write ourselves into whom we make Lincoln to be. (Is it any coincidence that I portray Lincoln as a Southerner and not only as the greatest president, but the greatest theologian of the nineteenth century?) Often it is our better angels, and sometimes our greatest fears and fantasies. Parks’ plays also suggest the changing image of Lincoln among African Americans, from the Great Emancipator to the white honky. At a session last fall on my book, *The Age of Lincoln*, at a meeting of the Association for the Study of African American Life and History, every African American scholar younger than I am could not say anything good about Lincoln. An attempt to get right with Lincoln by African Americans was dramatically personalized in Henry Louis Gates, Jr.’s documentary on PBS, “Looking for Lincoln.” The shift in views of Lincoln came about with the modern Civil Rights Movement, correctly labeled the Second Reconstruction. In the public sphere, Stokely Carmichael attacked Lincoln as a racist, and Lerone Bennet, long time editor of *Ebony*, publicized the view in an important essay in 1969, and has written about it again in *Forced Into Glory* (2000). With the Civil Rights Movement, when historians’ interests shifted from slavery to race and racism, Lincoln’s more gradualist policy was seen as inadequate. So much so that Mark Neely found the

Great Emancipator characterized as “the perfect embodiment of Northern racism” in the path-breaking book *North of Slavery* by white scholar Leon Litwack in 1961.

I am part of that generation of scholars who came of age with the Vietnam war and who for various reasons rejected the idea of heroes. Partly because so many of us were social historians, we were not as interested in the great white men that had dominated American history. In my own field of Southern history, I was fond of mentioning how those Confederate heroes like Robert E. Lee and Jefferson Davis had turned the South prematurely gray. We were eager to show that our national monuments were too often constructed of clay. On reflection, it is good to understand that heroes are people just like us with their good and bad qualities, and often their own personal demons. We need to understand that leaders like Lincoln were flawed, but we also have to judge them by their own time and place.

Like most people in the nineteenth century, Lincoln used the “n” word and told racist jokes. That does not mean we should not value his heroic characteristics and efforts. In 1864 a delegation of African American men came to see Lincoln to request equal pay for laborers. Henry Samuels remembered the event and how Lincoln listened quietly. Then, according to Samuels, Lincoln said in a jocular manner, “Well, gentlemen, you wish the pay of ‘Cuffie’ raised.” The story does not end with that patronizing tone of Lincoln. When Samuels boldly confronted the president that they did not make use of the word Cuffie in their “vernacular,” but they were there to request “the wages of the American Colored Laborer be equalized with those of the American White Laborer,” Lincoln apologized. He told Samuels, “I stand corrected, young man, but you know I am by birth a Southerner and in our section that term is applied without any idea of an offensive nature.” But, unlike so many others, Lincoln got the idea. Lincoln went on to say that he would “at the earliest possibly moment, do all in my power to accede to your request.” Wages were equalized only a month later. This and other corroborating evidence have shown that Lincoln’s incredible, flexible mind allowed him to grow so that by the end of the Civil War he was leading the nation to a better place on race. To appreciate this change in Lincoln is a good thing in a democracy. We can grow better on issues when we are open-minded and willing to learn more about them.

One way to put Lincoln’s racism into a historical context is a comparison between Lincoln and the other major political figure of the day, Stephen A. Douglas. I realized that in my generation’s inability to believe in heroes, we also did away with villains. And that has led to our not understanding those less noble parts of American history, like those individuals who supported slavery and racism. We may not need villains to make heroes, but it is easier not to have them because we do not like dealing with the ugly parts of American history.

Douglas was much more in line with the rest of white America, North and South. It is important to compare Lincoln to Douglas because it offers quite a different perspective, and only by talking about Stephen Douglas's avocation for white supremacy and his use of the race card to mobilize voters can we appreciate where Lincoln was on race.

I am amazed that when I ask students what they know about the Lincoln-Douglas debates, they will say that Lincoln was this tall dude, 6'4" tall and Douglas was this squat short guy. Who cares!! What is important is that Lincoln and Douglas were debating two visions of America. Stephen Douglas, the most dynamic politician of his age, the leading light of the Democratic party, stood blatantly for white supremacy.

When Douglas learned that Lincoln would be his opponent for the Senate in 1858, he turned his considerable talents into discrediting him. On 9 July 1858 in Chicago, Douglas cited Lincoln's "House Divided" speech and accused Lincoln of advocating civil war. The following evening from the same Chicago balcony, Lincoln responded. After clarifying his "House Divided" statement, he became more animated when refuting Douglas's assertion that the United States government was "made by the white man, for the benefit of the white man, to be administered by white men." Lincoln threw caution to the wind; he claimed remarkable privilege for the Declaration of Independence and its implications about race and equality. "I have only to say, let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man—this race and that race and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position. . . . Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall once more stand up declaring that all men are created equal."

Douglas promptly turned this back on Lincoln, indignantly proclaiming "this Chicago doctrine of Lincoln's—declaring that the negro and the white man are made equal by the Declaration of Independence and by Divine Providence—is a monstrous heresy." Douglas denounced Lincoln's extraordinary suggestion to "discard all this quibbling" about race and to declare "that all men are created equal." He found a ready audience; only ten years earlier, in 1848, more than two-thirds of Illinois voters approved a constitutional amendment to exclude even free African Americans from the state. The old Whig territory in the middle of the state was very much opposed to the abolition of slavery, and both Douglas and Lincoln understood that no man who declared equality for blacks could be elected to a statewide office in Illinois. Republicans advised Lincoln to back away from his call for equality, and Lincoln did.

In his fourth debate at Charleston, near where his father had moved and his widowed stepmother still lived, Lincoln made statements that still haunt today. Southern Illinois was especially racist. Even in 1850, after the large migration of New Yorkers into the state, Kentucky ranked second as the birthplace for Illinois

household heads and 37.5 percent of all household heads were born in slave states. The southern influence was so great on Illinois that Springfield, Lincoln's eventual home and the eventual state capital, was initially named Calhoun after the South Carolina politician most associated with the pro-slavery argument.

This was the context in which Lincoln spoke and said some things we wish he had not. In his meanest pronouncement on race, he denied that he favored civil rights for African Americans. Yet he kept his ground in declaring that the Declaration of Independence included all men in its claim for natural rights. Douglas' plan of attack was to make certain that voters understood that those natural rights inevitably led to civil rights. In the last three debates, Lincoln went on the offense and became bolder on African American rights. In Alton, the second most southern location of the debates, Lincoln eloquently cast slavery as a moral issue.

Just like with the Lincoln-Douglas debates, anyone studying Lincoln can use historical context to evaluate other accusations used against him. This includes his views on colonization and his supposedly "slow" movement toward the Emancipation Proclamation. Within the context of the time, evidence used to condemn Lincoln as a racist can be used for just the opposite conclusion.

As Lincoln grew in his presidency, he came to see emancipation as a war issue and a justice issue. And yet, Abraham Lincoln was killed not for the Emancipation Proclamation, but for advocating African American voting, as limited as that was. On 11 April 1865, when Lincoln gave his last speech, one man in the audience understood perfectly what Lincoln was speaking about. John Wilkes Booth told his companion, "That means n—citizenship. Now, by God, I'll put him through. That is the last speech he will ever make." Hence, Lincoln is part of a long list of martyrs who died for black voting rights.

Thus Lincoln's legacy continues to reverberate in strange and interesting ways. Perhaps with President Barack Obama's identification with Lincoln as a leader, or at least the parallels created by the campaign and the media, we will see more willingness from Lincoln's critics to accept the good with the bad, to understand the context of the nineteenth century, the ambiguity of individuals and of humanity itself.

In our time, when the Democratic primary came down to Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton, the debates eerily reflected themes of race and gender from the Age of Lincoln. Before the Civil War, reformers who had worked for women's suffrage put women's rights on the back burner to focus on eradicating the larger evil of slavery. But when former male slaves received the franchise in 1867 and women did not, the women's movement split; while some women like Lucy Stone and Julia Ward Howe continued to support Reconstruction and the rights of African Americans, others such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony turned against interracial

democracy in the South and joined the racist chorus against African Americans that helped to undermine the gains for African Americans during Reconstruction. Feminism and Race were at odds.

Other comparisons to the nation's greatest president and his era reveal interesting parallels with our own times. Then, as now, a fearful America faced war, postwar occupation, and nation-building. Terrorism did not begin with 9-11, African Americans in the United States lived in a terrorist society in the former Confederacy at least from 1865 till well after the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Then, as now, religious fanaticism strongly influenced events. People who believe they know and do God's will are not likely to compromise, whether on slavery, immigration, *jihads*, or conquest. Our own cultural wars parallel those of the nineteenth century in intensity, let's hope not in result. Both Lincoln and Obama had to finance a war. One of the reasons for our own terrible economic situation is our involvement in wars and our not having paid for them. The Confederacy believed that the United States could not possibly maintain a Civil War because without the South's cotton, they could not pay for the war. But Lincoln did pay for the war, imposed the first supposedly "temporary" income tax, and while he personally did not benefit financially from the war, the United States actually made money off the Civil War.

In both the Age of Lincoln and in our own day there is great *anxiety* about a changing economy, in the Age of Lincoln from independent yeoman or craftsman to market forces and manufacturing; in our own times we are changing from manufacturing to a knowledge-based economy. Both eras brought an intense fear of being left behind. At the same time there were more opportunities, and some entrepreneurs made great fortunes. In both periods we have our most extreme income distribution gap. Prior to our current financial meltdown, our own era was often compared with the period Mark Twain named the Gilded Age. And in both eras, unbridled capitalism led to recessions and depressions, from the Panic of 1857 and the Great Depression that began in 1873 and ran into the 1890s, and, of course, to our own economic crisis. And it needs to be a warning to us that during those historically difficult economic times, revolutions can and do go backward, as in the Great Depression of 1873 into the 1890s, racial idealism and minority rights are often sacrificed when the economic pie shrinks.

Let me conclude with the conclusion of my book, *The Age of Lincoln*. Now, as two hundred ago, Lincoln's words ring true: "Determine that the thing can and shall be done, and then we shall find the way."

Painting What Cannot Be Painted: Pieter Brueghel's Silent Opinion

David Basinger

Pieter Brueghel's art remains a mystery not because of the genre in which he painted, but because of the interpretation of what he depicted. Broad canvasses of bumbling bodies with bright clothing and brisk movements stimulate the senses, allowing the viewer to see, hear, smell, and taste the merriments and folly of Brueghel's peasants. Though his unique style and subject portrayal are widely praised, the nagging question of "why" remains. Researchers and scholars like Walter Gibson and Terez Gerszi have debated the reasoning behind Pieter Brueghel's apocalyptic images and his cheerful peasant scenes.¹ His depth of detail and the volatile historical environment in which he painted invite geographical, social, political, and religious interpretation.

The date and place of Brueghel's birth is still debated, although consensus places him in Breda about 1525.² In an engraved portrait published in 1572, he appears to be between the ages of forty and forty-five. The portrait was made several years before he died in 1569. Brueghel's career is not documented before 1550. According to his biographer, Karel Van Mander, Brueghel trained with Pieter Coecke van Aelst.³ Coecke employed landscape specialists to finish the backgrounds of his pictures, and a young Brueghel performed this function in Coecke's workshop. In 1551 Brueghel is recorded in Claude Dorizi's workshop in Malines, but he did not remain there long. He traveled in France and Italy and through the Alps. His drawings for Hieronymus Cock reveal his itinerary.⁴ Brueghel worked consistently with the Four Winds from 1555–1563. He produced forty drawings for Coecke's engravers and was introduced to Abraham Ortelius and other Antwerp intellectuals. In 1563 Brueghel moved to Brussels and married Mayken, the daughter of Pieter Coecke. The couple had two children, Pieter and Jan, in 1564 and 1568, respectively. Brueghel concentrated on paintings in the last years of his life until his death in 1569.⁵

Although Brueghel's works are more appreciated in the twenty-first century than they were in the past, he still remains a misunderstood, enigmatic figure. Gustav Gluck noted that though his art commands attention in every respect, it cannot but provoke difficult problems of interpretation. He believed it was an art of the past and the present—of the past, because his art connected with the culture of bygone times and of the present because each image presents something new and comparable to

contemporary art.⁶ Early research stressed that he was crude, played tricks on his friends, and painted funny pictures for a laugh. His seventeenth-century biographer, Karel van Mander, wrote that, "There are few works by his hand which the observer can contemplate with a straight face. However still and morose he [the viewer] may be, he cannot help chuckling or at any rate smiling."⁷ Experts of later centuries accepted Van Mander's view. For scholars like Max Friedlander, Brueghel was a humorist whose depictions of folklore, proverbs, and peasants produced mere entertainment. Friedlander wrote that Brueghel's unskilled prints and drawings appealed to average people. Brueghel drew inspiration from sources of popular imagination and entertained and delighted a public that enjoyed humor and caricature.⁸ Art historian Roger Marijnissen believed that Brueghel did not fit into any artistic category. He noted that some of Brueghel's works, such as *Triumph of Death*, reveal a Surrealist touch because of his ability to transform daily reality into something horrifying, but even then, the term "Surrealist" can be applied to different genres.⁹

Brueghel's art, however, found homes among the wealthiest and most cultivated members of Flemish society.¹⁰ From this we can infer, perhaps, that Brueghel was a cultured and educated man and that his paintings had deeper meanings than Van Mander thought. Scholars such as Charles De Tolnay and Carl Gustav Stridbeck assume that most of Brueghel's works reveal deep philosophical or moral concepts, often with a pessimistic view of the nature of man.¹¹ In a eulogy to Brueghel, Abraham Ortelius, who took a more serious view of Brueghel's works, said that he "painted many things that cannot be painted."¹² Brueghel's work revealed the predilection of Northern European art for allegory and symbolism. The moralizing treatment of his subjects also had a tradition in Flemish prints of the period, reflecting the tastes and attitudes of merchants, bankers, and humanists.¹³

Brueghel's art reflects his emphasis on the realistic portrayal of the contemporary world. Art critic and historian Keith Robert believes that Brueghel combined the distinct Flemish style with the raw vitality of Bosch to create his unique designs. Brueghel did not, as Raphael, paint the beautiful. He seemed to have no interest in the idealized anatomies that became a cornerstone of Rubens' works. His sketches of peasants are composed *naer het leven* (in the life) and present human beings and the harsh realities of their existence. The small figures, in contrast with the expanse in which they are placed, reveal the frailty of man in the face of nature. His characters act out their own lives, and this perception of everyday life connects the viewer to the actors in the paintings. Had Brueghel not watched and studied peasants firsthand, he may not have captured the qualities that connected with viewers. It was his ability to capture their gestures, laughs, manners, and clothing that made his art profoundly moving. Philip Roberts-Jones, in describing Brueghel's conception of reality writes,

Thanks to him the countryside has ceased to be a décor and has become a character in its own right, animated by surging sap. A tree can be as brittle as a needle of frost, as heavy as a sponge in autumn, corn golden as a trumpet call. People in their turn are no longer merely depicted, but breath in life through a hundred diverse moods.¹⁴

Italian altarpieces, adorned with gold leaf and idealized saints, evoked a devotional response in viewers. A Brueghel painting, filled with realistic people, reminded viewers to remember not only the event being portrayed, but their identification with that event. By avoiding classical idioms and the trappings of the ancient world, Brueghel succeeded in creating this impression.

The degree to which Brueghel wanted to connect past events to the people of his day cannot be established from his words; his work, however, speaks to his views of man and society. Living in Antwerp, Brueghel enjoyed many social and intellectual benefits. Yet, living in the Netherlands often introduced him to religious persecution. Knowing that Brueghel painted what he saw leads the viewer to believe that each scene, though grotesque or beautiful, was a truthful rendering of that subject. The unique treatment of religious and allegorical subjects gives his interpretations their harsh, raw, and even cruel vitality.¹⁵

Brueghel's religious subjects, particularly *Procession to Calvary*, contain symbolic and allegorical elements. Allegory is often understood as a method used to obtain a singular meaning for a work. The following analysis of Brueghel's *Procession to Calvary* will focus on different groups of people within the painting to determine their political, social, and spiritual significance. This method will be supplemented with brief examinations of other paintings to which *Procession to Calvary* alludes.

Brueghel painted *Procession to Calvary* for the Antwerp banker Niclaes Jonghelink in 1564. Christ's procession to Calvary was a popular religious subject, as the work of Flemish artists Otto van Veen, Jan van Amstel, and Pieter Aertsen, and Italian artists like Raphael attest. Yet, Brueghel's rendering differs greatly from those of his contemporaries. Flemish painters placed Christ in the foreground. Brueghel's piece, however, unfolds in a wide landscape that curves towards a hill in the back right corner of the painting. Multitudes awaiting the execution swarm the hill of Golgotha as dark clouds loom ominously, presaging the darkness that is to cover the earth. Red-clad soldiers speckle the scene, and children are playing games while their elders stare at the scene in curiosity. The priests attend to the two thieves in the cart, and soldiers pry Simon of Cyrene away from his wife to help carry the cross. In the center of the painting, almost indiscernible, is Christ, stumbling to his knees under

the weight of the cross. His tormentors kick and strike him, while an unconcerned soldier watches.

Brueghel's portrayal of the most important event in Christianity is visually taxing because of the range of emotions portrayed. Anger, apathy, concern, piety, and laughter fill this scene of execution. His literal and realistic approach strips away the traditional weight of the scene, creating a different visual experience. How he does this is much easier to answer than why; but examining the purposeful way in which Brueghel constructed *Procession to Calvary* makes his intentions clearer.

Brueghel arranges people into groups on the canvas. There is a group of children playing, a company of soldiers and officials, a small religious contingency, and Christ himself. Brueghel uses people from previous paintings to enhance the symbolic and emotional impact. Red-clad soldiers, prancing on horses, are portrayed several times in Brueghel's work and give us a look into the political interpretation of the painting. Similar soldiers appear in his painting *The Massacre of the Innocents*.

The Massacre of the Innocents illustrates Brueghel's merging of history and art. He draws from the biblical account of Herod's murder of all Jewish firstborn children but portrays those who carry out the order as Spanish troops. The soldiers wear red uniforms identical to the red coats of the so-called *bandes d'ordonnance*. These were the locally recruited police force active under Margaret of Parma. The *bandes d'ordonnance* earned notoriety for their cruelty. The soldiers in *The Massacre of the Innocents* also use contemporary armor and weaponry and burnish a flag that bears the imperial double-eagle. Scholars like David Kunzle believe that his painting is a direct indictment of primarily Spanish military and judicial cruelty and religious repression. The painting was completed in the 1560s during a generation of repression under Charles V and Margaret of Parma. The infamous Duke of Alva arrived in 1567.¹⁶ Contemporary writers such as Bor, Motley, Pirenne, and Geyl wrote that mass killings of religious innocents was a continual and escalating political feature throughout Brueghel's lifetime. The Alvan repressions galvanized the persecutions. So infamous was Alva, Brueghel seems to have painted him in *The Massacre of the Innocents*. Encircled by a band of troops, a figure bearing unique (to the painting) black armor and a pointed gray beard looks on the scene of murder. The long, forked beard has led several scholars to believe that this is Alva. An identical beard appears in his portraits and tapestries. In an age when short, square-cut beards were more popular, the eccentric long beard is a distinctive feature along with his favorite black armor. Returning to *Procession to Calvary*, we see the importance of the red-clad men. They are a vivid reminder of the Spanish regime. Their inclusion reminds viewers that just as Christ was murdered by foreign powers, so too were they.¹⁷ What degree

of interpretation Brueghel meant to place on the painting is unknown, but by leaving no obvious interpretation, Brueghel allowed the personal experience of each viewer to dictate each response.

As the soldiers represent abusive foreign powers, so the three different forms of execution represent the persecution and wars that pervaded Dutch society. In *Procession to Calvary*, the viewer's eyes move up the hill to the place of execution. A crowd circles around three crosses, of which two have been erected. In the distance, beyond the crowd, an emaciated man hangs from a gallows. Crude, torturous wheel poles, Dutch in design (not Roman) dot the landscape, including one painted in the foreground. This scene was most likely familiar to Brueghel because it records an execution processional to a barren space outside a city. Those condemned by tribunal were broken on the wheel, hanged, burned alive, or strangled. Brueghel used these instruments of execution in several paintings, but none reveal the terror and uncertainty of the times more than his *Triumph of Death* painted in 1562.

Borrowing on the methods of Hieronymous Bosch, Brueghel creates a horrific scene of despair and organized slaughter.¹⁸ He presents the viewer with a mechanized professional army of skeletons going about their professional business of annihilation. The skeletons' diabolical nature is as disconcerting as the enjoyment that Death receives from killing. Led by a giant figure of Death on a red horse, an army of rotting corpses herds its victims into boxes. The skeletons are organized behind their shields, devised from coffin lids. A group of skeletons clad in white togas supervises the destruction from a bridge. We find the same gallows and wheel poles seen in the middle and backgrounds of *Procession to Calvary* in *Triumph of Death*. The blending of torture and war is astounding because of the context of the painting.¹⁹ After an imperial victory, many times Inquisitions were established. Torture was regularly inflicted to produce confessions, and special tortures were reserved for those in defiance, as described by Motely and other historians of the period.²⁰ In *Triumph of Death*, the tribunal stands in judgment on the bridge and condemns more of the living to death. Candles of the Inquisition are burned, and two skeletons ring the Inquisition bell. Edward Veryard, a contemporary traveler in Holland, remarked that no bells tolled at a Dutch funeral because of the memories of the Inquisition bell. Brueghel's painting is a ghastly indictment of a political and religious system. Knowing the context of Brueghel's *Procession to Calvary* and how it is connected to processional executions and torture, we see that he continued to connect a past event with the devastations and anxieties of his time.

Brueghel's *Procession to Calvary* presents different possibilities for interpretation. Geographically, Brueghel uses a hill outside a city, which is consistent with executions

he might have witnessed. Politically, he purposefully includes distinct soldiers in red who symbolize the hated local and foreign authorities. Socially, he depicts ghastly images of the tortures endured by his own people in the form of the wheels and gallows. Religiously, Brueghel's inclusion of the rosary and priests shows the false piety and hypocrisy of the religious system. At each specific level, a meaning can be drawn from previous paintings, but what can be made of the painting as a whole? Christ is in the center of the painting but is lost in the crowd of peasant, farmers, dignitaries, religious figures, and soldiers. In a way, this is a cross-section of society. *Procession to Calvary* reveals the vicious cycle in which people lived. Man is enslaved by his own sense of true religion (*Massacre of the Innocents*). Yet it is the false sense of truth and piety that leads to man's ultimate destruction (*Triumph of Death*). Ironically it is the broken, bleeding man, destined to destroy his present religious system, who is completely ignored.

How much of his own society Brueghel meant to portray in the crucifixion of Christ cannot be completely determined. In the paintings discussed, Brueghel's pessimism is manifested in his revelation of the worst in human nature. According to Van Mander, Brueghel had several works burned to avoid reprisals against his family, so he did realize the consequences of his art. While Brueghel cannot be considered a moralist who painted, his ability to convey images that translate themselves into ideas and warnings in the minds of viewers cannot be ignored. From a solitary figure to a whole painting, Brueghel's images carry significant meanings. Art historian Keith Roberts duly noted that when looking at the works of Brueghel, the first sensation is not of quaintness or beauty, but of urgency: extraordinary urgency.

NOTES

1. Walter Gibson portrays Brueghel as a gentleman painter rather than a peasant. He sees Brueghel's works as more moralizing than others, saying he was a realist. Walter Gibson, *Brueghel* (New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1977). Terez Gerszi also sees Brueghel as making distinct parallels between the biblical scenes and his own time. Terez Gerszi, *Bruegel and His Age* (New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1970).
2. Karel Van Mander, perhaps on the assumption that Brueghel's surname reflected his place of birth, claimed he was born in the village of Bruegel or Brogel near Breda. A contemporary painter, Ludovico Guicciardini referred to him as "Pieter Bruegel of Breda." His name is spelled two ways. Until 1559 Breughel spelled his name with an "h" (Brueghel) but then dropped it for an unknown reason. Gibson, *Brueghel*, 4–7. This paper will use Breughel throughout.
3. Coecke, active from 1527, was the leading Flemish artist of his day and supervised an extensive workshop. Raphael's influence is revealed in Coecke's altarpieces, tapestry designs, and panels. Scholars debate whether Brueghel had any affiliation with Coecke because he is left on the Antwerp Artist's Guild pupil list, and Brueghel's work bears little influence of Coecke.

-
4. Cock's publishing house, the *Quatre Vents* (Four Winds), published the most prints in the Netherlands during this period. From 1550 to 1570, he produced over a thousand etchings and engravings.
 5. The section on Pieter Bruegel's life is taken from Gibson's *Bruegel*
 6. Gustav Gluck, *Peter Breughel the Elder* (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1932), 5.
 7. Karel van Mander wrote religious plays and painted landscapes. After traveling to Italy, he settled in Haarlem in 1583 where he lived and later published his painter's book. Gluck, *Peter Breughel*, 10.
 8. Max Friedlander (1876–1958) was a German art historian and became director of the Kaiser Friedrich Museum in Berlin. He settled in Holland in 1933. A specialist in Dutch painting, he is best known for his works on that subject. "The Columbia Encyclopedia," 6th. ed., 2008. www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1E1-FriedlanM.html. Though Max Friedlander considered Breughel a draughtsman and illustrator at heart, he praised his ability to capture movement and his boldness to overlook detail. Max Friedlander, *Early Netherlandish Painting: From Van Eyck to Bruegel* (New York: Phaidon Publishers Inc. 1956), 135.
 9. Roger H. Marijnessen, *Bruegel* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons 1971), 9–10.
 10. In addition to Abraham Ortelius, the great mapmaker and cartographer, Brueghel garnered commissions from Cardinal Granvella, counselor to the Regent Margaret of Parma. The wealthy banker and royal official Nicolaes Jonghelinck and the German merchant Hans Franckert had large collections. The magistrates of Brussels commissioned Brueghel to paint a series of pictures commemorating the completion of a large canal. Gibson, *Brueghel*, 16–18.
 11. Charles de Tolnay was an art historian and painter born in Budapest, Hungary. He worked as a lecturer in art and archaeology for many institutions in Europe and America. He is noted for his works on the Old Masters and his six volume study on Michelangelo. John S. Bowman, *The Cambridge Dictionary of American Biography* (Cambridge University Press), 1995.
 12. Ortelius' eulogy was called the *Album Amicorum* or friendship album. Gibson, *Brueghel*, 11.
 13. This short discussion is taken from Keith Roberts, *Brueghel* (London: Phaidon Press, 1971), 16–22.
 14. Philippe Roberts-Jones, *Bruegel* (Brussels: Laconti s. a., 1969), 6.
 15. Parts of this discussion on Brueghel's style are consulted from Roberts, *Brueghel*, 7–12.
 16. Heretics and rebels by law were considered below humanity, and any restraints upon the conduct of war and judicious procedures did not apply to acts against God. Dirck V. Coornhert figures that thirty-six thousand were executed with Alva boasting eighteen thousand. Some one hundred fifty thousand exiles were said to have left by 1565. Gibson, *Bruegel*, 123–28.
 17. This discussion is partly drawn from the thoughts of David Kunzle, "Spanish Herod, Dutch Innocents; Bruegel's Massacre of the Innocents in Their Sixteenth-Century Political Contexts." *Art History* 24:1 (2001) 51–82.
 18. Bosch garnered widespread popularity for his fiery images of hell and vice, containing hosts of devils. He frequently portrayed human vice and the demons that lured or kidnapped humans into gross acts of sin. Gibson, *Bruegel* 45–49.
-

19. In 1555 Phillip II republished an edict written earlier by Charles V. It forbade the reading and discussion of scripture, illegal gatherings and conventicles, preaching in open air, and offered huge rewards for informers. R.H.Wilenski, *Dutch Painting* (London: Faber and Faber, 1945), 34–38.

20. Le Blas, a condemned heretic, was found guilty of flagrant defiance and put through three sessions of torture in order to extract information about associates. He later had his right foot and hand burned and wrenched off with two hot irons and his tongue ripped out. His arms and legs were tied behind his back, and a chain connected to his waist held him over a slow fire until he was completely roasted. Wilenski, *Dutch Painting*, 34.

To “Vomit his Fury and Malice”: English Fears and Spanish Influences on the Exploration and Establishment of Carolina through 1670

Timothy P. Grady

When European eyes turned to the southeast coast of North America, the Spanish were the first to lay claim to the region. Though explorers from many nations cast a covetous glance at the thick forests along the coast and the imagined riches of the interior, it was the Spanish at St. Augustine in 1565 who established the first permanent European presence in North America. While throughout its history this small outpost suffered from a lack of funding and support, the Spanish effectively used it to spread their influence through the Southeast. Over the next several decades, they created a chain of Franciscan missions among the Indians in much of northern Florida and coastal Georgia, which directly influenced thousands of Guale, Timucua, and Apalachee Indians. From this center of power, the Spanish pressured native groups outside their direct control into cooperation, using a combination of trade and intimidation with varying degrees of success. By 1600 the Spanish exercised a fragile hegemony in the region with loose alliances of Indians, whose desire for European trade goods could only be satisfied through good relations with St. Augustine.¹

It was not long, though, before others began to challenge Spain's claims on the region. England in particular sought to counter the growing power of Spain in Europe by attacking its possessions in the Americas. Indeed, Spain would exercise an enormous, though often indirect, influence on the shape of English colonialism in the Southeast throughout the seventeenth century. Nowhere was this more apparent than in the case of the founding of Carolina. When Governor William Sayle led the appropriately named ship, *Carolina*, up the Ashley River in 1670 to establish Charleston, the new colony was merely the culmination of decades of proposals, planning, and exploration of the region. Well before 1670, proponents of colonization recommended repeating the Virginia experiment to the south, and traders from Virginia opened lines of communication and trade with Indians to the south of Jamestown. In the twenty years preceding the Sayle expedition, many individuals in England and in Virginia saw the territory that would become Carolina as the next big opportunity. In each case, however, all those individuals recognized that any colonial enterprise to the south of Virginia would represent an active and unequivocal confrontation with Spanish claims to the territory, reinforced by their longstanding presence in

Florida. In each proposal and in each expedition, the English dealt with both the direct and indirect influence of the Spanish. Indeed, at practically every turn in the exploration, organization, and founding of Carolina, the Spanish in Florida represented a crucial factor, shaping many of the events and activities that culminated in the establishment of the town of Charleston.

The fact that English Carolina was founded and grew in a region with many competing powers and influences, European and Indian alike, has been a common theme in many major publications of late, and most historians of colonial South Carolina acknowledge the role of the Spanish in the region to some extent. Indeed, much of the current historiography has sought to expand our understanding of South Carolina's early history from the almost purely Anglo-centric story of conquest and imperialism, which dominated interpretations since it was first introduced in 1928 in Verner W. Crane's seminal work, *The Southern Frontier, 1670–1732*. This overly simplistic and narrow way of viewing early Carolina has changed in the last decade thanks to works such as Alan Gallay's *The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670–1717* and Steven J. Oatis' *A Colonial Complex: South Carolina's Frontiers in the Era of the Yamasee War, 1680–1730*. Gallay's and Oatis' works allowed historians of colonial Carolina to begin seeing the region during this period as one in which numerous groups, (i.e. Indians, English, Spanish, and eventually French) competed for power and control in a fluid relationship that allowed Indians to operate with enormous independence and control over the actions of the others.²

As worthy as the recent historiographical shift has been in terms of a fuller understanding of the region, it shares a few limitations with its predecessor, though this does not by any measure detract from the collective merits of recent work. Gallay's and Oatis' interpretation concentrates its primary attention on the fundamental and critical role of Indians in the course of this region's history. The Spanish are merely a secondary player from this viewpoint, though one that Gallay and Oatis acknowledge. In addition, since all three of the above-referenced works begin their deliberations in 1670, the events for which this article seeks to provide fuller discussion receive only cursory mention in the early work and none at all in the later two. The purpose of this paper is to remedy this oversight and to answer the question, what exactly was the role of the Spanish presence in the early discussion, exploration, and planning of the colony that would become Carolina?

It is common knowledge that the rivalry between England and Spain played an important role in much of the English experience of early America. Just as individuals such as Sir Humphrey Gilbert and his half-brother, Sir Walter Raleigh, were pioneering, unsuccessfully, the establishment of English colonies in places such as

Newfoundland and Roanoke during the 1570s and 80s, English privateers such as Sir Francis Drake were greedily eyeing and raiding Spanish towns throughout the Caribbean and along the coast of South America. The successful establishment of the colony at Jamestown was also accomplished with the Spanish in mind. It was no accident that the walls of the three-sided fortress constructed on the James River in 1607 bore cannons pointed out at the water in defense of a potential seaborne attack as well as inward towards the land. By the time Virginia had become an established enterprise, the Spanish in Florida had accepted the presence of the English on the Chesapeake as an annoyance rather than an immediate threat to their colony in Florida. When the English began to look southward, however, the Spanish presence and influence in the region was a critical factor, once again, in the process.³

Actually, English interest in the territory that would later be named Carolina originated soon after the founding of Jamestown, though it would be decades before anyone would begin to explore the region. In 1629 Charles I acted on his presumed claim to the territory to the south of Virginia by granting the land between the thirty-first and thirty-sixth degrees of north latitude to his attorney-general, Sir Robert Heath, for the founding of a colony. Despite the opportunity, Heath did almost nothing with it, and very little attention was given to the region for the next thirty years.⁴

Not until the 1650s did the English truly begin to contemplate settling the land that would become Carolina. Early English concerns over the region directly related to the presence and perceived power of the Spanish in Florida. The growing wealth of Virginia gave the English a reason to fear that the relatively unprotected spot was vulnerable to a potential Spanish assault. In 1650 E. W. Gent, a proponent of the idea of founding a new colony in the area, published a treatise arguing for the need for a defensive bulwark for Virginia. He pointed out the “apparent danger all the Colonies may be in if this [Carolina] be not possessed by the English” to convince others of the need for a new southern colony. Like many of the Spanish who had been concerned with the danger posed by Virginia, Gent believed the distance between Virginia and the northern provinces of New Spain was much smaller than it actually was. With this in mind, Gent suspected that “the Spaniard, who already hath seated himself on the North of Florida, and [now is] on the back of Virginia in [latitude] 34, where he is already possessed of rich silver Mines.” Given this supposed proximity, he thought the Spanish would “no doubt vomit his fury and malice upon the neighbour Plantations, if a prehabitation anticipate not his intentions.”⁵

By the 1650s and 60s, after initial explorations of the area reported a friendly reception by some of the local natives, traders and explorers in Virginia began to slowly expand their knowledge of the Carolina territory, beginning first with its northernmost

reaches, most of which are in modern North Carolina. They searched for trade opportunities and for lands that might serve as good locations for new settlements. One of these explorers was Francis Yeardley, the son of Sir George Yeardley, one of the early governors of Virginia. After traveling into the region, the younger Yeardley wrote a letter in 1654 describing the land to John Ferrar, Esq., formerly a prominent member and deputy treasurer of the Virginia Company. Yeardley described the worth of the territory and encouraged further explorations southward. He described lush forests, a mild climate, and lands ripe for agricultural cultivation. He also noted the presence and influence of the Spanish among the Indian tribes in the area. In one encounter, Yeardley recounted that “the Tuskarorawes emperor, with 250 of his men, met our company, and received them courteously; and after some days spent, desired them to go to his chief town.” The Tuscarora chief informed the English that at his main village “was one Spaniard residing, who had been seven years with them, a man very rich, having about thirty in his family, seven whereof are negroes; and he had one more negro, leiger [resident] with a great nation called the Newxes. He is sometimes, they say, gone from thence a pretty while.” Though the business of the Spaniard is unclear from the description, it is likely the man was either a trader who would have traveled from village to village and perhaps maintained his entourage in the main village or a similarly itinerant Franciscan missionary. Regardless of the exact nature of the reported Spaniard, the fact of a Spanish presence and influence in the area was clear to Yeardley. The Spanish were there, and their influence would have to be dealt with if the English were to spread their control to the south.⁶

Though Yeardley noted the presence of the Spanish in Carolina, a fact that must have been of some concern, he also pointed out that not all Indians were happy with their influence. Yeardley believed that this could provide an opening for the English. He recounted in his letter to Ferrar that besides the Tuscarora, who had welcomed a trading relationship with the English, there was another large tribe who could be of value. He remarked on “another great nation by these [the Tuscarora], called the Haynokes, who valiantly resist the Spaniards further northern attempts.” He gave the location of these Indians as three days inland from the coast and to the south of the Tuscarora near another larger Indian tribe he called the “Cacores.” With the large number of native inhabitants in the region and their mixed relationships with the Spanish, the possibility of the English supplanting the Spanish intrigued many. Thus the territory’s seemingly willing native population, welcoming climate, and a supposed role as a bastion against the Spanish gave others the motivation to pursue the possibility of a colony south of Virginia.⁷

Following up on the initial explorations and the calls for a new colony south of Virginia, on 20 March 1663, King Charles II granted to eight proprietors a prov-

ince to be called Carolina. It included all the lands formerly granted to Heath and extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific. These original Lords Proprietors included such prominent individuals as Lord Anthony Ashley Cooper, first earl of Shaftesbury; Edward Hyde, earl of Clarendon; and George Monck, duke of Albemarle. Other proprietors had experience in the colonies such as Lord John Berkeley and his younger brother, Sir William Berkeley, the governor of Virginia, as well as Sir John Colleton, whose oldest son Peter would become active in the Carolina venture. Most of them had been ardent supporters of the Stuarts during the restoration of Charles II to the English throne, and the Carolina grant represented, in part, a reward for their backing.⁸

After obtaining the grant, the first order of business for the proprietors was to more fully investigate the area and search for potential areas of settlement. For this, the proprietors and their agents solicited proposals from outside groups to organize exploratory expeditions to Carolina, and the territory attracted a great deal of interest among land-hungry colonists from other British colonies. During the 1660s several different groups sought to obtain licenses from the proprietors to settle at various points along the Carolina coast. The territory was split into three sections. The northernmost, Albemarle, already had a small population of planters who had migrated from Virginia in search of new land. The second section centered on the Cape Fear region and the last on the Port Royal area. The two southern regions attracted the most attention. Several groups of Barbadian planters, frustrated by the lack of available land in the West Indies, organized an early expedition to the southern regions under Captain William Hilton. Another group from New England landed a small colony near Cape Fear in 1663, although due to hunger and Indian hostility, it was abandoned within a few years. Hilton's initial expedition gave a glowing report of the land's potential, while the New Englander's accounts gave the opposite impression. To clarify the matter of conflicting accounts, separate groups of interested Barbadians sent out two expeditions in the mid-1660s to further explore the region and to locate possible sites for settlement. The first of these was organized under the leadership of Hilton, whose earlier explorations made him an obvious choice, as well as Captain Anthony Long and Peter Fabian. The Barbadians ordered Hilton to explore the coast from Cape Fear south, and the expedition left in the ship *Adventure* on 10 August 1663. A few days later, confident in the success of the mission, the group wrote a pre-emptive request to the Lords Proprietors for permission to purchase land from the Indians and to hold it under the authority of the proprietors.⁹

Hilton's explorations gave evidence not only of the potential profit to be had by holding land in Carolina, but also of the potential risks of being so close to Spanish Florida.

Hilton related that on “Wednesday the 26 instant, four of the clock in the Afternoon, God be thanked, we espied Land on the Coast of Florida, in the lat. of 32 deg. 30 min. being four Leagues or thereabouts to the Northwards of Saint Ellens.” The party immediately found strong evidence of the continued influence of the Spanish in the area. In one encounter, Hilton recalled that “several Indians came on Board us, and said they were of St. Ellens; being very bold and familiar; speaking many Spanish words, as *Cappitan*, *Commarado*, and *Adeus*.” Rather than being awed, the Indians showed easy familiarity with the English ship and armaments. Hilton reported

They know of the use of Guns, and are as little startled at the firing of a Peece of Ordnance, as he that hath been used to them many years: they told us the nearest Spanyards were at St. Augustins, and several of them had been there, which as they said was but ten days journey; and that the Spanyards used to come to them at Saint Ellens, sometimes in Canoa’s within Land, at other times in small Vessels by Sea, which the Indians describe to have but two Masts.

It was evident to Hilton that the Spanish influence over the Indians in the area remained strong and that caution was necessary.¹⁰

Events proved the reality of this attitude when the “Edistow,” an Indian tribe living just north of Santa Elena, captured five Englishmen from a long-boat scouting the area. Hilton and the other leaders of the expedition, responding to the Indian chieftain who informed the English of the captives,

shewed him store of all Trade, as Beads, Hoes, Hatchets and Bills, etc., and said, he should have all those things if he would bring the English on board us; w[hi]ch he promised should be done the next day. Hereupon we wrote a few lines to the said English, fearing it to be a Spanish delusion to entrap us.

The captives proved to be the remnants of a larger crew from a different English ship that had been attacked by the Indians when their small boat overturned along the coast as they sought to obtain provisions and fresh water. When one of the captives, a young boy, was brought to the ship he “informed us that there were four more of their company at St. Ellens.” Relating the plight of the captives, the youth “could not tell us whether the Indians would let them come to us: For saith he, Our Men told me, that they had lately seen a Frier and two Spanyards more at St. Ellens, who told them that they would send Soldiers suddenly to fetch them away.”¹¹

The standoff between Indians and English was resolved without further bloodshed through the intervention of the Spanish. When the Spanish soldiers ar-

rived to rescue the English, an exchange between the English and Spanish camps included a gift from the Spanish of “a quarter of Venison, and a quarter of Pork, with a Complement, That he was sorry he had no more for us at that time.” The Spanish used their relationship with the Indians to arrange the release, sending a message to Hilton that

I advise you, that if these Indians (although Infidels and Barbarians) have not killed any of the Christians, do require as a gift or courtesie for those four men, four Spades, and four Axes, some Knives, and some Beads, and the Four Indians which you have there.

After the release of the captives, Hilton and his expedition continued their explorations and returned to Barbados with another glowing report of Carolina. The Proprietors’ agents promptly used the report to reach an accord with the group known as the ‘Adventurers’ and other potential settlers in Barbados. Hilton’s account, while positive on the potential promise of a Carolina colony, also showed that no English presence in the area would be free from the Spanish threat posed by Florida. It also proved to the Proprietors and the Barbadians that the crucial factor in countering the Spanish influence in the region would be to cultivate their diplomatic and trade relationships with the Indians of the region. Just as the real power of Spanish Florida lay not in St. Augustine, but rather in the thousands of mission Indians to the west and north, Carolina’s success in countering the Spanish would have to be done with the assistance of Indians as well. The next mission would need to be prepared to gain the knowledge and experience to make this so.¹²

After hearing Hilton’s account, another expedition was organized by a second group of Barbadians interested in obtaining land in Carolina and led by Sir John Yeamans. Yeamans conducted negotiations and obtained a formal agreement with the Proprietors in 1665 over terms of government for the new territory. The Proprietors named Yeamans governor of the territory of Carolina, and he made a short visit to the soon-to-be abandoned colony at Cape Fear that same year. Yeamans intended two settlements, one at Cape Fear and another in the Port Royal region. To find a suitable site for the later colony, he organized an expedition under Captain Robert Sandford to follow up on Hilton’s trip. Sandford set out from the Cape Fear settlement in June 1666 to explore the coast to the south.¹³

Sandford spent a month exploring the Port Royal region and encountered several groups of natives in the area. In the area around the North Edisto River, Sandford reported going “a shoare on the East point of the Entrance, where I found

Shadoo (the Capt. of Edistow, that had been with Hilton att Barbados), and severall other Indians come from the Towne by Land to see for our coming forth." Meeting several friendly tribes, Sandford was impressed with the reception he received at each point, but one encounter stood out. At one point just north of Port Royal, he described meeting an Indian

who used to come with the Southern Indians to trade with us att [the colony at Cape Fear]... and is knowne by the name of Cassique [chief]. Hee belongeth to the County of Kiwaha[Kiawah], and was very earnest with mee to goe with my Vessell thither, assuring me a broad deep entrance, and promising a large welcome and plentiful entertainment and trade.

Sandford realized that the various Indian chieftains each wanted an alliance with the English to give them an advantage over rival tribes. With this in mind, he explored the area around the "County of Kiwaha," located around the Ashley River where the town of Charleston would eventually be founded. The reception he received and the strategic position of the area, located at the mouths of two converging rivers, led to his recommendation that this be the site of the new colony.¹⁴

Sandford's expedition also came across signs of a Spanish presence. He mentioned a visit to one Indian village in which he came across one building "att th'end of which stood a faire wooden Crosse of the Spaniards ereccon." In another village he watched an Indian having his hair "shoaren on the Crowne, after the manner of the Port Royall Indians, a fashion which I guesse they have taken from the Spanish Fryers thereby to ingratiate themselves with that Nacon." Overall though, Sandford's journey was free of Spanish interference, and he felt the area safe enough to leave a volunteer with the Indians in the Port Royal area for the purpose of learning their language and culture. To this end, he left "Mr. Henry Woodward, Chirurgeon, [who] had before I sett out assured mee his resolucon to stay with the Indians if I should thinke convenient." Henry Woodward was the answer to the undisputed need recognized after Hilton's report: that the English absolutely had to win the friendship of the local Indians to counter the Spanish. With this in mind, Sandford had planned even before his voyage to take advantage of any opportunity to better learn about the local Indians. With Sandford's permission, Woodward remained in the region for several months after Sandford's departure. His presence, however, was reported by other Indians to the Spanish and he was soon captured by Spanish soldiers and taken to St. Augustine where he would remain for over a year. Woodward was ultimately freed in 1668 during a devastating attack on the Spanish colony by the English pirate Robert

Searles, an attack that burned a good deal of the town and caused great consternation among the Spanish. He would later serve Carolina effectively for a decade as its chief Indian negotiator, taking advantage of his experiences and directly setting the course of Indian-Carolina relations.¹⁵

Despite the threat of the Spanish, the Lords Proprietors, led by Lord Ashley Cooper, followed up on the Hilton and Sandford expeditions by financing a fleet of three ships with over one hundred colonists, which set out from Ireland late in 1669 bound for Barbados, where additional supplies and colonists would be furnished by a group led by Yeamans. After leaving Barbados, storms hindered the mission and forced two of the ships back to port, though one, the *Three Brothers*, immediately set sail again for Carolina. The remaining ship, the *Carolina* under William Sayle, reached the Port Royal area in March 1670. After exploring the region, the colonists decided that Port Royal was too near Spanish Florida for comfort and, relying on Sandford's recommendation, traveled north to the Ashley River, where they landed in April 1670 and established a settlement on its west bank.¹⁶

But the voyage of the *Three Brothers*, seeking to locate and join the *Carolina*, once again brought the English into direct confrontation with the Spanish. Maurice Mathews, a passenger on the ship, recounted the episode later, when the ship stopped at St. Catherine's Island, in what is today Georgia, for supplies and word of the *Carolina*. According to Mathews, two male and two female servants were sent ashore to gather wood and wash linens while the rest of the ship secured provisions from the local Indians. They disappeared and though Mathews and others "hollowed to them right ashore... they made no answer." The next day four armed Spaniards appeared "armed with muskets and swords... and bid [the English] yield and submit to the sovereignty of [the Spanish]." The Spanish soldiers informed Mathews and the other colonists that the four missing passengers were captives and had been sent to St. Augustine for questioning. When the *Three Brothers'* captain refused to surrender, the Spanish opened fire. Despite enduring a "volley of Musket shott and a cloud of arrows" that continued for over an hour the English suffered no casualties and were able to sail out of range, eventually joining the *Carolina* at the place the Indians labeled "Kayawah" but which the colonists named Charles Town.¹⁷

The settlers immediately set about fortifying the settlement, building a high palisade around the closely-grouped houses, knowing that the Spanish would react harshly to their presence. This precaution proved fortuitous when three small Spanish ships, aided by Indian allies, attacked the small village in August 1670. Joseph West, a prominent lieutenant of Governor Sayle, wrote to the proprietors of the Spanish hostility. He noted that local Indians warned the colonists that "three ships at St.

Augustines . . . would come to surprise the Shallop,” by which they meant the *Three Brothers* which had been at St. Catherine’s Island. When the Spanish ships failed to find the English ship, they headed north for the new outpost at Charleston.¹⁸

When the Spanish arrived at the mouth of the Ashley River, they immediately sought to destroy the new colony but ran up against the palisade that Governor Sayle had ordered built immediately in recognition of the potential Spanish and Indian threat to the new settlement. Additionally, the cacique of the Indians at Kiawah warned the colonists of the impending attack of both the Spanish and a large force of Spanish-allied Indians from the south. Governor Sayle had time to “put ourselves in a reasonable good posture of receiving them . . . having mounted our great guns and fortified ourselves as well as time and the abilities of our people would give leave.” The combination of prior warning and bad weather limited the Spanish forces to only a small assault before storms forced them to withdraw to St. Augustine. The English were there to stay, and the complex course of the Southeastern borderlands, with its multiple players, intricate negotiations, and fierce rivalries, was set in motion.¹⁹

Ironically, English activities in the area and Spanish concern over the potential vulnerability of its Florida colony resulting from the Searles attack in 1668 finally set the stage for the last influence on the founding of Carolina, although an indirect and unwitting one on the part of the Spanish. By 1670 reports of the Hilton and Sandford explorations from local Indians as well as the Woodward and Mathew’s episode concerned officials in St. Augustine greatly. Requests from Florida for reinforcements and additional supplies sent to the Council of the Indies met with little success for most of the 1660s. Overall, the Spanish empire was hard-pressed to meet the needs of its far-flung empire as revenues from the silver mines of the Americas declined. Given the number of demands on the empire as a whole, the hardships of a minor outpost on the frontier fell far down the list of priorities. The Searles attack of 1668 on St. Augustine exposed the extreme vulnerability of Florida and led the Spanish Crown to seek a diplomatic solution with England to protect the position of its outpost in North America while at the same time approving the increased fortification of St. Augustine itself.²⁰

It was a diplomatic initiative that ensured Charleston’s survival, though that was not the Spanish intention. Beginning in 1669, English and Spanish officials in London and Madrid undertook a series of diplomatic negotiations to resolve the disputes over territory and trade that had bedeviled the relationship between the countries for decades. These negotiations resulted in the Treaty of Madrid, signed in 1670, which formally recognized all of the English possessions in the West Indies, including Jamaica. The treaty also allowed the English free passage through the waters of the Caribbean, though it limited trade by each side to their own territories.

Significantly for Carolina, it recognized the English title to the territory of Virginia, setting the limits of English settlement to just below the new settlement at Charleston. Thus, ironically, the treaty was signed only three months after the arrival of the *Carolina* at the Ashley River and before the Spanish diplomats in Europe were even aware of Charleston's existence. The treaty technically legitimized the new English colony and ensured that the Spanish would be forced to accept the presence of a rival for power and influence in the region.²¹

At the end of 1670, the state of affairs in the Southeast was a stalemate. The Spanish in Florida held a fortified position in St. Augustine, but the key to their power in Florida, the Indian missions, remained vulnerable to raids along the frontier. In the new colony at Charleston, the English slowly increased their presence and soon began negotiating with the Indians in the region to establish their influence in the region to counter the Spanish. The stage was set for a three-sided struggle for power in the region. Yet the Anglo-Spanish rivalry that would affect the next several decades of Carolina's existence had been part of that colony's history from its very inception. During the conception, exploration, and founding of Carolina, the Spanish had influenced every stage of the English expansion south from Virginia and had played an important role in the story of early Carolina.

NOTES

1. For sake of simplicity, place names that have been modernized or anglicized from the Spanish usage will be used in their more familiar, modern form. For example, San Agustín will be referred to by the modern St. Augustine, Charles Town will be modernized to Charleston.
2. Verner Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670–1732* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1928, 1981); Alan Galloway, *The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670–1717* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002); Steven J. Oatis, *A Colonial Complex: South Carolina's Frontiers in the Era of the Yamasee War, 1680–1730* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004).
3. See David B. Quinn, *Set Fair for Roanoke: Voyages and Colonies, 1584–1606* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985) and Karen O. Kupperman, *The Jamestown Project* (New York: Belknap Press, 2009).
4. Robert Weir, *Colonial South Carolina: A History* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1983), 47–49.
5. E. W. Gent, "Virginia: More especially the South part thereof, Richly and truly valued..., 1650," in Peter Force, *Tracts and Other Papers Relating Principally to the Origin, Settlement, and Progress of the Colonies in North America, From the discovery of the Country to the Year 1776*, 5 vols. (Washington, 1837, 1963), 3: 7, 43.
6. "Francis Yeardley's Narrative of Excursions into Carolina, 1654," in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, 27.

7. *Ibid.*, 29.
8. Weir, *Colonial South Carolina*, 46–51; Walter Edgar, *South Carolina: A History* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1998), 35–46.
9. Weir, *Colonial South Carolina*, 51–52; “Editor’s Note for ‘A Relation of a Discovery, By William Hilton, 1664,’” in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, 33–35.
10. “A Relation of a Discovery, By William Hilton, 1664,” in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, 37–39.
11. *Ibid.*, 39–40, 41.
12. *Ibid.*, 53–54.
13. Weir, *Colonial South Carolina*, 51–52; Editor’s note for Robert Sandford, “A Relation of a Voyage on the Coast of the Province of Carolina, 1666,” in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, 77–81.
14. Sandford, “A Relation of a Voyage on the Coast of the Province of Carolina, 1666,” 93–94.
15. Sandford, “A Relation of a Voyage on the Coast of the Province of Carolina,” 100, 104–106; Paul Hoffman, *Florida’s Frontiers* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002) 145–46; Weir, 52; For Woodward’s service as Indian negotiator see Eric E. Brown, *The Westo: Slave Traders of the Early Colonial South* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2005)
16. Weir, *Colonial South Carolina*, 58–59.
17. Maurice Mathews, “Mr. Mathews’s ‘Rela on’ of St. Katherina” in in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, 114–16.
18. Joseph West, “Letter of Joseph West” in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, 120–21.
19. William Sayle, “Letter of Governor Sayle and Council” in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, 122–123; Weir, *Colonial South Carolina*, 58–59.
20. Memorandum from the Junta de Guerra to the King. Madrid, Jan. 22 1669, AGI 58-2-2/11 bnd 1668 (Stetson); Junta de Guerra to the King, Madrid, March 7 1669, AGI 58-2-3/1 bnd 1669 (Stetson).
21. Henry Kamen, *Empire: How Spain became a World Power, 1492–1763* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2003), 432–33.

Origins and Development of College Football in South Carolina, 1889–1930

Fritz Hamer

“The colors of the two institutions were conspicuous. Furman’s banner of purple and white floated in the air and the students wore badges of the same color . . . the players were dressed in canvass cloth uniforms and wore caps of purple and white. The old gold and black of Wofford was everywhere to be seen . . .”¹

Such was the splendor surrounding the second year of intercollegiate competition between the two upstate college rivals in January 1891 as the teams formed on the field of Wofford’s home ground in Spartanburg. Although the new game of “football” had only begun to take root in the Palmetto State less than a decade before, it was gaining a significant following on these two upstate campuses. At this early stage, though, the rules were different from what they have become. In fact it probably resembled a rugby match more than what we see in college stadiums today. Scrimmage lines were unbalanced, the forward pass was illegal, and scoring a touchdown only earned four points, while the extra point, or goal, as it was called then, earned two. On the sidelines there were few, if any bleachers, but the fan support, with perhaps one hundred in attendance, was enthusiastic and partisan in cheering for their respective team. But as the fans of this third intercollegiate football game in South Carolina cheered, they could hardly have foreseen how the game would steadily grow from a contest between amateurs into tightly organized teams with well paid coaches and very demanding alumni, all with a passionate desire to win. By 1930 college football was established on virtually every college campus in the state.²

In the early years of collegiate football in the Palmetto State, faculty advisors with personal interest in football aided fledgling teams from the upstate to the low country. These faculty members had usually played the game at a northern school before coming south. Paid coaches came later, once the game was more established. Yet even though unpaid, such coaches were not supposed to coach during games. Only the team captain could give instruction during the matches. Even so, the games of this early period could become violent, and injuries followed. But this was only one of the reasons most college presidents and their faculties discouraged football. As football took root on South Carolina campuses, professors and administrators feared that too much student attention to the game and its players distracted them from their academic pursuits—concerns that had already affected colleges in the northeast, where football began more than three decades earlier.³

Neither of the administrations of Wofford or Furman seemed as concerned about their students playing the new game as they would a decade later. Instead, the president and his trustees appeared indifferent since they did not support it financially or attend the first games. The early years of college football in South Carolina were organized and supported by the players, with moral support from the rest of their student bodies. While faculty members often helped to train players, everything else—uniforms, transportation to games, and even arranging games—was the responsibility of the players and their student managers. Faculty members might serve as liaisons for their institutions to monitor college interests and be sure integrity was maintained. In South Carolina, the early years of intercollegiate football were truly amateur contests, little more than a step above the class football competitions staged on most campuses.⁴

Baseball was the main sport on South Carolina college campuses through the 1890s, though recreational football had begun at some institutions by the 1880s. At what was then South Carolina College (later the University of South Carolina), football was already a popular sport between groups of students who just seemed interested in its recreational value. In October 1888, a student wrote, half jokingly, that football was good for health, because after playing a game, players bloodied themselves to the point that they “never need to be bled by a physician.”⁵ Wofford and Furman seemed to have gained knowledge of football prior to its first game in December 1889 through recreational contests held on its campuses. And even after the first game between the two schools, intramural contests between classes at many campuses became an annual contest in the late fall. In 1911, after the intercollegiate season, the University of South Carolina (USC) had a competition between the four classes for the Football Trophy. Similar class competitions were held on campuses from Greenville to Newberry even when intercollegiate competition was suspended by most upstate schools during the first decade of the twentieth century.⁶

But without its introduction from northern transplants, neither class nor varsity football would have advanced much in the state. The most noted of these early northern pioneers to come to South Carolina was the future innovator and coaching legend, John Heisman—an 1892 graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and football star. In 1899, Clemson College lured him from Auburn in Alabama to lead the upstate school to its earliest football success in brief four-year tenure. The second paid coach in the state, Heisman is the most famous coach of the early years of college football in South Carolina. Less heralded northern transplants brought the game to other state campuses, including Yale graduate Elwin Kerrison, who trained the Wofford team for the first Furman contest in 1889. It was unclear if Kerrison played at Yale, but he certainly must have known about the game, since the Connecticut school was one of college football’s

top teams in the country with a tradition of winning championships. When USC began a varsity program in 1894, it also enlisted a faculty advisor with northern roots and continued to do so until the school hired its first paid coach two years later.⁷

But while these northerners introduced the game, they could not coach in the modern sense of the word, at least not until Heisman took over at Clemson. No coach or trainer is mentioned in the reports for the 1891 Wofford-Furman game. And except for Clemson and South Carolina, the games between other South Carolina schools seemed genteel affairs in which both sides respected the competitive spirit of the other. The Furman writer who accompanied the 1891 team to Spartanburg for the third contest described a friendly and spirited cheering between the rival fans as the teams prepared for the muddy match in rain and cold wind. Although a low scoring affair in which the visitors prevailed 10–0, the sides had a hotly contested game in which Wofford's tackling and blocking for its running backs were its best attribute. It was mainly Furman's better teamwork that seemed to overcome the home side in the end. The Wofford writer concurred, although he attributed the loss to insufficient practice time along with injuries to key players before the contest.⁸

South Carolina and Clemson began varsity programs in 1894 and 1896, respectively, but none of the state's other colleges began intercollegiate programs until the new century. North of South Carolina, the University of North Carolina had begun playing a small schedule of intercollegiate games in the late 1880s and to the west, the University of Georgia began playing other colleges in 1891, followed by Georgia Tech. During this first decade of intercollegiate football, the state's colleges occasionally scheduled these out-of-state schools.⁹

But there were a few schools playing football in South Carolina that, by law, could not compete with South Carolina, Clemson, or the small upstate schools. These were the black schools in Orangeburg and Columbia. Sadly, the early records for these programs are meager, leaving the historian with just a few facts. Privately supported Claflin College of Orangeburg had a team by 1899, but none of its early records are extant. Eight years later its neighbor, South Carolina State College, began an intercollegiate team, defeating Morehouse College in that year's only match. The following year, the Orangeburg school tied Allen University of Columbia and lost its other four games. Within three years of its first varsity season, State College became part of a segregated college league called the Georgia-South Carolina Intercollegiate Association (later renamed the South Atlantic Conference), winning that conference's title for the first time in 1919. Allen University was part of this league during the same period.¹⁰

On the South Carolina coast, the College of Charleston began its first intercollegiate squad in 1899, defeating the more experienced Furman 22–0, but losing

to South Carolina 18–0. After that first year, the college did not play another team outside Charleston for three years. The lowcountry school, like other programs in the state, focused its competition on local rivals, particularly the city YMCA, teams of former college players living in the city, and even high schools. Its future in-town rival, the Citadel, would not have a varsity squad until 1905. With a small student body of barely one hundred and a very small budget, the college's local competitive schedule seemed linked to cost factors.¹¹

But even as the game was introduced to Charleston colleges, the upstate institutions that introduced varsity football to the state banned it. Both Wofford and Furman had intermittent years when football at the varsity level was absent. The Spartanburg school did not play intercollegiate football for a three-year period from 1897 to 1899. Furman had no schedule in 1894 and then, like Wofford, had a three-year hiatus in the late 1890s. As the new century began both schools returned to varsity play for two years, with Wofford playing its fullest schedule in 1901 with six games. Shortly after that, intercollegiate play ended for more than a decade.¹²

By this time, the game, while growing in popularity on most South Carolina college campuses, had become a major distraction among student bodies, at least according to the faculty and administrators at Wofford and Furman. Concern that football marginalized the academic purpose of their institutions was coupled with what Wofford President Henry Snyder described as “the unadulterated spirit of battle appealing primarily to the primitive instincts of man.” Furthermore, the two schools' presidents claimed that permitting football in the fall, when baseball already took up the spring term, meant that academics would be compromised in both the fall and spring terms to the severe detriment of their small student bodies.¹³ Another factor that influenced their decision could be linked to the strong religious affiliation of both colleges. With strong ties to the Methodist denomination at Wofford and the Southern Baptists at Furman, condoning the violent, unsportsmanlike conduct that football generated led to criticism from lay and clergy alike. By the end of 1896, the Board of Education of the South Carolina Methodist Conference denounced football not only as brutal and wasteful of “time and money,” but destructive of intellect and morals at Wofford. Eventually the trustees accepted the Conference recommendation, but only in part. Intercollegiate games continued until 1903, when the Methodist school ended varsity play for the next decade, though class football continued.¹⁴ In 1896 Furman's board at first seemed less critical, for it continued to allow some football off campus, though strictly at the expense of the students who participated. Then, seven years later, the board banned intercollegiate play because it was “too rough and expensive” while, curiously, continuing to encourage class football on campus. As off-campus football disappeared on these and

other upstate colleges, the ban may have also been connected to the growing criticism by the national press, which was carried in at least one state newspaper.¹⁵ Columbia's *State* followed the intense criticism of football in the Northeast, especially as the season ended in December 1905. It quoted a Boston paper that claimed that football rules, as then permitted, "encouraged brutality and roughness, and put a premium on deceit." That same month, the Columbia paper reported that one of the biggest northern colleges, Columbia University, had banned football outright.¹⁶

Despite these bans, the game at public-supported state colleges continued with opponents from other states. But for the two biggest schools in South Carolina, the growing rivalry between Clemson and the USC became the biggest clash in the state as the new century began. By 1908, one former player recalled years later, football was displacing baseball as the premier game on South Carolina's campus and most of the other colleges. The bitter rivalry between the two biggest schools in the state had already become legendary. The first full manifestation of the Carolina vs. Clemson face-off came in the aftermath of Carolina's 12-6 victory in 1902. It began shortly after the game's conclusion, when South Carolina students produced a "transparency" of a gamecock crowing over a crouching tiger. When they marched down Columbia's Main Street with it in their midst, Clemson students confronted them, resulting for a brief time in "a scrimmage in which it is said knives and swords and knucks [sic] were used." No one was seriously hurt, but the transparency was badly damaged. Following the melee, the Carolina faithful returned to campus to produce another copy to use in the following day's Elks' parade. Clemson cadets were livid once more. Efforts by authorities on both sides failed to find a compromise. The cadets marched to the brick wall of the Horseshoe on Sumter Street ready to storm the Carolina campus and destroy the new copy. At the last moment, cooler heads prevailed when a three man committee of each side met and agreed to allow each side to get one half of the image and burn it before the other.¹⁷

While little blood was shed, in the wake of this incident, Carolina's board chose to ban the Clemson game for the next seven years. Three years later, Carolina ended intercollegiate competition for the 1906 season. Apparently the game's brutal nature and the student body's fanatical interest made the trustees decide that banning football was the best option for the school. USC's decision, however, did not influence either Clemson or the two Charleston institutions to follow the same course. As far as the College of Charleston and the Citadel were concerned, their budding rivalry was the biggest for either in the first decade of the twentieth century. Although the college began playing regular inter-collegiate football two years before the military school, the cadets did not take long to catch up to their city neighbors. After fierce opposition to student petitions requesting football, the commandant and his board

reluctantly granted permission in late 1904. Fears by the Citadel leaders that the game interfered with cadets' academic and military training had finally been overcome. The new Citadel team played mostly local teams, both colleges and high schools. In this first decade of play one opponent included the "Medicos," a team of medical students from the Medical College of South Carolina. But the main rival for the new Citadel varsity was the College of Charleston. And the biggest game in these early years probably was the 1910 contest between the two schools.¹⁸

In October the Citadel seemed poised for another win over its city rival, having a larger, more physical side compared to the smaller college squad. Furthermore, the cadets had not allowed their city rivals to score on them since 1907. Nevertheless, the bigger side was stymied all day, while the quicker, smaller "Maroons," found ways through and around the cadet defense. The culminating play of the game, sealing the upset, was devised in a huddle by Alex "Frau" Pregnall, the college's speedy quarterback. After the ball was centered, Pregnall hid behind his backfield, stuffed the ball under his jersey (a legal move at this time), and took off. While the rest of his backfield headed around one end of the line, the quarterback took off around the opposite end toward the Citadel goal line. Perplexed at first, the cadet defense only realized the ruse after Pregnall was well down the field. Although tackled just a few yards from a score after a sixty yard gallop, it took just one more play for him to take it over the goal line, sealing the victory 11-0.¹⁹

Such a triumph, the only one over the Citadel in the College of Charleston's brief football history, was followed after the game by one of the college's biggest celebrations in the early sporting history of Charleston. In the evening a large parade of student fans marched through several streets in the center of the city dressed in robes of white and banging two big drums while others made more noise with mouth organs and sundry other instruments. Along the way, they stopped to serenade businesses and undisclosed residences, including the *Charleston News and Courier* offices.²⁰

College of Charleston fan support, coupled with the near riot in Columbia eight years before, is indicative of how college football had evolved into more than a game on most campuses across the state. Winning, especially against bitter rivals, was more important than having just a sporting competition. The almost friendly atmosphere in the early contests between Furman and Wofford had changed. As the new century began, nasty encounters between rival fans and players on the field began to resemble some of the games in the Northeast. An alumnus of the South Carolina team of 1908 recalled a half century later that in his playing days a bonfire and loud cheering began on campus the night before the Carolina-Clemson contest. If the Gamecocks were victorious, the student body had a "shirt tail parade" into downtown Columbia. At the game itself, the sidelines were jammed

with zealous fans milling about, following the progress of the ball during each play. Shouts of all kinds, including advice to their teams and game officials, were punctuated by “waving streamers, sticks and derby hats.” A similar atmosphere surrounded Citadel games. Grandstands in these early years were few and often temporary; one paid thirty-five cents to sit, while the fans who stood on the sidelines paid ten cents less. These supporters often stepped onto the field of play forcing the game to be held up while officials shooed them off. Fights between rival fans made disruption of play even more frequent.²¹

The teams on the field gave no quarter to their opponent either. At Citadel games a former Bulldog, James Hammond of the class of 1907, recalled that “anything went and there were plenty of injuries.” Smaller players carrying the ball were nearly torn apart when their linemen pushed the ball carrier forward to gain yardage while the defensive team “dragged” him by the neck to hold him back. And verbal exchange between rival players could be just as abusive. This was especially the case when a player transferred from one school to another. One former Charleston native, who had played a season at the Citadel, recalled that when he changed sides the following season to join the rival Charleston Athletics, he was cursed at regularly during the game, but in Gullah.²²

Based on such rough, abusive behavior, it would seem, as one historian has argued, that in the early decades of college football women were excluded from the sidelines or kept segregated from boisterous male fans. Granted, few South Carolina colleges in the early-twentieth century allowed women students. Those that did (South Carolina was one) had just a small cohort of co-eds, usually little more than 10 per cent. Some all male campuses, such as Furman, had a separate female campus. Young ladies who attended Furman games usually had a male escort. Usually, unescorted women who attended came in carriages and watched the game from them, somewhat protected from potentially rowdy fans, though not always. In Greenville at the November 1893 Furman game, Wofford had a contingent of female fans who came from Converse, Spartanburg’s college for women. Here they seemed not to be segregated from the rest of the fans. With nearly one thousand in the temporary stands, the crowd included “an array of feminine beauty that could only be produced in the genial clime of the fair South-land.”²³ At other Wofford games, it seemed that female fans were more protected. The young women stood in the “neighboring piazzas” waving Wofford’s black and gold covers. At the most male-oriented college in the state, the Citadel, several “female sponsors” attended the home games to encourage the team and its cadets before and during each game. Young women from the all-female Chicora College in Columbia came to Carolina games escorted by male students. After a big victory over a rival in 1910, Carolina students made a procession to Chicora to proclaim their triumph to the girls on campus.²⁴

Whether the growing excitement generated by the games at Carolina, Clemson, and Charleston had an impact or not, by 1913 the decade-long moratorium imposed by presidents at Furman and Wofford was wavering. Students of both schools had never liked the prohibition, and each year they had attempted, but failed, to have football reinstated. Then, at the end of 1912, Furman's student body overwhelmingly voted that a three-student delegation plead its case to the Furman board meeting in Abbeville that December. Although what the argument was that persuaded the board to suspend its ban is unrecorded, the campus had a huge celebration when its representatives telegraphed the student body back in Greenville afterwards announcing the reinstatement.

Perhaps the board had not needed too much persuasion. Seven years later, on the eve of another football season, one Furman student proclaimed that the football team had a new and significant "drawing card" with a new stadium, which would help increase Furman's student body to five hundred. The new stadium was now more than just a way to increase school spirit. It also promoted the school beyond the confines of Greenville and helped with new student recruitment. It is difficult to know if the latter rationale helped change the minds of other college administrations about allowing football, but all had student bodies that wanted the game allowed on their campuses. Wofford reintroduced the game a year after its Greenville rival. Newberry College officially introduced inter-collegiate football the same year that Furman reinstated it. Erskine College, a Presbyterian institution in Abbeville County, began its first team in 1915. In each case the student body had lobbied for several years to either reinstate the game or allow it on campus for the first time. Presbyterian College in Clinton, South Carolina, began play in 1913 after the faculty committee accepted a student petition with ninety signatures asking that football be permitted. Perhaps because of student lobbying, college administrations began to realize that football at their campuses would help bring the new students that everyone eagerly wanted.²⁵

Just as football began its renaissance on upstate campuses, the nation found itself becoming entangled in the international crisis of World War I. Until the United States declared war on Imperial Germany and its allies in April, 1917, college football remained unaffected. Even in the fall season of 1917, college teams in the state seemed to carry on as they had in peace time. The only difference was that on most schedules, one or two military teams were included. Along with Guilford (in North Carolina) and Presbyterian, Wofford also played the First New York Ambulance football team. The military team was part of the 27th Division that came to train at the newly established Camp Wadsworth located on the western outskirts of Spartanburg. The army team was defeated by the college boys 21–10. In Columbia, where Camp Jackson was

established about the same time, USC used former players, then training at the camp, to serve as officials for its first game of the season against Newberry.²⁶

The new army installations that were forming in South Carolina (and across the nation) in the summer and fall of 1917 provided much more than just football officials and new opposition on the field. Because the new army recruits included former college players, most units formed teams that had intra-squad games on base. Most military camps also formed all-star teams that competed against other military bases. While their schedules were usually just a few games in the fall, they provided great interest both on and off base. When Camp Jackson's team prepared to play Camp Gordon of Atlanta, Georgia, in November, local coverage of the game was extensive. *The State* noted that both squads consisted of many stars from South Carolina colleges, including Clemson and USC. The game was played at Melton field, the home field for USC, ending in a 10–0 victory for Camp Jackson.²⁷

A year later army authorities initially discouraged football on those campuses that had Student Army Training Corps units. Since most colleges in South Carolina had their male students enrolled, it appeared that little, if any, football would be played for the 1918 season. But the army's stand on football changed within a month. In early October it was announced in a Columbia newspaper that football would be permitted although travel and schedules would be curtailed. But more than the war situation seemed to curtail football, at least during the month of October. In this period the influenza pandemic had its greatest impact throughout the state and the nation, closing most public activities from church services to cinemas. It also had impact on football games. USC played just four games that year, while Wofford and the Citadel had only three, all in November or December. Military teams such as Camp Jackson and the Charleston Navy Yards Training Service teams continued play but with longer schedules.²⁸

Once the Armistice ending the Great War was signed in November 1918, football on South Carolina's college campuses expanded with longer seasons and improved facilities. The only exception was the College of Charleston. With its student body of barely one hundred and a miniscule budget, 1913 was its last season on the grid-iron. During the college's final two seasons, its teams earned just one victory in ten games, ending its last season with embarrassing defeats to its Citadel rivals, 72–0, and Newberry, 39–0.²⁹

The rest of the state's schools played on with improved student and financial support and a formal league association. By 1914 the South Carolina Intercollegiate Athletic Association had most state schools under its umbrella with a written code of ethics and sportsmanship agreed upon by all members. Although not all schools obeyed the code, it was apparent that intercollegiate athletics, especially football,

had become more than just an occasional sport for nearly all the state's campuses. By the early 1920s, the state's two largest schools left the state conference to join a new Southern Intercollegiate Conference. In 1921 Clemson became one of the first members with several other Southern schools, including Alabama, Georgia, and North Carolina, forming a fourteen team conference known today as the Southern Conference. The following year South Carolina joined with four other institutions. This association regulated team behavior on and off the field with regard to recruiting and conference championships. Although the decade's perennial power, Furman, did not join the Southern Conference until the 1930s, it seemed satisfied with its dominance within the state football ranks until then.³⁰

In 1919 Furman began a run of titles that surpassed all the other state colleges through the twenties. Any qualms by the Furman administration about football had disappeared. A new ten-thousand-seat Manly Stadium was inaugurated for the new season. This facility, with better players and a young, successful coach, Billy Laval, led to the Baptist-affiliated school's dominance of the state college ranks with six state titles through 1927. By the 1922 season, Furman Professor W.H. Coleman proudly wrote that students and faculty were united in their support of the football team in its mounting success, "The strong, clean teams that have represented Furman on diamond and gridiron . . . have added new brilliance to the name and fame of Furman." The Greenville college's strong football team gave the institution greater name recognition, which many students and faculty thought attracted not only better athletes but more new students in general.³¹

None of the other state schools could claim such a record, but all tried to build winning programs through hiring better coaches and recruiting top players. Clemson and USC built on their rivalry, and though neither consistently challenged Furman in the decade after World War I, they never stopped trying. After the 1927 season, Carolina went to the extreme of luring Furman's Laval to Columbia. Although after his second season the new coach accused Carolina's student body of lacking sufficient spirit and commitment to the football team, there was still quite a bit of campus support, including the "Cheerios," a student cheering section numbering 275. Even with a loss to Clemson in 1929, the annual rivalry between the two state schools drew 14,000 fans. Indifferent records on the field could not dampen significant interest in the Gamecocks despite Laval's criticism.³²

Within the segregated college varsity programs of the state, the competition to win had become just as strong even if it did not get the same coverage as its white college counterparts. By the mid- to late-1920s, African American journalists began to scrutinize several black college athletic programs, including Claflin and South Carolina State. Noted civil rights leader, scholar, and editor of the NACCP magazine, *The Crisis*, W.E.B. DuBois,

severely criticized several black college athletic programs for recruiting abuses in which players had regular roster spots even though their academic records were poor to non-existent.³³ A DuBois assistant, George Streater, wrote in 1932 that for several years South Carolina State, Claflin, and Allen had admitted athletes without reviewing their transcripts. In particular he claimed that South Carolina State had placed athletes on its football team who had played for the “last eight years” on teams in the region. He did not enumerate at what level, but he seemed to suggest they had played on other college teams.³⁴

Problems with illegal recruiting had become big issues in white schools across the nation by the 1920s. USC had already become embroiled in illegal recruiting prior to World War I. After the 1914 season, with only two victories over its archrival Clemson since their first game in 1896, Carolina alumni and local Columbia supporters decided to bring in players with better football credentials. By the middle of the 1915 season, its surprising wins over state and out-of-state competition drew the suspicion of Clemson officials and investigators from around the state. Even Carolina faculty expressed suspicions. As one professor wrote to USC President Currell, “We’re importing ‘ringers’ from Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and heaven only knows where else.”³⁵ Before the Clemson game in late October, several Carolina players were barred from playing because of eligibility questions. That match ended in a 0–0 tie, but the issue continued to affect the rest of the season, with Davidson cancelling its game with Carolina outright after further evidence proved the original suspicions to be accurate. With Carolina’s student honor system severely compromised, the president had to act. Currell dismissed two players for falsifying their records, and two others left on their own accord to avoid further publicity. In addition the Gamecocks had to forfeit three of their early wins of the 1915 season. While the school regained some of its respect in the academic community, the next year it suffered another dismal season.³⁶

By the end of the First World War, colleges across the state had decided that competitive football teams were important for their campuses. So even as Clemson and South Carolina had 5–5 records against each other during the decade and only moderate success against other competition within and beyond the Palmetto State, any reservations about varsity football were forgotten. Other schools in the Palmetto State, from Erskine and Wofford to the Citadel, had modest football records but it did not discourage varsity play. Erskine had only two winning seasons after 1921. Likewise, Wofford had few wins to boast about during the decade, losing all six games against its Furman rival. While there is still more research required to delineate the social and economic impact of football on South Carolina college campuses, this paper has tried to demonstrate that college football had become a mainstay by the twenties. Although the money and influence it has on today’s campuses is considerably greater, football’s

social and economic value was already accepted and promoted by students and most of South Carolina's college faculties and administrations by 1930.³⁷

NOTES

1. Undated news clipping, Furman football folder, (probably January 1891 based on *Furman Football Media Guide, 2008*, 199), Special Collections and Archives, Furman University Library, Greenville, SC. The author has not found a rule book or clear description of how these first games were played in South Carolina. For the best idea of how football was played in the early years, see *Wofford College Journal*, January 1891, 20–22, Wofford College Archives, Spartanburg, SC.
2. *Wofford College Journal*, January 1891, 20–22
3. For analysis of the origins of football in the US and its early history and controversy in the 1880s through the 1900s see John S. Watterson, *College Football: History, Spectacle, Controversy*, (London: John Hopkins University Press, 2000), 23–24, 28, 78, 171–72; John H. Moore, “Football’s Ugly Decades, 1893–1913,” in Steven A. Reiss, *The American Sporting Experience*, (West Point, NY: Leisure Press, 1994), 168, 171–72. For some early rules of football and their evolution see David M. Nelson, *The Anatomy of the Game* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware, 1991), 436–38.
4. Undated news clipping [1891], Furman football folder. *Wofford College Journal*, January 1891.
5. Carolyn B. Matalene and Katherine C. Reynolds, ed., *Carolina Voices: Two Hundred Years of Student Experiences* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001), 97.
6. For early intermural football at Carolina, *Garnet and Black*, 1912; for Newberry College see Gordon C. Henry, ed., *God Bless Newberry College: Memories of Newberry College’s Yesterday and Today* (Newberry College, Newberry, SC, 2006), 170; for Wofford College see junior class team photo, 1904, Wofford College Archives, Spartanburg, SC.
7. John Heisman published resume, Clemson, 1900, Football folder, Special Collections, Clemson University Libraries, Clemson, S.C. *John Heisman: Principles of Football* (University of Georgia Press: Athens, 2000), originally published 1922. For Wofford see *Wofford College Journal*, (December 1889), 21 and for South Carolina see *Garnet and Black*, 1901, University of South Carolina Library, Columbia, SC.
8. Undated newspaper clipping, [1891], Furman football file,” Furman. *The Wofford Journal*, (January 1891), 19, Wofford College Archives.
9. For Georgia and North Carolina see John F. Stegeman, *The Ghost of Herty Field*, (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1977), 2–3, 10, 27.
10. Claflin team photo, dated 1899, is in possession of John Daye, Irmo, SC, but nothing further has been found to date about the team. For early SC State College football records, *A Century of Football SC State University, 2007 Bulldog Media Guide*, 70; *South Carolina State College Athletic Reunion, April 5–8, 1990*. This pamphlet provides more details about its early football history, including conflicting information on the college’s first opponent in 1907. According to this they defeated Georgia State. South Carolina State University Library Archives, Orangeburg, SC. The author thanks his colleague, Elaine Nichols, for locating this resource.
11. Schedule for College of Charleston, 1903–1912, compiled by John Daye, Irmo, SC, copy provided the author.

-
12. The schedules for both schools are based on *Furman 2008 (Football) Media Guide*, 166–67.
 13. Edited versions of the letters from Wofford and Furman, as well as Presbyterian and Erskine, were solicited by Newberry College Board Chair George Cromer in 1911 when that school began contemplating the introduction of varsity football, see Henry, *God Bless Newberry College*, 169
 14. David D. Wallace, *History of Wofford College, 1854–1949* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1951), 109.
 15. Alfred S. Reid, *Furman University: Toward a New Identity, 1925–1975* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1976), 22; Robert N. Daniel, *Furman: A History* (Greenville: Furman University, 1951), 107, 110.
 16. For the *State* articles from the Northeast see 6, 20 December 1905, I wish to thank Ann Watts, Columbia, SC for locating these two articles.
 17. For the growing importance of football on campus see James H. Hammond narrative on early football at Citadel and Carolina. Class of 1907, in a letter dated 4 August 1961, Hammond Papers, Manuscripts Room, South Caroliniana Library, USC, Columbia, SC (SCL hereafter). The author thanks Ann Watts of Columbia, SC, for locating this fascinating account. For an account of the 1902 near riot see Matalene and Reynolds, *Carolina Voices*, 100–102.
 18. For the beginning of Citadel football see Hammond narrative, 1961, SCL; for the College of Charleston see Katherine Chaddock and Carolyn Matalene (ed.) *College of Charleston Voices: Campus and Community through the Centuries* (Charleston: The History Press, 2006), 95–96.
 19. Chaddock and Matalene, *College of Charleston Voices*, 95-96. The author is indebted to William Pregnall, Irvington, Va., for sharing his memories of his father's athletic career and a copy of his unpublished manuscript about his father that included several copies of news articles, including a description of the 1910 game dated 23 October 1910.
 20. Chaddock and Matalene, *College of Charleston Voices*, 96.
 21. James Hammond narrative, Class of 1907, SCL; this account seems to have confused the dates since Carolina did not play Clemson during the years 1903 to 1908, although he refers to the game as taking place in 1908. Since Hammond was recalling events more than a half a century later, he probably meant to say 1909 when the rivalry resumed.
 22. *Ibid.*
 23. *Wofford College Journal*, December 1893, 118.
 24. *Wofford College Journal*, April 1893; James Hammond narrative, Class of 1907, SCL.
 25. *Bonhomie* (Furman annual) 1913, Special Collections, Furman; Henry, *God Bless Newberry College*, 176; Lowry Ware, *A Place called Due West*, n.d., thanks to Richard Haldeman of Due West for providing this information and notes to the author. For the Presbyterian College student petition and faculty agreement to allow football, see Faculty Committee Minutes (29 May 1913, 72), Special Collections, Presbyterian College Library, Clinton, SC.
 26. *The State*, 1, 5, 14 October 1917.
 27. *The State*, 1, 10 November 1917; thanks to John Daye, Irmo, SC, for providing further details about military teams during World War I. He will detail this and more in a forthcoming book scheduled for release in summer 2010, *Armed Services Football: A History of Service Teams in Wartime and Peace*.
-

28. For Army's changes in football for colleges in 1918, see *The State*, 13 September, 4 October 1918. Thanks to Kate Jernigan, USC student volunteer intern, for locating this information. On the impact of the influenza on the state and nation see Fritz Hamer, ed. *Forward Together: South Carolinians in the Great War* (Charleston: The History Press), 44–48. For reduced schedules for these teams see John C. Griffin, *The First Hundred Years: A History of South Carolina Football* (Atlanta: Longstreet Press, 1992), 157; also http://athletics.wofford.edu/sports/2008/7/16/FB_0716083941.aspx?path=football, accessed May 16, 2009; *Citadel Bulldogs [Football] Media Guide, 2009*, 131.

29. Chaddock and Matalene, *College of Charleston Voices*, 95; the College of Charleston football record came from South Carolina colleges football records file (compiled by Rich Topp, Chicago, IL.) shown at the SC State Museum exhibition, "Mud, Sweat, and Cheers: A History of Palmetto State football," 1 August 2008–8 February 2009; on funding problems at this time see Walter Fraser, Jr., *Charleston! Charleston!* (University of South Carolina Press: Columbia, 1991), 350. Note that although published sources claim all football ended at the College after 1913, it appeared that at least one more game was played after the war against Erskine, see *The State*, 14 October 1921. The author is indebted to John Daye, Irmo, SC, for providing this source.

30. For an early reference to the state association see "Presbyterian College Faculty Minutes," (1913), (1914), Special Collection, Presbyterian College Library; for the 1920s see *Furman Football Program, 1928*, Special Collections, Furman Library. For the history of the Southern Conference see its web site, http://www.soconsorts.com/ViewArticle.dbml?DB_OEM_ID=4000&KEY=&ATCLID=177772. Accessed December 1, 2009. Other members of the original conference were Auburn, Georgia Tech, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi State, North Carolina State, Tennessee, Virginia, Virginia Tech, and Washington & Lee.

31. *Official Furman Football Program, 1922*, Special Collection, Furman.

32. *Garnet and Black, 1929*. Carolina lost seven and won just three games over Furman from 1919 to 1930. Clemson's record during the same period was little better at six losses, three wins and one tie, *Furman 2008 Football Media Guide*, 199. For fan attendance see *New York Times*, 25 October 1929; the author thanks Debra Bloom, Librarian, Richland County Library, Columbia, SC, for locating this article.

33. Patrick B. Miller (ed.), *The Sporting World of the Modern South* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 137–38.

34. *Ibid.*, 138–39.

35. Miller, *Sporting World in South*, 139. Daniel Hollis (*University of South Carolina: College to University* (University of South Carolina Press: Columbia, 1956), 282–84.

36. Hollis, *University of South Carolina*, 284.

37. The records of the schools in the 1920s are based on data compiled in *Furman 2008 Media Guide*, 167-168; Ware, *A Place called Due West*, n.d., "Erskine College football results, 1915–1951," thanks Richard Haldeman, Due West, SC, for supplying a copy of this to the author.

Beaufort and Louvain: Public Reaction to Library Destruction during the American Civil War and the World Wars

Roger K. Hux

Introduction

In 1979, Patrick C. Smith, the former state auditor of South Carolina, donated to the James A. Rogers Library at Francis Marion College (now University) a concordance to the Bible, written in Latin and published in Basel, Switzerland, in 1531. Bound in sheepskin with teakwood boards, the book is the oldest in the collection.¹ Inside the book is an acid-free envelope with news clippings relating some of its unusual history. The first clipping names Mrs. Faye Smith, Patrick Smith's aunt, as the prior owner of the book, and reveals further that she purchased it in a Canadian antique shop several years before. The article also states that the book had probably been housed in a "European museum that was destroyed between 1914–1918."

The second clipping, from the *Baltimore American*, tells of a research trip to the Library of Congress by a librarian who wanted to find out something about a "very unusual book owned by Mrs. Faye Smith, a concordance written in Latin and printed in 1531." The Library of Congress staff examined the book and said that it was rare and an edition that their library did not own.²

The third clipping, dated 21 May—presumably 1940—gave an account of conditions in Louvain (or Leuven), Belgium³, after German forces took control of the city following four days of fighting earlier that month. Most of the city's population of 41,000 had fled, and many of the buildings had been destroyed by fire, including the library of the University of Louvain, whose collection of 700,000 volumes was a total loss. The author recalled that the destroyed library was, in fact, the second university library, the first having also been destroyed by fire during World War I and replaced by "the beautiful library which America rebuilt." Mrs. Smith had apparently purchased the concordance in the belief that it was a survivor of one or both of the destructions of Louvain.⁴

Seventy-nine years before 1940 and approximately forty-two hundred miles away from Louvain, another library in South Carolina faced the wartime threat of an invading army. The collection of the Beaufort Library Society, housed on the second floor of Beaufort College, made an inviting target for Union forces as they swarmed over the town in 1861. The local population had likewise fled this invasion, which had come from an offshore fleet. Though it did not face immediate destruction, the

library collection's fate was unsettled while the conquerors argued over whether or not to sell it. Four years later, these books were also destroyed in an accidental fire where they had come to rest, namely, in the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C.⁵

The history of libraries has lagged behind the history of the book, which has expanded from studies of the physical artifact to research on the significance of the book in human history. In recent years, however, library history has come alive, and recent studies have focused on the topic of library loss, in particular as a result of wartime devastation. Library historians have studied such cases throughout history, from the ancient library of Alexandria, Egypt, to the libraries of modern Baghdad, Iraq, and have found that libraries under attack, whether as victims or legitimate targets, represent not just storehouses of information, but also the very symbols of the cultures and civilizations they seek to document and preserve. Historians have also found that both perpetrators and victims use different versions of the story of attack or conquest to further their respective aims, and thus these accounts often descend into a form of political propaganda. Finally, in an atmosphere where the war seems to continue after the physical fighting has stopped, the consequences of library destruction sometimes take considerable time to unfold.⁶ This paper will examine the two cases of wartime destruction of libraries in Beaufort and Louvain to see how they are alike and differ. This modest contribution to the study of wartime library destruction should help to show how libraries influence not just the history of books and reading, but social and political history as well.

Louvain / Leuven

The original university of this city, now actually two separate institutions (the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven and the Université catholique de Louvain), gained a papal foundation charter in 1425. Drawing students from what is now Germany, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands, the university established itself during the medieval and early modern periods in a city that became a center of culture, a headquarters for the book trade, and a home for scholars like Erasmus. The library, built in 1730, housed seventy thousand volumes by 1914, including 300 manuscripts and 350 incunabula.⁷

German forces entered Louvain in August 1914 during the first month of the Great War. The Belgian army offered no resistance, but local civilians armed with weapons apparently fired on German troops, and the Germans retaliated by indiscriminate shooting and by burning much of the town, including the university library. German reports of the episode said that their forces had acted in self-defense, but Allied accounts maintained that the destruction was not justified. British

newspapers trumpeted the headline “March of the Hun.” Noted historian Barbara Tuchman later observed that the Germans fired the town “as a deterrent and warning to all enemies.” It was “a gesture of German might.”⁸ The German war policy called for the army to attack not just enemy soldiers, but “to destroy the total material and intellectual resources of the enemy.”⁹

The destruction of the Louvain University Library brought a worldwide reaction. Monsignor Jules De Becker, long-serving (1898–1931) rector of the American College (a Catholic seminary of the university), could not subsequently mention the library without breaking into tears. After the war various American groups, including not only the Carnegie Endowment and Herbert Hoover’s Commission for Relief in Belgium, but also many college students, alumni, and schoolchildren, raised money to rebuild and restock it. The Japanese Minister to Belgium offered classics of Japanese literature and collected fourteen thousand volumes, but unfortunately they, too, prior to shipment, were burned in an earthquake in Japan in 1923. The Treaty of Versailles also required Germany to replace many of the valuable books and manuscripts, which it did.¹⁰

An American architect, Whitney Warren, was engaged to design a new building. Cardinal Désiré-Joseph Mercier, archbishop of Mechelen, suggested that a Latin motto be placed over the entrance that, translated into English, would read “Destroyed by German Fury, Rebuilt by American Generosity.” The suggestion divided the city of Louvain. Monsignor Paulin Ladeuze, who had been rector of the university in August 1914 and had been taken prisoner by the Germans, opposed the inscription and ordered the blocks on which it was carved removed. Students who supported the inscription rioted when it was taken down. The Belgian press was evenly divided, but not so the foreign journals. “Shall we continue to build monuments to hate ten years after the world war?” asked the *Literary Digest* in 1928. Plans also called for a tower to house busts of war heroes and Cardinal Mercier and a carillon that would play the national anthems of Allied countries. But the sculptures and bells were never installed. Only the tower in which they were to be placed was built.¹¹

German forces came once again to Louvain in May 1940 as part of Hitler’s blitzkrieg, and the library burned for the second time. British forces had been stationed in the city, and afterwards the Germans blamed the retreating British for the destruction. German Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels, while inspecting the library after the attack, called the damage “a British war crime.” Eyewitnesses reported, however, that German artillery officers had asked before the attack which structure was the library’s tower. The proceedings of the post-war Nuremberg Military Tribunals concluded that the library had been a deliberate target. A 1985 history of

the library published by the university, however, admitted that the nature of the 1940 destruction was “still a matter for discussion.”¹²

The events of World War I and the inter-war years led many to conclude that Germany represented not just a threat to people, but an enemy of culture and civilization. According to Tuchman, the attack in 1914 convinced many people that Germany was “barbarian” and had to be defeated.¹³ Government and civilian reports called the attack on the university’s library “a revolt against culture.”¹⁴ Nazi book burning in Berlin in 1933 only added to the feeling that German actions were a “crime against humanity.”¹⁵

During World War II, the destruction of Louvain inspired American forces to launch special efforts to save treasures at other cultural institutions in Europe and Asia. General Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, issued a directive in 1943 asking his forces to make every effort to protect cultural treasures, including books. He called these items “a source of American civilization.”¹⁶ American librarians joined the cause, especially Librarian of Congress Archibald MacLeish, who called book burning evidence of the “essential nature of fascism.” MacLeish also encouraged librarians to “declare war on fascism” while he attacked other writers for failing to respond, “calling their inaction a moral rather than artistic failing.”¹⁷

Beaufort

Founded in 1802, the Beaufort Library Society was the third such institution established in South Carolina, following similar organizations in Charleston and Georgetown. Its founders included Robert Barnwell, a former U.S. congressman; Steven Elliott, a state senator; and Robert Screven, a state legislator. The collection, which included 3100 volumes by 1861, was carefully chosen by society members on collecting trips to Europe. General Isaac Stevens, the Union commander at Beaufort after its conquest, planned to save the books for the citizens of Beaufort, but William Reynolds, an agent of the Treasury Department, ordered him to ship the books to Hiram Barney, customs collector for the port of New York, for sale at a public auction in 1862. However, Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase stopped the sale, declaring “we do not war on libraries.” In 1863, Secretary of War Edwin Stanton had the books shipped to the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C.¹⁸

Members of the Northern press all saw the Beaufort Library collection as a symbol, but their ideas differed regarding what it signified. While it resided in the warehouses of the New York customs collector, it became a potential source of shame for the North, at least in the eyes of some journalists, who spoke against the potential auction. *The New York Times*, for instance, warned of the consequences:

Those who malign us will not be slow to cite it as proof of the barbarism which they absurdly say is rolling over us . . . that we, above all who have sneered at the Southern States for their poverty in literature, and in schools, in libraries, should seize by force of arms and sell at auction one of the few public libraries which had existence there.¹⁹

By contrast, Samuel W. Benjamin wrote for *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* that the Beaufort library collection symbolized rebellion and human bondage. It was "gathered by the unpaid wages of slaves," he wrote. "Scatter its volumes and sweep it into oblivion. Then start over when the state is free."²⁰

While the Beaufort books remained in Washington, other library destruction occurred in the South, some of it blamed on General William T. Sherman. South Carolina author Paul Hamilton Hayne, writing after the war (2 January 1871) to Lyman Draper, secretary of the Wisconsin Historical Society, maintained that William Gilmore Simms's library had been burned under a "special order of your General Tecumseh Sherman." Draper was looking for manuscripts to help him write a biography of Revolutionary General Thomas Sumter. "If you find any of the officers who accompanied Sherman on his grand march to the sea," wrote Hayne, "it is just possible that what you want may be procured from them. The soldier of fortune would be an ass indeed to leave them behind."²¹

The 1863 *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution* noted that the Beaufort Library collection had been received and would be placed in an "apartment in the south tower above the Regents' room." A year later the editor of *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* reported that the library was still intact.²² On 28 January 1865, however, a temporary stove caught the roof of the Smithsonian on fire and destroyed several collections, including that of the Beaufort Library.²³

Initial efforts to compensate Beaufort for its library began during Reconstruction and continued into the post-Reconstruction era. In 1869, South Carolina Senator Frederick Sawyer, a Republican and Massachusetts native, presented a petition from Beaufort citizens asking for funds to pay for the library collection "burned in the Smithsonian Institution building." The following year the U.S. Senate denied the request. Robert Smalls, the African-American congressman from Beaufort, unsuccessfully sought restoration of the library in 1886, the last year of his term. Four similar bills were introduced in Congress in the 1890s, but none passed.²⁴ In 1902, the Clover Club Literary Society, a group of white women, founded a new library in Beaufort that would become the Beaufort Township Library. When their campaign to obtain restitution for the lost books resumed in 1939, this library would be the eventual recipient of federal support.²⁵

The problem Beaufort had in obtaining restitution grew out of the fact that the federal government would not provide assistance to persons and institutions deemed part of the rebellion. For example, Centre College (Danville, Kentucky) lost half of its library books during the battle of Perryville and its aftermath in 1862–63. However, since the college was located in an area with numerous Confederate sympathizers, the federal government refused to grant more than four hundred dollars to pay for rent of college premises occupied by the Union army.²⁶

Beaufort was eventually successful in getting compensation, but it took eleven years to accomplish. First, William Elliott, Jr., publisher of *The State* (Columbia, SC), wrote an editorial in August 1939 entitled “They’re Beaufort’s Books.” He called for the federal government to return the books, which Elliott still believed to be stored in the Library of Congress. After the Library of Congress verified the destruction of the books to U.S. Senator James Byrnes, Byrnes sponsored a bill similar to one presented in 1893 calling for a gift of duplicate books from the Library of Congress equal in value to those in the lost Beaufort collection. Using the projected auction catalogue from 1862, the Library of Congress assigned a value of forty-three hundred dollars to the books. But Mabel Runnette, Beaufort librarian, could find only two hundred-seventy-five dollars worth of books at the Library of Congress that she thought Beaufort could use. Nothing further was done until 1950, when U.S. Senator Burnet Maybank, with encouragement from the State Library Board, was able to get a congressional bill passed that called for the sale of duplicate books providing four thousand twenty-five dollars, the difference between the assigned value and what Miss Runnette had chosen. Eventually the Beaufort Library received six thousand dollars that were subsequently earmarked not for books, but for an expansion of their building.²⁷

Conclusion

The stories of the Louvain and Beaufort libraries are different in many ways, yet there are also some similarities. The destruction of the Louvain University Library drew worldwide attention, while the capture and transfer of the Beaufort Library drew very little notice. In fact, the destruction of Beaufort Library’s books in the Smithsonian fire of 1865 was not even known to William Elliott Jr., a prominent South Carolina newspaperman, in 1939. Louvain became in 1914 and 1940 the symbol of German brutality and a rallying point for those who considered the Germans a threat to European civilization and culture. In the eyes of some Northern journalists, Beaufort provided for a brief time a warning of what the Union army might become if it carried out the sale of the books captured there. For others, Beaufort’s books represented the profits of exploitation by a slave-owning rebellious South that needed to be defeated. The Germans in both wars blamed others for the destruction at Louvain, and the

Allies also engaged in hostile propaganda. During the 1920s, some of the victors even planned a second library building with an anti-German inscription on its façade. The rhetoric regarding the loss of Beaufort's books largely lacked the vitriol associated with Louvain, but Congress passed up several opportunities to compensate Beaufort for a loss that, although clearly the unintended fault of the U.S. government, could also be considered collateral damage in a war of rebellion. In some ways the policy of the federal government in refusing to compensate the library represented a continuation of the war. Treasury Secretary Chase deserves credit for his actions in the Beaufort case because the transfer of the collection to the Smithsonian placed it in a special category that eventually helped to gain it compensation. The restoration of both libraries dragged on for many years, but they survived and received some compensation for their destruction.²⁸ Both were compensated in the twentieth century, when the destruction of two world wars inspired a strengthened linkage of library preservation with human rights. In that sense they are exceptions when compared to many other book depositories that have suffered a similar fate.²⁹

NOTES

1. *Concordantiae Maiores Sacrae Bibliæ Summis Vigiliis Iam Denuo Ultra Omnes Aeditiones & Castigatae & Locupletatae: Additio Insuper Dictionem Elencho* (Basileae, 1531). While Mrs. Smith's presumed inference is certainly plausible, as yet it has not been corroborated.

2. Clippings found in envelope placed within the book mentioned in prior note: "Owns Oldest Book?," newspaper unknown, date unknown, page unknown; Untitled article, *Baltimore American*, date unknown, page unknown. The librarian was a certain "Miss Welsh," who was perhaps investigating the book on Faye Smith's behalf.

3. Linguistic politics are particularly contentious in contemporary Belgium for speakers of that nation's two main official languages, Dutch/Flemish and French. Louvain/Leuven lies near the current government-sanctioned linguistic fault line, a circumstance that led in 1968 to splitting the university into two separate institutions. The author is neutral in this matter, and in this study will use the French form of the city's name only because it has hitherto been more prevalent among Anglophones and because the French character of the university was stronger during the first half of the twentieth century.

4. Frederick C. Ochsner, "Louvain's Historic Library with 700,000 Books Sacrificed to War," newspaper unknown, date unknown, page unknown; clipping found in envelope placed within the book mentioned in n. 1 above.

5. Roberta V. H. Copp, "South Carolina's Library Societies, 1800–1900: the Foundation of South Carolina's Public Library System," *South Carolina Librarian* 30 (1986), 21.

6. James Raven, "Introduction: The Resonances of Loss," in James Raven, ed., *Lost Libraries: The Destruction of Great Book Collections Since Antiquity* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 1–40.

7. Matthew Battles, "Knowledge on Fire," *American Scholar* 72, no. 3 (2003), 35–36.

-
8. Barbara Tuchman, *The Guns of August* (New York: Macmillan, 1962), 319, 321.
 9. Tuchman, *The Guns of August*, 321.
 10. Kathy Peiss, "Cultural Policy in a Time of War: the American Response to Endangered Books in World War II," *Library Trends* 55 (2007), 373; Raven, "Introduction," 22; "The Germans Restore the Louvain Library," *Nation* 116 (1923), 227.
 11. Battles, "Knowledge," 37–38; "The Word War on the Louvain Front," *Literary Digest* 98 (14 July 1928), 11. The proposed inscription read *Furore Teutonico Diruta; Dono Americano Restituta*. See "Belgium: At Louvain," *Time*, 9 July 1928, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,723467,00.html> [accessed 16 June 2009].
 12. *Leuven University Library, 1425–1985* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), 221; Battles, "Knowledge," 38–39.
 13. Tuchman, *Guns of August*, 321.
 14. Matthew Fishburn, "Books Are Weapons: Wartime Responses to the Nazi Bookfires of 1933," *Book History* 10 (2007), 227–28.
 15. Peiss, "Cultural Policy," 373.
 16. *Ibid.*, 371.
 17. *Ibid.*, 376; Fishburn, "Books Are Weapons," 233.
 18. Lawrence S. Rowland, Alexander Moore, and George C. Rogers, Jr., *The History of Beaufort County, South Carolina, 1514–1861* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 1:287; Alexia Jones Helsley, *Beaufort A History* (Charleston: A Press, 2005), 117–18; Copp, "South Carolina's Library Societies," 21.
 19. *New York Times*, 14 November 1862, 5.
 20. S[amuel] W. Benjamin, "Libraries," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* 29 (September 1864), 485–86.
 21. William B. Hesseltine and Larry Gara, "Sherman Burns the Libraries," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 55 (1954), 137–42.
 22. *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution*, U. S. Senate, 3d Session (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1863); *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* 29 (November 1864), 813.
 23. *In the Senate of the United States, Report*, 38th Congress, 2d Session, Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, Report No. 129, 23 February 1865.
 24. "Senate Journal—Monday, December 20, 1869, Page 57," *A Century of Lawmaking for a New Nation: U.S. Congressional Documents and Debates, 1774–1875* [database on-line], <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/amlaw/lawhome.html>, under search terms: Beaufort Library [accessed 11 July 2009]; Benjamin Perley Poore, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Publications of the United States, September 5, 1774–March 4, 1881* (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1885; Johnson Reprint, 1970); Okon Edet Uya, *From Slavery to Public Service: Robert Smalls, 1839–1915* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 123; Kopp, "South Carolina's Library Societies," 21.
 25. Estellene P. Walker, comp. and ed., *So Good and Necessary a Work: The Public Library in South Carolina 1698–1980* (Columbia: South Carolina State Library Board, 1981), 13.
-

26. Stuart W. Sanders, "The Cost of War: Centre College and the Battle of Perryville," Centre College, <http://www.centre.edu/web/library/sc/special/Perryville/index.htm> [accessed 16 June 2009].

27. The following three items are in the James F. Byrnes Papers, Senatorial Series, "Legislation: Beaufort Library, 1939–1940," Clemson University, Mss 90, Series 2, Box 48, Folder 5: "They're Beaufort's Books," *The State*, 7 August 1939; William Elliott to James Byrnes, 2 November 1939; Memorandum, David C. Mearns "To the Acting Librarian," 18 August 1939. See also Helsley, "Beaufort A History," 182; Dudley Cooper and Spencer Murphy, "Unique Restoration," *State Magazine*, 20 March 1955. Apparently no one at the time appreciated the irony that federal compensation for confiscated and subsequently burned books—artifacts supposedly emblematic of culture—actually funded construction expenses instead.

28. The second Louvain destruction did not resonate as had the first, because most of the books burned in 1940 were replacements for the earlier collection. The American Book Center and private donors provided substantial help, and the Germans subsequently released reparation payments already deposited in Belgium that they had held up during World War II. See Dirk Aerts and Chris Coppens, *Leuven in Books, Books in Leuven* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 152–53, 181–84.

29. Peiss, "Cultural Policy," 382.

“A Little Learning is a Dangerous Thing”: Attitudes Toward Popular Literacy in Sixteenth-Century England

Carol A. Loar

In 1582, the wardens of the Stationers' Company appealed to the Privy Council for help in resolving a potentially explosive dispute. John Wolfe, a fishmonger,¹ had set up a printing press and was printing and distributing inexpensive copies of books and pamphlets protected by royal patent. The Stationers informed the Council that Wolfe had, among other things, “incensed the popularity of London,” and was employing “others as disordered as [himself] who run up and down to all the fairs and markets through a great part of the Realm, and make sale of them [books and pamphlets]; . . . [patronizing] Inns and Ale-houses and . . . , [then] with . . . some likelihood of further disorder they return home.”² The fact that Wolfe’s activities took place among the lower sorts was especially worrisome. Not only did he and his cohorts frequent fairs and alehouses, which were notorious for attracting the wrong element of society, but they also “incensed the meaner sort of people throughout the City . . . in Alehouses and taverns and suchlike places, whereupon issued dangerous and undutiful speeches of her Majesty’s most gracious government.”³ The language in which the Stationers couched their complaint played straight into the growing anxiety among those in power that an increasingly literate population was a potential threat to social and political order. The status of Wolfe’s customers seemed to confirm the worst fears of the elite concerning the explosive combination of the printed word and the common people.

That sixteenth-century England witnessed significant increase in both popular literacy and printed works is well known. According to David Cressy, the period between 1560 and 1580 reveals a dramatic improvement in literacy among husbandmen and yeomen, tradesmen, and artisans. Among yeomen, for example, literacy rose from about 45 percent in 1560 to approximately 70 percent in 1580. Tradesmen and artisans showed similar gains. Literacy among this group grew from 40 percent to 60 percent, an increase of 20 percentage points in as many years. Those even lower on the social scale, the husbandmen, demonstrated an even more dramatic improvement, rising from only 10 percent to 25 percent literacy over the same twenty-year period.⁴ Influenced both by the humanists of the sixteenth century who saw widespread education as the means to moral reform and progress, and by Protestant reformers who emphasized the value of personal Bible reading, literacy grew across the social spectrum during the sixteenth century. So dramatic was this growth that Lawrence Stone characterized the phenomenon as an

“educational revolution” that began in the mid-sixteenth century and continued essentially unabated until the middle of the next century, when the Restoration provoked a reaction among those who blamed popular literacy for the upheavals that characterized the Civil War and Interregnum.⁵ Stone and other historians who have noted a similar trend have failed to recognize, however, that the reaction against widespread literacy began not in 1660, but in the second half of Elizabeth’s reign, i.e., the 1580s and 1590s. Exploring attitudes toward literacy in this earlier period reveals a significant decline in support for popular literacy among social and political elites as it became evident that a more literate public did not always mean a fully biddable, obedient population.⁶

In the early sixteenth century, however, literacy was closely linked with moral reform. These years saw the publication of a number of works whose common goal was to light the way to a well-ordered Christian society. Despite differences in detail, the message was clear: education had the power to mold character, and access to the printed word, if carefully selected, would go far in producing the desired change. Erasmus, for example, eloquently argued this concept: “I would that even the lowliest women read the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles. I would that they were read and understood not only by Scots and Irish, but also by Turks and Saracens.”⁷

Perhaps the most influential of these early humanist works on the benefits of popular literacy was *De Subventionem Pauperum (On Assistance to the Poor)* of Juan Luis Vives.⁸ A Spanish humanist who spent several years at the English court in the mid-1520s and held appointments at Oxford during the same period, Vives was concerned that the increasingly visible poor were trapped in a vicious cycle: poverty made education or training inaccessible, which prevented the poor from obtaining jobs that would provide adequate income and access to education for their children. He envisioned a comprehensive program in which even the very lowest persons received vocational training and simple literacy combined with a Christian education. Both boys and girls were to be included in this scheme.⁹ Lest his readers doubt the need for such a program, Vives provided a clear and compelling argument:

[The poor] envy those richer than themselves, they rage and complain bitterly that the rich should have a superabundance to enable them to maintain buffoons, dogs, mistresses, mules, horses, and elephants, while they for their part have not enough food for their hungry little children. . . . It is difficult to believe how many civil wars such outcries have provoked among all nations, in which the populace, infuriated and burning with hatred has first of all made trial of its rage against the rich.¹⁰

Only prompt intervention and thorough indoctrination with Christian values could avert these dire consequences, and the ability to read was a key element in this process.

It is important to remember that humanists such as Erasmus and Vives were well-respected and influential members of European society whose impact on England has been well documented.¹¹ *De Subventionem Pauperum* provided the model not only for the hospitals and workhouses of London, but also for those established later in the century in cities such as Norwich and Bristol, among others.¹² Furthermore, unrestricted access to the vernacular Bible was among the first policies of the Church of England following the break with Rome. Injunctions issued in 1536 mandated that ministers place a copy of the English Bible in every parish church, and “comfort, exhort and admonish every man to read the same . . . whereby they may the better know their duties to God, to their sovereign lord the king, and their neighbour.”¹³

Four years later, Archbishop Thomas Cranmer argued in favor of admitting poor scholars to the grammar school in Canterbury, because “poor men’s children are many times endued with more singular gifts of nature . . . and also more apt to apply their study than is the gentleman’s son delicately educated.”¹⁴ Moreover, he claimed that to suggest that the poor should be denied education was tantamount to blasphemy: “to utterly exclude the ploughman’s son and the poor man’s son from the benefit of learning, as though they were utterly unworthy of having the gifts of the Holy Ghost bestowed upon them as well as upon others, is as much to say that Almighty God should not be at liberty to bestow his great gifts of grace upon any person.”¹⁵ Though Cranmer was addressing the matter of admission to grammar school, one can only assume that his attitude towards basic vernacular literacy would be at least as generous, as grammar-school students were expected to be fully literate before being admitted.

The humanists’ support of popular literacy continued into the reign of Mary and the brief restoration of Roman Catholicism. Those close to her continued to call for universal literacy, including free education for those children whose parents could not afford tuition. In his “Pleasant Poesy of Princelie Practize,” William Forrest, the Queen’s chaplain, recommended that children between the ages of four and eight

to school be set/ to gather and learn such literature/ by which they
may after know their due debt/ to him that is author of each crea-
ture/ . . . Lest some perhaps at this might object;/ the poor man his
child cannot so prefer/ because he hath not substance in effect/ . . . I
answer, it must provided be/ in every town the school to go free.¹⁶

As with Erasmus and Vives, the desired outcome was not just the Christianization of the people, but a well-ordered commonwealth. The concepts were inseparable.¹⁷ Furthermore, there seems to have been an implicit assumption during Mary’s reign that the attraction of the Scriptures was so powerful that the only possible outcome would be the total rejection of all other possible paths.

A hint of what was to come in the late Elizabethan era occurred in 1543, when Henry VIII ordered a repeal of the injunctions of 1536 on the grounds that “a greate multytude of [h]is saide subjects, moste speicialie of the lower sorte have so abused [the right to read the Bible] that they have . . . fallen into greate dyvision and disencion . . . to the greate unquietnes of the Realme.” The solution was to prohibit women, apprentices, husbandmen, and laborers from reading the Bible, at least until the king perceived “such reformation and amendement in theyre lyeves and behaviour.”¹⁸ Henry died not long after this, however, and the government of Edward VI reverted to the earlier practice, one which was reaffirmed by royal proclamation in 1559, in which universal Bible-reading was not only permitted, but was also actively encouraged.¹⁹ Henry’s fears seem to have been limited to Bible reading; those concerns aside, extensive distrust of popular literacy would not appear again for another forty years.

By the 1580s, however, calls for widespread or even universal literacy had come to be associated with the “hotter-sort” of Protestants called, for lack of a better name, Puritans.²⁰ Despite their commitment to reform from within, many were, in fact, on the periphery of the Church, and frequently found themselves in direct conflict with the religious establishment, especially after John Whitgift became the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583. It is this group that continued to insist upon the value of literacy for all, though they fully recognized that reading could be put to other and non-godly uses.

Probably the most famous and comprehensive of the Puritan plans was that of the Dedham *classis*, that is, of the formal, well-organized gathering of reform-minded clergy centered around that Essex town. Among the orders they adopted and intended to implement was one calling for universal literacy. To ensure that all would be able to benefit, they set aside fully half of the money collected at Communion to pay tuition for “such poor men’s children as shall be judged unable to bear it themselves”; the orders also extended to provision for the teacher.²¹ Because of its members’ activities, most notably promoting presbyterianism, the *classis* was suppressed in 1589 and several of the members arrested.

In a similar vein, the Puritan Nicholas Bownde urged everyone to read the Bible at every opportunity, “and they that cannot, let them see the want of it to be so great in themselves, that they bring up their children unto it.”²² Though Bownde managed to avoid arousing the ire of ecclesiastical superiors, his fellow Puritan, Josias Nichols, who has been described as the “ringleader of the Puritan ministers in Kent,” was suspended by Archbishop Whitgift in 1583 for refusing to agree to the Three Articles intended to expose Puritan clergy. These articles required ministers to take an oath to uphold the royal supremacy and the Thirty-Nine Articles, and to swear that the *Book of Common Prayer* “containeth nothing in it contrary to the word of

God.” Twenty years later, Nichols was deprived of his living for continuing his radical Protestantism.²³ Although his activities extended well beyond advocating universal literacy, we can get a glimpse of the intensity with which he pursued his beliefs by examining his approach to schooling. All heads of families, regardless of social or economic status, were urged to “cause all their household, men, women, and children, to be able to read the English tongue.”²⁴ Those who could not afford schooling were encouraged to learn from friends or neighbors—apparently in flagrant opposition to the law requiring all schoolmasters to be licensed.

Beginning around 1580, however, a distinctly different atmosphere emerged among more mainstream groups. No longer were establishment thinkers advocating universal literacy as the solution to society’s ills or arguing that “good order [will] shine and flourish”²⁵ upon implementation of any of the various plans for broader literacy already discussed. Instead, they retreated from this position, accompanied by a firm conviction that the lower sorts were too morally immature and inherently rebellious to be trusted to handle their new skill responsibly. References testifying to the dangerous nature of the lower classes abound: they are “ignorant and superstitious,” easy prey for leaders of rebellion;²⁶ “by nature given to ease” and “of all others most untractable”;²⁷ and finally, “rude and ignorant, having of themself small light of judgment.”²⁸ The ability of individuals to read is difficult, if not impossible, to separate from the increased opportunity of those individuals to interpret the material themselves. As Luther found to his horror with the Peasants’ Revolt of 1525, even the Bible could be dangerous in the wrong hands. In the increasingly difficult 1580s and 1590s, the dangers consequent upon promoting widespread literacy were beginning to register with those in power.

Neither was there any guarantee that, once literate, the people would prefer, or even choose, approved devotional literature as their primary reading material. The proliferation and evident popularity of chapbooks, ballads, and broadsides tended to support this fear.²⁹ Early attempts to control the trade of this inexpensive material included orders that all ballads be licensed, as were all chapmen, the principal distributors.³⁰ Newer approaches to the problem ranged from calls for the exclusion of the lower social classes from petty (or elementary) schools, to attempts to deny them access to printed material regarding subjects deemed inappropriate. Only the Puritans continued to support universal literacy.

The first of these newer approaches, which advocated limiting the number of schools and restricting access to learning, found its most influential spokesman in Richard Mulcaster, who held lengthy stints as headmaster of two of London’s most prominent grammar schools. He counted Elizabeth among his patrons and Edmund Spenser among his pupils.³¹ His *Positions . . . for the Training Up of Children* (1581),³²

in which he set forth his views, was dedicated to the queen, to whom it was evidently not unwelcome. The Privy Council, citing his virtue and contributions to the state, subsequently intervened in 1589 on his behalf to order creditors to grant him a one-year grace period;³³ and in 1598, Elizabeth appointed him to a living in Essex.³⁴

Although some historians have seen Mulcaster as one who viewed education as a way “to destroy [class] selectivity,”³⁵ this interpretation is wildly off the mark. His call for a statute limiting the number of schools in England is clear evidence of his true feelings. Indiscriminate education could only disrupt the body politic: “if the like proportion be not kept in all parts, the like disturbance will creep throughout all parts.”³⁶ Only by limiting access to education will disorder be averted: “it is better to nip disorder in the very ground, that it may not take hold. . . . He that never conceived great things may be held there with ease.”³⁷ Should these restrictions prove a hardship for those denied the chance to learn to read and write, Mulcaster was apologetic, but argued that exceptions should be made only “upon some reasonable persuasion even for necessary dealings.”³⁸ For the poor, however, who were the most likely to be affected by these interdictions, Mulcaster reminded them that God “bestoweth as great gifts of them which showed not.”³⁹ Perhaps they were to conclude that their chance presumably would come in the next life.

Despite an awareness that literacy might be an economic necessity for some, Mulcaster argued that a literate populace would inevitably lead to disruption. The poor “will not be content with the state which is [intended] for them, but because they have some petty smack of their book,” they will aspire to any and all occupations.⁴⁰ To the sixteenth-century elite, there were few more serious crimes than attempting to move out of one’s appointed status. This is one point on which even Puritans completely agreed with the mainstream.

Like Mulcaster, Sir Francis Bacon believed that education was potentially disruptive. He argued that universal education leads to “want in the country and towns, both of servants for husbandry, and apprentices for trade.” Furthermore, it tended to create a situation in which “many people will be bred unfit for other occupations, and unprofitable for that in which they are brought up; which fills the realm full of indigent, idle and wanton people.”⁴¹ Not only would the social order be in jeopardy, but the economy as well. In this area, Bacon was clearly Mulcaster’s heir.

While limiting access to education was both impractical and impracticable, limiting the availability of potentially incendiary material was easier to manage, given the requirement that all printed material be licensed prior to publication.⁴² Among others, Mulcaster argued that certain works ought to be available only in Latin or other foreign languages, thus limiting their audience to those who were highly educated.⁴³ There is

evidence that certain types of works written in foreign languages were more likely to be licensed for printing than similar works in English. Barrett Beer has shown, for example, that Tudor historians were understandably cautious in their accounts of rebellions. “Of the two histories of rebellion published during the sixteenth century, the first . . . was unadulterated government propaganda, and the other . . . [was] written in Latin to guarantee a select readership.”⁴⁴ This second work, a history of Kett’s rebellion, was not translated into English until 1615, well after Elizabeth’s death.⁴⁵ Similarly, Donald Thomas noted that “the erotic or bawdy classics of European literature” were licensed in their original language only; English versions were not allowed.⁴⁶ Both these examples illustrate how the elite erected barriers in a conscious effort to maintain strict divisions between the various levels of society in political, cultural, and intellectual matters.

It is in this context that we must view William Lambarde’s 1580 proposal for the establishment of “Governors of the English Print.”⁴⁷ A prominent Kentish J.P. and author of the well-known *Eirenarcha; or Of the Office of the Justices of the Peace*, Lambarde was concerned regarding the growing numbers in English of “sundry books, pamphlets, Poesies, ditties, songs and other works . . . serving . . . to none other ends . . . but only to let in a main Sea of wickedness.”⁴⁸ He advocated replacing the current licensing system with a council composed of the Bishop of London, the Recorder of London, and eight others, including at least four lawyers; any work written all or partly in English would be licensed by at least three members of this council.⁴⁹ Lambarde saw a clear connection between cheap printed works and “the intolerable corruption of common life and manners, which pestilently invadeth the minds of many,”⁵⁰ including, presumably, those appearing before him in his capacity as a justice of the peace. Lambarde’s apparent lack of concern for works published in other languages suggests that the latter—or their primarily elite readers—were not considered threats to society. It was only when those works were translated into English, and thus became more widely accessible, that Lambarde became alarmed.

Furthermore, the government now made various attempts in this period to limit popular access to printed material. In 1586, for example, the Privy Council repeated an order issued the previous year, calling for the “repressing of carriers of news.”⁵¹ These news carriers were most likely chapmen,⁵² “paltry Pedlars who in a long pack or maund, which [they carry] for the most part open, and hanging from [their necks] before [them] hath Almanacs, Books of News or other trifling wares to sell.”⁵³ At the same time, the Queen, citing a history of “many fantastical and fond prophecyings,” renewed Richard Watkins’s and James Roberts’s monopoly on printing almanacs on the grounds that, under their careful supervision, the almanacs “come yearly forth in print more orderly and apt for the benefit and use of our subjects then [sic!] . . . [those printed] by other persons in former times.”⁵⁴ Although the readership of almanacs

was not confined to the lower classes, they were priced within the means of many, and were clearly part of popular, rather than purely elite, culture. Patents to print this type of material must thus be seen as further attempts to tighten censorship of those items targeted at the general public.

The reaction against the rise in popular literacy is part of a trend in policy that John Guy has labeled the “second reign of Elizabeth.” Politically, diplomatically, economically, and religiously, the changes that began in the 1580s were dramatic and marked a real shift from the first part of her reign.⁵⁵ With the appointment of John Whitgift as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583, Elizabeth’s government became less tolerant of religious dissent and suppressed the Dedham *classis*, the separatist Brownists, and publishers of radical Puritan works, including Philip Stubbes. More immediately relevant for the issue of popular education, the link between calls for wider literacy and more troublesome Puritans cannot be discounted. Increasingly marginalized in late Elizabethan England, the Puritans were forced to utilize print as an efficient way to proselytize large numbers of people. Universal literacy thus became central to their success, but became tainted, in the minds of more mainstream thinkers, with the sin of radicalism.

The economic downturn of the late sixteenth century only exacerbated the problem. As grain and enclosure riots seemed to become more common, the link between these disturbances and a literate lower class became troubling. In Kent, for example, at least two of the major disturbances of the mid-1590s involved written protests and petitions, and in 1593 the Privy Council became alarmed about a “vile ticket or placard . . . purporting some determination and intention the apprentices should have to attempt some violence on the strangers [i.e., foreigners].”⁵⁶ The striking rise in literacy over the previous twenty years, in combination with the proliferation of increasingly secular printed titles over the course of the century, did not go unnoticed.⁵⁷

Evidence of the impact of these changing attitudes toward literacy is striking. By the early seventeenth century, literacy among yeomen fell from 70 percent to 64 percent, while husbandmen, who had enjoyed a 30 percent literacy rate in 1580, had only a 12 percent rate by 1610.⁵⁸ Though the economic difficulties of the 1590s undoubtedly played a role in this decline, they cannot be viewed as the sole or primary cause, for economic recovery did not produce a similar recovery in literacy rates. It was not until the late eighteenth century that husbandmen and others of similar status regained the levels of literacy first seen in 1580, a fact that argues for a shift away from an emphasis on popular literacy, a shift based on elitist fears of revolt and social unrest.

The increasing popularity and availability of inexpensive literature, the rise in popular literacy, and a pervasive belief that the common people were a never-ending

source of disquiet and disorder combined to create a situation that the elite in late-sixteenth-century England felt it could not ignore. The common thread linking the various approaches to the problem was a recognition that the growth in popular literacy, if unchecked, could escalate out of control and unravel the fabric of society beyond repair. It was a belief only fortified by the chaos of the Civil War era when increasingly radical materials appeared in print during the absence of censorship. So great were the fears linked to popular literacy that it was not until the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries that there were again widespread and sustained calls for universal education.

NOTES

1. It was customary for freemen of a London company to be allowed to engage in the trade of another. For an explanation of how this applied to printing, see Gerald R. Johnson, "The Stationers versus the Drapers: Control of the Press in the Late Sixteenth Century," *The Library*, 6th ser., 10, no. 1 (March 1988): 1–17. Wolfe was eventually translated to the Stationers' Company, and later appointed the Company's beadle. In an ironic twist, he was chosen in 1591 to defend another member's patent before the Stationers' court. See W.W. Greg and E. Boswell, ed., *The Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company 1576–1602* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1930), xxxvii, 38.
2. Edward Arber (ed.), *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1544–1640 A.D.* (London: privately printed, 1875–77), 2:779.
3. Arber, *A Transcript of the Registers*, 2:782.
4. David Cressy, "Levels of Illiteracy in England 1530–1730," in Harvey J. Graff, ed., *Literacy and Social Development in the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 115.
5. Lawrence Stone, "The Educational Revolution in England, 1540–1640," *Past and Present* 28 (1964): 41–80.
6. The best introduction to early modern English social history is Keith Wrightson, *English Society, 1580–1680* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1982). Also useful is Keith Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000). Older, but still worth reading are Peter Laslett, *The World We Have Lost: Further Explored*, 3rd ed. (New York: Scribners, 1984) and Margaret Spufford, *Contrasting Communities: English Villagers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974). The structure of early modern English society was far more complicated than a simple division into "elite" and "non-elite" would suggest. William Harrison, the late-sixteenth-century author, divided the nation into four broad categories: "gentlemen, citizens or burgesses, yeomen and artificers, and laborers." Even those four groups disguised a more elaborate ranking. "Gentlemen," for example, encompassed eight distinct sub-divisions, not including the monarch and bishops, whom Harrison also placed in this category. Citizens, burgesses, and merchants were roughly the urban equivalent of the lowest ranks of gentlemen. Beneath them were the yeomen—or at least the older, married ones—who "have a certain pre-eminence and more estimation than laborers and the common sort of artificers, and these commonly live wealthily, keep good houses, and travail to get riches." The most industrious of them were able to provide

their sons either the education or the lands necessary to elevate them to the ranks of gentlemen. Virtually everybody else occupied Harrison's fourth category: "the day laborers, poor husbandmen, and some retailers . . . copyholders, and all artificers, as tailors, shoemakers, carpenters, brickmakers, masons, etc." While many, if not most, were productive members of society, Harrison described them as those who "have neither voice nor authority in the commonwealth, but are to be ruled and not to rule." In dividing early modern English society into "elite" and "non-elite," Harrison's first two categories clearly qualify as the elite, while his fourth group equally clearly belongs to the non-elite. More problematic are the yeomen. Although by definition they met the property qualifications to be able to vote for Parliament, regularly served on juries, and were accorded real respect by their contemporaries, Harrison was clear to distinguish between the more mature, typically married yeomen and the younger "fleeting" ones lacking "stability in determination and resolution for the execution of things of any importance." In 1543, Parliament included this younger, less responsible group in its ban on reading the English Bible (see below, n. 18). For this purposes of this paper, I will follow Harrison's categorization. See William Harrison, *The Description of England*, ed. Georges Edelen (Washington and New York: Folger Shakespeare Library and Dover Publications, 1994), 94–123.

7. Erasmus, *The Paraclesis* (1516), in John C. Olin, ed., *Christian Humanism and the Reformation: Selected Writings of Erasmus* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1975), 97.

8. In *English Poor Law History*, Sydney and Beatrice Webb characterized Vives's book as "probably the 'best seller' of its time." Cited in Ivy Pinchbeck and Margaret Hewitt, *Children in English Society* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), vol. 1, *From Tudor Times to the Eighteenth Century*, 91.

9. Juan Luis Vives, *De Subventione Pauperum* (1526), in F.R. Salter, ed. and trans., *Some Early Tracts on Poor Relief* (London: Methuen and Co., 1926), 18–19.

10. Vives, 6–7.

11. See, for example, J.H. Hexter, "The Education of the Aristocracy in the Renaissance," in idem, *Reappraisals in History* (London: Longmans, 1961), 45–70; and Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

12. Pinchbeck and Hewitt, 1:133.

13. C.H. Williams, ed., *English Historical Documents 1485–1558* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1967), 807.

14. John Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, in A.F. Leach, *Educational Charters and Documents* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), 471.

15. Ibid.

16. William Forrest, "Pleasaunt Poesye of Princelie Practize" (1548), in David Cressy, ed., *Education in Tudor and Stuart England* (London: Edward Arnold, 1975), 95–96.

17. Lacey Baldwin Smith, *Treason in Tudor England: Politics and Paranoia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 73–74.

18. 34–35 Henry VIII c.I (1543), *Statutes of the Realm* (London: G.Eyre and A. Strahan, 1817), 3: 894–97, esp. 896.

19. P.L. Hughes and J.K. Larkin, ed., *Tudor Royal Proclamations* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1969), 2:119.

-
20. "Puritan" is a problematic term; it is being used here to refer to a body of fervent Protestants dissatisfied with the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559, most of whom were—at least in the sixteenth century—committed to the idea of reform of the Church of England from within.
21. Roland G. Usher, ed., *The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth as Illustrated by the Minute Book of the Dedham Classis, 1582–1589* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1905), 100.
22. Nicholas Bownde, *The Doctrine of the Sabbath* (London, 1595), 202.
23. The quotation comes from Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 245. See W.A. Shaw, "Josias Nichols," *Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee (New York: Macmillan & Co, 1885–1901), xli: 8–9. Hereafter: *DNB*.
24. Josiah Nichols, *An Order of Household Instruction* (London, 1596).
25. Forrest, "Pleasaunt Poesye," 96.
26. Sir Ralph Sadler, cited in *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, Addenda 1566–1579*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London: Longman & Co., 1871), xv: 139.
27. *An Ease for the Overseers of the Poore* (Cambridge, 1601), 20, 28.
28. Thomas Starkey, *An Exhortation to the People, instructing them to unity and obedience* (London, 1536), 34.
29. See, for example, R.A. Houston, *Literacy in Early Modern Europe: Culture and Education 1500–1800* (London and New York: Longman, 1988), 155–203.
30. Kenneth Charlton, "'False Fonde Bookes, Ballades and Rimes': An Aspect of Informal Education in Early Modern Europe," *History of Education Quarterly* 27 (Winter, 1987): 459.
31. J.H. Lupton, "Richard Mulcaster," *DNB*, xxxix: 275.
32. Richard Mulcaster, *Positions Wherin those Primitive Circumstances be Examined, which are necessarie for the Training up of Children* (London, 1581).
33. John R. Dasent, ed., *Acts of the Privy Council, 1547–1607* (London, HMSO, 1890–1907), xvii: 25. Hereafter: Dasent, *APC*.
34. Lupton, *DNB*, xxxix: 275.
35. Richard L. DeMolen, "Richard Mulcaster and the Profession of Teaching in Sixteenth Century England," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 35 (1974): 128.
36. Mulcaster, *Positions*, 134.
37. *Ibid.*, 144.
38. *Ibid.*, 144.
39. *Ibid.*, 146.
40. *Ibid.*, 143.
41. Francis Bacon, "Advice to the King Touching Sutton's Estate" (1611), in James Spedding, ed., *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1868), 4:252–53.
42. In 1557, the Stationers' Company was charged with registering all publications, a move that effectively implemented pre-publication censorship in England. See David Loades, *The Reign*

of *Mary Tudor: Politics, Government and Religion in England 1553–58*, 2nd ed. (London and New York: Longman, 1991) 380–81.

43. Mulcaster, *Positions*, 144.

44. Barrett L. Beer, “John Stow and Tudor Rebellions, 1549–1569,” *Journal of British Studies* 27 (Oct. 1988): 352–53.

45. Beer, “John Stow,” 353 n.3.

46. Donald Thomas, *A Long Time Burning: The History of Literary Censorship in England* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969), 16.

47. William Lambarde, “Draft of an Act of Parliament for the Establishment of the *Governors of the English Print*” (1580), printed in Arber, *A Transcript of the Registers*, 2:751–52.

48. *Ibid.*, 2:751.

49. *Ibid.*, 2:752.

50. *Ibid.*, 2:751.

51. Dasent, *APC*, xiv:199.

52. Matthias A. Shaaber, *Some Forerunners of the Newspaper in England, 1476–1622* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1929), 11.

53. Quoted in Thomas Laqueur, “Cultural Origins of Popular Literacy in England, 1500–1800,” *Oxford Review of Education* 2, no. 3 (1976): 268.

54. Arber, *A Transcript of the Registers*, 2:818.

55. John Guy, “The 1590s: The Second Reign of Elizabeth I?,” in idem, ed., *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 1–19.

56. Peter Clark, “Popular Protest and Disturbance in Kent, 1558–1640,” *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., 29, no. 3 (1976): 365–81; see also Dasent, *APC*, xxiv:187.

57. The author’s Early English Books Online (EEBO) search based on year of publication has determined that by 1500, fewer than 350 titles were published in England; by 1600, that number had risen to nearly 1000 titles. Of all the works published before 1500, roughly 75 percent were religious works; by the mid-seventeenth century, the proportion of religious or godly chapbooks had fallen to less than one-third the total. See also Margaret Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and its Readership in Seventeenth-Century England* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1981), 135. As literacy expanded, the sixteenth century also witnessed the growth of demand for cheap printed works—the kind that were consumed by readers lower down the social scale.

58. Cressy, “Educational Opportunity,” 315–16. He argues that the decline can be explained by the fact that the sons of the gentry occupied places in grammar schools and excluded those of a lower social status. The problem with this explanation is that, as noted above, boys were expected to be fully literate in English before their admission to grammar school.

Confessionalization and the Creedal Tradition

Lincoln Mullen

To explain, or even to study, the Reformation is an undertaking of immense scope. It occurred over several centuries, and several more must be taken into account to understand its origins and consequences. It affected the entire continent of Europe, and North and South America too. It affected every aspect of life—religion, politics, society, education, philosophy, economics, art, sex, and family life, to mention just some of the topics covered in one history of the Reformation.¹ The topic is so broad that some scholars even doubt that one can use the term *Reformation*, some preferring the term *reformations*.² Nevertheless, historians have often utilized various historiographic perspectives and methodologies in their quest to understand the Reformation as a whole. One such “big idea” is confessionalization.

Anticipated in the work of Ernst Walter Zeeden, confessionalization is primarily the idea of two German historians, Heinz Schilling and Wolfgang Reinhard.³ Both scholars sought to explain how modern Europe developed from the conflicts of the sixteenth century. They began by observing that Reformation Europe produced an astonishing number of creeds, confessions, and catechisms. Schilling argued that Protestant states used these confessional texts to enlarge their authority. They used their power to benefit the reformed religion by requiring their subjects to take confessional oaths, disciplining anyone who strayed from confessional conformity, and educating their subjects with catechisms. In exchange, reformed religion gave the state a distinct identity, and churches used their power to discipline and command loyalty in service to the state. Adapting Schilling’s theory, Reinhard argued much the same for Catholic confessions.⁴

According to Schilling and Reinhard, this process of confessionalization or *Konfessionalisierung* (the creation of separate Christian communities in the West) also produced modernity. Schilling wrote that confessionalization was a “fundamental social transformation,” affecting religion, culture, society, and politics, and that it “largely coincided with . . . the formation of the early modern State and the shaping of its modern, disciplined society of subjects.”⁵ This modernity was characterized by, among other things, state discipline, rationality in argumentation, bureaucracy of churches and governments, state support for religion, and religious support for the state.⁶

Schilling and Reinhard's theory has created something of a cottage industry for historians, who have tested the theory for regions other than Germany and for eras beyond the sixteenth century. For example, Philip Benedict has accepted a pared-down version of the confessionalization thesis for Montpellier in France. Graeme Murdock, however, has concluded that confessionalization does not fit the history of Eastern Europe, where many confessional groups coexisted peacefully. Etienne François argues not only that confessionalization works for Germany, but also that the process extends into the eighteenth century.⁷

For all the attention historians have paid confessionalization both as a macro- and microhistorical approach, they have paid surprisingly little attention to the confessional documents themselves. Of course, scholars of confessionalization mention the confessions and assign them to various polities, but they have not analyzed the genre and doctrine of the confessions. This decision not to read confessions closely is an intentional part of the confessionalization theory. Confessionalization asserts that religion is characterized by "social forms and consequences rather than by its theological assertions." And because the advocates of confessionalization seeks to demonstrate that different faith communities (e.g., Catholicism, Lutheranism, Anglicanism, and Reformed Christianity) developed their dogma and institutions in parallel, they intentionally ignore *propria*, their term for the textual details of confessional texts that distinguish one confessional group from another.⁸

The root of this disregard for doctrine is found in the two meanings of the word *confession*. The German *Konfession*, like the English *confession*, can mean either a document that confesses Christian doctrine or a group of believers who confess that doctrine. Advocates of confessionalization note the close identification between a religious sect and its doctrinal statements, and choose to study only the sect.⁹ Nevertheless, the two meanings are distinct. One historian of doctrine specifically warns against confusing the meanings, and to conflate the terms would be to commit the fallacy of equivocation.¹⁰ If advocates of confessionalization argue that confessional statements produced confessional groups, thereby fracturing Europe and introducing modernity, then they must demonstrate how the dogma of the confessions could produce that result, or at the very least they must be able to demonstrate that the dogma as a whole does not contradict that result. Therefore, the confessional documents must themselves be examined.

A close reading of these confessional documents, however, demonstrates that they do not fit the confessionalization theory as it pertains to modernity. Not only does confessionalization leave unexamined the varying *propria* of theological doctrine by neglecting the content of confessional texts, but it also misses the fundamental

and shared characteristic of these texts, namely, their continuity with the Christian creedal tradition. Reading the Reformation confessional texts demonstrates that they are more closely related to the ancient creedal tradition than they are to the supposed modernity of mutually antagonistic confessional groups that they allegedly produced. This brief study will address the second failing.

By the creedal tradition, I mean that body of creeds and confessions created by Christians, beginning with the ecumenical creeds of late antiquity and extending through the Middle Ages. In many ways the Reformation confessions were indebted to the creeds that came before them. The Reformation confessions occupied the same genre as the ancient creeds, and they cited the ancient creeds as authorities. And as part of that creedal tradition, the Reformation confessions performed the same functions as any creed—to define and establish uniform doctrine, and to unite Christians around that doctrine.¹¹ Therefore the confessions—that is, the confessional documents—were actually attempts at establishing universal and unified Christian doctrine. Although it is indisputable that the Reformation broke Europe into diverse confessional groups, the participation of sixteenth-century confessional texts in the intentionally irenic creedal tradition was neither the cause nor the means of that fracturing.

As just mentioned, the Reformation confessions often explicitly connected themselves to the creedal tradition by quoting the ancient creeds. This holds true for every group save those of the radical Reformation, such as the Anabaptists and Mennonites. The confessions tended to refer especially to the same three texts: the *Nicene Creed*,¹² the *Apostles' Creed*,¹³ and the *Athanasian Creed*.¹⁴ Those references were present in the sections of confessions that dealt with the doctrines of Christ or the Trinity, or sometimes in sections about church tradition. The absence of the ancient creeds from other sections merely indicated that the creeds never touched on the subject matter of the latter.

Among Reformation confessions generally and certainly among the Lutheran confessions, the *Augsburg Confession* (1530) was undoubtedly preeminent. Pelikan and Hotchkiss argue that “[t]he *Augsburg Confession* . . . helped to define . . . what a ‘confession of faith’ means.”¹⁵ In its first article, the *Augsburg Confession* cited the Council of Nicaea on the unity of God’s essence, and it imitated the Nicene formula about the Trinity. In the section on the doctrine of Christ, the *Augsburg Confession* roughly followed the *Apostles' Creed* and cited that creed to cover anything left unsaid: “The same Lord Christ will return openly to judge the living and the dead, etc., as stated in the Apostle’s Creed.”¹⁶

The *Marburg Articles* (1529) cited the *Nicene Creed* as ancient, universal doctrine, defining the Trinity “as it was decreed in the Council of Nicaea, and is sung

and read in the *Nicene Creed* by the entire Christian church throughout the world.”¹⁷ The *Smalcald Articles* (1537), written by Martin Luther to define Lutheran doctrine that could not be compromised, situated itself in the creedal tradition by rehearsing Nicene doctrine about Christ, quoting from the *Apostles’ Creed*, and citing the *Athanasian Creed*.¹⁸

Lutheran creeds written after Luther’s death likewise quoted from the creedal tradition. Nearly as important as the *Augsburg Confession* was the *Formula of Concord* (1577), which was intended to resolve the dispute between antagonistic Lutheran groups (the so-called Philippists and Gnesio-Lutherans). In defining the doctrine of church authority, the *Formula* stated that

the ancient church formulated symbols (that is, brief and explicit confessions) which were accepted as unanimous, catholic, Christian faith and confessions of the orthodox and true church, namely, *The Apostle’s Creed*, *The Nicene Creed*, and *The Athanasian Creed*. We pledge ourselves to these, and we hereby reject all heresies and teachings which have been introduced into the church of God contrary to them.

The *Formula* further condemned anti-Trinitarian errors on the basis of a creedal tradition, that is, “according to the word of God, the three creeds, *The Augsburg Confession*, *The Apology*, *The Smalcald Articles*, and *The Catechisms* of Luther.” Though the *Formula* confessed to believe only what can be taught from the Scriptures, it accepted the descent of Christ into hell solely on the authority of the *Apostles’ Creed*, without citing any Scripture. When the *Formula* was printed in the *Book of Concord* (1580), it was bound together with the *Augsburg Confession*, the *Smalcald Articles*, Luther’s *Catechisms*, the *Apostle’s Creed*, the *Nicene Creed*, and the *Athanasian Creed*, and thus constituted a one-volume library of the creedal tradition.¹⁹

Another Lutheran confessional text, not even important enough to make it into Pelikan and Hotchkiss’s collection, was the *Corpus Doctrinae* of Braunschweig (1567). Written by Joachim Mörlin and Martin Chemnitz to deal with doctrinal problems in Lower Saxony, the document described itself as a *repetitio* of the creedal tradition, that is, “a repetition of the chief ideas and content of the true universal Christian church’s teaching as it is comprehended in the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and Smalcald Articles.” The *Corpus Doctrinae* relied on the *Apostles’ Creed*, the *Nicene Creed*, the *Athanasian Creed*, and the so-called creedal statements of Ambrose and Augustine to resolve difficult passages in the Scripture, to define orthodoxy against alleged recent Catholic deviations, and to explain the true meaning of the *Augsburg*

Confession against the allegedly incorrect interpretation of the Lutheran theologian Andreas Osiander. In short, the *Corpus Doctrinae* claimed to be the continuation of a long tradition extending from the ecumenical creeds through the teachings of the Fathers and through the *Augsburg Confession*, and it considered that creedal tradition to be the arbiter of doctrine and the “rule of faith” for interpreting Scripture.²⁰

The Reformed confessions of every region showed similar dependence on the creedal tradition. Ulrich Zwingli’s *Reckoning of the Faith* (1530) cited “the Creed, the Nicene as well as the Athanasian,” concerning the doctrine of God.²¹ The *First Confession of Basel*, drafted in 1534 by Oswald Myconius, quoted the *Apostles’ Creed* and referred to it in a marginal note as “the universal faith.” The *First Confession* also had twelve articles, in imitation of the *Apostles’ Creed*.²² The *Second Helvetic Confession* (1566) concluded the doctrine regarding Christ by stating that the Scripture’s teaching was “summed up in the creeds and decrees of the first four most excellent synods convened at Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon—together with the creed of blessed Athanasius, and all similar symbols.” And in dealing with the Trinity, the *Second Helvetic Confession* noted that “we receive the Apostles’ Creed because it delivers to us the true faith.”²³ The *French Confession*, presented to Francis II in 1560 and to Charles IX in 1561, stated “[w]e confess the three creeds, to wit: the Apostles’, the Nicene, and the Athanasian.”²⁴ The *Belgic Confession* (1561) “willingly accept[ed] the three ecumenical creeds—the Apostles’, Nicene, and Athanasian—as well as what the ancient fathers decided in agreement with them.”²⁵

Anglican and Irish Protestant confessions were likewise situated in the creedal tradition. The *Ten Articles* of 1536 obligated Englishmen to believe “the three creeds or symbols”—the *Apostles’*, the *Nicene*, and the *Athanasian Creeds*. It further required that doctrine be expressed in the “very same form and manner of speaking” as the creeds, and it damned anyone who denied them.²⁶ The *Thirty-Nine Articles* (1571) confessed the same three creeds, as did the later *Irish Articles* (1615).²⁷

The Catholic confessions that derived from the Council of Trent also claimed the creedal tradition. The very first decree of the council, promulgated in 1546, accepted the *Nicene Creed* as a “shield against all heresies,” and provided an authoritative text of the creed.²⁸ Because the council required all the clergy to affirm everything decided at Trent, Pope Pius IV authorized the *Tridentine Profession of Faith* in 1564. That statement required the recitation of “the symbol of faith,” the *Nicene Creed*. Indeed, the full text of the *Nicene Creed* took up nearly half of the *Tridentine Profession*.²⁹

The *Apostles’ Creed* was quoted, albeit without citation, in the Anabaptists’ *Dordrecht Confession* (1632).³⁰ And even the anti-Trinitarian Laelius Socinus, in a profession of faith (1555) defending himself against detractors, mentioned the *Apostles’ Creed*

and the *Nicene Creed*, which he “acknowledged to be the most ancient, accepted at all times in the church.”³¹ Of course, only an outright denial of the two creeds could have been less supportive than Socinus’s tepid acknowledgement of them; he must have mentioned them largely in recognition of the respect his contemporaries had for the credal tradition.

Catechisms, a subgenre of confessional texts, likewise depended on the credal tradition. They primarily used the *Apostles’ Creed* as a pedagogical tool for teaching basic doctrine. Lutherans learned the creed in Luther’s *Small Catechism* (1529) both at church and in morning and evening prayers with the head of the family.³² The Reformed (or Calvinists) learned it in Calvin’s *Geneva Catechism* (1541), which called it “the confession of faith used by all Christians” and “a summary of the true faith which has always been held in Christianity, and was also derived from the pure doctrine of the apostles.” That catechism dedicated some fifteen large pages to expounding this creed.³³ Calvinists also learned about “our universally acknowledged confession of faith” in the *Heidelberg Catechism* (1563), which extended teaching of the *Apostles’ Creed* over seventeen weeks—a full third of a year. Anglicans learned the same creed in their catechisms, and it was bound into various editions of their *Book of Common Prayer* from 1549 onward.³⁴ Even the Anabaptist Balthasar Hubmaier of Moravia used this creed in his *Christian Catechism* (1526).³⁵ Indeed, the only catechism of major importance not to integrate the *Apostles’ Creed* was the Calvinist *Westminster Shorter Catechism* (1648), which—as Pelikan and Hotchkiss note—nevertheless included it as an appendix.³⁶

Why did the confessional texts make these connections to the ancient creeds? The ones submitted to monarchs, such as the *Augsburg Confession* and the *French Confession*, were attempting to prove their orthodoxy. The confessions also used the creeds as shorthand, as a way of affirming belief in commonly accepted doctrines. But the affirmation of the credal tradition was too prevalent and too strongly worded to be explained just by those reasons.³⁷ Rather, the Protestant confessions positioned themselves as the custodians of the true doctrine of the church, whether against alleged Catholic man-made traditions on the one hand, or against alleged Protestant deviations from orthodox tradition on the other. In Christianity it is the conservator of orthodoxy who can claim to unify the church, not the innovator. Doctrine is considered never to have changed, only to have exposed ever-changing heresies. The confessional texts thus claimed to be universally authoritative. In short, they claimed to be ecumenical and orthodox, not divisive.

The confessionalization theory observes, however, that these texts were local. They were, after all, characterized as French, Helvetic, of Basel, of Dordrecht, and the like. The local nature of confessional texts would seem to have belied their ecumeni-

cal claims. If the ecumenical creeds (or at least the *Nicene Creed*) were the product of ecumenical councils, how then could confessions produced by local councils or even by individuals have claimed to be ecumenical? This objection could be answered by noting that the authors could hardly have conceived that the doctrine they held could have been optional for others. The idea that a belief can be personal rather than normative had little to no currency in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe. If the confessional documents were local, they were so only because Europe fractured into separate religious and political groups before or while the confessions were drafted.

But more importantly, the confessionalization thesis is wrong in concluding that confessions bearing local titles were intended to be local in their effect. Even confessions written for local confessional groups were often widely known and even adopted in other regions. Confessions crossed geographic, political, and sometimes even sectarian barriers.³⁸

The *Augsburg Confession* was a primary example. The confession either influenced or was formally accepted by Calvin, the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, the Reformed churches of Germany and Switzerland, and, of course, by the Lutheran churches in Germany, in the rest of northern Europe, and eventually in North America. It was so widely influential that Pelikan and Hotchkiss point out that even Catholic theologian Avery Cardinal Dulles accepted it and that in 1970 it was considered for acceptance as an ecumenical creed by the Roman Catholic Church!³⁹

A few other examples will suffice. The *First Helvetic Confession* was accepted by Basel, Bern, Biel, Constance, Mühlhausen, St. Gall, Schaffhausen, Strasbourg, and Zurich.⁴⁰ The *Second Helvetic Confession* was adopted or recognized in Geneva, Bern, Chur, Biel, Mühlhausen, Scotland, Austria, Hungary, and Poland, and it was influential in France, England, and the Netherlands.⁴¹ The *Dordrecht Confession*, an Anabaptist document, was also adopted by groups in Alsace, Switzerland, Germany, and Pennsylvania.⁴² The *Westminster Confession* and *Shorter Catechism* were adopted widely throughout the Reformed world. The same relationships could be traced for many other confessions.

In creating this web of confessional interdependence, the confessional texts were a part of the creedal tradition that strove for ecclesiastical and doctrinal unity. These ancient creeds are called, after all, the ecumenical creeds. That label can be attributed not only to the origin of the *Nicene Creed* at two ecumenical councils. The *Apostles' Creed*, *Nicene Creed*, and *Athanasian Creed* were ultimately considered ecumenical because they were accepted by most Christians.⁴³ Like their creedal antecedents, the Reformation confessions were widely known. That they fell well short of ecumenical acceptance is more a reflection and symptom of Europe's division, not its cause.

Besides the doctrine that they shared with the ancient creeds and the wide influence that many of them enjoyed, the Reformation confessions had another characteristic that continued the creedal tradition: many tried to reconcile different sects rather than to divide them. The confessional genre anathematizes heresy, to be sure, but it also finds shared doctrine between different groups. The Reformation confessions, like their ancient predecessors, were intended to heal schisms between confessional groups.⁴⁴

The *Augsburg Confession's* primary purpose was to justify Lutheran doctrine to the emperor, but it also aimed to restore unity within the German churches. Its Latin preface stated that

to this end it was proposed to employ all diligence amicably and charitably to hear, understand, and weigh the judgments, opinion, and beliefs of the several parties among us to unite the same in agreement on one Christian truth, to put aside whatever may not have been rightly interpreted or treated by either side, to have all of us embrace and adhere to a single, true religion and live together in unity and in one fellowship and church, even as we are all enlisted under one Christ.⁴⁵

The *Marburg Confession* was another example of a reconciliatory confession. Though historians rightly emphasize the failure of the Marburg Colloquy to find agreement between Luther and Zwingli on the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the theologians present there did find much other doctrine in common. For example, the *Marburg Confession* agreed on the Trinity “as it was decreed in the Council of Nicaea, and is sung and read in the Nicene Creed by the entire Christian church throughout the world.” That confession was signed by Luther, Melancthon, Oecolampadius, Zwingli, and Bucer.⁴⁶ Other examples of reconciliatory confessions included the Lutheran *Formula of Concord*, intended to resolve the disputes between the Gnesio-Lutherans and the Philippists,⁴⁷ the *First Helvetic Confession*, intended to balance Lutheran and Reformed ideas about the Eucharist,⁴⁸ and the mission of John Dury, an English preacher and diplomat who attempted to find common confessional ground between Anglicans and the Swiss Reformed churches.⁴⁹ Even the Council of Trent and the confessional documents it produced were intended to unite Catholic Christendom, which was broader by far than any political entity or entities. To be sure, the reconciliatory confessional texts often failed in their attempts to promote unity, and none of them was a resounding success. But the point is still that the confessions were not tools intended to hasten the political and ecclesiastical division of Europe, but attempts to restore its religious unity.

To sum up, I have tried to question some of the assumptions and arguments of the confessionalization theory. Can the *propria* or actual statements of the confessions be ignored, or must they be examined? Were the Reformation confessional texts a new phenomenon, or did they draw on an existing tradition? Were they local, or did they cross political and confessional boundaries? Can the confessional texts be said to have fostered or exacerbated the division of Christendom, or did they attempt to restore its unity? Was it the form or the content of the ideas in the confessions that divided Christians? My answers contradict those of the confessionalization theory. In order that the identification of confessional groups with confessional documents not rest upon mere equivocation, the confessional texts must be examined closely and their *propria* identified, characterized, and compared. These texts were not new phenomena, but instead continued a tradition that was older than a millennium. Though bearing local titles, they were widely known and influential. Rather than foster division, many of the confessional statements sought to unite confessional groups. Though some of the ideas in the confessions were new, they were couched in old, familiar forms—new wine in old wineskins, as it were. Confessionalization alone, then, can hardly explain how the medieval Europe unified in faith became the modern and divided Europe. It was not the confessional documents as a genre that divided Europe, for in the midst of the terrible sixteenth-century rending of Europe, Protestants and Catholics alike tried to rehabilitate the ancient ideal of the unity of Christianity. In other words, the confessions were in large measure an attempt to put Europe back together.

NOTES

The author thanks Dr. Brenda Schoolfield, for whom an earlier draft of this article was written.

1. Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation* (New York: Penguin Books, 2003).
2. For example, John Bossy, *Christianity in the West, 1400–1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 91; Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 12–16.
3. The best historiographical overviews are Ute Lotz-Heumann, “Confessionalization,” in *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research* (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2007), 136–57; Thomas A. Brady, “Confessionalization—The Career of a Concept,” in *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700*, ed., John M. Headley, Hans J. Hillerbrand, and Anthony J. Papalas (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004), 1–20; and Joel F. Harrington and Helmut Walser Smith, “Confessionalization, Community, and State Building in Germany, 1555–1870,” *The Journal of Modern History* 69 (1997): 77–101.
4. Lotz-Heumann, 140–41; Markus Riedt, “‘Founding a New Church . . .’: The Early Ecclesiology of Martin Luther in the Light of the Debate about Confessionalization,” in *Confessionalization in*

Europe, 1555-1700, ed. John M. Headley, Hans J. Hillerbrand, and Anthony J. Papalas (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004), 57–59.

5. Brady, 4, quoting Heinz Schilling, “Die Konfessionalisierung von Kirche, Staat und Gesellschaft—Profil, Leistung, Defizite und Perspektiven eines geschichtswissenschaftlichen Paradigmas,” in *Die katholische Konfessionalisierung. Akten eines von Corpus Catholicorum und Verein für Reformationgeschichte veranstalteten Symposions, Augsburg, 1993*, edited by Wolfgang Reinhard and Heinz Schilling (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus and Münster: Aschendorff, 1995), 11–49.

6. Riedt, 59–60.

7. Philip Benedict, “Confessionalization in France? Critical Reflections and New Evidence,” in *Society and Culture in the Huguenot World*, 44–61; Graeme Murdock, “‘Freely Elected in Fear’: Princely Elections and Political Power in Early Modern Transylvania,” *Journal of Early Modern History* 7, no. 3/4 (2003): 213–44. Jörg Deventer, “Confessionalisation: A Useful Theoretical Concept for the Study of Religion, Politics, and Society in Early Modern East-Central Europe?,” *European Review of History* 11, no. 3 (2004): 403–25.

8. The quotation is from Brady, 5; see also Lotz-Heumann, 137, 144–45. Schilling wrote: “Research on confessionalization, therefore, is not only concerned with the formation of the modern confessional churches as institutions or with the confessions as religious cultural systems, clearly distinct in doctrine, spirituality, ritual, and popular culture. Rather, at issue is a process of change and formation, directed by religious and ecclesiastical forces, which embraced all areas of public and private life and which fundamentally molded the profile of modern Europe.” See Heinz Schilling, “Confessionalization: Historical and Scholarly Perspectives on a Comparative and Interdisciplinary Paradigm,” in *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555-1700*, ed. John M. Headley, Hans J. Hillerbrand, and Anthony J. Papalas (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004), 29; see also Heinz Schilling, “Confessional Europe,” in *Handbook of European History, 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation*, ed. Thomas A. Brady, Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1996), 2:641–81.

9. Riedt, 57; Brady, 3.

10. Jaroslav Pelikan, *Credo: Historical and Theological Guide to Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 62.

11. Pelikan, *Credo* is the best source for a definition of creeds and confessions (35–64), for an explanation of their purpose (186–215, 278–305), and for a history of confessions during the Reformation (457–85). *Credo* is the companion volume to Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie Hotchkiss, ed., *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, 4 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), the best collection of confessional documents. Pelikan’s work on the creeds replaces Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, rev. David S. Schaff, 6th ed., 3 vols. (New York: Harper and Row, 1931; reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2007), which is still valuable.

12. Pelikan and Hotchkiss, *Creeds and Confessions*, 1:160–63, 670–72. The creed that is commonly called the *Nicene Creed* actually exists in three versions: the original Greek version promulgated by the Council of Nicaea in 325; an expanded Greek version promulgated by the First Council of Constantinople in 381; and a Latin version subsequently accepted by the Western church that includes the *filioque* clause. To avoid confusion, Pelikan uses the labels *Creed of Nicaea*, *Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed*, and *Western Recension of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed*. The Reformation confessions universally use the *Western Recension*. Because the distinction is not necessary to my purposes, I have retained the title *Nicene Creed*.

-
13. *Ibid.*, 1:667–69. The origin of the *Apostles' Creed* is uncertain, but its earliest elements probably date to the second century. Though the Middle Ages assigned authorship to the twelve apostles, both Protestant and Catholic scholars of the Reformation-era accepted the *Apostles' Creed* without accepting that attribution.
 14. *Ibid.*, 1:673–77. The *Athanasian Creed*, also known as *Quicumque vult*, is actually of uncertain origin in the fifth or sixth century, but sixteenth-century Christians often ascribed it to St. Athanasius.
 15. *Ibid.*, 2:27.
 16. *Ibid.*, 2:58–60, quotation at 2:60.
 17. *Ibid.*, 2:793.
 18. *Ibid.*, 2:125. Luther wrote the *Smalcald Articles* in preparation for the council that the pope had called to meet at Mantua, which was actually held several years later at the Council of Trent. The confession was signed by theologians and ecclesiastical leaders, but not by the political leaders of the Smalcald League.
 19. *Ibid.*, 2:168 for quotation; see also 2:166, 195, 200–201.
 20. Robert Kolb, “The Braunschweig Resolution: The *Corpus Doctrinae Prutenicum* of Joachim Mörlin and Martin Chemnitz as an Interpretation of Wittenberg Theology,” in *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700*, ed. John M. Headley, Hans J. Hillerbrand, and Anthony J. Papalas (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004), 67–90.
 21. Pelikan and Hotchkiss, *Creeds and Confessions*, 2:252.
 22. *Ibid.*, 2:272–79, marginalia at 2:274.
 23. *Ibid.*, 2:479, 464.
 24. *Ibid.*, 2:376.
 25. *Ibid.*, 2:410.
 26. *Ibid.*, 2:299–300.
 27. *Ibid.*, 2:530–31, 554.
 28. *Ibid.*, 2:821–22.
 29. *Ibid.*, 2:873.
 30. *Ibid.*, 2:776.
 31. *Ibid.*, 2:706.
 32. *Ibid.*, 2:31–32, 36–37.
 33. *Ibid.*, 2:325–35.
 34. *Ibid.*, 2:432–40, quotation at 433; 2:364–71.
 35. *Ibid.*, 2:679.
 36. *Ibid.*, 2:650.
 37. Furthermore, some confessions were promulgated from a position of strength, not supplication, for example, the *Ten Articles* and the *Thirty-Nine Articles*. Only a few confessions used the creeds as a summary of doctrine.

38. Pelikan and Hotchkiss, *Creeks and Confessions*, 2:458, regarding the *Second Helvetic Confession*.

39. *Ibid.*, 2:51–52. This of course reveals more about the ecumenical tendencies of a later age than it does the *Augsburg Confession*, but it still demonstrates that the confession was initially intended to be ecumenical.

40. *Ibid.*, 2:280–81.

41. *Ibid.*, 2:458–59.

42. *Ibid.*, 2:768.

43. The Orthodox churches recognize neither the *Athanasian Creed* nor the *Western Recension of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed* as ecumenical, because both include the *filioque* clause. But the division between the Western and Eastern churches antedates the Reformation and so has no bearing on this discussion.

44. Pelikan, *Credo*, 186. Pelikan and Hotchkiss's *Creeks and Confessions* has a section of "Confessions of Attempts at Reconciliation and Alliance" (2:789–816), and his *Credo* has chapter titled "Formulas of Concord— And of Discord" (186–215).

45. Pelikan and Hotchkiss, *Creeks and Confessions*, 2:53–54.

46. *Ibid.*, 2:793–95, quotation at 793.

47. *Ibid.*, 2:166–67.

48. *Ibid.*, 2:280.

49. Bruce Gordon, "'The Second Bucer': John Dury's Mission to the Swiss Reformed Churches in 1654–55 and the Search for Confessional Unity," in *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700*, ed. John M. Headley, Hans J. Hillerbrand, and Anthony J. Papalas (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004), 207–26.

**“We Are Marching to Zion”:
Zion Church and the Distinctive Work of Presbyterian Slave
Missionaries in Charleston, South Carolina, 1849–1874.**

Otis Westbrook Pickett

Integration in South Carolina occurred sporadically at best prior to the twentieth century. For instance, from 1849 to 1874 a unique interracial interchange took place within a Presbyterian Church in the low country of South Carolina that sheds light upon nineteenth-century “interracialism” in the South and carries implications for contemporary notions of racial interchange.¹ In what historians have referred to as “slave missions,”² an antebellum church in Charleston called Zion Presbyterian contained a blend of white leadership, in the form of pastors and ruling elders, and a mostly enslaved African American audience and membership. The interracial aspect of this particular slave mission church produced a distinctive yet measured racial progressivism expressing itself in terms of expanded freedoms within the antebellum church structure and through an unusual ecclesiastical equality during Reconstruction.

The slave missionaries at Zion Presbyterian provided, in a multitude of ways, a counterexample to the prevailing cultural expectations of race, the institution of slavery, and race relations during the mid-nineteenth century and through Reconstruction. The culmination of this interracial exchange occurred in 1869, when seven African American freedmen from Zion became the first individuals of African descent to be ordained as elders in the southern branch of the Presbyterian Church of the United States. Undoubtedly, their experiences in the antebellum church structure at Zion prepared them for important ecclesiastical leadership roles during Reconstruction and beyond. After the Civil War, while whites and African Americans were separating along racial lines politically, culturally, and ecclesiastically, the history of Zion Church provides an intriguing study in late-nineteenth century interracialism and the measured egalitarian structure of Presbyterian Church leadership and polity.

Known by the African American community in Charleston simply as “Big Zion,” Zion Presbyterian Church had, in the mid 1850s, one of the largest congregations of enslaved Africans in the entire South. The old Zion building, on Calhoun Street near Meeting Street, was also one of the largest church structures in the state of South Carolina, seating upwards of three thousand individuals on a given Sunday.³ The structure, however, was not the most impressive aspect of Zion. Indeed, there had seldom been a space provided by whites in Charleston that afforded ecclesiastical equality,

and thus hope, to the enslaved African American population as at Zion. Historian John Boles has mentioned that some biracial churches “offered a spark of joy in the midst of pain, a promise of life-affirming forgiveness to soften the hopelessness of unremitting bondage, an ultimate reward in heaven for unrewarded service in this world.”⁴ More than that, Zion offered a practical and useful ecclesiastical structure for enslaved African Americans hoping to display their spiritual leadership abilities and thus, eventual ecclesiastical equality.

The missionaries at Zion, John B. Adger and John L. Girardeau, seemed to possess what can only be described as a moderately reformed racial perspective toward Africans compared with the prevalent societal notions of race in the mid-nineteenth century South. Containing something distinct even from Boles’ notion of a “limited emancipationist impulse” among various slave missionaries, the Presbyterian missionaries in Charleston introduced measured reform within the institution of slavery through expanded freedoms within the church structure, culminating in ecclesiastical equality during Reconstruction. While these slave missionaries were undoubtedly operating within a paternalistic framework, they offer a unique portrayal of individuals whose varying ideologies of race, policies of ecclesiastical equality, and educational goals place them in a different category of nineteenth-century racial moderates.⁵

In 1846, the Second Presbyterian Church commissioned John B. Adger to oversee the work of caring for the spiritual needs of the enslaved Africans of the congregation.⁶ Despite some early support, however, many members of the Charleston community rejected domestic mission work with enslaved Africans. One notable complaint against Zion occurred in a letter to the editor of the *Charleston Mercury* under the pseudonym “Many Citizens.”⁷ The writer described the work as a “dark and dangerous movement.”⁸ He wrote, “The blacks would be joined together in an organized society with the right to consult and deliberate and be heard in matters of church government.” He went on to say that “they would develop a spiritual allegiance to the church” and that “they would learn that what they suffer for the church will be a proud distinction,” and “to minds thus matured, what will be the language of the master or the owner.”⁹ However, in spite of community uncertainties, Adger and the leaders of Second Presbyterian were able to convince the Charleston public, in a public response to “Many Citizens” and others, that the mission would not become a breeding ground for insurrection.¹⁰

In the summer of 1847, the slave mission began in the basement of a building on Society Street known as the Presbyterian Lecture Hall. In 1850 it moved to an old Catholic Church on the corner of Anson Street, just south of Calhoun Street. In 1852 Adger’s health began to fail due to debilitating eye problems, and in December

of 1853, at the age of twenty-nine, John Lafayette Girardeau filled the pulpit at the Anson Street Mission Church. Born in 1825 on James Island, John Lafayette Girardeau was the first College of Charleston honors graduate and a relative of Charles Colcock Jones, the famous slave missionary from Liberty County, Georgia. Under Girardeau's guidance, Anson Church experienced "steady growth" and was "divided into classes." His ministry and preaching attracted large numbers of enslaved African Americans, and the congregation soon outgrew the building on Anson Street as it "quickly became the most prominent gathering place for the African American community of the city."¹¹ Girardeau remembered the building at Anson "became too strait for them, the fences around it being occupied by those who could not get in, and sometimes even the trees in the rear" were filled.¹² The young preacher's fame as an orator captured national repute, but his desire to work explicitly with the African American population of Charleston kept him near the place of his birth.

According to Girardeau's original biography, his work at the Anson mission during weekly instruction "led the leading negroes of other churches to admit that the Anson Street work was 'of the Lord'."¹³ The mission began with thirty-six members in 1854, and by 1857, there were over six hundred enrolled members, with an attendance of over fifteen hundred in a regular Sunday worship service. Eventually, the six hundred-seat Anson Street building was simply not large enough to accommodate the individuals attending, and the session decided that the church needed a new meeting place.¹⁴ Robert Adger, an elder at Second Presbyterian and a wealthy real estate investor, located a "prime piece of property near the corner of Meeting Street and Calhoun Street — barely a block from Second Presbyterian Church — and bought it for \$7,220."¹⁵

Displaying the complexity of Presbyterian slave missions and the distinct nature of Zion, the church became a stand-alone congregation with its own session (which comprised all white members from Second Presbyterian), mission plan, vision, and atmosphere. Indeed, according to John Adger, it was the enslaved membership that "named it Zion."¹⁶ Enslaved members chose the name Zion to signify it as a "dwelling place" that God had set apart for his chosen people.¹⁷ Other Presbyterian churches with enslaved converts, according to historians Randall Balmer and John Fitzmier, "were not permitted to form independent congregations. Instead, they attended white Presbyterian Churches but were generally barred from officeholding and were seated in separated areas of the sanctuary."¹⁸ Almost the exact opposite occurred with the formation of Zion.

Zion was an independent congregation. Its members were allowed to hold leadership positions, and while the seating was separated along racial lines, the African

American congregants occupied the best seats or “the places of honor” in the pews directly in front of the pulpit.¹⁹ Further, many slaves flocked to Girardeau’s church because he acknowledged the distinct needs of the enslaved African American community, and Zion possessed an identity independent from the white congregations in Charleston.²⁰ Erskine Clarke described Girardeau’s Zion as “their [African Americans] church, as no other church in Charleston had been theirs since Morris Brown and the African Methodist Church.” To slaves, it “was a building, a place that had been built for them. Here they could gather, could claim a community and thus humanity in the very midst of an alienating and dehumanizing bondage.”²¹ Girardeau acknowledged that enslaved African Americans needed spiritual encouragement, education in the theology of the church, and equal treatment as human beings. Therefore, pastor and congregant endeavored together to form a distinctive missions style. There was no doubt that Girardeau defended the racial order inherent within the institution of slavery. Something in his approach to interracialism within the context of slave missions, however, separated him from the predominant categories among many white theologians and churchmen in the nineteenth century.²²

At Zion, Girardeau divided the church into “classes.” The “leaders” of each class took up collections from their members for the sick or infirm. It was also the leaders’ duty to visit the members of their class and report on any sickness or discipline matters to the session. Through these leadership positions, enslaved Africans discovered a unique sphere to “nurture (and be recognized by whites to have) moral responsibility and what historians have called ‘moral earnestness.’”²³ The pastor, session, and congregation gave serious consideration to these positions, and the leaders undoubtedly saw themselves as possessing a measure of spiritual authority over their fellow congregants. To be sure, in “a society that offered few opportunities for slaves to practice organizational and leadership skills or hear themselves addressed and see themselves evaluated morally on equal basis with whites, small matters could have large meanings.”²⁴

The class leaders also appeared at session meetings and at church discipline cases where elders considered their testimony valuable. It was significant that Girardeau and the session allowed enslaved Africans to give testimony in the church courts. This occurred in a society that did not allow enslaved Africans to testify in civil courts. At Zion, however, enslaved Africans appeared as witnesses and gave testimony either for or against their fellow African American members. Church discipline cases included punishments for a variety of behaviors including drunkenness, lying, and adultery. Referring to this interracial ecclesiastical court structure, Boles mentioned that, “nowhere else in southern society were slaves and whites brought together in an arena where both were held responsible to a code of behavior sanctioned by a source

outside the society—the Bible.”²⁵ Zion not only held whites and African Americans to the same “code of behavior—the Bible,” but the church courts allowed slaves to give statements and testify to one another’s guilt or innocence. This treatment might have given enslaved leaders of Zion the slightest sense of equality, if not a glimpse toward a hoped-for equal civic status in the future.

There were also “exhorters” among the enslaved African leaders. Exhorters could conduct funeral services and were able to teach and preach to other members of the church. Some of these exhorters could read, and while they could not, legally, teach others to read, they could read from the Bible at certain classes and prayer meetings. Allowing enslaved Africans to read to one another sent a clear message to participants in the classes.²⁶ John Boles, noting the importance of enslaved leaders in a congregation, said, “Slaves apparently had their image of being creatures of God strengthened by the sermons” and their “evident pleasure in occasionally hearing the black preachers speak to biracial congregations no doubt augmented their sense of racial pride.”²⁷ Indeed, enslaved Africans did not rely on white-operated institutions to encourage their sense of self-respect and identity, but neither were they adverse to grasping opportunities wherever they found them and using them suitably to meet their own needs as well as the requirements of the congregation. Girardeau’s insistence on having enslaved class leaders, exhorters, and readers rejected many notions that African Americans were incapable of reading and interpreting theology, deep spiritual understanding, and leadership. In Girardeau’s Zion, expanded freedoms through the development of spiritual leadership afforded enslaved Africans the opportunity to seize positions of honor in an otherwise degrading society.

Girardeau also conducted wedding ceremonies and funerals, a feature not unusual for slave mission churches. Girardeau, however, performed these ceremonies with large numbers in attendance and in the very center of the social district of the city of Charleston. Slave weddings were usually performed for small parties on plantations outside the public eye. As a Presbyterian of the reformed tradition, Girardeau believed in the importance of the institution of marriage, and therefore he celebrated it publicly. Further, Girardeau, like Charles C. Jones, tried to preserve families in his congregation and disagreed with separation of the nuclear family. It is possible that Girardeau used large wedding displays to show slaveholders, and the broader Charleston community, that he did not support the separation of families to make profits in slave trading. In addition, one can also only imagine the reaction of white onlookers as hundreds of slaves gathered to celebrate a wedding in the very center of the Charleston peninsula.

Girardeau’s regard for his flock as human beings is particularly apparent in the church roll books of Zion. Girardeau meticulously recorded the names of individuals he

baptized and married. Contrary to many church record books of this era, Girardeau recorded the first and the surnames of each slave in the roll books.²⁸ In antebellum society, slaves did not receive surnames as this suggested their status as a human being with a lineage rather than as chattel property. One historian, noting the importance of such a demarcation said, "This equality in terms of address may seem insignificant today, but in an age when whites were accorded the titles of Mr. and Mrs., and it was taboo for a white to so address a black, any form of address that smacked of equality was notable."²⁹ Girardeau was acknowledging a slave as a human being with a soul, a family, and a spiritual and physical heritage.

This unique attribute has distinguished Zion Church from other denominations in that the "typical Baptist or Methodist churches included black members, who often signed (or put an "X")."³⁰ Usually, missionaries listed enslaved Africans in church roll books as, for example "Sam, servant of John Dawson."³¹ For decades, slave owners throughout the South had denied their slaves surnames in order to display that slaves had no genealogical connections because of their status as property. Members of Zion who claimed surnames did so bravely, displaying individuality, humanity and self-determination. By encouraging this, Girardeau made Zion Presbyterian Church a place where slaves could declare a genealogy, a family history, and thus that they possessed an allegiance to someone other than their owners. Further, slaves did not just pick the names of their owners but "by the late 1850's, more than 92 percent of the slaves who joined Zion gave as their own surnames names that were different from those of their owners." Slaves were declaring not only a family history, but one that was separate from their owners. Further, "in addition to claiming the name of their families of origin, wives gave the surnames of their husbands, affirming their slave marriages."³² These aspects of Zion were indicative of the larger philosophy behind Girardeau's experimental work. Indeed, small matters could have large meanings.

Augmenting this philosophy of humanity at Zion was the seating of enslaved African Americans. While many churches throughout Charleston relegated enslaved African Americans to the stifling hot galleries, at Anson Street, and later at Zion, enslaved congregants occupied the pews directly in front of the pulpit. Lois Simms, the first historian of Zion Presbyterian Church, has called this seating "the place of honor."³³ African Americans at Girardeau's Zion occupied the pews while white session members and visitors sat in the galleries. Regarding this unusual phenomenon, John Grimball, after visiting Zion, wrote home to his family on 27 November 1859, "I waited until after J.L. Girardeau had performed the service for the Negroes. There were there unusually large numbers and occupied all of the pews of the church."³⁴ Grimball showed frustration that his presence was not given preference over enslaved attendees.

This was yet another display of Girardeau's belief in the humanity and ecclesiastical equality of his congregants. The seating arrangement told white visitors and participants that they were of secondary importance in Zion's mission. There were certainly few spaces in the mid-nineteenth-century South that white men and women were ever considered secondary to African Americans. Zion was one of those spaces. Enslaved Africans did not discover a civic equality at Zion, but they encountered spaces where Girardeau provided a resemblance of equality and some appearance of common humanity. Far from insignificant to the lives of enslaved Africans, the acknowledgment of a common humanity and ecclesiastical equality in biracial churches was one of the ways enslaved Africans conjured the will to survive an inhuman bondage.³⁵

Throughout the Civil War, Girardeau served as Chaplain of the 23rd South Carolina Volunteers. During Reconstruction, Girardeau's work with the African American community in Charleston, now freedmen, continued. While many of Girardeau's contemporary southerners fought against integration, against African American leadership, and against the rights of freedmen after the Civil War, Girardeau was working for progressive ecclesiastical reform. Further, many African American congregants left their old antebellum churches, but Zion continued to experience growth. African Americans "in significant numbers—eventually all of them—began to move out of the biracial churches and join a variety of independent black denominations." Likewise, many white churchmen of biracial antebellum churches applauded "the new segregated patterns of worship" during Reconstruction.³⁶ Several African American members of the antebellum Zion church, however, retained their membership. Indeed, newly freed members of the old antebellum Zion formally requested that Girardeau return and serve as their pastor throughout the period of Reconstruction.

In a letter dated 27 July 1865, Paul Trescot, one of the African American class leaders and exhorters from the antebellum Zion church, wrote to Girardeau expressing the church's interest in Girardeau's return to Zion: "The past relations we have engaged together for many years as pastor and people are still in its bud in our every heart. Therefore we would welcome you still as our pastor." Trescot also informed Girardeau that "our past congregation will be the same in future and till death, provide past relations with you are and considered the same."³⁷ These individuals could have offered a call of ministry to an African American Presbyterian minister from the North, or they could have simply joined other African American churches in Charleston, but they decided to invite Girardeau, once again, to serve as their pastor.

Despite the Second Presbyterian offering the more prominent pulpit to Girardeau in 1865, he agreed to the request of the freedmen. He went on to become

one of the leading advocates for integrated worship and improved ecclesiastical status of African Americans, and he became the first white southern Presbyterian to ordain African American elders in the southern branch of the Presbyterian Church. These somewhat abnormal postbellum racial notions were rooted in both the expanded freedoms and progressive nature of Girardeau's antebellum experiences. His work towards integrated worship was an indicator of his moderate views towards race in an environment that was growing increasingly hostile towards African Americans' new civic freedoms.

In 1873, following the Civil War, factions within the Presbyterian Church of the United States (PCUS) began to debate the new ecclesiastical status of freed African Americans. In 1874 Girardeau was the lone member of the PCUS to vote against the formation of a separate black denomination. It was his conviction that African Americans and whites should worship together.³⁸ He desired to see both whites and African American members "continue in their spiritual relations as an integrated body."³⁹ To resolve this matter, the general assembly of the PCUS called Girardeau to serve as chair on a committee in order "to consider the relations of the church to the freedmen and report on the whole subject."⁴⁰ He drafted a report to the Assembly in 1866. Many of those at the assembly commended the report, and "the assembly adopted the committee's resolution and ordered that Girardeau's paper be published in the *Southern Presbyterian Review*."⁴¹

In the report, Girardeau explained his fundamental beliefs on the equality of the freedmen in the church, and he cited several biblical texts supporting these views, including Galatians 3:28.⁴² In further support of his position, Girardeau suggested that the new civil climate of Reconstruction demanded a renewed consideration of African Americans' status in the church. In accordance with the emancipation of the slaves, Christians were now under civil obligation to grant full ecclesiastical equality to former enslaved Africans. Girardeau wrote, "The ecclesiastical disabilities which attached to them, growing out of the state of slavery, are no longer in existence. It must be admitted that, technically speaking, their minority in the church must be removed."⁴³ He believed that southern Presbyterians could no longer use the "slave argument" to keep freedmen from serving as equals in the church. For Girardeau, it was time for ecclesiastical freedom, which meant granting greater privileges and equality to African Americans in the context of the church.

It is noteworthy that while many southerners were fighting for strict segregation of every single institution during Reconstruction, from government positions to public facilities, Girardeau was advancing integration in one of the last places that southern whites still maintained a measure of control: the church. The church was one of the last strongholds for southern whites to maintain racially stratified

antebellum roles and one of the few places where federal law could not intervene to force ecclesiastical equality. Conversely, Girardeau was advocating integration of freedmen into the church power structure, education with a gradual move towards pastoral leadership, and equality in ecclesiastical leadership (i.e. the possibility of having African American deacons and elders).

Zion experienced membership expansion after the war, and the annual reports display growth. In 1867 a meeting of African American members at Zion determined how many individuals would remain. At that meeting, 187 indicated that they continued to want to be a part of Zion with Girardeau as their pastor. One witness remembered that many “were ready to come back to their old church and remained loyal to their former faithful and devoted pastor, and sometimes large congregations attended the services.”⁴⁴ On 25 March 1867, the (white) session of the church nominated seven (African American) individuals to be superintendents over the new congregation.⁴⁵ Many of these men were the same class leaders, exhorters, and readers who served in the antebellum Zion. In 1869, Girardeau’s work towards ecclesiastical equality of the newly freedmen came to fruition, “upon recommendation of the Session, the following African-American men were nominated to serve in the office of Ruling Elder—Paul Trescot, William Price, Jacky Morrison, Samuel Robinson, William Spencer, and John Warren.”⁴⁶ As a result, Girardeau became the first white member of the Southern Presbyterian Church to ordain African Americans to the position of elder, which is the highest position of authority in the Presbyterian Church. This success, however, was short lived.

In 1874 Benjamin M. Palmer, among other southern Presbyterian leaders at the Columbus, Missouri, General Assembly, called for the organic separation of African Americans from white Presbyterian churches. Girardeau became the only member of the national Presbyterian General Assembly to vote for integration. As the solitary voice, Girardeau’s effort to retain a racially incorporated church ultimately failed and “with the establishment of the African Presbyterian Church, Girardeau’s cause for an integrated church was lost.”⁴⁷

In 1874 the last of Girardeau’s African American members left Zion. Many joined other local African American churches or remained to form what later became Zion-Olivet Presbyterian Church. Girardeau later remarked, “it was in past days, my privilege to enjoy with those courteous and noble gentlemen. They were my warm friends, and I hope, through grace, to meet them when not long hence it shall be my turn to go.”⁴⁸ Fighting for the ecclesiastical equality of African Americans, however, was not the only legacy of Girardeau’s post bellum work. His work towards education and ecclesiastical integration lasted well into the twenty-first century.⁴⁹

The heritage of Girardeau's missionary work left an indelible imprint on the history of African Americans in the low country of South Carolina. During Reconstruction, the Zion Church housed one of the first schools for African Americans in Charleston. Zion Church was also an initial place for the establishment of a political leadership for African Americans in South Carolina during Reconstruction. As Thomas Holt recounted, "meeting at Zion Church in Charleston during the late fall of 1865 was by all accounts unprecedented." Experiencing the freedom of political expression for the first time, many "black Charlestonians crowded into the Church's galleries to hear the daily debates and to applaud speeches of their newly emergent, largely indigenous leadership at nightly mass meetings." It was in Zion that African American "men—mostly freeborn and relatively affluent—met to demand new liberties and to fashion their first major political manifesto."⁵⁰ Indeed, it was not strange or unnatural for freedmen to consider and remember Zion as a place of equality and spiritual liberty for the African American community. For some, Zion was one of the only spaces in antebellum Charleston where enslaved Africans experienced any semblance of equality.

Thus, Zion became one of the first spaces where freed African Americans of Charleston established political leadership and were formally educated. This was in part due to the work of the Adger family and Girardeau, whose efforts led to the building of this facility, whose work led to the education of many enslaved Africans, and whose ideology of expanded freedoms created ecclesiastical equality as well as development of an indigenous leadership base within the enslaved African community of Charleston. After the Civil War, the fact that the newly freed African American community was continuing all three of these principles in the space at Zion Church was not a coincidence.

Finally, the work of the old Presbyterian slave missionaries had a lasting impact into the twentieth century. In 1948 the ninetieth anniversary celebration of the African American Zion-Olivet congregation remembered the work of Girardeau and Adger. Reverend Sandy David Thom produced a booklet and noted in the foreword that "We now come to this ninetieth anniversary with grateful hearts and souls overflowing with thanksgiving. This booklet is dedicated to the Honorable Past, the Prosperous Present and the Promising future." He went on to remark, "Here we view the road long and dismal; the white friends that shepherded the slaves in the Second Presbyterian Church and later organized them into a separate Church." Indeed, Thom recognized that out of this slave mission church, an autonomous African American congregation developed with an indigenous African American leadership. He thus remarked, "We can never know the great multitudes of lives that have been awakened . . . and must

never forget or be ashamed to ‘Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged’.” Throughout the booklet, produced by a congregation of African Americans in the very midst of a segregated Jim Crow South, there was certainly a sense of thanksgiving and remembrance for the Christian interracialism that occurred through “white friends” who ministered and worshipped alongside a large portion of the enslaved African community of Charleston.⁵¹

NOTES

Dr. W. Scott Poole provided constructive criticisms as well as insightful comments in the drafting of this paper for conference presentation. His careful guidance as a mentor and thesis director made this work a possibility. I would also like to thank Drs. Charles Reagan Wilson and Ted Ownby for their suggestions and continued support of my research. Drs. Sean Lucas and C.N. Willborn have been a bountiful source of knowledge on the topic. I also would like to thank everyone at the Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture, particularly Georgette Mayo, and Drs. W. Marvin Dulaney and Bernard Powers. I would especially like to thank Lois Simms, whose knowledge and insight on the topic was a source of inspiration.

1. Paul Harvey, *Freedom's Coming: Religious Cultures and the Shaping of the South From the Civil War through the Civil Rights Era* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2005). The old hymn “We are Marching to Zion” is a song of hope, and it describes Zion as a place of beauty, of freedom and of rest. Part of the title of this article came from the old hymn, which was sung by the remnant of the Zion congregation at the merger of Zion and Olivet Presbyterian churches on 16 August 1959, according to the worship pamphlet in Lois Simms, *A History of Zion, Olivet, and Zion-Olivet Churches 1850–1985 Charleston, South Carolina* (Mercury MicroComputer Products: Library of Congress, 1987), 40.

2. There is a tremendous amount of literature on religion in the South and slave religion, but for works directly dealing with slave missionaries see John Boles, *Masters and Slaves in the House of the Lord: Race and Religion in the American South, 1740–1870* (Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 1988); Anne C. Loveland, *Southern Evangelicals and the Social Order, 1800–1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1980); and Janet Duitsman Cornelius, *Slave Missions and the Black Church in the Antebellum South* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1999).

3. It should be noted here that while upwards of three thousand individuals would attend Zion’s services weekly, the actual membership (or individuals that made an official commitment to the church usually in the form of a ceremony) never reached these numbers. According to church roll books and minutes of session the membership was usually around five hundred to six hundred individuals. The author is also currently unaware of any connection that Zion Church had with the African American Freed People of Color community of Charleston prior to the Civil War. After the war, Zion was a gathering place for politicians, teachers and race leaders within the African American community, but prior to the war, Zion’s membership was mostly enslaved African Americans.

4. John Boles, *Masters and Slaves*, 9–10.

5. H. Shelton Smith, *In His Image But . . . Racism in Southern Religion, 1780–1910* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1972). Smith’s examination of southern theologians, pastors and missionaries throughout the nineteenth century provided an interesting comparative framework in which to place individuals like John L. Girardeau and John B. Adger. These individuals provided a stark contrast to Smith’s southern racists such as Theodore Weld, John Fletcher, Robert L. Dabney, and Thornton W. Stringfellow, who did not see a common humanity or future ecclesiastical equality with African Americans (or conceived of Africans as somehow degenerate).
6. W.F. Robertson, *History of Zion Presbyterian Church*. Vertical File, Churches-Presbyterian-Zion-Olivet, Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture.
7. Erskine Clarke mentioned that the author of “Many Citizens” was A.G. Magrath who became “judge of the United States District Court and would serve as governor of South Carolina during the last days of the war. As a fire-eating judge, he would declare that the foreign slave trade was not piracy when the slave ship *Wanderer* was captured illegally selling African slaves in Georgia.”
8. C.N. Willborn, “John L. Girardeau: Pastor to Slaves and Theologian of Causes” (Doctoral Dissertation, Westminster Theological Seminary, 2003), 100.
9. Erskine Clarke, *Wrestlin’ Jacob: A Portrait of Religion in the Old South* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), 146.
10. John Adger and several members of the influential Second Presbyterian Church responded to editorials and letters to the editor in the *Charleston Mercury*. They assured the community that there would be white oversight and control, and that a white session member would always be present at meetings of enslaved members.
11. Erskine Clarke, *Our Southern Zion: A History of Calvinism in the South Carolina Low Country* (Tuscaloosa, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1996), 108–9.
12. Thomas Smyth Papers: Prefatory Notes, Second Presbyterian Church Papers: Records of Anson Street and Zion Church kept by Dr. Girardeau, Collection 24, box 5, folder 6. South Carolina Historical Society.
13. George A. Blackburn, ed. *The Life Work of John L. Girardeau, D.D., LL.D.: Late Professor in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Columbia, S.C.* (Columbia, SC: The State Company, 1916), 32.
14. Clarke, *Our Southern Zion*, 195.
15. *Minutes of Session of Zion Presbyterian Church, 1858–1869*, South Caroliniana Library, 5 June 1858. A Holiday Inn is now located where the old Zion Church was located on Calhoun Street in downtown Charleston. There is a small plaque in front of the hotel commemorating Zion Presbyterian Church.
16. Thomas Smyth Papers: Unpublished notes of his ministry, Second Presbyterian Church Papers: Records of Anson Street and Zion Church kept by Dr. Girardeau, Collection 24, box 5, folder 6. South Carolina Historical Society.
17. Throughout the Old and New Testament, Zion was the residing place of God’s chosen people. Called the city of David in 2 Samuel 5:6–9, 2 Chronicles 5:2 and it was a figurative representation of God’s kingdom in Psalms 125:1, Hebrews 12:22 and Revelation 14:1. Enslaved Africans who named the church were undoubtedly influenced by these passages linking a physical “dwelling place” with God’s chosen people. John Boles also touched on this aspect

in *Masters and Slaves* by referencing Katherine Dvorak's assertion that "for an enslaved people stolen from African homes and too often torn from 'home' slave communities by sale, home became an eschatological symbol celebrated in slave songs as a new Jerusalem, as Canaan's shore, as promised land," 174.

18. Randall Balmer and John R. Fitzmier. *The Presbyterians* (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1993), 73.

19. Lois Simms, *A History of Zion*, 2.

20. Willborn, "Girardeau," 102.

21. *Ibid.*, 152.

22. H. Shelton Smith, *In His Image But... Racism in Southern Religion, 1780–1910* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1972). See above note.

23. Boles, *Masters and Slaves*, 14. Boles references Timothy L. Smith who referred to the importance of "moral earnestness" within enslaved African American communities.

24. *Ibid.*, 14.

25. *Ibid.*, 13.

26. Willborn, "Girardeau," 129–31.

27. Boles, *Masters and Slaves*, 14.

28. *Zion-Olivet Papers*, Box 1, Folder 1, Avery Research Center For African American History and Culture.

29. Boles, *Masters and Slaves*, 12.

30. *Ibid.*, 9.

31. Clarke, *Our Southern Zion*, 153.

32. *Ibid.*, 197.

33. Lois Simms, *A History of Zion, Olivet, and Zion-Olivet Churches 1850–1985 Charleston, South Carolina*. (Mercury MicroComputer Products: Library of Congress, 1987), 2.

34. John Berkley Grimball Collection, letter dated 27 November 1859. South Caroliniana Library.

35. Boles, *Masters and Slaves*, 14.

36. *Ibid.*, 5, 17.

37. Blackburn Family Papers, letter from Paul Trescot to John Girardeau dated 27 July 1865, Microfilm Roll #160, South Caroliniana Library.

38. Clarke, *Wrestlin' Jacob*, 178.

39. Willborn, "Girardeau," 190–91.

40. *Ibid.*, 192.

41. *Ibid.*, 193.

42. This section deals specifically with Paul teaching the Church in Galatia that there are no racial differences between Jew or Greek that can separate them from Christ and the promise of salvation. Girardeau applied the same logic arguing that African Americans and whites

now have the same civic status and therefore they should have the same ecclesiastical status. Girardeau argued that they should be able to join the ranks of the Presbyterian Church as members in equal standing.

43. John Lafayette Girardeau, "Ecclesiastical Relations to Freedmen," *The Southern Presbyterian Review* (Vol. 18, 1866), 4.

44. Willborn, "Girardeau," 203.

45. Thomas Smyth Papers, Prefatory Notes, Second Presbyterian Church Papers: Records of Anson Street and Zion Church kept by Dr. Girardeau, Collection 24, box 5, folder 6. South Carolina Historical Society. The seven individuals include Paul Trescot, John B. Mitchell, Sam Robinson, John Warren, Jacky Morrison, William Price and William Spencer.

46. Willborn, "Girardeau," 203. W.F. Robertson also recorded "Charleston, July 6, 1869—At a meeting of the colored congregation of Zion Church, Charleston S.C., held this night and called for the purpose of considering the propriety of organizing them according to the plan recommended by the last General Assembly, the following resolution was adopted—Resolved—That this congregation accepts the plan of the Assembly and desires to be organized accordingly threreto."

47. Willborn, "Girardeau," 205.

48. Tennent Family Papers, letter from John L. Girardeau to Dr. Charles Tennent dated 6 June 1878. South Caroliniana Library.

49. Robertson, W.F., *Dr. Girardeau Devoted to Negro Work*. In *History of Zion Presbyterian Church*, Vertical File, Churches-Presbyterian-Zion-Olivet, Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture. Part of the legacy of Girardeau was that in April of 1878 the Records of the Charleston Presbytery show that "the Zion colored church, Calhoun Street, Charleston, S.C., is still open and religious services are conducted twice every Sabbath by a Presbyterian minister, a minister, however, who is not in connection with our Presbytery."

50. Thomas Holt, *Black Over White: Negro Political Leadership in South Carolina during Reconstruction* (Urbana, Ill: University of Illinois Press, 1979), 9.

51. *Anniversary of Zion Presbyterian Church 1858–1948*. Souvenir Booklet, Vertical File, Churches-Presbyterian-Zion-Olivet, Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture.

“Educational Opportunities for African Americans in the South Carolina Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-1942”

Robert Waller

The Great Depression of the 1930s adversely affected all Americans, especially the African American community. Although President Franklin D. Roosevelt primarily hoped the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) would lessen the economic chaos ravaging the nation's youth, one indirect consequence was the enhancement of opportunities for African Americans nationwide.¹ This article is an attempt to overcome the deficiencies in recording the educational experiences of African American men from South Carolina in the CCC. An examination of camp newspapers, educational programs, inspection reports, news sources, and working conditions reveals some of the history of this neglected facet of the American experience. Given the importance of the CCC's contributions in South Carolina, historians have given too little attention to its effects upon the black community.² Two recently published articles attempt to correct that omission.³ This current research primarily examines the operation of the CCC in South Carolina with regard to the educational program and its affect on minorities. While the promise of educational advancement did not live up to its potential, there nevertheless was progress during the existence of the program.

Unfavorable economic conditions in the South for blacks and whites were aggravated by the onset of the Great Depression. For the youth of the nation, FDR's New Deal held out the promise of a new beginning. Thanks to an amendment by Representative Oscar De Priest (R-IL), then the only African American member of Congress, the national legislation creating Emergency Conservation Work specified that there should be no discrimination “on account of race, color, or creed.”⁴ Application of this principle was noteworthy by its absence in the administration of CCC work and educational programs because the camps were segregated.

The number of South Carolina “boys” from the ages of eighteen (later seventeen) and twenty-five (later twenty-three) who benefited from CCC participation is represented by the following table:

Enrollment Period	# Camps	White	Black	White Veterans	Black Veterans	Total
Nov. 27, 1933	18	2,830	-0-	263	0	3,093
Aug. 31, 1934	18	3,149	-0-	342	-0-	3,491
June 30, 1935	22	4,650	258	482	-0-	5,390
June 30, 1936	38	4,691	1,407	322	-0-	6,420
June 30, 1937	37	4,005	1,380	352	-0-	5,737
June 30, 1938	30	3,370	1,211	399	-0-	4,980
June 30, 1939	30	3,592	1,304	380	-0-	5,276
June 30, 1940	28	2,067	1,088	365	-0-	3,520
June 30, 1941	27	<u>1,570</u>	<u>1,159</u>	<u>287</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>3,081</u>
Total		29,924	7,807	3,192	65	40,998

These figures reveal the number of men who participated in the work program. The exact number who became engaged in the educational component is unknown, but it is estimated to be high because the need was so great. Nationwide, over fifteen thousand African American enrollees were taught to read and write.⁵ Eleanor Roosevelt, among others, advocated a similar work/study program for girls, commonly referred to as the She-She-Shes. Camps for South Carolina women were placed at Clemson, Kingstree, and Orangeburg. Their educational program consisted of classes in English, domestic science, hygiene, public health, and "simple economics." Enrollments were limited to eight weeks and those enrolled received five dollars per month for personal expenses.⁶ No recoverable data establishes the enrollment by race.

The educational program was an unanticipated early addition to the CCC undertaking. Initially, enrollees received food, clothing, shelter, equipment, medical attention, and a monthly allowance of thirty dollars, of which twenty-five were sent home to a dependent. The salary and relief allotments were the principal areas in which there was no discrimination between black and white, though the same could not be said in educational matters. Beginning in 1934 the United States Office of Education assumed primary responsibility for all the after-hours instructional activities. Essentially, the emphasis took three forms: a) remediation for those with only rudimentary education or classified as illiterate, b) vocational training courses, and c) life adjustment instruction. As an inducement to learning to write one's name, the camp commander at Cassatt required a signature for payroll disbursement. After that rushed lesson, educational instructors continued by focusing upon spelling, then reading. At the African American camp at Witherbee, the addition of two WPA teachers skilled in reading and writing made it possible to declare a new war on illiteracy.⁷

The remediation program was especially valuable in the Palmetto State, where the literacy rate was only 29.9 percent in 1930. South Carolina ranked near the bottom of the states in school expenditures and near the top in birth rate. The task of the camp educational advisers was monumental at the secondary level as well. A 1941 report on enrollees indicated that only 8 percent of South Carolina selectees had high school experience, whereas the national average was 36 percent and the southeastern Fourth Corps area was 17 percent. At the college level in 1940, sixty-one CCC members were reported attending Clemson College (now University) and the Greenwood School of Business on financial aid.

These programs had their desired effect in terms of employment gains. Studies of former members of the CCC indicated South Carolina as among the states showing the highest employment rate following CCC service. In South Carolina the employment percentage was over 30 percent, whereas the national average was 22.5 percent, and in many industrial states the rate was as low as 15 percent. In addition to the classroom skills that CCC instructors provided, the total CCC environment instilled a work ethic and employment habits that would be valuable in the work force. National CCC Education Director Clarence S. Marsh described the educational effort as “a great American folk school.”⁸ Instructors included camp officers, supervisory personnel, nearby public school teachers, local businessmen, and Works Progress Administration/National Youth Administration employees. The range of offerings varied with the interests and needs of the enrollees, the available instructional talent, and the suitability of facilities. The federal investment in CCC education foreshadowed the World War II G. I. Bill and its educational assistance to black and white veterans.

Illiterates, black and white, became the primary beneficiaries of the numeracy and literacy workbooks created for the camps. For national distribution, the Office of Education staff designed a series of five arithmetic workbooks arranged in twenty-two progressively more difficult lessons. The last exercise dealt with money handling needs in the post-CCC world. To provide an instrument for marginally illiterate corpsmen, the education division designed a series of two language workbooks with lessons on appearance, thrift, the flag, and on such practical subjects as felling trees, building a house, and getting a job. The instilling of Boy Scout-like virtues was the embodiment of the “citizenship” training expected in the CCC program. The last workbook entitled “After You Leave Camp” was especially instructive for it revealed the educational/citizenship goals of the CCC instructional efforts. The editor/instructors encouraged those completing their six-month enrollment to consider the many values learned from their CCC experience. The suggested list included:

You learn to live and get along with your fellow man. You learn the value of a well-ordered life. . . . the value of cleanliness . . . the value of well balanced meals. . . . the value of good health. . . . the value of exercise. . . . to give first aid to the sick and injured. . . . the value of the worthy use of leisure time. . . . the value of thrift. . . . the value of safety. These are only a few things. Can you think of others? Write them on the lines below.⁹

These benefits permeate the middle-class approach to the society into which the CCC graduates were expected to enter with values such as patriotism, loyalty, obedience to authority, and physical self-control.

One quality to be instilled by the educational program was participation in the democratic process by voting. Initially the Director of Emergency Conservation Work decreed that “the men [those 21 or older] shall be allowed two days off to vote, if they so request, without pay or government transportation.” A few months later that directive was modified to allow CCC men “who are also voters [to] be given the privilege of a three-day leave to go home to cast their vote. One day, only, will be with pay.” As the 1936 presidential election neared, additional stress was placed on eligibility in exercising the franchise. As a service to the 25 percent of enrollees nationwide who were over twenty-one, *Happy Days* provided a synopsis of state voter regulations. For South Carolina that meant “Personal registration required every two years. Poll tax of \$1 payable 30 days before the election. Absentee voter not allowed to vote.”¹⁰ No comparable effort was made before the 1940 election.

To assure the academic quality of an educational adviser’s credentials, the United States Office of Education made the actual appointment, but the corps area commanders were permitted to designate the camps where the individuals would serve. In 1935 the Southeast, comprising the Fourth Corps under Major General George Van Horn Moseley, lagged far behind the rest of the nation in the appointment of African American educational advisers. Moseley’s seventy-nine black companies, serving half of the minority population in the South, had only fifteen African American advisers. Six months later, as the national total of African American advisers rose from seventy to ninety-four, Moseley’s Corps experienced no increase. In 1936 CCC Director Robert Fechner, under pressure from President Roosevelt, promulgated a policy that would increase the number of African American educational advisers on the payroll in African American camps. Moseley was the only corps commander who did not willingly go along. By late July he was expected to have 286 white advisers and 63 black advisers in the camps under his command. The 286 whites were assigned but only 22 African Americans. Moseley claimed to be working hard to fill the allotted number. George

Imes, assistant to the principal at Tuskegee Institute, was temporarily assigned to Fourth Corps headquarters in Atlanta to help remedy the situation. Late in 1936, four more African American advisers were appointed, and ten whites were assigned to serve with black companies. In 1937 the *Hill Side News* at Montmorenci warmly welcomed the appointment of William B. James, "one of our race," as a replacement educational adviser. Only in the waning days of the CCC (1941–42) did all 150 African American companies nationwide have an African American educational adviser.¹¹

The importance of African American educational advisers was not lost on the camp inspectors who conducted inquiries into CCC activities. The eighty-seven extant reports for South Carolina CCC camps offer an insightful source for understanding their operation. Inspectors made routine, unannounced visits for safety checks, work progress, and considerations of general morale. These inspectors also responded to specific complaints about working conditions, food quality, camp punishments, officer misconduct, and so forth. In one instance early in the implementation of the educational program, Special Investigator Neill M. Cooney, Jr. noted that no educational adviser had been appointed at the African American forestry camp in Clinton. He observed that, given the need in all African American companies, full-time educational advisers should be assigned immediately.¹² Unfortunately, no direct evidence exists that his recommendation was immediately pursued, but it illustrates the importance of the contribution education was expected to make and the important role of the individual in making it happen.

Service in the CCC provided some enrollees with educational opportunities that assisted themselves and their comrades. Too frequently the CCC experienced drownings in camp swimming pools, and corps commanders were encouraged to provide training programs in life saving. For example, George Council and Isaiah Simmons of Company 4470 at Montmorenci attended the segregated Fourth Corps Area Life Saving School held at Fort McClellan in Anniston, Alabama, during the week of 11 to 19 July 1937. African American enrollees from seven Southern states attended the segregated schools, and nearly all returned to their camps as Senior Life Saving Guards.¹³

The emphasis on safety also applied to other facets of camp activity involving sharp blades, rolling equipment, heavy lifting, and sometimes fire fighting. Safety was preached in the classroom and in field work. The "Colored" Soil Conservation Service CCC company 5423-C stationed in Spartanburg was lauded nationally for 1,052 days "without a lost time accident." The camp's attention to "collective carefulness" served as a model for others to emulate and for the men to practice when entering the work force.¹⁴

Camp newspapers were frequently the outcome of classes in journalism. A common theme in black as well as white camp newspapers concerned job opportunities following the completion of an enlistment. At the direction of Major General Moseley, the Fourth Corps embarked upon a campaign for employment following CCC service. An illustration of one such campaign is found in Witherbee's *Little Ethiopia*, which reproduced the full-page letter sent by the company commander to area employers extolling the virtues of 121 African American enrollees being honorably discharged from his unit on 30 September 1937. These men, he reported, "have been taught discipline, special job training, and have attended our educational classes." The accompanying sheet listed job classifications alphabetically from auto mechanic through waiter, along with assurances that only "morally and mentally fit" men would be recommended. Each fall meant a new cycle of after-hour classes aimed to make the enrollees more employable. Typical was the open letter of the company commander at Newberry urging participation "to enable the enrollee to go out into the world and make a living for himself and his family." A Department of Labor study had recently reported that more than four hundred thousand domestic and service workers were needed. The commander urged enrollment in the Domestic Service Course being offered. For the "colored" members of Company 4465 in Clinton, such instruction was considered "something practical" that could be used in civilian life.¹⁵ While stereotypical of the job classification assigned minorities at that time, such training nevertheless offered prospects of a better life. Proper attention was also given to the leisure-time educational activities of the men. This included supplying a library of reading materials for every camp. The War Department, responsible for the administration of the camps, made available two copies of the three most popular journals of the time (each with a million in circulation or more): *Collier's*, *Liberty*, and the *Saturday Evening Post*. Initially forty-three journals were supplied to every camp. In 1937 *Newsweek* was added, with two copies going to each camp library. Nationwide, the black companies also received *Opportunity: A Journal of Negro Life*, published monthly by the National Urban League, and in 1937, *Service*, published by Tuskegee Institute was added to their list. Just as the liberal *Nation* and *New Republic* were considered "unsafe" reading material for white companies by the officers in the War Department, the militant *Crisis: A Record of the Darker Races*, published by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was declared off limits for black companies.¹⁶

As war clouds loomed larger on the horizon, the educational mission of the CCC was altered to contribute to the defense effort. Senator James F. Brynes of South Carolina sponsored an amendment to the June 1940 appropriation bill requiring the CCC to offer instruction in "non-combatant training." That expression included

classes in “cooking, baking, operation and maintenance of motor vehicles, road and bridge construction and maintenance, first aid to the injured, photography, signal communication, and other matters incident to the successful conduct of military and naval activities.” Such training enabled black military recruits to pass physicals for admission to the Armed Forces and to gain skills enabling them to perform capably when it became necessary to defend the nation against Axis aggressors.¹⁷ By 1942 this war-oriented approach was labeled the “Victory Program,” as CCC efforts were diverted to building air strips, constructing barracks for the Army, and developing target ranges on military bases. CCC members had become Depression Doughboys.

In whatever guise, the educational component of the CCC program was invaluable to the African American community. When Director Fechner died on the last day of 1939, representative African American newspapers such as the *Palmetto Leader* of Columbia were quick to praise him as a “friend to the colored CCC youth.” The reporter noted that the vocational and educational system in the CCC camps had been “very beneficial to the youth[,] both colored and white.”¹⁸ Seemingly, progress in educational matters was being made.

As part of the state investment to honor its commitment for an African American recreational/educational center, CCC work began at Lake Greenwood. That master plan offers an ironic and outstanding illustration of the meaning of the 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* principle of “separate but equal,” as the area was divided into two sections, “one for the white population and one for the negro population,” with the following features as suggested by Landscape Architect Albert Schallenberg:

White	A. Day use	Black
Boat Basin and Boat Storage		
Community Building		Community Building
Swimming Pool		Swimming Pool (separate)
Contact Station		Contact Station
Stables		
Picnic Areas		Picnic Areas
Field House		
Play Fields (Baseball/Football)		Play Fields (Baseball/Football)
Foot Trails		Foot Trails
Road and Truck Trails		Road and Truck Trails
Horse Trails		
Outdoor Theatre		Outdoor Theatre

B. Campgrounds

Fishing Camps
Organized Camp

C. Supervision and Maintenance

Custodian's Dwelling (living room,
dining room, kitchen, bathroom,
3 bedrooms; colonial type of
architecture)

Custodian's Dwelling ('a
small four or five room
dwelling')

Service Building

Service Building

D. Utilities

Water System
Sewage Disposal System
Power Line
Telephone Line
Fire Tower

Water System (separate wells)
Sewage Disposal System
Power Line
Telephone Line

"The plan indicates that we suggest a separate entrance from the county road in order that when it becomes necessary to close the [black] park area, the caretaker will not have to use the main entrance."¹⁹ Such were the extremes to which community planners went to assure not only separation but distinction among the races.

The development of the thousand-acre Greenwood State Park is unusual because two CCC camps were assigned to work there simultaneously. A company of white veterans was assigned the task of developing the white portion of the area, and a black company was assigned development of the section for African Americans across the road. The two camp sites were a short distance apart. Despite the high interest on the part of the African American community in the establishment of the first state park serving their educational and recreational needs, the local newspaper took little cognizance of these efforts.²⁰ Such invisibility was not unique in the newspaper coverage of the African American experience.

What had begun as an employment relief effort turned into an arm of the military complex preparing for war. The educational goals were directed to practical outcomes. One of the contemporary appraisals of the impact of the CCC upon African American enrollees was penned by Chaplain G. Lake Imes, who generalized about the twelve thousand African Americans in eighty-three CCC camps then scattered about the Fourth Corps area. He observed that the skills learned, weight gained, pride instilled, and attitudes improved contributed to a sense of "belonging" in American society. The chaplain concluded:

What a wealth of meaning that has for the South where there are so many of these black boys and where they have constituted for so long an unsolved problem. If the CCC camps did nothing more than reveal the latent capacities of black boys in the South, and the latent goodwill of southern white men toward these same black boys, it would be worth every dollar that has been spent on them.²¹

Such optimism did not always prevail however, as discrimination, suspicion, and intolerance persisted. Nevertheless, progress had been made. In a systematic fashion, both the federal and the state governments subconsciously found a way to begin addressing fundamental barriers to racial progress by providing expanded educational opportunities. The racial divide was being reduced. At its inception the CCC was designed as a depression antidote with no goal of eliminating segregation or addressing racism, yet it performed admirable work on both counts. The African Americans of the New Deal era in South Carolina achieved greater educational benefits and more practical recognition than at any time previously in the nation's or the state's history.

NOTES

1. Representative studies include John A. Salmond, "The Civilian Conservation Corps and the Negro," *Journal of American History* 52 (June 1965), 75–88; Ann Burkly, "Blacks in the Civilian Conservation Corps: Successful Despite Discrimination," *Proceedings and Papers of the Georgia Association of Historians* 14 (1993), 337–45 (focusing primarily on Georgia); Olen Cole, Jr., *The African-American Experience in the Civilian Conservation Corps* (Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 1999) (emphasizing the California experience); Olaf Stieglitz, "'I Was Black and I Acted As Such': Diskurs, Erfahrung und Junge African-Americans im Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933–1942," *Werkstatt Geschichte* 29 (September 2000), 60–80; and David J. Nelson, "Florida Crackers and Yankee Tourists: The Civilian Conservation Corps, The Florida Park Service, and the Emergence of Modern Florida Tourism" (Ph.D. thesis, Florida State University, 2008). The latest catalogues of CCC publications are found in Jackie Mc Fadden and Jean Wells, *The Civilian Conservation Corps: A Bibliography* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellon Press, 2005) and Larry N. Sypolt, *Civilian Conservation Corps: A Selectively Annotated Bibliography* (Westport, CN: Praeger Publishers, 2005).
2. Sample studies of the CCC in South Carolina include Edna Kennerly, "The Civilian Conservation Corps As A Social Resource In South Carolina" (Master of Social Service thesis, University of South Carolina, 1940) and Jack I. Hayes, *South Carolina and the New Deal* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2001), 52–55.
3. Robert A. Waller, "Happy Days and the Civilian Conservation Corps in South Carolina, 1933–1942," *The Historian* 64 (Fall 2001), 39–61 and "The Civilian Conservation Corps and the Emergence of South Carolina's State Park System, 1933–1942," *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 104 (April 2003), 101–25.

4. *Congressional Record*, 73rd Congress, 1st Session, Volume 77 (March 29 and 30, 1933), 983 and 1042. For an understanding of the early opposition to the CCC consult Robert W. Dubay, "The Civilian Conservation Corps: A Study of Opposition, 1933–1935," *Southern Quarterly* 6 (April 1968), 341–58.
5. "Colored" was the quasi-official name for African Americans in the CCC. Figures prepared by Frank Bridges located at Kings Mountain National Park in a file labeled CCC-AG-3245-CCC. This summary also reports out-of-state CCC assignments (none of them African American by Director Fechner's policy) as follows: June 30, 1936 shows 4,582 South Carolinians being sent to the Third Corps (Mid-Atlantic States); June 30, 1937, another 5,981 sent to Third Corps; June 30, 1938, an additional 8,468 young men transported to Ninth Corps (Western States); June 30, 1939, another 6,530 enrollees to Ninth Corps; June 30, 1940, 5,890 more to Ninth Corps; and finally June 30, 1941, 7,776 assigned to Ninth Corps thus allowing an additional 39,227 South Carolinians to benefit from the CCC experience. Nationwide, 30,000 African American veterans from World War I served in the CCC, but no available record explains why there were only 65 from South Carolina enrolled in the CCC and those not until the waning days of the program. For a national summary of "Participation of Negro Youth" see "Eight Years of CCC Operations, 1933–1941," *Monthly Labor Review* 52 (June 1941), 1412.
6. Very limited attention has been given the South Carolina She-She-Shes and none about a minority presence, but consult *Happy Days*, 3 June 1933, 12:1; 30 June 1934, 9:1; and 5 December 1936, 20:1. For the national picture consult Joyce L. Kornbluh, "The She-She-She Camps: An Experiment in Living and Learning, 1934–1937," in Joyce L. Kornbluh and Mary Frederickson (ed.), *Sisterhood and Solidarity: Worker's Education for Women, 1914–1984* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1984), 255–83.
7. "Classes Organized," *The Hill Top*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (15 November 1935), [9]: 1; "'Outlaw Illiteracy' Battle Cry of Co. 5418," *Little Ethiopia*, Vol. 2, No. 29 (28 October 1938), 1:1. A complete collection of the South Carolina CCC newspapers, both black and white, is available in the Clemson University Library, Media Collection.
8. College data in Kennerly, "CCC as a Social Resource in SC," 61. For an overview of the CCC educational program consult David Tyack et al, *Public Schools in Hard Times: The Great Depression and Recent Years* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), especially 116–22; report contained in letter from Persons to Cone dated 28 April 1941 in National Archives Annex, College Park, MD (hereafter Archives II), Record Group 35 (hereafter RG 35), "Records of Civilian Conservation Corps, Division of Selection, Publicity File, 1940–1942," "Clippings," Box 5.
9. *Camp Life Arithmetic Workbook*, Numbers 1 through 5 (Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office, June 1940 through April 1941); *Camp Life Reader and Work Book: Language Usage Series*, Numbers 1 and 2 (Washington, DC: U. S. Office of Education, 1939). [Copies are rare, but available in the Florida State University Library in Tallahassee.] Quotation is reproduced in Steven Jay Gross, "Civic Hands Upon the Land: Diverse Patterns of Social Education in the Civilian Conservation Corps and Its Analogues, 1933–1942" in Christine Woysner et al. (ed.), *Social Education in the Twentieth Century* (New York: P. Lang, 2004), 46, 47–48 for comments specific to the African American experience. For other analyses see Eric B. Gorham, *National Service, Citizenship, and Political Education* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1992), 137–40 and Olaf Stieglitz, "... very much

an American life': The Concept of Citizenship in the Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933–1942" in Knud Krakau (ed.), *The American Nation, National Identity, Nationalism* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1997), 191–92 or his *100 Percent American Boys: Disziplinierungsdiskurse und Ideologie im Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933–1942* (Stuttgart, Germany: F. Steiner, 1999).

10. "Men Get To Vote If, When and As," *Happy Days*, 28 October 1933, 14:2; "Three Days For Voters," 27 October 1934, 1:1; "Voting Is Up To States," 1 August 1936, 1:4; editorial, "Can You Vote?" 15 August 1936, 4:3–4; and "CCC Voters to Get Regulation Leave if They Wish to Vote," 22 August 1936, 1:1 and 24:1–3. For elaboration on South Carolina voting regulations showing a fourteen percent turnout in 1936, consult Ralph J. Bunche (edited by Dewey W. Grantham), *The Political Status of the Negro in the Age of FDR* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1973), 143–47, 323, and 330.

11. Allen Frances Kifer, "The Negro Under the New Deal, 1933–1941" (Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1961), 17, 57, and 88; "Camp News," *The Hill Side News*, Vol. II, No. 2 (March 1937), [3]:1. Moseley was the most racist of all corps commanders. For his pre-CCC background consult Edward M. Coffman, *The Regulars: The American Army, 1898–1941* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004) and James F. and Jean H. Vinson, "The Bonus March of 1932: The Role of General Van Horn Moseley," *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 51 (Autumn 1967), 26–36 and for his views on race Bernard C. Nalty, *Strength for the Fight: A History of Black Americans in the Military* (New York: Free Press, 1986), 129–31.

12. Archives II, RG 35, "Records of CCC Division of Investigation, Camp Inspection Reports, 1933–1942," South Carolina, Boxes 191–95.

13. "Corps Area Life Saving School Attended by Members of Company 4470 CCC," *Hill Side News*, Vol. I, No. 5 (July 1937), 1:2.

14. "1052-Day Record Set by Colored Outfit Tops Safety Program in Southeast," *Happy Days*, November 1, 1941, 10:1–3 with picture of two African American enrollees in front of bulletin board. Other African American companies receiving recognition for a single year without accident were located at Edgefield and Awendaw. Consult Greenwood *Index-Journal*, May 9, 1941, 3:5–6 and *Happy Days*, May 24, 1941, 7:1–3 with two pictures.

15. Moseley directive reproduced in *Happy Days*, 17 September 1937, 4:1–4; letter dated 16 August 1937 and enclosure from Captain Lyman B. Schuh in *Little Ethiopia*, Vol. 1, No. 7 (14 August 1937), [3 and 4]:1–2; memo of Lt. Eldon J. Hoar in *The Lighthouse*, Vol. IV, No. 1 (8 September 1938), [3]:1–2; and "They Need 'Something Practical,'" *Happy Days*, 13 February 1937, 7:1.

16. *Happy Days*, 1 June 1935, 1:3–4; 5 June 1937, 19:5; and 15 June 1940, 1:3.

17. Five-page letter from CCC Director J. J. McEntee to Senator James F. Byrnes, Washington, 21 December 1940 responding to his 11 December letter regarding "non-combatant military training" in Byrnes Papers, Miscellaneous 1940, Charleston D–Z through Clarks, Ci file housed in Special Collections, Clemson University Libraries, Clemson, SC; Harold Martin, "CCC Boys, Ignorant of Combat, Can Perform Vital Battlefield Work," *Atlanta Constitution*, 26 June 1940, 1:4–5 and 2:4–6 with pictures; Howard W. Oxley, "The CCC and the Defense of the Nation," *Education* 61 (October 1940), 74–77; Federal Security Administration, "Civilian Conservation Corps: Contributing to the Defense of the Nation" (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1941); and "The Contribution of the CCC to National Defense" in Linda Flint McClelland,

Building the National Parks: Historic Landscape Design and Construction (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 457–58.

18. T. J. (Tim) Johnson (CCC P.A.) in *Palmetto Leader*, 13 January 1940, 1:6. While Fechner made the cover of *Time Magazine* 33 (6 February 1939), along with an accompanying article, “Poor Young Men,” 10–12, a more revealing portrayal of his overall racial attitudes is conveyed in John Jacob Saalberg, “Roosevelt, Fechner, and the CCC—A Study in Executive Leadership” (Ph. D. thesis, Cornell University, 1962).

19. Eleven-page “Master Plan Report for Greenwood State Park, Greenwood County, South Carolina” [undated but probably 1938] in South Carolina Archives, 162.2 CCC files, Master Plan Report, SP-11 Greenwood., Box 10. This park is now the site of the state’s “Civilian Conservation Corps Museum” at the Drummond Center.

20. See for example the coverage on the Eighth Anniversary of the formation of the CCC in Greenwood *Index-Journal*, 28 March 1941, 8:2–5 with four pictures of the park facility; 30 March 1941, 1:4–5 and 3:3; 31 March 1941, 1:4–5 and 7:5–6. There is nothing in the stories about the black facilities or the black camp.

21. Imes, “Fourth Corps Negro Contingent Went From Plow Handle to Pencil and Grasped Opportunity’s Hand,” *Happy Days*, 18 July 1936, 2:1–3. For placement in perspective at the conclusion of the program consult Marian Thompson Wright, “Negro Youth and Federal Emergency Programs: CCC and NYA,” *Journal of Negro Education* 9 (July 1940), 399–400. For another equally optimistic contemporary analysis on the national scene consult Edgar G. Brown, *The Civilian Conservation Corps and Colored Youth* (Washington, DC: Federal Security Agency, 1940). For a broader social, economic, and environmental perspective on the consequences consult Thomas D. Clark, *The Greening of the South: The Recovery of Land and Forest* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1985), 81.

Minutes of the Seventy-seventh Annual Meeting

7 March 2009

CAMPUS LIFE CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA UPSTATE

8:30 a. m.–9:30 a.m. Registration

SESSION I 9:30 a.m.–10:45 a.m.

A. Domestic Spaces across Time

Chair and Commentator: Tracy J. Revels (Wofford College)

The Continuity of Piety: Religious Women in Late-antique Rome. Aneilya Barnes (Coastal Carolina University)

2025 Marion Street: The Modjeska Simkins House. Celia James (University of South Carolina)

The Domestic Effects of Sherman's March on the People of South Carolina. Karen M. Drexelius. (University of South Carolina)

B. Books, Literacy, and Libraries

Chair and Commentator: Robin Copp (University of South Carolina)

Beaufort and Lowvain: Public Reaction to Library Destruction during the American Civil War and the First and Second World Wars. Roger K. Hux (Francis Marion University)

A Little Learning is a Dangerous Thing: Attitudes toward Popular Literacy in Sixteenth-Century England. Carol A. Loar (University of South Carolina Upstate)

The Art and Science of Race Progress: Julia Mood Peterkin's Scarlet Sister Mary and Wil Lou Gray's Seneca Study. Mary Mac Ogden (University of South Carolina)

C. The Past is Now: Studying the Modern Era

Chair and Commentator: Herbert Hartsook (University of South Carolina)

James Cross (Clemson University)

Andrew J. Duncan (University of South Carolina)

Susan Hoffius (Medical University of South Carolina)

Dorothy Hazelrigg (University of South Carolina)

D. South Carolina Before 1800

Chair and Commentator: Sarah E. Miller (University of South Carolina Salkahatchie)

Horatio Gates as Commander of the Southern Department. Tom Powers (University of South Carolina Sumter)

The Forgotten Neighbor: Spanish Influences on the Exploration and Establishment of Carolina. Timothy P. Grady (University of South Carolina Upstate)

SESSION II 11:00 a.m.–12:15 p.m.

Exercises in Visual Literacy: Sixteenth-Century Art and Art about the Sixteenth Century

Chair and Commentator: Carolyn Coker Joslin Watson (Furman University)

Painting What Cannot Be Painted: Pieter Brueghel's Silent Opinion. David Basinger (Bob Jones University)

New Function, Old Form: Luther's Impact on the Visual Arts. Jen Moreau (Bob Jones University)

Remembering the Reformation: Aesthetic Expressions that Shape Identity and Memory. Brenda Thompson Schoolfield (Bob Jones University)

Crime and Punishment

Chair and Commentator: Jeffery B. Cook (North Greenville College)

The Axe, the Noose, and the Fire: What Forms of Execution during the English Peasant's Uprising of 1381 Reveal. Angela Dembiczak (College of Charleston)

Cruel and Unusual Punishment: The Eighth Amendment and the Execution of George J. Stinney, Jr. Jackie R. Booker (Winston Salem State University)

The War Crimes of Ante Pavelic. Robert B. McCormick (University of South Carolina Upstate)

Sports and Culture

Chair and Commentator: Andrew L. Doyle (Winthrop University)

Santee-Cooper Bass Fishing and Post-World War II Culture in South Carolina. T. Robert Hart (Canisius College)

Origins of College Football in South Carolina: 1889 to 1930. Fritz Hamer (South Carolina State Museum)

Contesting the Fitness Gap: U.S./Soviet Sporting Exchanges during the Cold War. Kevin B. Witherspoon (Lander University)

South Carolina During the Nineteenth Century

Chair and Commentator: William S. Poole (College of Charleston)

Jackson's Presidency and Political Turmoil on All Sides: An Analysis of Jackson's Presidency and the Rivalries that Helped Enrich the Intensity of the Nullification Crisis. Tomek Barc (University of South Carolina)

"We Are Marching to Zion": Zion Presbyterian Church and the Slave Missionaries of Charleston, South Carolina, 1849–1874. Otis Westbrook Pickett (University of Mississippi)

Luncheon, Keynote Address, and Business Meeting 12:30 p.m.–2:00 p. m.

President Wink Prince called the meeting to order at 1:45 p.m. following an interesting keynote presentation by Vernon Burton (Burroughs Distinguished Professor of History, Coastal Carolina University) about his recent book *The Age of Lincoln*.

The minutes of the 2008 annual meeting at the South Carolina Archives & History Center were unanimously approved as printed in the *2009 Proceedings*.

Rodger Stroup presented the treasurer's report. Copies of the treasurer's report were provided at each table to the members of the association. He indicated that the Association finished the year with a small surplus.

W. Eric Emerson presented the report of the nominating committee:

President: Andrew Myers, University of South Carolina Upstate

Vice-President: Kevin Witherspoon, Lander University

Secretary: Lars Seiler, Spring Valley High School, Columbia

Treasurer: Rodger Stroup, South Carolina Department of Archives & History

At Large (2012): Vernon Burton, Coastal Carolina University

Representative to the South Carolina Archives & History Commission: A. V. Huff, Furman University (emeritus)

Continuing on the executive board: J. Tracy Power (2010), W. Eric Emerson (2011), and the editors of the *2010 Proceedings*—Robert Figueira and Stephen Lowe

The report of the nominating committee was approved by acclamation.

Dr. Prince turned the gavel over to Dr. Myers who thanked the outgoing president for his service to the Association during his term on the board and as president.

Dr. Myers announced the 2010 meeting will be held in Columbia at the Archives and History Center on March 6, 2010.

Philip Stone from Wofford College invited the members of the Association to join the H-Net List for the History of South Carolina (H-SC@H-NET.MSU.EDU), a forum for announcements, discussions, and the review of books on significant themes regarding the Palmetto State.

Dr. Myers asked for volunteers to serve as judges for the Hollis Awards that will be presented at the 2010 meeting. Any persons interested were asked to contact him. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

SESSION III 2:15 p. m.–3:30 p.m.

Faith and State in the Sixteenth Century

Chair and Commentator: Kathryn Edwards (University of South Carolina)

“The Things That Are Caesars”: War, Politics, and the Role of the Believer to the Sixteenth-Century Reformer. Aaron Walker (Bob Jones University)

Confessionalization and the Creedal Tradition. Lincoln Austin Mullin (Bob Jones University)

The Authorized Version: Elizabeth’s Image and the English Bible. Lauren Hamblen (Bob Jones University)

Conservative and Southern Ideas

Chair and Commentator: Ron Romine (University of South Carolina Upstate)

A Valuable Tradition: Mel Bradford and Andrew Lytle’s Understanding of the Southern Past. Alan James Harrellson (College of Charleston)

Two Views: A Comparison of Thurgood Marshall and Clarence Thomas as Justices and Civil Rights Leaders. David Woodworth (Bob Jones University)

The Twentieth Century South

Chair and Commentator: Carmen Harris (University of South Carolina Upstate)

The Upcountry Homefront during World War II. Courtney L. Tollison (Furman University)

Educational Opportunities for Blacks in the South Carolina Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-1942. Bob Waller (Clemson University, emeritus)

Reforming a Danger-Prone Industry: Monongah Mine Disaster and the Bureau of Mines. Jeffrey B. Cook (North Greenville College)

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 fourteenth or fifteenth editions of *The Chicago Manual of Style*.

Editors:

Robert Figueira, Lander University, figueira@lander.edu

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

