
THE PROCEEDINGS
of
**The South Carolina
Historical Association**



2014

THE PROCEEDINGS

of

**The South Carolina
Historical Association**

2014

Robert Figueira, Stephen Lowe,
Brenda Thompson Schoolfield, Paul Yandle

Editors

The South Carolina Historical Association
Department of History
The Citadel, Charleston, South Carolina
www.scha1931.org
© South Carolina Historical Association

Officers of the Association

President: Stefan Wiecki, Presbyterian College

Vice President: Janet Hudson, University of South Carolina Extended University

Secretary: Michael Kohl, Clemson University

Treasurer: Amanda Mushal, The Citadel

Executive and Editorial Board Members

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

Fritz Hamer, University of South Carolina Columbia (2014)

Lewie Reese, Anderson University (2015)

Brenda Thompson Schoolfield, Bob Jones University (2015); editor

Robert C. Figueira, Lander University (2016); editor

Michael Bonner, University of South Carolina Lancaster (2016)

Stephen Lowe, University of South Carolina Union, editor

Paul Yandle, North Greenville University, editor

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 Microsoft Word. 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 Chicago Manual of Style*.

Editors' Notes

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

The editors are especially indebted to those colleagues who reviewed papers for publication. Their comments and suggestions have greatly improved the quality of the papers presented here. Reviewers for the 2014 volume were:

Robert Boggs, North Greenville University
M. Ryan Floyd, Lander University
Kevin Gannon, Grand View University
Carmen Harris, University of South Carolina Upstate
John Matzko, Bob Jones University
Kenneth N. Mufuka, Lander University (emeritus)
Franklin D. Rausch, Lander University
Connie Rice, West Virginia University
Cheryl Wells, University of Wyoming

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

Contents

<i>Upheaval in Charleston: Telling the Story</i>	7
Susan Millar Williams and Stephen G. Hoffius	
Henrietta Aiken Kelly and the Post-Civil War Silk Industry	13
Debra Bloom	
Essential Workers for Desperate Farmers and Pulpwood Operators: German POW Labor in South Carolina, 1943-1946.	25
Fritz Hamer	
The Recent History of Affirmative Action Policies in Higher Education and the U.S. Supreme Court	37
Marcia G. Synnott	
Evil Communications Corrupt Good Morals: Thomas Cooper and Francis Lieber's Proslavery Transformations	49
Jamie Diane Wilson	
Teaching American History in Tajikistan	59
Munavar Zaripova	
Membership	65
Minutes of the Eightieth Annual Meeting	67

Upheaval in Charleston: Telling the Story

Susan Millar Williams and Stephen G. Hoffius

WHEN PEOPLE SAY THEY “LOVE” HISTORY, most of them mean they love stories based on real events. In 1999, when we decided to collaborate on a book about the great Charleston earthquake of 31 August 1886, we wanted not only to establish the facts about a geological event that rocked the eastern half of the United States, but also to tell a dramatic human tale that would keep readers engaged. We decided early on to write narrative non-fiction, a genre both of us liked to read but which neither of us had studied. Except in specialized creative-writing programs, it is not taught in many colleges. Among the many books that inspired us were *Isaac’s Storm: A Man, a Time, and the Deadliest Hurricane in History* by Erik Larson and *In the Heart of the Sea: The Tragedy of the Whaleship Essex* by Nathaniel Philbrick. We expected to spend a year or two on the project and to produce a book that would focus on the dramatic, conflict-filled month after the quake.

We did not know that it would take us twelve years to do this story justice, to dig out the tiny crucial details, to understand and to explain what Charlestonians, white and black, carried into the disaster, and to figure out how to shape the telling so that historians and non-historians alike would care about what we had discovered. Along the way, while writing what became *Upheaval in Charleston: Earthquake and Murder on the Eve of Jim Crow* (University of Georgia Press, 2011), we learned many lessons about how to write narrative non-fiction.

There were hundreds of dramatic first-hand accounts of the earthquake, and we wrote a thirty-page introductory chapter that traced the path of the quake as it raced across the continent, causing destruction and panic in New York, Detroit, and even Cuba. But some of the readers of our early drafts had a hard time keeping track of so many people and experiences. One friend told us that in the early chapters she could not tell major characters from minor ones. She suggested that we cut all the names except those of major characters. It was one of the simplest and smartest pieces of advice anybody gave us, but at first it was hard to accept because we were so enamored of the details. We wanted to say that Dr. Francis Parker, not just “a man,” reported seeing earth waves two feet tall. But as soon as we made the change, the story became more dramatic and easier to read. (We did retain the names in the notes for readers who care as much as we do about who was who in nineteenth-century Charleston.) Eventually, as we cut and revised, our fact-filled pages dwindled to just five – but five tight, strong pages.

In writing narrative non-fiction, one challenge is to find a center, a real person who can serve as a surrogate for readers. For us, Mayor William Ashmead Courtenay was an obvious choice, but he was out of town when the earthquake struck and did not return for a week. Newspaper reporter Carlyle McKinley was in the middle of the action (his sleeping body was mistaken for a corpse the night of the quake), but we could not locate any of his personal correspondence. We found many heroic African Americans, including Reverend William Henry Heard, who endured both the tumbling buildings and the racism of the relief committee. But without letters, diaries, or other intimate accounts we could not get inside their heads. As our endnotes indicate, we tracked down hundreds of sources, but the *Charleston News and Courier* was far and away the richest. And eventually we realized that the editor, Francis Warrington Dawson, had his finger in every pie, including the relief effort. Not only did he control the newspaper, but he and his family left behind an enormous trove of personal memorabilia, now in the archives at Duke University. We did not, at first, like Dawson very much—he was arrogant, condescending, and something of a racist. But as we continued to probe, we discovered that Frank Dawson was a good deal more benign and forward-looking than most of his white contemporaries. Because he was born and raised in England, he did not grow up with the same prejudices as most white South Carolinians. We were also aware that Dawson was murdered just two-and-a-half years after the earthquake. He was, during the disaster and its aftermath, a dead man walking.

So we decided to extend our reach, to carry the story forward from August 1886 to June 1889, when details of Dawson's murder came to light with the trial of his killer. That added months to our research, but it gave us a climax at the end of the book, a way to keep readers interested while we filled in the grim details of the exponential spread of Jim Crow. That context became as interesting to us as the earthquake and Frank Dawson's murder.

As our friend Theodore Rosengarten pointed out early in our research, the earthquake struck exactly ten years after the violent end of Reconstruction in 1876 and ten years before the 1896 Supreme Court decision of *Plessy v. Ferguson* made segregation the law of the land. Early in 1886, a black journalist wrote with amazement that blacks sat unmolested beside whites on the Charleston streetcars; that atmosphere of tolerance eroded with breathtaking speed. After the verdict in the Dawson trial, just three years later, many white Charlestonians were calling for blacks to be disfranchised and banned from serving on juries. Did the earthquake cause this rapid hardening of the color line? No, of course it did not. Attitudes were changing all over the United States, and they had been evolving in this direction for

decades. But the crisis clearly stirred up old fears and resentments. It raised new questions about who deserved help and how African Americans should be managed and controlled. Moreover, news coverage of the disaster exposed Charleston's city government and its relief committee to national scrutiny. Policies and incidents that would have gone unremarked in normal times were recorded for posterity. In Charleston between the 1886 earthquake and the 1889 murder trial we could see the establishment of Jim Crow.

Susan teaches creative writing; Steve is the author of a young adult novel. We both believe that the most powerful stories show instead of tell. But that is easier said than done when you are writing nonfiction. We could not make up dialogue or scenes; we had to find them in contemporary sources. Nineteenth-century written language tends to be flowery and evasive, disguising brutality, oppression, and condescension with bureaucratic, romantic—or simply obfuscating—rhetoric; too much direct quotation can quickly kill a good story. And yet there are often pithy sentences or phrases buried in heaps of rhetoric, including words that tell us a good deal about how people really talked and thought. We used a lot of paraphrase mixed in with short direct quotations, to preserve, we hope, the flavor of the originals without bogging down readers. One of our greatest challenges was to push beyond the fine-sounding words to pin down the Orwellian contradictions of polite white discourse in the 1880s.

While working on *Upheaval in Charleston* we read the work of other historians, looking for guideposts in our quest to understand the period. But rather than quote them, and rather than slowing down the narrative to provide a formal historiography, we followed the lead of Erskine Clarke, who, in his masterful *Dwelling Place: A Plantation Epic*, provides voluminous historiographic notes but does not allow that discussion to intrude into the text. We felt fortunate to work with Nancy Grayson and her colleagues at the University of Georgia Press, who were willing to indulge both our desire to provide extensive documentation—New York publishers suggested that we eliminate all the notes and put them online—and our reluctance to interrupt the narrative.

People often ask us how we managed the collaboration. Steve did most of the onerous work of going through newspapers on microfilm and making copies. We filled more than a dozen three-inch binders with photocopies—a totally Old School approach that served us well. We copied relevant data to hundreds of note cards and, as we changed computers over the years, were glad to have non-electronic files that were always compatible with our current software and our twenty-first-century brains. (We are, in fact, still using the cards.) Susan generally wrote first

drafts, pulling details out of the sources and lining them up in a kind of information dump that would be revised, edited, rewritten, expanded, and cut by both of us, over and over. Steve managed the details of notes and citations; Susan hunted through thousands of pages of fine print to locate the source of facts we had neglected to write down. We often disagreed but never quarreled—when one of us had doubts about something, the other paid attention. Perhaps most important, when one of us was tired and willing to settle for a passage that was merely adequate, the other said, “No, we can do better.” The manuscript improved—a paragraph, a sentence, a word at a time.

In retrospect, we do not know how people write long and complicated books alone. Who other than a co-author would have the credibility to suggest cutting out a brilliant scene just because it was tangential?

The final stages of the revision involved shaping each chapter as a story in itself and figuring out how and when to provide flashbacks that explain why blacks and whites acted the way they did in the disaster of 1886. Ten years before, in 1876, South Carolina whites had overthrown Reconstruction in a wave of violence they chose to call “Redemption,” and Frank Dawson had played a central (and sometimes courageous) role in those events. But we had a hard time figuring out when to pause in telling the earthquake story—so dramatic and so full of action—and take readers back ten years to examine the emotional and political baggage Charlestonians carried into the disaster. It was our copyeditor who suggested that we should place that backstory early in the book, so readers would have it as a touchstone in understanding the often-perplexing behaviors of 1886-89.

The original manuscript was too long, and it strayed too far from the earthquake and the murder. The months between early 1887 and 1889 in Charleston were marked by a headlong rush toward segregation and Jim Crow. We found the details endlessly fascinating—Frederick Douglass came to town to deliver lectures and the mayor attended an A.M.E. church to hear him! But our best readers—among them novelist and historian Harlan Greene—warned us that people interested in Dawson and the earthquake would consider this a digression. In the end, we pared this section down to a shadow of its former self. But we are determined to tell that story at more length in another volume.

Fortunately for the book, neither of us has a tenure-track job, so there was no pressure to publish in order to stay employed. We had the luxury of time to polish and tweak, to scrap entire drafts and start over. Academic life can discourage extensive revision.

Of course, when the writing of a book is finished the authors are only half done. No matter how good a publisher’s public relations department may be, pro-

motion is largely a do-it-yourself enterprise. We enjoyed figuring out ways to make *Upheaval in Charleston* newsworthy, starting with a launch that took advantage of the 125th anniversary of the great Charleston earthquake. And nature cooperated. On 23 August 2011 a magnitude 5.8 earthquake centered in Virginia rocked the east coast of North America, cracking the Washington Monument. Who knew that earthquakes could hit the east coast? We did! We talked with several reporters and editors who would not have been interested in the story of the Charleston quake if not for the Virginia tremor.

After twelve years of work, we were eager to promote the book. We convinced Palmetto Brewery in Charleston to produce an “earthquake beer,” as a company by the same name had done after the 1886 quake. We suggested naming it “Upheaval,” but the guys at Palmetto pointed out that nobody wants to think about heaving when they are drinking a beer. So they called it “Aftershock,” and we prayed that it would just be drinkable. It turned out to be a great hoppy brew that we gladly talked up. Our combination book signings and beer tastings brought more attention to the beer than to the book (apparently people looking for a cold drink do not necessarily want a footnoted history book), but the story kept our audiences listening. We gave away a bottle at every appearance.

We talked to Rotary Clubs, senior-citizen centers, and book groups. We visited historical societies, libraries, colleges, bookstores, book festivals, churches, and museums. We Skyped with a high school class. We promoted the book at a minor-league baseball game, and had our faces and dust jacket displayed on the outfield scoreboard. We convinced a Charleston bakery to produce “cupquakes,” themed cupcakes with toppings meant to resemble fissured ground and fallen bricks. We met novelist Roxana Robinson, a great-granddaughter of Francis Warrington Dawson, who came to Charleston and shared her family’s stories. We wrote articles about how the earthquake had affected areas not generally associated with the quake—Savannah, Richmond, Augusta—for weekly papers in those communities. We set up a web site, of course, and even learned, kind of, how to maintain it. For almost a year we scheduled at least one event a week, sometimes more. The book went through two cloth editions and then paperback. It was a finalist for a couple of awards.

We would have liked to place articles in national magazines like *Smithsonian*, but somehow we failed to get a foothold. We were never reviewed in the *New York Times* or *Washington Post*. However, we did produce, in addition to the book itself, three lasting and easily accessible repositories of earthquake lore. We collaborated on physical and online exhibits at the Waring Historical Library at the Medical University of South Carolina, fact- and image-packed disquisitions on

the medical effects of the great earthquake (<http://waring.library.musc.edu/exhibits/earthquake/>). We worked with the South Carolina State Museum on an exhibit that premiered in Columbia and is now travelling to other institutions. (And the Special Collections staff of the College of Charleston library put together a display, highlighting the book and earthquake items in their own collection.) Our own web site includes an extensive self-guided earthquake tour of Charleston, with paired images from 1886 and 2011 (<http://www.upheavalincharleston.com>).

In the end, we produced the book we wanted, with minimal compromise. We have no regrets. We even met Erskine Clarke, whose book had helped inspire and instruct us. We shared *Upheaval in Charleston* with him and smiled when he wrote us this blurb: “If you are intrigued by Charleston and by a story of earthquake, fire, and murder, then you will love this history of a remarkable man and of a sad, tumultuous period in the city’s life.” That is exactly the book we had hoped to create.

Henrietta Aiken Kelly and the Post-Civil War Silk Industry

Debra Bloom

ON DECEMBER 1, 1901, AN IMMENSE CROWD attended the opening of the South Carolina Inter-State and West Indian Exposition under fair and warm skies in Charleston.¹ The exposition, which lasted until the following summer, was chartered by the state of South Carolina “for the purpose of holding in the city a general exposition of the arts, industries and resources of the state of South Carolina, the West Indies and . . . such other states, countries and nations as may desire to participate.”² Included at the exposition was a Women’s Building, which housed exhibits focusing on themes considered in the early twentieth century to be within the sphere of female endeavor: interior decoration, music and floriculture were among the offerings. Among the themes highlighted in the building was silk production.

At first glance, sericulture may seem an odd choice of themes to be emphasized at a fair in a southeastern state. However, silk was the dress material of choice for American society women, and it was in such demand that silk imports skyrocketed in the late 1800s, creating an interest in local silk farms not seen in South Carolina since the colonial era. The chair of the committee in charge of the Silk Culture exhibit, Mary Hughes, described her committee’s exhibit of colonial silk products: “One of the interesting features of the display,” Hughes noted, “will be the silk dresses and other articles made from silk manufactured in South Carolina in the days when Governor Broughton planted mulberry trees at ‘Mulberry Castle’ on Cooper River and Sir Nathaniel Johnson tried similar experiments at ‘Silk Hope.’”³ The principal reason Hughes’s committee was highlighting South Carolina’s history of sericulture was that the federal government, anxious to reduce raw silk imports, was looking to South Carolinian Henrietta Aiken Kelly to formulate a plan to inspire the South in general and South Carolinians specifically to grow mulberry trees and raise silkworms (*Bombyx mori*), which feed on mulberries and produce silk thread to make their cocoons.

Henrietta “Etta” Aiken Kelly is best known as the founder of the Charleston Female Seminary, which educated privileged South Carolina women from 1871 until 1896. Kelly’s life was surrounded by prominent Charleston figures. Her Philadelphia-born father, William, came to Charleston in 1822 and married Mary Stoll, who was descended from a family with deep Charleston roots. Henrietta, born in

1844, was educated at the Charleston Normal School with faculty that included prominent northern educators Frederick A. Sawyer and Anna C. Brackett, a native Bostonian who was instrumental in shaping women's higher education and the curricula for normal schools nationwide.⁴

Kelly's interest in sericulture did not emerge until after she was well into middle age and seemingly settled into her career as an educator. In 1890 she applied for a U.S. passport and made the first of several trips abroad.⁵ Initially her trips meshed with her pedagogy, as she escorted young South Carolina women on extended tours in continental Europe.⁶ However, in 1896, when Kelly was 52 years old, she closed her seminary, packed her bags and sailed to Europe to further her own education in biology and botany. Kelly's sojourn overseas put her on a new career path as a scientist and eventually helped provide her with an unusual opportunity to apply the humanitarian ideals she had taught her students to the problems facing the southern economy. Even by today's standards, her actions seem daring.

Thusnelda Berkley, a former student at Kelly's school, gave her insight into Kelly's humanitarian philosophy in a letter to the *New York Times* editor in 1903: "It was Miss Kelly who encouraged the graduates and diplomées to return and do post-graduate works in exchange for personal work on backward pupils," Berkley pointed out. "Miss Kelly urged the strong pupils to help the weak."⁷ Kelly's efforts to lead by example were not hollow. The Charleston Female Seminary Alumnae Association also exemplified the implementation of Kelly's philosophy to work "less for self and more for others."⁸ Initially formed as a social group in 1889 the organization, in honor of its "loved founder and Principal," opened a free kindergarten for Charleston factory workers and supported rural libraries.⁹

Kelly, then, did not close her school and move overseas for personal growth alone: "her attention was drawn to the problem of education in the south" and she ventured to Europe as part of her larger concern for men and women in her home state.¹⁰ She was leading by example the growing efforts of South Carolina women, including her own alumnae, to improve life for themselves and the state's children. "This is an agricultural country," Kelly explained when she returned home several years later, "and what we need is to teach our poor, white and black, how they can get a living out of the soil."¹¹ Kelly believed that silk farming would offer additional employment opportunities to bring South Carolinians out of the grinding poverty that many faced in the decades following the Civil War. Women and children, in particular, would benefit from raw silk production because cotton mill jobs took women away from their homes and children. Growing mulberry trees and spinning silk from cocoons was home based employment that could provide an alternative.

Progressive South Carolina women's clubs, already reacting to child labor in cotton mills and the number of children left alone at home, were administering free kindergartens to provide them with education and shelter. Kelly's approach addressed the same problem but approached it closer to the source: poverty and the lack of job opportunities. Silk production became a central component of Kelly's program to improve the lives of rural southerners.

Even as Kelly was finalizing plans to close her school, the United States was experiencing tremendous growth in raw silk imports. William Cornelius Wyckoff, secretary of the Silk Association of America, considered the 1864 tariff and the invention of the sewing machine crucial to the development of the silk industry in the United States. Overall the amount of raw silk produced in the United States was negligible. Wyckoff calculated that "the amount of native silk raised in 1860 was 11,944 pounds, valued at \$47,000. Three-fourths of this was produced in Ohio and Illinois, and no portion of it helped to supply our mills with raw material." In 1810 the domestic effort to produce raw silk led to the construction of a mill in Mansfield, Connecticut that produced thread and ribbons from domestically raised raw silk. However, domestic farming produced only a small amount, resulting in the importation of almost all raw silk needed for the manufacturing of silk products. When Congress passed a large tariff on imported raw silk in 1854, silk goods manufacturers began producing fewer and fewer products.¹²

However, when the Civil War broke out in 1861 the federal government dropped the tariff on raw silk importations and raised the tariff rate on imported manufactured silk to raise money to fund the war. As the war dragged on, the government continued to increase the tariff rate on imported manufactured silk goods.¹³ In 1861 the tariff was levied at 30 percent and then raised to 40 percent. Three years later, another tariff act levied a duty of 60 percent on the importation of silk fabrics.¹⁴ Combined with increasingly higher prices imposed on foreign silk products, the importation of cheap raw silk created an opportunity for American manufacturers to produce silk products for the domestic market. The 1879 Silk Association of America's annual report summarized the success of the wartime tariffs: "The war of the rebellion stimulated most of our manufacturing interests by checking the importations of foreign goods. During the period of inflated prices that followed, many new factories were built and the facilities for work were greatly expanded."¹⁵ Sheltered from foreign competition, the silk fabrics industry grew from near nonexistence to lead the world in the output of silk products.¹⁶ The number of silk manufacturing firms increased from 382 in 1880 to 575 in 1886.¹⁷ Silk fabric was used for a wide selection of products including upholstery, shoes, suits, military uniforms, umbrellas and neckties.

Even before the Civil War, silk manufacturers had begun developing a symbiotic relationship with the sewing machine. Early in the 1840s Elias Howe, the American credited with inventing the machine, consulted with John Ryle, a mill manager in Paterson, New Jersey, about problems Howe was having with his invention.¹⁸ Silk thread produced at the time was not strong enough to withstand the power of Howe's machine; it broke easily and skipped stitches. Together, Howe and Ryle developed a stronger silk thread and a new approach to spooling silk. Referred to as machine-twist, this silk product would become completely manufactured in the United States. Wyckoff, discussing machine-twist thread's commanding position in the American silk industry, remarked that "The sewing machine was the means of a revolution in this branch of business."¹⁹ The increase in production made silk products readily available to eager consumers. By 1910, industry analyst Franklin Mason was able to point out—albeit in a patronizing manner—that the silk industry was closely tied to the fashion market. Mason noted that

Subject to every whim and fancy of Dame Fashion, wide fluctuations occur from year to year, unpreventable and unforeseen. This year plushes are in favor, the next year broad goods. Add now to the ups and downs due to fashion those normal fluctuations attributable to the prosperity and depression of the country, and the result will show the wide range of the instability of the demand for silk goods.²⁰

"Even after the market is made and the use of the articles may be supposed to be established, nothing is more fickle than the demand for silk products," Mason concluded. In the 1870s, however, Wyckoff saw changes in clothing style in more optimistic terms, suggesting that "the rapid changes of fashion, although at times inflicting loss on our manufacturers, are probably on the whole, a benefit."²¹

Kelly was probably unaware of the expert analysis of the silk industry or the fluctuations of "Dame Fashion" when she disembarked in Liverpool from the steamship *Majestic* on July 14, 1896. Fortified with a letter of introduction from the U.S. Commissioner of Education, William Torrey Harris, she began her studies right away.²² From June 1896 to 1899, the multilingual Kelly studied for two years at the Sorbonne in Paris and took additional courses in Cambridge and Geneva.²³ When Kelly began her biology studies at the Sorbonne she was able to learn from some of the world's most prominent biologists and botanists, all former colleagues or protégés of Louis Pasteur including Phillippe Van Tiegham, Joseph Henri de Lacaze-Duthier, Gaston Bonnier, Robert Chodat and Alphonse Bertillon. Pasteur,

the noted chemist and microbiologist, died a year before Kelly's arrival at the Sorbonne, but part of his legacy was the identification of two infectious diseases, *pébrine* and *flacherie*, that were killing silkworms and threatening the silk industry in France. As a result of Pasteur's work, silk producers were able to separate diseased and healthy silkworm eggs, and the French raw silk industry was rescued. Pasteur's silkworm research laid the foundation for his future studies in infectious disease.²⁴ Kelly studied sericulture intensely at the Sorbonne, but it was not until she was reunited with a former Charleston student, Janie Johnston Perry, that she discovered her passion for silk farming as a tool for social reform.

Janie Johnston Perry came from an old Charleston family. Her father, Archibald, had extensive holdings throughout South Carolina's low country including Hope and Rose Bank plantations. In 1898, while Kelly was at the Sorbonne, Janie Perry was also in Paris announcing her banns of marriage to the Duc de Litta-Visconti Arese.²⁵ Duc de Litta, an Italian aristocrat, was also a self-proclaimed socialist. His ancient family estate in Milan produced raw silk, and after the wedding the newlyweds returned to the Litta family estate. The duke, eager to test his socialist philosophy, formed an agricultural association composed of peasants from his estate with the "object of furthering the moral, social and economic condition of its members." The peasants paid the association a fee based on the size of the portion of the duke's estate each peasant farmed.²⁶

Following her studies in 1899, Kelly left France to visit the duke and duchess in Milan. When Kelly arrived at the duke's estate the farmers were gathering silkworm cocoons in "great golden heaps" and the duke's social experiment was in place. Kelly watched and learned the sericulture process from Italian farmers themselves, beginning with observing *Bombyx* silk moths laying eggs. Once the eggs hatched, Kelly fed the larvae mulberry leaves and watched as they spun their silk cocoons. According to Kelly, working on the farm helped her observe sericulture less scientifically and more from a practical point of view.²⁷ In a later interview she noted, "I went among the peasants and observed all their methods. I got the silkworm eggs and made a number of rearings myself. I left no stone unturned to gain the knowledge which those people have accumulated through centuries of experience." Kelly argued that in many ways nineteenth-century Italy and South Carolina had similar political and agricultural backgrounds. Both had just transformed their political systems from governments controlled by landowner ruling classes to more unified governments that allowed increased participation by non-landowners. Both were traditionally agrarian societies, with Italy emerging from a feudal land system and South Carolina emerging from a slave-based economy.

By the late 1800s technologies, including electricity and sophisticated machinery, were influencing and encouraging silk and cotton textile manufacturing in both places. Because textile manufacturing was closely linked to agriculture it was an industry that seemed well-suited for South Carolinians as well as manufacturers in Milan.²⁸

In South Carolina the cotton textile industry grew throughout the late 1800s and by 1900, the state was home to a third of the South's textile mill workers.²⁹ In addition to employing local men, women and children the textile industry benefitted from having the raw product close at hand. Kelly never sought to usurp the cotton industry in South Carolina but hoped that silk farming would diversify employment opportunities, especially for women. Silk farming would supply an income and allow women the opportunity to work from home.

At one time Italy was the world's second largest producer of raw silk and it was the country's largest export. The Italian economy supported all phases of silk production from mulberry tree plantings to reeling and weaving. However, because of the growing availability of cheaper Asian silk and the negative effects of silkworm diseases, silk production was a declining industry and cotton was expanding by the turn of the century. As silk declined as an exported luxury product, cotton production increased due to solid domestic demand.³⁰

Nonetheless, at the time of Kelly's visit to Italy the Duke's estate was still following its centuries-old tradition of raw silk farming. Kelly's work at the estate convinced her that raw silk farming could be profitably implemented in South Carolina with proper education and application of scientific principles to mulberry seed selection. More important, silk farming would provide new jobs and agricultural careers for southern women. Blending her newly attained scientific education with her humanitarian philosophy, Kelly became a passionate proponent of building a raw silk industry in the United States, particularly in the South. She shared her "practical point of view" by writing to the U.S. Department of Agriculture "with enough letters to fill a book."³¹ James Wilson, the Secretary of Agriculture, responded to her letters with a request for her to visit him in Washington, D.C. when she arrived back in the United States.

Kelly spent six years abroad: three at her studies and three in Italy. By late 1901 it was time for her to return home to implement her ideas. Once she was back on American soil, Kelly accepted Secretary Wilson's invitation to meet him in Washington. Kelly's correspondence must have impressed Wilson, because he appointed her Special Field Agent in Silk Investigation with an appropriation of \$10,000 to flesh out a plan that would encourage the growth of a successful raw

silk industry.³² Kelly went on a nationwide promotional tour to promote silk farming, giving newspaper interviews to educate the public about potential careers in sericulture. Articles about Kelly and silk farming appeared in towns and cities as disparate as St. Louis, Blowing Rock (N.C.), St. Paul, Wichita and New York City. Kelly also spoke at the Charleston Exposition as the Women's Department sericulture expert. The successful Women's Department silk culture exhibit impassioned South Carolinians, including many of Kelly's former students, to consider silk farming.³³ Ida Lining, a former Kelly student, was a silk culture committee member, along with seven other Charleston society women. Lining wrote an essay about South Carolina's raw silk farming for *The Exposition*, a magazine promoting the fair. Lining reported that the committee had been asked many questions related to sericulture. Among them was a patronizing query whether each committee member would be producing "silk enough to have a dress woven?" Lining responded, tongue-in-cheek, that the "Silk committee is very ambitious... as to the dress, it may be a possibility, for some of the committee are developing a fondness for the *bombyx*."³⁴

After her promotional tour, Kelly developed and published an instructional manual called *The Culture of the Mulberry Silkworm*.³⁵ The manual was important to Kelly's outline for successful silk farming because she believed that earlier silk farming attempts failed because they had not been based on scientific principles. Farmers in the past, she argued, had used poor quality trees and seeds because of their lack of education about sericulture. Kelly insisted that education was a basic and necessary criterion for success in silk farming, and her manual provided detailed instructions for raising successful crops of silkworms. Next she advocated for the immigration of Italian silk farming experts. By 1905 several reports, including the *South Carolina Reports and Resolutions* for that year, noted that Kelly had secured Domenico Chisena, who was trained in the University of Turin's Agricultural Department, to manage a silk farm for her.³⁶ Planting mulberry trees was another part of Kelly's implementation scheme. For this part of her plan she turned to South Carolina's women.

Even before she left Italy, Kelly had begun introducing silk farming to South Carolina. Logically and symbolically she began with seeds. The *Bombyx* moth prefers to feed on leaves from the White Mulberry (*Morus alba*) so Kelly selected White Mulberry seeds from the duke's estate and sent packets to her South Carolina friends and former students. Among those who received a packet was Marion County resident Nellie Ellerbe, the wife of U.S. Congressman James Ellerbe. Ellerbe was delighted with the growth of her trees, and for a year she and Kelly corresponded

about mulberry tree propagation and the future of South Carolina's silk culture. In a letter to the editor of "From a Woman's Viewpoint," a Spartanburg *Herald Journal* column, Ellerbe explained that Kelly was anxious to "form clubs throughout the state to promote the culture of the mulberry necessary for the support of the silk worm, so that we may be prepared to begin raising the worms as soon as the United States government sees fit to aid us in establishing the industry in South Carolina."³⁷ Before Kelly returned to the United States, Ellerbe appointed a committee in each county to identify the number, age and variety of the mulberry trees that already existed in their counties. She also asked each member to be responsible for five mulberry trees every year until the silk industry was established. Speaking directly to South Carolina women Ellerbe wrote passionately, "This seems such a novel and interesting occupation for women apart from the possibilities of its becoming one of the great industries of our state that it seems to me that we should push it with all our might and the might of the twentieth century woman means power."³⁸

Following the Charleston exposition and Kelly's return to South Carolina, interest in cultivating White Mulberry trees reached its peak. According to the South Carolina Department of Agriculture's annual report for 1906, Italian Consul Cavaliere Giovanni Sotile established a silk farm near Summerville. The farm consisted of 9,000 mulberry trees and was managed by Domenico Chisena.³⁹ In Beaufort County, Tosaku Mizutani, a Japanese silk grower, farmed some 4,000 mulberry trees. The 1908 *Handbook of South Carolina* also identified these farms and added that trees were also planted as far inland as Bamberg County and Winthrop College in Rock Hill.⁴⁰

A strange turn of events prompted a contribution to Kelly's attempts to establish sericulture in South Carolina from the Duke and Duchess Litta Visconti-Arese, whose estate had inspired Kelly to become an advocate for silk farming. By 1904 the duke and duchess were forced to reestablish their lives in Paris and Charleston after losing their estate to an uprising of peasants participating in the couple's socialist experiment.⁴¹ Before the disappointing demise of the duke's socialist dream, he delivered 1,000 mulberry trees to a plantation owned by his wife's family. The Perry family became deeply invested in the silk culture; the duchess's sister, Mary Hughes, was the chairperson of the Charleston Exposition's Silk Culture Committee. Once established in Charleston, Duke Litta became a business partner with his brother in law, J. Lamb Perry. The partnership owned a large tract of land in Manatee County, Florida where the duke hoped to create another socialist farm to employ Italian survivors of the 1908 Messina earthquake.⁴²

Despite the feverish pitch of interest in raw silk farming in South Carolina there were economic impediments to the success of sericulture in the United States.

At the turn of the century, the Japanese government was trying to improve the quality of Japan's exported silk. In an attempt to identify inferior bales, Japan instituted a quality control system using trademarks for individual raw silk exporters.⁴³ This effort assuaged many American manufacturers' longstanding concerns about the poor quality of Asian silk. American technical innovations combined with the high cost of American labor created another obstacle. Silk from the cocoon had to be spun (or reeled) to prepare it for silk product manufacturers. The best reeling machines were available only in France and Italy. Ironically, they were all American-made but the high cost of employment in the United States prohibited manufacturers from investing in stateside reeling machines. The Department of Agriculture soon recognized that silk cocoons were of little value if machines were not available to reel cocoons.⁴⁴ Low wages in Europe and Asia created insurmountable problems. In his analysis of localized silk farming Mason explained, "There is no possibility of applying machinery to the raising of silkworms or of conducting it in such a way as to make the labor in this country more efficient than it is abroad, and unless that is done, the laborers could not be paid more than the impossibly low wages in Italy or the Orient."⁴⁵ The only solution to low overseas salaries was a heavy tariff on raw silk imports, which silk manufacturers opposed.

As the nation continued into the twentieth century, department stores happily accommodated consumer demands for imported silk products. In 1922, Eliza B. Thompson, an Instructor of Textile Merchandise at New York University, published a *Department Store Merchandise Manual* for silk department salespeople.⁴⁶ The detailed 232-page manual included an eight-page index, a history of silk, instruction on silk cultivation, 65 silk-fabric classification descriptions, sections on silk-exhibit design and the dyeing and weaving of silk, and a list of additional books for further research. Thompson's introduction to the manual makes it clear why she saw the need for salespeople to receive such a high amount of instruction. "In all modern stores the Silk Department is one of the largest and most important," Thompson pointed out. "It is a very extensive department including portions of stock in many other sections of the store."⁴⁷ Silk departments were considered large enough to be divided into sections: plain silks, white silks, black silks, novelty silks, wash silks, evening silks, pongee silks, velvets and chiffons. Thompson also explained to her salespeople the force of changing fashions. "Every season has its new and so-called fashionable color, which is designed only to increase trade. Most women in order to be fashionable adopt these new colors, for the simple reason that they are new and what other people are wearing."⁴⁸

By the time Thompson's manual appeared, Kelly's influence on sericulture had subsided. As early as 1905, according to one source, Kelly moved to California

to study languages at the University of California, Berkeley and Kelly's interest in silk production diminished.⁴⁹ In 1911 she wrote to the Department of Agriculture Commissioner E.J. Watson that she was donating 100 silk-bearing trees from her Charleston property to any school that might be interested in sericulture study.⁵⁰ After six years, poor health and a stroke forced Kelly to return to Charleston. Following a second stroke, Kelly died on January 18, 1916. Her will, written in Berkeley on November 4, 1912, left her library to her "beloved nephew Theodore Barnwell Kelly."⁵¹ Theodore died in Los Angeles in 1962, and so did any clue to the location of Kelly's library.

While Kelly's vision of raw silk farming as a resource for helping women and children raise themselves out of poverty was not successful, she was an inspiration to South Carolina women. The students from "Miss Kelly's school" spread out all over South Carolina and became nurses, missionaries, mothers, teachers and social activists. Many of the obituaries for Kelly's students sounded very similar to one written for Sudie Furman Dabbs. A Sumter native, Dabbs entered Kelly's school in 1884. Following her death in 1931, Dabbs's family wrote a tribute to her that could be applied to many Kelly students: "She was always looking for opportunities to do good, and gave freely of her means to all worthwhile enterprises."⁵²

NOTES

1. "Dawning of a New Era in the City By the Sea," *The State*, 2 December 1901.
2. "Want Commissioners," *The State*, 7 August 1901.
3. "The Women's Department," *The Exposition 1* (April 1901): 146.
4. "Noted educator has passed away," *News and Courier*, 19 January 1916; "Miss Anna C. Brackett Dead," in *New York Times*, n.d., at <http://query.nytimes.com>, accessed 21 October 2013.
5. "U.S. Passport Applications 1795-1925," at www.ancestry.com, accessed 31 December 2012.
6. "Biographical and Genealogical Research on Henrietta A. Kelly" (File 30-4 Kelly), vertical files, South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston, S.C.
7. Thusnelda Berkley, letter to the editor, *New York Times*, 6 September 1903.
8. Mrs. J. M. [Sarah Bentschner] Visanska, "Charleston Female Seminary Alumnae Association," "Biographical and Genealogical Research on Henrietta A. Kelly" (File 30-4 Kelly).
9. *Ibid.*
10. "To Rear Silkworms Here," *New York Sun*, 7 September 1902, in "Biographical and Genealogical Research on Henrietta A. Kelly" (File 30-4 Kelly). A digital copy is located at <http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83030272/1902-09-07/ed-1/seq-13>.
11. *Ibid.*

12. William C. Wyckoff, "The Silk Goods of America: A Brief Account of the Recent Improvements and Advances of Silk Manufacture in the United States," *Silk Association of America Annual Report* (1879): 15, at <http://archive.org/details/silkgoodsofameri00wyck>, accessed 5 February 2013; William C. Wyckoff, *American Silk Manufacture* (Trenton, N.J.: John L. Murphy, 1886), 41, 38 (quote), 10-11, at <http://archive.org/details/americansilkman00amergoog>, accessed 5 February 2013.
13. Frank Richardson Mason, "The American Silk Industry and the Tariff," *American Economic Association Quarterly* 11 (1910): 9, at <http://archive.org/details/cu31924013820364>, accessed 5 February 2013.
14. *Ibid.*, 41.
15. William C. Wyckoff, "The Silk Goods of America," 7.
16. Mason, "The American Silk Industry and the Tariff," 175.
17. William C. Wyckoff, *American Silk Manufacture* (Trenton, N.J., John L. Murphy, 1886), 46.
18. Charles Shiner, *Paterson, New Jersey: its advantages for manufacturing and residence: its industries, prominent men, banks, schools, churches, etc.* (Paterson, N.J.: Press Printing and Publishing Co., 1890), 198, at <http://archive.org/details/patersonnewjerse00inshri>, accessed 5 February 2013. Ryle, a former British silk worker, came to Paterson, New Jersey to open a silk mill. Because of its location near Great Falls, a powerful water source, Paterson was the foundation of the silk industry in the United States. By the early twentieth century 50 percent of the nation's silk goods were produced in more than 100 mills in Paterson (see http://www.nps.gov/nero/greatfalls/GreatFallsSRS_November2006.pdf).
19. Wyckoff, "The Silk Goods of America," 15.
20. Mason, "The American Silk Industry and the Tariff," 3.
21. Wyckoff, "The Silk Goods of America," 8.
22. "Sericulture in South Carolina," *The Exposition* 1 (September 1901): 434.
23. "Noted educator has passed away," *News and Courier*, 19 January 1916.
24. *Ibid.*; Louise Robbins, *Louis Pasteur and the Hidden World of the Microbe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 53-61.
25. "A Duke Weds a South Carolina Girl," *New York Times*, 25 October, 1898.
26. Litta-Visconti Arese, "Agrarian Reform in Italy," *North American Review* 176 (1903): 27-30 (quote on page 29).
27. "Girl Would Establish Silk Industry in the South," *St. Louis Republic*, 2 November 1902, at <http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn84020274/1902-11-02/ed-1/seq-20>.
28. *Ibid.* (quote); "To Rear Silkworms Here," *New York Sun*, 7 September, 1902, in "Biographical and Genealogical Research on Henrietta A. Kelly" (File 30-4 Kelly).
29. Edward L. Ayers, *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction* (N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1992), 111-112.
30. Martin Clark, *Modern Italy: 1871-1982* (New York: Longman Group Limited, 1984), 24.
31. "Girl Would Establish Silk Industry in the South," *St. Louis Republic*, 2 November 1902, at <http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn84020274/1902-11-02/ed-1/seq-20>.

-
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid. See also Sidney Bland, "Women and World's Fair: The Charleston Story," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 94 (1993): 179.
34. Ida Lining, "Silk Culture," *The Exposition* 1 (July 1901): 274. The silkworm is the caterpillar of the *Bombyx mori* silk moth.
35. See Henrietta Aiken Kelly, *The Culture of the Mulberry Silkworm* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1903), at http://books.google.com/books?id=_4waAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=henrietta+aikenkelly&hl=en&sa=X&ei=i1oWUfXGOq670QGoyYDgDQ&ved=0CDAQ6AEwAA, accessed 5 February 2013.
36. "Department of Agriculture," *Reports and Resolutions of South Carolina to the General Assembly* (Columbia, S.C.: n.p., 1905), 676.
37. Nellie E. Ellerbe, "From a Woman's Viewpoint," *The Herald Journal*, n.d.; "Biographical and Genealogical Research on Henrietta A. Kelly" (30-4 Kelly).
38. Ellerbe, "From a Woman's Viewpoint."
39. "Department of Agriculture," *Reports and Resolutions of South Carolina to the General Assembly* (Columbia: n.p., 1906), 921; *Congressional Directory*, 59th Cong., 1st. sess., 1905, S. Doc. 4, serial 4918 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1906), 325, 357, 359.
40. E.J. Watson, *Handbook of South Carolina* (Columbia, S.C.: The State Company, 1908), 323. For additional information on the surge of interest in the silk industry in the Carolinas, see Ben Marsh, "Silk Hopes in Colonial South Carolina," *Journal of Southern History* 78 (November 2012): 809-10, including 809, n. 8.
41. Noel Vance, "Socialist Duke and American Duchess Undiscouraged By Loss of a Fortune," *The State*, 9 February 1908.
42. "Duke Pompeo Litta, the Italian Nobleman, Who Plans home for 20,000 Quake Survivors, Outlines the Details of the Colonization," *Miami News*, 20 January 1909, at <http://news.google.com/newspapers?id=RBxVAAAIBAJ&sjid=fj0NAAAAIBAJ&dq=duke-pompeo-litta&pg=4652%2C1003470>, accessed 5 February 2013.
43. Mason, "The American Silk Industry and the Tariff," 32.
44. Ibid., 37.
45. Ibid., 38.
46. Eliza B. Thompson, *Silk* (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1922 [1918]), at <http://archive.org/details/silk00thomgoog>, accessed 5 February 2013. Thompson's book was published as part of the Ronald Press Company's Merchandise Manual Series.
47. Ibid., 1.
48. Ibid., 105.
49. "Notable Woman Has Passed Away," *The State*, 19 January 1916.
50. "Donates Trees to Schools," *The State*, 9 February 1911.
51. Henrietta Aiken Kelly, will dated November 1, 1912, South Carolina Probate Records, no. 19 (box 542), South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, S.C.
52. "Sudie Furman Dabbs," *The State*, 15 February, 1931.
-

Essential Workers for Desperate Farmers and Pulpwood Operators: German POW Labor in South Carolina, 1943-1946

Fritz Hamer

Why should they [industries and military] compete with us for our vitally needed labor? (N.P. Bryan, Kane Island Farm, Beaufort County to Congressman Mendel Rivers, May 1943)¹

This is to advise that we, in our operation, are fearfully undermanned.... (John T. Cannon, Manager, Saluda River Wood Products Co. to D.W. Watkins, extension agent, Clemson College, August 1943)²

DURING 1943, AS WAS THE CASE IN MOST OF THE NATION, South Carolina faced severe labor shortages. The shipyards in Charleston, textile mills throughout the state, and other businesses were constantly in need of more workers during wartime. South Carolina farms and pulpwood operations probably suffered even greater shortages. The armed forces and war industries had snapped up most of the rural labor since the outbreak of war through either military service or the attraction of better pay in war industries. Exactly one year after the Pearl Harbor attack, South Carolina's Farm Placement Supervisor C.B. Kendrick informed B.F. Ashe, regional supervisor of the War Manpower Commission in Atlanta, that there was a general shortage of sharecroppers and other farm workers in the state. He observed that most South Carolina farmers were unsure what to plant in the 1943 season because of insufficient labor. He illustrated the problem with the example of two farm brothers in Beaufort County. Although the latter usually had cultivated 7,500 acres until the war, in 1942 they could only plant a third of this because they lacked workers.³ Even as the war seemed to be turning in favor of Allied forces during summer 1943, the precarious supplies of food and forest products needed by millions of troops and civilians made state and federal officials deeply concerned.⁴

In an ironic twist of war, captured German soldiers would come to rescue many South Carolina farmers and pulpwood operators. But to make this possible, a vast bureaucratic maze had to be negotiated by state officials, local officials, and prospective employers to hire prisoner of war (POW) labor. This inquiry will examine several case studies regarding how rural areas drew POWs for work and how these workers fared.⁵ To employ these workers, prospective employers first had to

apply to their local extension agents. But that was just the beginning of the process. Local extension agents then had to work with state employment officials and their federal counterparts before they could seek POW labor from the Army. Local and state representatives turned to politicians for help to speed up this process.

In the first year-and-a-half of war few people other than U.S. Army officials and others in the State Department even anticipated a future for POW labor. The Army began implementing plans to hold POWs before the first prisoner of war entered the United States. The Provost Marshal General's Office (PMGO) was given administrative control of all prisoners with the responsibility to plan, build, and staff prison camps. Its guide on camp construction and treatment for prisoners of war was the Geneva Convention of 1929 to which most western nations were signatories. Among its many humanitarian provisions the Convention stipulated that adequate shelter, food, and water had to be provided by the host nation to every POW held by its military. Likewise all enlisted prisoners were required to work for the country in which they were held. Noncommissioned officers, while not required to work, were obligated to supervise enlisted prison labor; commissioned officers could volunteer, but had no working obligations. The Geneva Convention also stated somewhat nebulously that prison labor could neither be war-related nor dangerous. Although American Army commanders and State Department officials wanted to adhere to this code both in spirit and letter, it was not necessarily followed in practice, as shall be detailed below. Beyond the obvious humanitarian reasons behind the provisions of the 1929 convention, Americans also had a clear self-interest in adhering to its provisions. It was hoped that by treating German POWs humanely, American POWs held in German camps would receive similar treatment.⁶

South Carolina administrators and prospective employers who needed workers had more practical issues at the state and local level as they sought ways to bring POW labor into the state. For a time there was confusion regarding what the procedures were. Before the PMGO had clear policies for prospective employers, county agents began receiving inquiries from farmers and pulpwood operators. The first POWs had hardly entered the Southeast in June 1943 when state authorities began receiving pressure to bring them into rural South Carolina. State extension agent Daniel Watkins at Clemson College received such requests from all over the state. By August he had compiled a survey of the labor needs of the state's farmers and pulpwood operators. Apparently it became clear to him that many of the latter were desperate to employ POW labor. Unfortunately the exact number of farmers and operators surveyed by him is unknown because the document is no longer extant. On 3 August, Watkins even complained to South Carolina's U.S.

Senator Burnett Maybank that South Carolinians “feel that I have some power of deciding about war prisoner labor where as [sic!] my function is to accumulate and certify as to the agricultural situations and demands for such labor.”⁷ Although he had submitted his survey of South Carolina counties to Colonel John Hatch, who represented the Commanding General of the 4th Service Command in Atlanta,⁸ he thought that Senator Maybank’s influence would help locate camps and sub-camps in the state. In effect, he contacted the latter because the interest in POW labor was so widespread that he needed someone in the political arena to make a public statement about the prospects for camps in the Palmetto State.

Watkins had also already begun to communicate with federal officials in Atlanta, both civilian and military, on how his state could receive POW labor. As early as June 1943 he had contacted Washington, DC, for information on this matter. In the first telegram reply from Meredith Wilson, War Manpower Commission representative there, Watkins learned that the Service Commanders had authority to grant prison camp commandants permission to construct sub-camps in areas where a labor emergency existed. But less than a week later these instructions were revised. Now Wilson advised Watkins to contact first the camp commandants of major POW camps and to recommend locations for sub-camps. But the camp commandants then had to seek the Service Commanders’ permission to build the sub-camps while the state extension agent had to certify the labor emergency and have this certification countersigned by the State War Manpower Commissioner. To make things more complicated, Wilson then told Watkins that since South Carolina did not at that time have a prison camp on its territory, he would need directly to contact the Commander of the 4th Service Command in Atlanta after all. It was clear that Washington was still trying to work out the official procedures for applying for prison labor.⁹

In the meantime Watkins tried his best to gather the data that he needed to convince other state authorities and their counterparts in the federal government of South Carolina’s labor needs. Not only farmers wanted POW labor, but pulp and paper mill operators were in dire need as well. In the same month that Watkins was trying to ascertain application procedures for POW labor from the federal agricultural officials, John T. Cannon of the Saluda River Wood Products Company in Chappells, South Carolina (in the western section of the state) wrote to the state extension agent. Cannon made it quite clear that his operation was severely undermanned and its production much diminished. He needed between 75 and 100 POWs for his operation, and asked what the requirements might be for guarding, housing, and feeding them. He even went so far as to stipulate which

nationality of POWs he preferred: “our first choice would be Italians, second Germans. Japs, we feel that we would not want at all.” It is unclear how Cannon devised this preference.¹⁰

As it turned out, during the next two years federal authorities in the civilian and military sectors would revise the rules on applying for POW labor. As the need grew and more businesses and organizations sought to hire prisoner labor, Washington remained very concerned, for reasons outlined earlier, about their treatment and working conditions. But other concerns also arose. Some authorities and labor leaders feared that American workers might be displaced by POW laborers. And of course, there was the fear that enemy prisoners might escape and carry out sabotage on infrastructure and war industries. Although it seemed clear from reports received from South Carolina that the labor shortage there was genuine, labor leaders in other parts of the nation voiced their concern that native workers were being displaced by POW labor. Generally speaking, in South Carolina where labor unions were weak, state and federal authorities did not have to worry about this to the extent that they did in the nation’s Northeast and West where strong union leadership kept a close eye on the situation. Nonetheless, a few in South Carolina did voice concern early on. Christie Benet, a Columbia lawyer and a member of the Clemson Board of Trustees, learned of the POW labor program in June 1943. He cautioned Watkins that “[t]he handling of war prisoners will raise many problems, new and difficult of solution, and may be loaded with dynamite.”¹¹ It is not clear if Benet was referring to the displacement of local labor or the security issues enemy prisoners might pose in the state. As it turned out, the initial fear of prisoner escapes and sabotage of local infrastructure proved unwarranted. Few POWs tried to escape and those that did were captured within a day or two. There is hardly any evidence that prisoners tried any sabotage except perhaps to damage or misplace tools assigned to them at the work site.¹²

In any event, by late August any fears that might have impeded POW labor from entering the Palmetto State were overcome. Watkins received permission from the South Carolina War Manpower Commission and the U.S. Employee Service representatives to bring POWs into South Carolina. His county extension agents now contacted the nearby prison camp commandant at Camp Gordon, outside Augusta, Georgia, to begin the process of transferring a portion of its prisoners into the western counties of the state for farm labor and pulpwood harvest. One of Watkins’ associates at Clemson, extension economist Olin M. Clark, went to Barnwell to meet with three Army officers in order to check on possible locations for a sub-camp. They picked a site on the edge of town that Carol Cheek, a local

business leader and lumber operator, agreed to lease. According to one recollection, State Representative Sol Blatt and State Senator Edgar Brown were instrumental in locating the camp there. Both of these men were among the state's most powerful legislators, serving respectively as Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Senate President *Pro Tempore*. They formed a powerful political group in the state commonly referred to as the "Barnwell ring" because of the many political deals they made in the legislature that benefited their political allies and constituents in that county. Brown contacted the South Carolina delegation in the U.S. Congress to seek their help in streamlining the process with the Provost Marshal General and the War Manpower Commission with a view to bring a sub-camp to his home county. Not only did this effort seem to work for Barnwell, but it also may have helped the neighboring Aiken, Bamberg, and Hampton counties. All four gained the state's first POW sub-camps that fall.¹³

These first sub-camps in western South Carolina were satellites from larger camps in other states with more than a thousand prisoners. Camp Gordon in Georgia and Camp Forrest in Tennessee supplied between 200 and 250 POWs to each of these sub-camps. In each case the sub-camps were initially to last only for the 1943 fall harvest season to gather the large peanut, sweet potato, and cotton crops. The Barnwell peanut acreage alone was estimated to cover 14,000 acres.¹⁴

When the first prisoners came to these rural communities, concerns were high about the security risk that they might pose. But this concern was generally overcome by the local population's initial curiosity at just having the enemy in their midst. In Bamberg the POWs that were shipped from Camp Gordon in September drew large numbers of curiosity seekers at first. Naturally Army authorities had strict rules against fraternization between civilians and prisoners, and were not pleased when crowds came to the camps. Yet camp commandants could do little about the large number of civilians who gathered outside the barbed wire fences to look at the vaunted German warriors.¹⁵

The Bamberg and Hampton sub-camps generally resembled that of Aiken, which opened around the same time as Barnwell. The facility at Aiken contained: a compound of eighty-one tents, each erected on a wooden base that usually housed from four to six prisoners each; two administrative barracks for the camp commander and his staff; two buildings for showers and latrines, a recreation tent; a workshop; a medical tent; six tents for dining; and a canteen for POWs to purchase small items such as tooth paste, soft drinks, and even beer. This was surrounded by a barbed wire fence about ten feet high with guard towers at the corners where armed U.S. military personnel watched over the compound. Over time these sub-

camps, initially built for seasonal work, were made permanent enough that they even added small libraries with 100 to 200 volumes and showed movies at least once a week. In 1944 Fort Jackson outside Columbia and Camp Croft near Spartanburg were organized. They became the largest POW camps in the state with 2,000 and 1,000 prisoners, respectively, by the end of 1944. Since they were larger, they had more substantial structures, more recreation facilities, and playing fields for soccer matches and other sports. By the last year of the war Fort Jackson became the headquarters for all South Carolina camps.¹⁶

Since the sub-camps were built for supplying workers to county farmers and pulpwood operators, POWs were put to work within a day or two of arrival. They usually were sent out in details of ten to twenty men. At the Aiken sub-camp the prisoners had the following assignments in July 1944: twenty-one in farm work; twenty-one assigned to sawmills; eighty-four for wood cutting; thirty-eight for impregnating wood; and sixteen for loading wood onto cars. At other sub-camps in the area the assignments probably varied according to the specific needs of the surrounding local employers. In late 1945 John Byars of Windsor in Aiken County hired twelve men and one noncommissioned officer—as group leader—from the local POW camp to work for twenty-six days in the woods cutting and stacking timber for pulpwood. They were expected to work eight hour days excluding the transportation between the sub-camps and the work sites. This was a common contract for farm work as well.¹⁷

Payments for prisoner labor initially started with a base wage, but this was revised over time. The standard wage for each POW laborer stipulated by the PMGO was \$3.50 per day. Eighty cents of this was for the prisoner and the rest went to the Army for the upkeep and housing of that individual. However, employers in the pulpwood industry revised these standards, arguing that their POW workers were unable to cut the same amount of wood as pre-war laborers had. Inexperienced and unused to the extreme heat and wilderness of the southern forests, few prisoners could match native workers for producing the daily amounts expected. According to a 1945 Southern Pine Association report, wartime workers, including many POWs, were only 65% as efficient as pre-war workers. To rectify the problem the PMGO and its camp commandants worked out an incentive plan with pulpwood managers. Instead of paying a daily wage, employers soon turned to daily quotas for their POW laborers. When John Byars hired twenty POWs in December 1944, he contracted to pay the Federal government \$1.80 per cord for 99 days. It is unknown what arrangement Byars made with his POW workers who finished their quota for the day. In general, when individual workers in other southern pulpwood

operations completed their quotas, they could return to camp. These quotas usually ranged from three quarters of a cord to a full cord of wood per day. Over the two years of the POW program the work regulations were revised such that by spring 1945 the PMGO had issued fifty-four national circulars to all agencies involved in the POW work programs.¹⁸

For POWs this work was exhausting and sometimes dangerous. Wolfgang Rupp, a prisoner based in the Aiken sub-camp for several months, recalled his assignment to a pulpwood company as hard physical labor that was always fatiguing and often dangerous because of the heat, bugs, and snakes. As soon as he could arrange it, he transferred to agricultural labor, which he preferred much more. Rupp's experiences were similar to those of many prisoners employed in this type of work and explained, in part, why the POWs were not as efficient as pre-war civilian labor had been.¹⁹ In some cases POWs refused to do certain tasks ordered by their American managers. For example, in 1945 several unidentified southern operations reported that prisoners refused to cut tops of trees, one of the most dangerous of all the duties when cutting timber. And on these occasions the POWs had outside support from their American guards. As can be imagined, the Army quickly issued a directive to all camp commandants and their personnel that such sympathy would not be tolerated as it "embarrassed the contractors."²⁰

In the majority of cases, however, prisoners still seemed satisfied with their general conditions. Many had been at war for more than four years, and even those who had recently entered the German armed forces before their capture had endured severe rationing, air raids, and other deprivations. Now, at last, they were away from the war zone, getting regular meals daily and enjoying tent cover over their heads, albeit under the watchful eyes of their American guards. Because of strict adherence to the Geneva Convention for POWs, the prisoners were provided reading material and some forms of recreation, as illustrated earlier.²¹

By almost every account, farmers were pleased with their prisoner labor. After one month of working on the fall 1943 peanut harvest in Barnwell, farmers were almost universally positive about what the Germans had done for their peanut harvest. Beginning 8 September 1943, the POWs had worked every day but three. The work force of 250 had been distributed to 68 farms and had harvested 1,111.5 acres of peanuts that represented 350 tons or \$50,000. So pleased was the local extension agent with their work that he announced that the POWs would be kept beyond mid-October to work on the sweet potato harvest.²²

The accolades for the POW work force were repeated many times during the rest of the war and remembered fondly years later, long after the Germans had

returned home. One of the most positive recollections came from a Pee Dee farmer at the opposite, i.e., eastern, end of the state. Frank Rogers had served overseas in the Air Force during much of the war, but he was demobilized in early summer of 1945 and returned to his father's Pee Dee farm outside Bennettsville to help with the late planting and upcoming harvest. His father employed twenty POWs from the local camp at the deactivated Palmer Airfield. Rogers recalled that the German work force provided some of the best workers he and his father ever employed. They were thorough in their work ethic, always completed what they started, and did a fine job—whether it was digging ditches, harvesting crops, or fixing farm equipment. Not satisfied that the lunch the prisoners brought with them from camp each day was adequate, Rogers' father supplied each POW with a lunch that usually included a half loaf of white bread, liverwurst (they preferred that to bologna), and at least a bottle of beer (either Pabst Blue Ribbon or Schlitz).²³

But problems also occurred occasionally in spite of the many positive reports. Across the border in Georgia it was reported that twenty POWs harvesting peanuts suddenly refused to work after two days in the fields. They claimed that the sand spurs they worked around were too many and dangerous to continue.²⁴ Sometimes prisoners found the work too hard when they were assigned to an industrial plant. This happened at the AF Pringle and Company fertilizer plant outside Charleston. Twenty German POWs struck because of what they claimed were bad working conditions. Eight others remained on the job and did not suffer the punishment of their colleagues, who were placed on a diet of bread and water for a week. The most serious incident in South Carolina appeared to be at the Charleston Army Air Base. In late May 1945 four POWs were shot in what apparently was an attempted escape. One was seriously wounded, but the others had slight wounds and returned to base. Unfortunately the details of what happened and the repercussions for the prisoners afterwards are unknown.²⁵

Several prisoners looking back on the time in South Carolina had mixed feelings about their experience. Wolfgang Rupp felt at times that he was treated roughly and exploited unfairly. Even the necessary drinking water that was provided was often stale and warm for the hot conditions in which he and his companions had to work. He recalled that some of his fellow prisoners found their working conditions so unbearable that they secretly mutilated themselves to avoid working in such circumstances. This happened most frequently when working in the woods for pulpwood operators. Temperatures were so hot that if by noon the POWs had not met their quota, they were unable to continue. Rupp recalled that there were many injuries and even some deaths, but he could not provide a reliable estimate

of such occurrences. Even some farming work was difficult, especially the peanut harvest. He recalled that many fellow POWs collapsed from the heat and dust. Nevertheless, the former German POW also remembered that there were many other sympathetic South Carolinians who helped him and his fellow POWs survive their hard times.²⁶

When Daniel Watkins at Clemson was desperate for POW workers, his concern was not about working conditions, but how to get them to his state. As James Fickle and Donald Ellis conclude in their 1990 article about POW labor in the South, the working conditions for many prisoners were sometimes very hard and dangerous. In several cases they note that these conditions even circumvented the letter of the Geneva Convention, not to mention the spirit. But they also observe that these same conditions were operative for American civilian workers in these same tasks before the war, and suggest that local operators and prison camp commandants simply did not anticipate that this work would prove too dangerous for POWs. In some cases this presumption was probably true, but as Rupp recalled, prisoners nevertheless at other times felt exploited and placed in circumstances beyond their endurance. While government officials tried to prevent this large network of camps throughout the nation from endangering and exploiting prisoner labor, it was impossible for them to monitor adequately all aspects of the POW work program. But Wolfgang Rupp also recalled that many prisoners and their guards often got along with each other in spite of the tough working conditions.²⁷ In any event, most participants—whether POWs or their employers—recognized that the experience had given each group valuable mutual assistance. The Germans escaped further bloodshed and could eat adequately as they waited for the war to end. Farmers and pulpwood managers received vital prisoner labor. Even if the POWs were sometimes not as productive in certain tasks as pre-war workers had been, they nevertheless provided—all things considered—an essential service that enabled the harvest of valuable food and wood products.

NOTES

1. Bryant to Rivers, May 1943, File: Labor Mobile and SC, Box 3, Series 11, War Manpower Commission (hereafter WMC), RG 211, National Archives, Southeast Region, Atlanta, GA.
2. Maybank, Burnett file, August 1943, Folder 2, Box 113, Series 32, Cooperative Extension Service, Special Collections, Clemson University Library.
3. Kendrick to Ashe, 7 December 1942, Box 3, Series 11, WMC, RG 211, National Archives, Southeast Region, Atlanta, GA. For labor shortages in South Carolina, see Walter Edgar, *South Carolina: A History* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1998), 513-515; for the Southeast, see George

B. Tindall, *The Emergence of the New South, 1913-1945* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967), 703; for the national demand for POW labor on farms, see Antonio Thompson, *Men in German Uniforms: POWs in America during World War II* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2010), 77, 81.

4. For other concerns about farm labor in this part of the state at the Kane Island farm in Beaufort County, see N. P. Bryan to Mendel Rivers, U.S. Congressman, May 1943, Box 3, Series 11, WMC, RG 211, National Archives, Southeast Region, Atlanta, GA. Bryan claimed that builders of the local airfield employed farmers in the area to such an extent that he believed food production would be “materially cut.”

5. Over the last four decades a growing body of research regarding World War II POWs—mostly German—in America has examined their conditions and experiences, and even their interactions with Americans. Harold Kramer’s *Nazi Prisoners of War in America* (Chelsea, MI: Scarborough House Paperback, 1991) is the most comprehensive national study to date. More recently Antonio Thompson published *Men in German Uniforms*; he provides more detailed insights into the national experience of POWs, but does not significantly revise Kramer’s earlier work. There are many state-specific histories of POWs in article and book form. These include Kathy Coker, “World War II Prisoners of War in Georgia: German Memories of Camp Gordon,” *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 76 (1992): 837-61; Calvin Dickinson, “Camp Crossville, 1942-1945,” *Journal of East Tennessee History* 68 (1996): 31-40; John H. Moore, “Nazi Troopers in South Carolina, 1944-1946,” *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 81 (1980): 306-15; and Robert Billinger, *Nazi POWs in the Tar Heel State* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008). The study presented here gives more voice to the needs of South Carolina farmers and pulpwood operators for wartime labor. It details the administrative difficulties that these employers had in gaining prison labor, explores the crucial importance of POW labor in wartime farm and forestry operations in South Carolina, and suggests that working conditions for prisoner labor were not always as the U.S. Army desired.

6. Kramer, *Nazi Prisoners of War*, 48; John H. Moore, *The Faustball Tunnel: German POWs in America and their Great Escape* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2006), 32-33; Thompson, *Men in German Uniforms*, xii. In 1944 the commander of the Fort Jackson POW camp explained this rationale of reciprocity to a Columbia Rotary Club when local people complained that Germans were being given special treatment; see *The State*, 19 December 1944, South Carolina Defense Scrapbooks, Number 6, 2032, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, SC. Monitoring of POW camps by the International Red Cross assured that both German and American authorities had some information about the treatment of prisoners.

7. D.W. Watkins to Senator Burnett Maybank, May 1943, folder 2, Box 113, Series 32, Cooperative Extension Service, Special Collections, Clemson University Library.

8. D.W. Watkins to Col. John Hatch, 2 August 1943, folder 2, Box 113, Series 32, Cooperative Extension Service, Special Collections, Clemson University Library. The nation was divided into nine military administrative districts to administer troop movement and logistics. South Carolina was part of the 4th District that also included North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee; see John D. Millet, *The Organization and Role of the Army Service Forces* (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army, 1954), 195.

9. Telegrams from Wilson to Watkins, 16 and 19 June 1943 attached to letter from Watkins to Christie Benet, 1 July 1943, folder 2, Box 113, Series 32, Cooperative Extension Service, Special Collections, Clemson University Library.

10. Cannon to Watkins, 24 June 1943, folder 2, Box 113, Series 32, Cooperative Extension Service, Special Collections, Clemson University Library.

11. Christie Benet to Watkins, 30 June 1943, folder 2, Box 113, Series 32, Cooperative Extension Service, Special Collections, Clemson University Library. For details on Benet, see *The State*, 31 March 1951; the author thanks Debbie Bloom of the local history room, Richland Library, Columbia, SC for locating this newspaper clipping. On concerns of labor leaders about POW labor, see Kramer, *Nazi Prisoners of War*, 94, 103-106.

12. Only 2,200 reported escape attempts were documented in the entire nation during the war. There is not a definite number for South Carolina, but a rough estimate is perhaps two dozen. See Kramer, *Nazi Prisoners of War*, 136. For possible sabotage of tools at some Southeastern POW work sites, including Camp Croft in Spartanburg, see POW Instructions and Information Letter No. 13, 11 June 1945, Folder—April to July 1945, Box 4, Series 1, WMC, National Archives, Southeast Region, Atlanta, GA.

13. On Clark's visit see *Barnwell People Sentinel*, 26 August 1943. On claims that Sol Blatt and Edgar Brown helped bring about the Barnwell sub-camp, see the 1995-96 notes of Esther Cheek Williams, Barnwell Prisoner of War Camp 1944-45, copy in possession of author. On the influence of Blatt and Brown in South Carolina politics, see George Terry and Catherine Horne, ed., *The Bridge Builder: Solomon Blatt Reflects on a Lifetime of Service to South Carolina* (Columbia: McKissick Museum, 1986), 41-70; Sol Blatt Scrapbooks, 1941-1947, Sol Blatt Papers, SC Modern Political Collection, Cooper Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia; and Ernest M. Lander, *A History of South Carolina, 1865-1960* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960), 193. For Brown's correspondence with others on bringing a POW sub-camp to Barnwell, I am indebted to Susan G. Hiott, Exhibition Curator, Special Collections, Clemson University Library for checking the file. My review of the Blatt papers for the 1940s did not reveal any evidence that he had worked behind the scenes to gain POW labor for his county; however, Blatt's great political influence in the state and with South Carolina's congressional delegation makes it plausible that he would have used his position to bring POWs to his state.

14. Deann B. Segal, *The German POWs in South Carolina* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004), 128; *Barnwell People Sentinel*, 7 October 1943.

15. Regarding security concerns and the general curiosity of local civilians about the POWs in their midst, see Kramer, *Nazi Prisoners of War*, 44-45, 77, 147. For reactions in Bamberg see Fritz Hamer, "Barbecue, Farming and Friendship: German Prisoners of War and South Carolinians," *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association 1994*, 63, 66-67.

16. For the description of the Aiken sub-camp see U.S. Army Inspector's report, July 1944, PMGO, RG 389, Box 2480, National Archives, College Park, Maryland; for establishment of Fort Jackson and Camp Croft see *The State*, 23 March 1944, South Carolina Defense Scrapbooks, Number 5, 1726, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, SC.

17. For the Aiken sub-camp job duties of its POWs, see U.S. Army Inspector's report, July 1944. See also John B. Byars contract, Aiken Branch Camp, 28 December 1945, copy on file, POW research files, Manuscript Division, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

18. Thompson, *Men in German Uniforms*, 83-84. For an example of this in Aiken in the post-war period, see John B. Byars contract, 5 December 1944, where he is stipulated to have his work force cut 2079 cords at \$1.80 per cord over a four-month period. See also Wolfgang Rupp answers to questions by

author on life as a POW, 25 March 1992, POW research files, Manuscript Division, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. For a full discussion about POW labor in the Southern pulpwood industry, see James E. Fickle and Donald W. Ellis, "POWs in the Piney Woods: German Prisoners of War in the Southern Lumber Industry, 1943-46," *Journal of Southern History* 56 (November 1990): 695-724, especially 708-09 for wartime efficiency of POW workers.

19. Wolfgang Rupp answers POW questions, 25 March 1992, POW research file, Manuscript Division, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

20. POW Instructions and Information letter No. 13, 11 June 1945, Folder, 5 April-31 July 1945, Box 4, Series 1, WMC, RG 211, National Archives, Southeast Region, Atlanta, GA.

21. For three descriptions of sub-camp conditions in South Carolina, see International Red Cross Inspection reports of Walterboro (30 June 1945), Barnwell (30 June 1945) and Camden (26 June 1945) POW camps, Archives of International Red Cross, Geneva, Switzerland, copies in possession of the author.

22. *Barnwell People Sentinel*, 7 October 1943, 1, 4. There are two articles in this edition about the POWs and their labor. The first (1) provides a general report about their work and living conditions in the adjacent four counties (Barnwell, Aiken, Bamberg, and Allendale), while the second (4) concentrates on the work of prisoners in Barnwell County. In this latter article the local extension agent reported on acreage worked and the harvest yield for the past month. To put the county peanut yield in context, South Carolina's annual total harvest totaled 23,400 tons at a value of \$3,510,000; see "Year Book of the Department of Agriculture of the State of South Carolina, 1942-43" in *Reports and Resolutions of South Carolina to the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, 1943-1944* (Columbia: General Assembly of South Carolina, 1944), II: 198.

23. Frank Rogers interview with author, 19 November 1990, Bennettsville, SC, transcript, POW file, Manuscript Division, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. For two positive reports from newspapers, see *Aiken Standard*, 14 January 1944, and *The State*, 8 August 1945.

24. *The State*, 2 September 1943 in South Carolina Defense Scrapbooks (Number 5), 1438, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, SC.

25. *Charleston News and Courier*, 24 April 1945 and 1 June 1945.

26. Wolfgang Rupp answers POW questions, 25 March 1992, POW research file, Manuscript Division, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. For more details about the difficulties prisoners faced when working in the pulp and paper industries in other parts of the South, see Fickle and Ellis, "POWs in the Piney Woods," 702-05.

27. Wolfgang Rupp answers POW questions, 25 March 1992, POW research file, Manuscript Division, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

The Recent History of Affirmative Action Policies in Higher Education and the U.S. Supreme Court

Marcia G. Synnott

MOST AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES have implemented affirmative action policies in some form since the 1970s. Such policies aimed to increase the numbers and percentages of racial minority students in institutions that were historically white prior to the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s. Although federal court-ordered desegregation ended state mandated exclusions based on race, the process of racial inclusion was still incomplete. Due to both external pressures and internal decisions, southern public and private universities began to take positive steps to encourage racial minorities to seek admission and then enable them to enroll. Even in the northern states, where segregation had never been entrenched, colleges and universities recognized that they, too, had to increase minority enrollments so that their student bodies would adequately represent the demographic changes in the national population. Nevertheless, affirmative action policies have, in addition to their strong defenders, severe critics who are opposed to a practice, they argue, that may admit a less well-qualified minority applicant ahead of a better prepared white or Asian applicant. Thus, affirmative action policies have been and will continue to be debated in the federal courts, the state legislatures, and the media, perhaps for years to come. To be informed about the history of affirmative action policies—and to hold one’s own in any debate—one should review the history of judicial rulings on affirmative action.

Beginning with its decision in *Regents of the University of California v. Allan Bakke* in 1978, the United States Supreme Court has defined for higher educational institutions the permissible boundaries for using race in their affirmative action policies. When in 2003 the Supreme Court ruled that colleges and universities could continue to use racial preferences in a “holistic” review of each applicant, as conducted by the University of Michigan Law School (*Grutter v. Bollinger*), it also found impermissible the application of a point system for minority students by its College of Literature, Science, and the Arts (*Gratz v. Bollinger*). Ten years later, the Supreme Court again reviewed the use of race-based affirmative action in *Fisher v. Texas* and also agreed, beginning in the fall term of 2013, to consider whether to uphold or overturn a 2012 ruling by the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals that a voter-approved ban on racial preferences in Michigan was unconstitutional (*Schuette*

v. *Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action*). Judicial curtailment of affirmative action, its supporters fear, may well decrease minority enrollments at all institutions that accept federal money, both private and public universities.

In the 1970s, university officials, civil rights proponents, minority groups, and President Jimmy Carter's administration committed themselves to removing segregation's legacies that hindered the educational and economic progress of African Americans. They were reassured when race-based affirmative action was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978). Reversing the California Supreme Court, Associate Justice Lewis F. Powell, Jr. wrote, in a 5 to 4 opinion, that race as a category of preference could be used to "tip" the balance in favor of a minority applicant. However, in another 5 to 4 vote, Powell agreed with the California Supreme Court that Allan P. Bakke, a white applicant who had been twice rejected, should be admitted to the Medical School of the University of California at Davis, and that, under the Equal Protection Clause the medical school's obvious racial quota—the sixteen special minority admissions slots for which Bakke could not apply—was unconstitutional.¹

The Supreme Court entrusted to colleges and universities the freedom to decide, under the First Amendment's protection of academic freedom, how to implement affirmative action programs. The fact that Ivy League institutions now welcomed Jewish and racial minority students may have influenced Justice Powell to quote at length from the joint amici curiae brief submitted by Columbia, Harvard, and Stanford universities and the University of Pennsylvania, one of about 62 filed in the *Bakke* case. Specifically citing Harvard's recruitment of "not only Californians or Louisianans but also blacks and Chicanos and other minority students," he agreed that "race and ethnic background may be deemed a 'plus' in a particular applicant's file," when it did not insulate "the person from comparison with all other candidates for the available seats." Included in Harvard's non-academic criteria were "leadership potential, maturity, demonstrated compassion, a history of overcoming disadvantage, ability to communicate with the poor, or other qualifications deemed important." With applications from the best students of all races, Harvard's admissions staff could ensure that each applicant was compared to every other applicant from a number of perspectives, rather than having to rely primarily on test scores as did most tax-supported higher educational institutions. Because of its financial resources, Harvard, the oldest and wealthiest American university, retained almost all the students it admitted in contrast to less prestigious institutions, which usually had to compete for the best black and Hispanic students in applicant pools that were smaller than those of qualified white and Asian American students.²

In the aftermath of the *Bakke* case, prestigious private universities and state flagship universities expanded their institutional missions to recruit and educate a diversified student body that represented virtually all ethnic and racial groups. One of their tools was a so-called “diversity rationale,” defended on the grounds that its outcome was the inclusion of under-represented minorities, rather than the quota-based exclusion of certain ethnic, religious, and racial groups implemented during the 1920s. Critics of affirmative action have contended, however, that the use of race was applied too generously to benefit minority students and that Justice Powell examined neither the question of how long racial preferences in affirmative action programs should continue nor the problem of mismatching students with colleges. “In the wake of the *Bakke* decision, and especially in the 1980s,” noted the late Hugh Davis Graham, “you see more and more recourse to diversity as the rationale that legitimizes these various preferences,” because “it’s marvelously flexible. Diversity is endless, diversity never starts, never ends, never has constraints and diversity permits an enormous amount of discriminatory behavior without requiring a rationale.” Whereas he generally accepted “soft” affirmative action, such as the tactics of aggressive outreach and recruitment of racial minority students, he opposed “hard” affirmative action that could justify minority set asides or quotas in admissions and employment practices.³

Given limited places in prestigious colleges and professional schools, slots awarded on the basis of membership in one ethnic group or race in order to fulfill an institutional concept of “diversity” may lead to the exclusion of other groups better academically qualified, particularly Asian Americans and to a limited extent some whites. Political and judicial backlash against racial preferences in university and professional school admissions has occurred, for example, in Maryland, California, and Texas. Ward Connerly, an African American regent of the University of California, was campaign chairman for the passage of the California Civil Rights Initiative, also known as Proposition 209, that pledged to treat everyone equally: “no state agency shall discriminate against or grant preferential treatment to any individual or group on the basis of race, color, sex, ethnicity or national origin in public employment, public education or public contracting.” He claimed that over 16 percent of the African American students admitted to the University of California at Berkeley in 1994 “had been ‘admitted by exception,’” having failed to fulfill the “minimum requirements.” In contrast, only 1 percent of Asian Americans and 2 percent of whites were similarly unqualified. On November 5, 1996, Proposition 209 was approved by 54 percent of California voters. The regents of the University of California also voted to remove minority preferences from university admission

policies by 1997. The result was a sharp drop in the percentages of black freshmen at California's public universities.⁴

The University of Texas Law School also came under attack because it accorded special treatment to minority applicants. It color-coded application forms by race, created a minority subcommittee of three that considered the applications of blacks and Mexican Americans, set lower test score requirements for minority applicants, and racially segregated waiting lists. Cheryl Hopwood and three other white applicants denied admission brought suit against the law school. In March 1996, a panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit ruled 3-0, in *Hopwood v. State of Texas*, nicknamed "Bakke II," that the Fourteenth Amendment did not permit the University of Texas Law School to discriminate against whites and "non-preferred minorities" by according special treatment to blacks and Mexican Americans to increase their numbers. Another state, Georgia, which was then 29 percent African American, ended affirmative action at public universities after the Eleventh Circuit Court ruled in *Johnson v. Board of Regents of the University of Georgia* (2001) that it was unconstitutional for the university to award either bonus points in admissions decisions or race-based scholarships. The percentage of black students at the University of Georgia dropped to 5.5 percent from the 6.2 percent it had been in 1988.⁵

In 2003, affirmative action programs that steered clear of quotas were vindicated by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Grutter v. Bollinger*, which upheld the University of Michigan Law School's "highly individualized, holistic review of each applicant's file," though in *Gratz v. Bollinger*, it struck down the University of Michigan's awarding of points to minorities applying to its undergraduate College of Literature, Science, and the Arts. Of considerable influence on Justice Sandra Day O'Connor's 5 to 4 majority opinion in *Grutter* were the amici curiae briefs filed by many universities, among them the one by Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Brown, and Duke universities, together with Dartmouth College, the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Chicago. However, Justice O'Connor insisted that such preferences be phased out within twenty-five years in favor of a race-blind policy. For the first time, moreover, the Supreme Court indicated that its rulings included all institutions that accept federal money.⁶

Since 2003, enrollments of African American students have held steady or improved at once segregated universities with affirmative action policies. They were 19 percent at the University of South Carolina (USC); 14 percent at the University of Maryland; 13 percent at the University of Alabama; 11 percent at the University of Mississippi and at the University of North Carolina (which provided

tuition grants to pay all expenses of students from families at or below 150 percent of the federal poverty level); 10 percent at the University of Virginia; 9 percent at Louisiana State University (LSU); and 7 percent at the universities of Florida, Georgia, and Oklahoma. The University of Texas had 4 percent black enrollment; and Texas A&M, 3 percent.⁷

Outreach and retention programs are essential to colleges and universities that achieved higher than average minority enrollments. In 2012, forty-seven colleges and universities received the inaugural “Higher Education Excellence in Diversity (HEED) award from the magazine, *INSIGHT Into Diversity*, “the oldest and largest diversity-focused publication in higher education.” Among “the nation’s top universities for diversity and inclusivity” featured in the December issue are USC and LSU, the only two Southeastern Conference universities included. USC’s Gamecock Guarantee provides tuition and academic support to qualified South Carolina residents who are first-time freshmen and whose family’s adjusted gross income is less than \$25,000. African Americans are 17.1 percent of USC’s 44,000 students; 3.5 percent are Hispanic and 2.4 percent Asian and/or Pacific Islanders. In 2012, LSU’s enrollment was 10.6 percent African American, up from 8.8 percent in 2009.⁸

By 2010, under the impact of “Texas Top Ten Percent Plan,” an ostensibly “race-neutral” measure enacted by the legislature in 1997 that guaranteed the top tenth of high school graduates admission to their preferred in-state university, freshmen classes were more racially diverse. At the University of Texas at Austin white freshmen had declined to 47.6 percent, though they were 52.1 percent of university enrollment, counting graduate and professional school students. Hispanics were 23.1 percent of freshmen, Asians 17.3 percent, and African Americans 5.1 percent. The university admitted the balance of its freshmen classes by a “holistic” review of applicants that included race; it also planned to cap at 75 percent those admitted under the Ten Percent Plan beginning in 2011-2012. After just missing placement in the top 10 percent of her Sugar Land high school class in 2008 that would have guaranteed her admission, Abigail Noel Fisher sued on the ground that the University of Texas weighed race as a factor in awarding most of the remaining places to black or Hispanic applicants. After the three-judge panel unanimously ruled against the white plaintiffs, Fisher and Rachel Michalewicz, the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court ruled 9 to 7 on February 1, 2011 not to have a full panel rehearing of the case. In her opinion for the dissenting judges, Chief Justice Edith H. Jones disagreed with the university’s policy of admitting minorities to achieve a ““critical mass”” in the classrooms because it opened ““the door to effective quotas in undergraduate majors.””⁹

On September 15, 2011, lawyers for Fisher, then a senior at LSU, filed a petition for review by the U. S. Supreme Court, contending that universities should first use race-neutral measures before employing a holistic assessment of applicants.¹⁰ The Supreme Court agreed to hear Fisher's appeal on February 21, 2012, with Justice Elena Kagan recusing herself since as U.S. solicitor general she had filed a brief supporting the University of Texas. On October 10, the Court heard the oral arguments in *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin* and then began a lengthy study of the numerous amici curiae briefs and court documents. Eight justices would decide whether the University of Texas exceeded what was legally permissible in considering race and ethnicity in admissions under the *Grutter v. Bollinger* ruling. Is it permissible for the University of Texas to have both a plan giving students in the top decile of their high school class automatic admission to the public college they choose and also to consider race and ethnicity in admitting the remainder of the incoming class? Whereas the "Top Ten Percent Plan" that applied to all high schools in Texas has produced a student body that was 21 percent African American and Hispanic, does additional specific consideration of race and ethnicity exceed the legal benchmark? For its part, the university claimed it was endeavoring to achieve even greater diversity, a truly diverse diversity.¹¹

A committed defender of student diversity is Columbia University president Lee C. Bollinger, the named defendant in the 2003 University of Michigan cases. He feared that a majority of justices would turn away "from the court's recognition in *Grutter* of the 'substantial' and 'laudable' benefits of a diverse student body," which "would be as damaging to higher education as it would be ill-timed for the nation at large." Public universities especially should be allowed to admit a diverse student body, because they produce workers who contribute creatively to the global economy and educate those who serve in the military, some 40 percent of whom are minorities. As a private institution applying both racial and economic criteria in undergraduate admissions, Columbia University was the leader in admitting "the highest percentage of low- and moderate-income students and the largest number of military veterans of our peer institutions, as well as the highest percentage of African American students among the nation's top 30 universities." Bollinger applauded the guidance on implementing *Grutter* issued in December 2011 by the federal departments of Education and Justice as "a strong antidote to what had been a prevailing vagueness in legal guidance and its attendant chilling effect on university presidents and admissions officers."¹²

Among those predicting the end of racial preferences in admissions, at least in public universities, was Adam Liptak, Supreme Court correspondent for the *New York Times*. In "College Diversity Nears Its Last Stand," he contended that *Grutter*

v. Bollinger “elevated the concept of ‘diversity’ from human-resource department jargon to constitutional stature” and allowed “admissions personnel at public universities to do what the Constitution ordinarily forbids government officials to do—to sort people by race.” Although Fisher could not show that she would have been admitted if she had been a racial minority, the “diversity rationale” lacked “analytical rigor” and the “Texas Top Ten Percent Plan” was “idiosyncratic,” observed Liptak. The new justices appointed since 2003 were “likely to cut back on if not eliminate the use of race in admissions decisions.” A rejection of the “diversity rationale” would transform “the student body at the University of Texas and many other public colleges and universities” into one that is “whiter and more Asian, and less black and Hispanic.”¹³

Asian-American organizations have taken stands both for and against the plaintiffs. Those submitting or planning to submit briefs for the plaintiff Fisher included the non-profit Asian-American Legal Foundation in San Francisco and the 80-20 Educational Foundation in Delaware. On the other hand, four Asian-American organizations, among them the Asian Pacific American Legal Center, believing in the educational benefit of a diverse student body, supported the University of Texas.¹⁴

Though perhaps having less to fear than public universities from a Supreme Court ruling against affirmative action, a number of elite private institutions—the Ivy league (Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Princeton and Yale universities, Dartmouth College, and the University of Pennsylvania), the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of Chicago, and Duke, Stanford, Johns Hopkins, and Vanderbilt universities—filed a brief defending the University of Texas on August 13, 2012. This brief reasserted affirmative action arguments made in the 1978 *Bakke* and 2003 *Grutter* briefs.¹⁵

However, Ivy League universities are not immune to criticism for their use of preferences, which include alumni/ae children as well as racial minorities. Pointing to Princeton’s admission in 2009 of “41.7 percent of legacy applications, compared with 9.2 percent of the overall applicant pool,” Zoya Walianny argued in *The Daily Texan* that “universities should commit to admitting students based on merit.” When an academically stronger student with “an all-around better application is rejected in favor of a student whose father attended the college and recently offered a generous donation, it breeds an environment of elitism and nepotism that will hinder our country’s growth.”¹⁶

University of Southern California School of Law Professor Richard Sander, who criticized *Grutter* for becoming “‘a mechanical calculation,’” instead of encouraging “a holistic approach” to admission, predicted three possible rulings. First,

the Supreme Court could uphold *Grutter* by ruling that the University of Texas had deviated from its intent. Second, the Court could revise *Grutter* to make unambiguous the legal guidelines universities should follow. Third, it could take the step most feared by universities: rule that affirmative action is unconstitutional.¹⁷

However, Richard D. Kahlenberg, co-author with Halley Potter of the Century Foundation's 2012 report, *A Better Affirmative Action: State Universities that Created Alternatives to Racial Preferences*, argued that the Supreme Court is likely to rule that "race-neutral" measures should first be pursued before using race-based affirmative action to achieve diversity. As the swing vote on a more conservative Supreme Court since Sandra Day O'Connor's 2006 retirement, Justice Anthony Kennedy may likely point to a growing body of "evidence from a number of universities that race-neutral approaches can produce as much racial and ethnic diversity as using race per se." Indeed, the University of Texas's "Top Ten Percent Plan" and its affirmative action preferences for all economically disadvantaged students are such race-neutral measures. Moreover, three public universities have relinquished legacy preferences, and six states have fostered partnerships between higher educational institutions and K-12 schools to strengthen the "pipeline" for lower-income and minority high school students. Kahlenberg and co-author Potter discovered that "in 7 of 10 cases, the use of race-neutral alternatives such as class-based affirmative action produced as much black and Latino representation as had the previous use of race." In addition to the University of Texas at Austin, the other six universities are Texas A&M, the University of Washington, the University of Florida, the University of Georgia, the University of Nebraska, and the University of Arizona. If, as Kahlenberg expected, the Supreme Court ruled that universities should "only use race as a very last resort," it "would apply across the board," and thereby "revolutionize the way universities admit students."¹⁸

Meanwhile, on March 25, 2013, *Fisher v. Texas* took on even greater significance when the Supreme Court agreed to review the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals' ruling in *Schuetz v. Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action* (2012) that Michigan's ban on the use of racial preferences was unconstitutional because it undermined the equal protection guaranteed for all races. Four years after 58 percent of voters had approved the ban in 2006 the percentage of African American undergraduates at the University of Michigan had dropped from 6.7 to 4.5 percent. In the term beginning in October 2013, eight justices, with Justice Kagan again recusing herself, will determine whether Michigan's ban is constitutional. Their ruling could either uphold or strike down the constitutional amendments banning race-based affirmative action passed in Florida and California.¹⁹

Since a 4 to 4 tie on *Fisher* or *Schuette* would leave the appellate court's decision standing, the Supreme Court's most conservative justices (Samuel Alito, Antonin Scalia, Clarence Thomas, and Chief Justice John G. Roberts) would prefer to persuade Anthony Kennedy, the swing vote, that affirmative action has outlived its usefulness. But to avoid a sharp split with the three liberal justices (Stephen Breyer, Ruth Bader Ginsberg, and Sonia Sotomayor), the Supreme Court worked toward an acceptable consensus position. On June 24, 2013, the Court ruled 7 to 1 to send *Fisher v. Texas* back to the Federal Appellate Court in New Orleans for re-examination. In his majority opinion, Justice Kennedy wrote that the appellate court should apply "strict scrutiny" to the University of Texas's use of race, which may be permissible only after "no workable race-neutral alternative would produce the educational benefits of diversity." As the Court had ruled in 2003, "it remains at all times the university's obligation to demonstrate, and the judiciary's obligation to determine, that admissions processes ensure that each applicant is evaluated as an individual and not in a way that makes an applicant's race or ethnicity the defining feature of his or her application." The lone dissenter was Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg, who argued that the federal district and appellate courts had "adhered to" the *Grutter* ruling on the permissible use of race.²⁰ The Supreme Court will revisit this contentious issue in 2013-2014, when it decides the *Schuette* case, and when it may also hear the appellate court's second ruling on *Fisher*.

Greater precision in assessing how race and ethnicity contribute to diversity is becoming essential as immigration and inter-marriage change the racial composition of the American population, and as individuals forge their own personal racial and ethnic identity. In the 2010 Census, 9 million Americans, about 3 percent, reported themselves as being of more than one race.²¹ As both public and private universities endeavor to educate not only for today but for the future, they can use affirmative action to identify and recruit talented students from families in the bottom quartile of income who might not even think of applying to competitive colleges. With notable exceptions, most students from lower-income families are likely to settle for a community college or local four-year college, according to a study by Caroline M. Hoxby of Stanford University and Christopher Avery of Harvard University. Only 34 percent of students with high SAT scores from the bottom quartile of family income were enrolled in one of the "238 most selective colleges," in contrast to the 78 percent of children from the top quartile.²²

As Justice Sotomayor's popular 2013 autobiography, *My Beloved World*, demonstrates, her life as a Puerto Rican girl growing up in a Bronx housing project was transformed by admission to Princeton University and then to Yale Law School.

Even children handicapped by poverty, inferior schools, and health problems may have dreams, even “fantasies,” she wrote, that stir within them “the will to aspire.”²³ For their part, the best public and private American universities have a two-fold challenge: the responsibility to recruit the top students from all socio-economic groups by making an extra effort to seek out those from the bottom quartile and then to accurately assess which applicants among the thousands yearning for acceptance letters have that “will to aspire,” a quality that can determine success in college.

NOTES

1. *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265 (1978). Marcia G. Synnott, “The Evolving Diversity Rationale in University Admissions: From *Regents v. Bakke* to the University of Michigan Cases,” *Cornell Law Review*, Symposium issue on “Revisiting *Brown v. Board of Education*: Fifty Years of Legal and Social Debate” 90:2 (January 2005): 463-504. “Text of the Opinion by Justice Powell,” in “What the Court Said in Two 5-to-4 Rulings on the *Bakke* Case,” and “The Year of *Bakke*, Excerpts from Published Commentary,” *Chronicle of Higher Education* XVI, no. 17 (July 3, 1978): 3-12, 36.
2. *Brief of Columbia University, Harvard University, Stanford University and the University of Pennsylvania as Amici Curiae*, June 7, 1977 (in the Supreme Court of the United States, October Term, 1976, no. 76-811), *Regents of the University of California, Petitioner, v. Allan Bakke*, Respondent. Synnott, “The Evolving Diversity Rationale in University Admissions,” I. “Justice Powell’s ‘Diversity Rationale’ and the Impact of Split Votes in *Bakke*”; and II. “Harvard Admissions Policies: A Problematic Model?,” 466-474.
3. Barbara R. Bergmann, *In Defense of Affirmative Action* (New York: A New Republic Book, Basic Books, 1996), 88. *PBS Democracy Project: Affirmative Action: The History of an Idea* (Public Broadcasting Station, September 6, 1996), comments of Hugh Davis Graham, transcript, p. 4. Graham, “Civil Rights Policy in the Carter Presidency,” in *The Carter Presidency: Policy Choices in the Post New Deal Era*, ed. Gary M. Fink & Hugh Davis Graham (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1998), 217-218.
4. Paul Brest and Miranda Oshige, “Affirmative Action For Whom”; and Selena Dong, “Too Many Asians—The Challenge of Fighting Discrimination Against Asian-Americans and Preserving Affirmative Action,” *Stanford Law Review* 47 (May 1995): 855-900 and 1027-1057. The U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled, in the *Podberesky v. Kirwan*, 38 F.3d 147, 153 (4th Cir. 1994), cert. denied, 115 S. Ct. 2001 (1995), that the University of Maryland could not continue to offer the annual 30 to 40 Benjamin Banneker scholarships only to black students. *PBS Democracy Project: Affirmative Action*, comments of Ward Connerly and Abigail Thernstrom,” 14, 16.
5. Synnott, “The Evolving Diversity Rationale in University Admissions,” III. “*Hopwood v. Texas*: A Challenge to *Bakke*?,” 474-478; *Hopwood v. Texas*, 861 F. Supp. 551, 564-567, 581 (W.D. Tex. 1994); reviewed, 78 F.3d 932-938, 962 (5th Cir. 1996). *Johnson v. Board of Regents of the University of Georgia* F.3d 1234 (11th Cir. 2001), 8; *Washington and Lee Race and Ethnic Ancestry Law Journal* 161 (2002), <http://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/crsj/vol8/iss1/15>, accessed March 1, 2013.

-
6. Synnott, "The Evolving Diversity Rationale in University Admissions": VI "The Supreme Court's Split Decisions in the University of Michigan Cases," 493-497. Ann Springer, "Affirming Diversity at Michigan," *Academe* 89, no. 5 (September-October 2003): 54-58, 55. Jonathan Alger, University of Michigan Assistant General Counsel, "Summary of Supreme Court Decisions in Admissions Cases," U.S. Supreme Court—June 23, 2003, <http://www.umich.edu/~urel/admissions/overview/cases-summary.html>; and <http://www.umich.edu/~urel/admissions/research/expert/intro.html>, accessed December 10, 2003. Jacques Steinberg, "After 25 Years, a Road Map for Diversity on Campus," *New York Times*, June 24, 2003, <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/06/24/politics/24ASSE.html?th=&p>, accessed June 26, 2003.
7. Table 10.1 "Black Proportions: State Population, School Enrollment, and Index of Dissimilarity," 281; and Marcia G. Synnott, "African American Women Pioneers in Desegregating Higher Education," in *Higher Education and the Civil Rights Movement: White Supremacy, Black Southerners, and College Campuses*, ed. Peter Wallenstein, Southern Dissent Series, ed. Stanley Harrold and Randall M. Miller (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008), 199-228. Winthrop University in Rock Hill, S.C., more than doubled minority enrollment from 14 percent in 1989-90 to 29 percent in 2012-13 ("DiGiorgio leaves impressive legacy," *The State* (Columbia, S.C.), March 21, 2013, A9).
8. Peggy Binette, "USC named among nation's best for diversity," November 20, 2012, www.sc.edu/news/newsarticle.php?nid=5272, accessed November 22, 2012. The HEED award "recognizes exemplary initiatives for all aspects of diversity including gender, race, ethnicity, veterans, people with disabilities and members of the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) community." See "Gamecock Guarantee," <http://www.sc.edu/guarantee/>; and "A Report Card on Racial Diversity at Louisiana State University," March 8, 2013, <http://www.jbhe.com/2013/03/a-report-card-on-racialdiversity-at-louisiana>, both accessed March 10, 2013.
9. "Class of First-Time Freshmen Not a White Majority This Fall Semester at the University of Texas at Austin," September 14, 2010, www.utexas.edu/news/2010/09/14/student_enrollment2010/ and William Lutz, February 8, 2011, "Thoughts and opinions about the UT affirmative action case," *The Lone Star Report*, <http://www.lonestarreport.org/LoneStarReport/BlogArchive/tabid/65/EntryId/989/Thoughtsandopinions-about-the-UT-affirmative-action-case.aspx>, both accessed February 15, 2011.
10. Richard Kahlenberg, "Is Affirmative Action Headed Back to the Supreme Court," June 21, 2011, <http://chronicle.com/blogs/innovations/is-affirmative-action-he/29699>; and *National Review Online*, September 19, 2011, "The University of Texas and Racial Preferences," <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/277519/university-texas-and-racial-preferences-hans-von-spakovsky>, both accessed September 25, 2011.
11. Scott Jaschik, "Affirmative Action on the Docket," February 21, 2012, <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/02/21/supreme-court-takes-affirmative-action-case>; and Mark Sherman, "High court to take new look at affirmative action," *Boston.com*, http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2012/02/21/high_court_to_take_new_l/, both accessed February 22, 2012.
12. Lee C. Bollinger, "College diversity at risk," *The Washington Post*, January 15, 2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/college-diversity-at-risk/2012/01/13/gIQACxpn1P_story.html?wpisrc=nl_opinions, accessed January 17, 2012.
13. Adam Liptak, "College Diversity Nears Its Last Stand," *New York Times*, October 16, 2011, SR4, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/16/sunday-review/college-diversity-nears-its-last-stand.html?pagewanted=all>, accessed October 20, 2011.
-

14. Daniel Golden, "Harvard, Princeton in Discrimination Probe," February 2, 2012, *Bloomberg*, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-02/harvard-targeted-in-u-s-asian-american-discrimination-probe.html>, accessed February 4, 2012.
15. Scott Jaschik, "Friends of Affirmative Action," *Inside Higher Ed*, August 14, 2012, <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/08/14/college-groups-flood-supreme-court-briefs-defending-affirmative-action>; Travis Anderson, "Harvard, MIT file brief in affirmative action suit," August 14, 2012, *Bostonglobe.com*, <http://bostonglobe.com/metro/2012/08/13/harvard-mit-file-brief-s/Kuc8BwBmD2SJI-ufiVXZMIL/story.html>; and "Harvard Makes the Case for Diversity," *Harvard Magazine*, July-August 2012, <http://harvardmagazine.com/2012/08/harvard-files-amicus-brief>, all accessed August 15, 2012. Harvard Law School dean Martha Minow and Yale Law School dean Robert C. Post '69, Ph.D. '80, filed a separate amicus brief.
16. Zoya Waliany, "Challenging legacy bias in admissions," *The Daily Texan*, February 9, 2012, <http://www.dailytexanonline.com/2012/02/09/challenging-legacy-bias-in-admissions>, accessed February 24, 2012.
17. Ben Prawdzik, "Supreme Court to rule on race in college admissions," *Yale Daily News*, February 24, 2012, <http://www.yaledailynews.com/news/2012/feb/24/supreme-court-to-rule-on/>, accessed February 26, 2012. Sander quoted by Prawdzik.
18. Richard D. Kahlenberg, "College Presidents in Denial," March 12, 2013, <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2013/03/12/presidents-denial-use-race-based-admissions-preferences-essay#ixzz2NlrNZl00>. Kahlenberg and Halley Potter, co-authors, *A Better Affirmative Action: State Universities that Created Alternatives to Racial Preferences*. [PDF] (New York: The Century Foundation, 2012), 11-12.
19. Robert Barnes, *Washington Post*, March 25, 2013, "Supreme Court accepts second case on race-based college admissions" http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/supreme-court-accepts-second-case-on-race-based-college-admissions/2013/03/25/6b520c38-9552-11e2-bc8a-934ce979aa74_story.html; U.S. Court of Appeals for the 6th Circuit (both accessed March 30, 2013). Sidebar: "What is at Stake in Schuette v. Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action," [Jurist.org/sidebar/2013/07/george-washington-affirmative-action.php](http://www.jurist.org/sidebar/2013/07/george-washington-affirmative-action.php), accessed February 24, 2014.
20. Mark Sherman, Associated Press, "High court sends back Texas race-based plan," June 24, 2013, CBS Atlanta 46 WGCL Atlanta.
21. Census 2010 News, "2010 Census Shows America's Diversity," March 24, 2011, http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/2010_census/cb11-cn125.html, accessed February 24, 2014.
22. David Leonhardt, "Income Gap Found for Elite College Applicants," Income gap found for elite college applicants - The Boston Globe, <http://bostonglobe.com/news/nation/2013/03/16/top-low-income-students-/g0RVDfBIA1mIUob6A1A4GM/story.html>, accessed March 18, 2013.
23. Sonia Sotomayor, *My Beloved World* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2013), Preface, viii, vii-x.

Evil Communications Corrupt Good Morals: Thomas Cooper and Francis Lieber's Proslavery Transformations

Jamie Diane Wilson

THOMAS COOPER AND FRANCIS LIEBER underwent a dramatic change of beliefs and behavior concerning slavery as a result of residence within the cultural environment of Columbia, South Carolina, and South Carolina College (SCC), known today as the University of South Carolina. Cooper and Lieber arrived in Columbia in 1819 and 1835 as anti-slavery ideologues to accept professorships, where they became pro-slavery authors and actual slave owners. Their new intellectual colleagues, the erudite professors of SCC, enchanted Cooper and Lieber. SCC students showed sincere respect for them as professors. Achieving professional success, Cooper gained a promotion and Lieber penned well-received scholarly works. The Columbia citizenry lavished hospitality on Cooper and Lieber.¹

The proofs of change also proved similar for the two men. Both purchased slaves, and Cooper defended slavery in his published writings and in public speeches. Lieber rationalized the behavior of his new slave-owning friends while his relationships with his abolitionist friends deteriorated. Even though the professors advocated humane treatment of the enslaved, the seductive pro-slavery culture of Columbia and SCC subverted Cooper's and Lieber's anti-slavery beliefs. The fact that they underwent a similar evolution brings to light the power that antebellum southern society wielded over the minds and convictions of its new members.²

Columbia, though not as impressive as the urban milieus Cooper and Lieber enjoyed in the North, possessed numerous charms. Many well-known scholars, lawyers, and politicians lived in Columbia and its environs, ready to befriend newly arrived intellectuals. The Columbia citizenry, remarkably hospitable, invited émigrés to their lavish dinners and parties. Columbia figured as a leader in social and political trends not only for South Carolina, but for the entire South. Although a small school boasting 100-200 students and six to eight professors during the antebellum period, SCC constituted the state's foremost institution of learning. The professors of SCC, erudite and cultured individuals, often participated in politics and the practice of law. The students were, almost without exception, the sons of wealthy plantation owners. These privileged young southern nobles enjoyed high spirits and a love of mischief and proved largely warmhearted and loyal to their charismatic professors. Cooper and Lieber quickly capitulated to the attractions of Columbia and the college.³

Although Thomas Cooper later became a slave owner and noted pro-slavery author, he began public life as an anti-slavery author. Born and educated in Great Britain, Cooper studied at Oxford University, passed the bar examination, and practiced law in Manchester, where he wrote his first anti-slavery essay, entitled *Letters on the Slave Trade*, in 1787. This work, which Cooper published in his zeal to disseminate his views, targeted the slave trade and expounded on slavery's evils as a domestic institution.⁴

In the essay, Cooper revealed some radical beliefs for his day. He believed that slavery stood contrary to Christian principles widely held at the time, comparing Christians who did not at least agitate "in favor of some alleviation to Negro servitude" to the Pharisees, the religious leaders condemned by Jesus as hypocrites. Cooper stated that slavery was unnecessary on biological grounds because blacks were whites' equals physically, debunking the theory that required black labor for farming in hot climates. He stated that blacks possessed equal mental capabilities to whites. "As to their [mental] capacity," he wrote, "let the Poems of Phillis Wheatley and the Letters of Ignatius Sancho be perused, and the question is decided."⁵

Cooper strongly condemned slave abuse in his essay, particularly in the South. He specifically criticized the state of Maryland for notoriously cruel and unusual slave punishments. He expressed disgust toward Virginia's laws permitting its citizens to kill runaway slaves on sight and requiring the Governor and Council to approve the manumission of any slave. Conversely, the anti-slavery polemicist praised those who agitated for manumission. He applauded Great Britain's general emancipation proclamation and the massive emancipation trends in the northeastern United States.⁶

Cooper immigrated to Pennsylvania in 1794, where he continued his anti-slavery writings in *Some Information Respecting America*. He declared himself "opposed to the system" that created a "humiliating distinction between man and man." Cooper wrote, "The southern states...seem quite out of the question [for residency due to] the presence of negro slavery." He possessed "very strong, if not insuperable, objections, to those parts of the continent where slaves are the only servants to be procured, and where the law and practice of the country tends to support [slavery.]" When warning his readers to avoid settlement in the region, he specifically named three states which constituted the worst option of all: Georgia, North Carolina, and *South Carolina*.⁷

Despite Cooper's open declaration that he would never move to South Carolina, in 1819 he took up residence in the state. In 1816, he had lost his professorship at Dickinson College in Pennsylvania. Cooper's close friend, Thomas Jefferson, maneuvered a post for him at the soon-to-be-completed University of Virginia.

Building delays forced Cooper to consider other options. His funds reached a dangerously low level for a man supporting a wife and several children. When SCC announced an opening for a professorship, Cooper hastily applied, the college accepted him, and he moved to Columbia.⁸

Francis Lieber underwent a similar experience. Although he purchased slaves when he moved to South Carolina, he was a champion of freedom during his early life in Germany and the northern United States. He fought for liberty as a young man in his native Germany. Lying about his age, he joined the Prussian army at age fifteen to liberate the German states from Napoleonic rule. During his college days at the University of Jena, the Prussian authorities imprisoned Lieber for four months due to his disapproval of their authoritarian monarchy. On his release, he sailed to Greece to fight in its revolutionary war. When he returned to Prussia, he was again a political prisoner, this time for a year. In 1827, he escaped the country and relocated to the United States, where he praised its system of government, hoping it would spread throughout “the civilized world.”⁹

Lieber clearly stated his anti-slavery views in his work *The Stranger in America*, published in 1835. Slavery, Lieber wrote, was “philosophically, an absurdity, (man cannot become property,)—morally a bane to the slave and his owner;—historically, a direct violation of the spirit of the times we live in, and with regard to public economy, a great malady to any society at all advanced in industry.” The writer scorned the common belief that slavery benefitted the South, stating that the region did not have the “right” to decide how it would treat certain people groups. Stating his belief in political equality for blacks, he wrote, “I believe that none will conscientiously deny that, when fairly educated, [blacks] stand on quite as high a level of mental development as the lowest of the whites, who are nevertheless admitted to a full participation in all political privileges.”¹⁰

When Lieber arrived in Boston in 1827, he formed friendships with well-known abolitionists, including Henry Longfellow, Samuel Gridley Howe, Julia Ward Howe, Joseph Story, and Charles Sumner. The Bostonians entertained Lieber, admired his erudition, and assisted him in his many maneuvers for employment. Sumner, later a senator and anti-slavery radical, became Lieber’s closest companion.¹¹

Between 1827 and 1835, despite the supportive interest of his many anti-slavery friends, Lieber constantly struggled to secure permanent academic employment. He was by turns the instructor of a boys’ swimming school, the editor of the *Encyclopedia Americana*, the author of a Latin dictionary, and an occasional lecturer. He submitted proposals to publishers and project ideas to the government.¹²

Lieber stood strongly against moving to the South, but still lacking permanent employment in 1835, like Cooper had in 1819, he felt forced to accept the offer of

the chair of history and political economy from SCC. The new professor, however, felt miserable about the impending move to South Carolina. "I must bid farewell to all that is precious and dear to me, and shall be compelled to live in a Slave State," he wrote a friend as he prepared for the transfer. He explained his reason for accepting the position; "It will give me the means of supporting my family." Lieber received \$2,500 per annum, approximately \$64,000 in 2013, as well as an excellent house on campus. Nevertheless, the day he arrived, he fumed into his journal, "And then slavery! This nasty, dirty, selfish institution!" Two weeks later, Lieber further wrote that he did not feel at "peace" or "at home" in his new "community," stating, "Here in the South we cannot live forever, that is certain."¹³

Like Lieber, Cooper also expected little out of the slaveholding environs of Columbia, but also, like Lieber, he encountered new intellectual colleagues who became lifelong friends. His particular town friends included pro-slavery advocates David McCord, Robert Y. Hayne, and future governor James Hamilton. He developed many close friendships among the slaveholding college alumni and faculty, including William Harper, pro-slavery author, William Preston, SCC professor, and future South Carolina governor, George McDuffie. Cooper closely allied himself with these influential friends in the nullification and states' rights struggles of 1827.¹⁴

The students also welcomed Cooper, giving him their respect and admiration throughout his fifteen-year tenure. Due to his stoutness or the similarity to his name, the students affectionately nicknamed him "Cooter," a common Southern name for terrapins, which they shortened to "Old Coot." Cooper held their attention in his lectures, illustrating his points with personal anecdotes involving men like Adams, Jefferson, and Robespierre. He composed one of his major works, *Lectures on Political Economy*, from SCC classroom lectures.¹⁵

When Cooper first accepted the position at SCC in 1819, the college trustees, faculty, and students already regarded him as a man of learning and experience and happily welcomed him. The next year, Cooper attained the college presidency, and over his tenure, the trustees allowed him to make significant changes to the program of study. A contemporary wrote that, in return, "He loved the College, and was flattered by his position. He labored honestly and industriously for what he conceived to be its best interests."¹⁶

Although Lieber missed the society of like-minded Northern colleagues, like Cooper, he did not remain lonely in his new home. The ruling class in which he found himself wined and dined him. Even before accepting the position, he visited Charleston to discuss the professorship with James Hamilton, former gov-

enor, who entertained him at his nearby plantation. Lieber wrote that “General Hamilton... is uncommonly kind and... I feel more attracted [to him] than to any American before.” He noted that barefooted slaves served the party a dinner with “four different meats.”¹⁷

The hospitality of Columbia continued to overwhelm him when he moved there six months later. George McDuffie, the governor, invited Lieber and his family to visit him for a week at his plantation. Lieber quickly formed a friendship with William Preston, a pro-slavery colleague of Cooper. “Preston I like much. He is a thinking man and a gentleman,” Lieber wrote. No wonder that Lieber wrote to Sumner, “The people seem to be fine, open-hearted; in fact, I have become acquainted with some who make a most excellent impression.” During his early days in Columbia, Lieber formed many other pro-slavery friendships with elites, such as David McCord, Robert Y. Hayne, and John C. Calhoun. Thomas Cooper lived for only four years after Lieber moved to Columbia, but they became friends “personally and intellectually.”¹⁸

In addition to that of the SCC faculty and inhabitants, Lieber also received his students’ respect and affection. The professor wrote, “The students behave perfectly well. Not once have I yet appealed to their honor and found myself disappointed.” Students frequently consulted with Lieber when preparing for a debate or speech. When Lieber expressed his hope in 1855 that the Board of Trustees would select him to be SCC’s next president, his students, both past and present, pledged their assistance and support.¹⁹

Even beyond his pro-slavery writings, the most dramatic indication of Cooper’s change concerning his beliefs about the institution of slavery was when he acquired slaves himself. Soon after his arrival, the professor purchased a slave named Sancho and his wife. Sancho served as Cooper’s valet until the professor’s death and the people of Columbia knew the slave well. In addition, Cooper purchased two slave families; no known information survives concerning them except that they and their descendants remained in Cooper’s household until his death. Although Cooper’s will emancipated Sancho and his wife, he willed his other slaves, consisting of two families, to his children.²⁰

Like Cooper, Lieber also purchased slaves in Columbia. He began life as a master in 1835 when he rented Little Tom, a fourteen-year-old. In 1836, Lieber made his first purchase, with his friend McCord’s assistance, of a mother and daughter, Betsy and Elsa. When Elsa died in 1841, Lieber grieved for her loss, writing that if heaven existed “she must have gone to a better state—this I hope.” His seeming feelings for her as a person did not prevent him from regretting his monetary loss

of her as property, approximately \$1,000. He later purchased Isaac and Henry for the express purpose of hiring them out for extra cash. Although Lieber's writings show that he treated his slaves well for his day, he had nonetheless reneged on his former ideals.²¹

In addition to becoming an active participant in the slave system, Cooper also defended it in his writings, in which he directly contradicted his earlier pre-Columbia works. In *On the Constitution*, he defended the legality of slavery, both on the federal and state level. "[A] state of slavery was a state acknowledged and admitted by the framers of our Constitution in 1787," Cooper asserted, "at which time slavery was common in almost every state in the Union." Cooper avowed that slavery was "not anti-republican, in as much as our republican Convention . . . allowed it." He continued by defending the rights of the states to choose for themselves; "That whether it be expedient or not, being a matter of internal policy and domestic regulation," the former anti-slavery author asserted, "can only be judged of by the citizens of the State where the question arises; and in which Congress can have no right to intermeddle, no such authority having been committed to them."²²

Cooper further defended the institution through philosophical arguments. Marshaling the Bible to his support, the professor declared it did not condemn the institution, but rather supported it by an extensive inclusion of slave-owning characters. He even stated that southern slaves enjoyed a superior situation to the "majority of the laboring people of Great Britain," victims of misery and starvation. Cooper warned that a general manumission would only "convert [blacks] into idle or useless vagabonds and thieves." His magnum opus, *Lectures on Political Economy* (1826,) further propounded his new pro-slavery beliefs. Defending his adopted state, the professor justified slavery in the South, particularly in Carolina, because of whites' incapability of working the land due to the heat. "The nature of the soil and climate," Cooper explained, "incapacitates a white man from laboring in the summer time . . . on the rich lands in Carolina and Georgia." Cooper now firmly believed that all men were not created equal and praised South Carolina's law "prevent[ing] free negroes and mulattoes from coming to and settling in the state" for any reason.²³

Although Lieber refused to write an actual pro-slavery document, impressions recorded in a slavery notebook he kept during his residence in Columbia, between 1835 and 1856, reveal his negative attitudes toward the blacks of Columbia. He wrote that "the servants are very slow—dirty of course," and then added, "Slovenly—forget everything." In moral areas, he considered slaves below whites' standards, "believ[ing] unhesitatingly in [slaves'] sexual abandonment." Lieber

believed that “slaves were incredible liars” because no one had ever showed them their moral obligations. When the professor discovered his son Hamilton playing with slave children, Lieber condemned this “disgusting intimacy with . . . negroes.” Lieber stated his belief “in the inferiority of the Ethiopian race” after observing the Columbia slave population, although he still claimed to be against slavery.²⁴

Lieber’s change can also be assessed by analyzing his relationships with his old anti-slavery friends. He and Longfellow had a “vigorous disagreement” on the subject, and he wrote Howe to stop “teas[ing him] about slavery,” but this was nothing compared to the dramatic falling-out he experienced with Charles Sumner in 1853, his closest friend of twenty-five years. Disagreements about slavery temporarily destroyed their friendship. When Sumner became a radical abolitionist and senator, Lieber protested against his extremism. Sumner examined Lieber’s Southern behavior and called him a “proslavery man.” They remained estranged for almost eight years until the Civil War provided the opportunity to mend the friendship.²⁵

Despite this sea change, Lieber retained traces of his former ideals. Some examples appeared in his numerous letter and journal entries in which he claimed to dislike living in South Carolina. For example, he felt miserable whenever he saw slave women plowing in the Carolina fields. In 1850, Lieber vented his guilty slave-owning conscience in letters to Calhoun condemning the institution of slavery, but never felt badly enough to mail them. Lieber continued to seek Northern employment throughout his tenure at SCC.²⁶

Unlike Lieber, Cooper spent the rest of his life in Columbia and professed himself quite happy with the arrangement. A letter written during the year of his retirement testified to Cooper’s respect and love not only for Columbia, but also for the whole of his adopted state. To an old friend, he wrote that the “little State” possessed “good sense and noble bearing” and that its 300,000 “white” citizens were “talented and fearless, less selfish than any mass of people I have met with.” Cooper “was held in awe by the ruling class of South Carolina.” Cooper identified with his new homeland; for example, he wrote to a Northern friend that he “must allow us in the South, to look through our own coloured spectacles, and you through yours.”²⁷

Lieber’s later life reveals a contrasting story with that of Cooper. In frustration after being passed over for the presidency at SCC, Lieber relocated to the North in 1856, where he returned to the abolitionist cause. He accepted a professorship at Columbia University of New York in 1857. In 1860 and 1864, he campaigned for Lincoln, and wrote articles insisting upon a speedy emancipation. The war

brought special tragedy to Lieber. Ironically, his son Oscar, who fought for the Confederacy, was killed in a battle in Williamsburg in which his brother Hamilton, a Union soldier, fought on the opposing side. Lieber's sons' experiences mirrored the professor's conflicted soul, which veered from anti-slavery beliefs to slave ownership in Columbia and then returned to abolitionism.²⁸

Despite Cooper's and Lieber's pre-Columbia lives as outspoken anti-slavery authors, the attractions of Columbia and SCC seduced them away from former beliefs. The two men purchased human beings, companioned with slaveholders, and refused to speak against the evil of slavery or went so far as to author and propound pro-slavery arguments and rationalize its existence. Preferring popularity to resistance, which would have cost them their positions in society and on the faculty, if not actual bodily harm, they allowed themselves to be convinced of the rightness of their compliant beliefs and actions.

The story of Cooper and Lieber further demonstrates the vulnerability of the individual, even an individual of exceptional intelligence, superior education, and thorough training in reason and debate, under the power of his particular society. Cooper's and Lieber's early writings stated their disbelief in the possibility of even residing in a slave state. Therefore, they probably would not have believed they could be capable of becoming slaveholders or authors of pro-slavery thought. Yet, when placed within the generative cultural medium, they capitulated to the influence of new intellectual colleagues, admiring students, the warm society of the affluent town, and increased professional opportunities.

NOTES

1. Dumas Malone, *The Public Life of Thomas Cooper* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1961, first published 1926 by Yale University Press), 242-243, 251-253, 259-260; Francis Lieber, *The Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, Thomas Sargent Perry, ed. (Boston: J.R. Osgood, 1882), 104-108, 110, 115; Charles Mack and Henry Lesesne, eds., *Francis Lieber and the Culture of the Mind* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2005), 17; Kenneth Platte, "The Religious, Political and Educational Aspects of the Thomas Cooper Controversy" (MA thesis, University of South Carolina, 1967), 16, 19-21.

2. Malone, *Public Life of Thomas Cooper*, 284; Platte, "Thomas Cooper Controversy," 22; Frank Friedel, *Francis Lieber: Nineteenth Century Liberal* (Gloucester, MA: P. Smith, 1968, first published 1947 by Louisiana State University Press), 236-237, 265-266.

3. *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 104-108, 115; Daniel Hollis, *University of South Carolina*, vol. 1, *South Carolina College* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1951), 22, 39, 53-68; Platte, *Thomas Cooper Controversy*, 14-21; Malone, *Public Life of Thomas Cooper*, 259.

4. Thomas Cooper, *Letters on the Slave Trade* (Manchester: C. Wheeler, 1787), 3.

-
5. Malone, *Public Life of Thomas Cooper*, 4-5, 19-22; Cooper, *Letters on the Slave Trade*, 26-27, 30-32.
 6. Cooper, *Letters on the Slave Trade*, 7, 18-20, 26-27, 32-33.
 7. Malone, *Public Life of Thomas Cooper*, 34-38, 68-70, 75-76; Thomas Cooper, *Some Information Respecting America* (London: J. Johnson, 1794,) 3-4, 7, 20, 24, 87.
<http://deila.dickinson.edu/theirownwords/title/0015.htm>
 8. Malone, *Public Life of Thomas Cooper*, 230, 235, 242-243.
 9. *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 7, 28-31, 34-41, 56-58, 75.
 10. Francis Lieber, *A Stranger in America* (London: Richard Bently, 1835; reprint Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2009), 189-190, 192-193, 207-208.
 11. *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 79, 87, 105, 140, 155, 214, Friedel, *Francis Lieber: Nineteenth-Century Liberal*, 83, 204, 242; Frank Friedel, "Francis Lieber, Charles Sumner, and Slavery," *Journal of Southern History* 9, no. 1 (February 1943): 81.
 12. *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 77-83, 92-93, 95, 101-102; Friedel, *Francis Lieber: Nineteenth-Century Liberal*, 87, 112-113.
 13. Lieber to Mittermaier, Philadelphia, February 1835, in *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 104; Francis Lieber to S.B. Ruggles, Columbia, May 19, 1842, in *Francis Lieber's Influence on American Thought and Some of His Unpublished Letters*, Chester Phinney, ed. (Philadelphia: International Print Company, 1918), 65; *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 108-109.
 14. Platte, "Thomas Cooper Controversy," 16, 19-21; Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese, *Slavery in White and Black* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 16-17, 187-188; Thomas Cooper to Mahlon Dickerson, March 13, 1830, in "Letters of Dr. Cooper, 1825-1832," *American Historical Review* 6, no. 4 (July, 1901): 728, 732-733; Maximilian LaBorde, *History of the South Carolina College, 1801-1865* (Charleston: Walker, Evans, and Cogswell, 1874), 296-299; James Farmer, *The Metaphysical Confederacy: James Henley Thornwell and the Synthesis of Southern Values* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1986), 27.
 15. Malone, *Public Life of Thomas Cooper*, 259; Hollis, *University of South Carolina*, vol. 1, 108; LaBorde, *History of the South Carolina College*, 167-168; Edwin Green, *A History of the University of South Carolina* (Columbia: The State Company, 1916), 34.
 16. LaBorde, *History of the South Carolina College*, 95, 121, 167, 175.
 17. *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 108.
 18. Francis Lieber to Charles Sumner, Columbia, October 27, 1835, in *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 109; *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 108; Mack and Lesesne, *Francis Lieber and the Culture of the Mind*, 35. Friedel, *Francis Lieber: Nineteenth-Century Liberal*, 128, 132.
 19. *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 115; LaBorde, *History of the South Carolina College*, 430; "South Carolina College," *American Publishers' Circular and Literary Gazette* (1855-1862), February 2, 1856, 2, 5.
 20. Frances Cooper Lesesne to "Gath" of the *Cincinnati Enquirer*, 1883, Colyer Meriwether Papers, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina.
-

21. *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 109-110; Hartmut Keil, "Francis Lieber's Attitudes on Race, Slavery, and Abolition," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 28, no. 1 (Fall 2008): 13, 22. The Huntington Library in San Marino, California holds the primary source documents concerning Lieber's purchase of Betsy and Elsa.
22. Thomas Cooper, *On the Constitution*. Vol. 3 of *Philosophical Writings of Thomas Cooper*, Udo Thiel, ed. (Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 2001), 44-46. First published in 1826 by D. and J.M. Faust.
23. Cooper, *On the Constitution*, 45-47.
24. Francis Lieber to Alexis de Tocqueville, New York, September 20, 1839, in *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 140. Lieber's slavery scrapbook is located at The Huntington Library in San Marino, California. Fortunately, Friedel, Keil, and Michael O'Brien have included passages from this important primary source in their writings; Lieber, "Slavery Notebook," quoted in Friedel, *Francis Lieber: Nineteenth-Century Liberal*, 236; Lieber, "Slavery Notebook," quoted in O'Brien, "A Sort of Cosmopolitan Dog: Francis Lieber in the South," *Southern Review* 25, no. 2 (Spring 1989): 310.
25. Mack and Lesesne, eds., *Francis Lieber and the Culture of the Mind*, 18; Francis Lieber to S.G. Howe, Columbia, May 22, 1848, Lieber to Hilliard, Columbia, June 29, 1853, Lieber to a friend, New York, April 18, 1858, Lieber to a friend, New York, April 18, 1858, all in *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 214, 228-229, 262, 297.
26. *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 189, 228-237; Lieber to Hilliard, Columbia, 1854, in *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 270; Lieber to Ruggles, December 30, 1855, quoted in Friedel, *Francis Lieber: Nineteenth-Century Liberal*, 287.
27. Thomas Cooper to Joseph Priestley, January 26, 1833, Thomas Cooper Papers, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina; Platte, "Thomas Cooper Controversy," 19; Cooper to Dickerson in "Letters of Dr. Cooper, 1825-1832," 731.
28. Mack and Lesesne, eds., *Francis Lieber and the Culture of the Mind*, 11; Lieber to Oscar Lieber, New York, Autumn 1860, in *Life and Letters of Francis Lieber*, 314, Friedel, *Francis Lieber: Nineteenth-Century Liberal*, 306, 307, 352; Francis Lieber, *A letter to Hon. E.D. Morgan, senator of the United States, on the amendment of the Constitution abolishing slavery*, Cowen Tracts, 1865. 2-4. <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/60200391>; Mack and Lesesne, eds., *Francis Lieber and the Culture of the Mind*, 6.

Teaching American History in Tajikistan

Munavar Zaripova

The following paper is a personal observation by a former Fulbright Scholar who spent a semester in residence in the United States at Lander University in Greenwood, South Carolina. There, Dr. Zaripova observed the teaching of history—particularly American History—and in the following observation she compares that teaching to the practice of her native Tajikistan. Formerly part of the Soviet Union, Tajikistan’s approach to the teaching of American history has changed since the collapse of the USSR. Aside from matters of historical debate, we publish this paper with the observation that it is important for American scholars to be aware of how the United States is viewed abroad, and for historians to know how the teaching of U.S. history abroad may affect relations with other nations. —The Editors

1. TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY DURING THE COLD WAR

During the Cold War, Soviet universities loaded their curricula with an ideologically defined image of the United States as the Soviet Union’s “main adversary” in a bipolar standoff. American history was taught in Tajik history classes together with the history of other countries of the world and students learned the geography, history, and culture of these countries. While history textbooks used at schools and universities in Tajikistan were written by Russian authors, as Tajikistan was then a part of the Soviet Union, and were mostly focused on studying Russian and Tajik histories, American history was still an important part of the curriculum. The relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States was not friendly, shaping the way U.S. history was taught. U.S. history courses served as propaganda to portray the United States as an enemy country and to emphasize the inequalities there, so as to make the Soviet Union look better by comparison.

To give one example, Tajik students learned that the United States of America was one of the biggest and wealthiest capitalist countries in the world with a highly developed industrial base. However, students were also taught that there was unemployment, showing that while the United States might be productive, it did not distribute its wealth fairly. One area of inequality that was particularly emphasized was racial discrimination. When learning the history of English-speaking countries, particularly the United States, Tajik students read texts about civil rights and the lives of Native Americans and African Americans. For example, teachers used Soviet newspapers and magazines showing the difficult lives of these people and the fact

that the U.S. government did very little to protect their civil rights. In particular, Tajik students studied the paradox that while the U.S. Constitution begins with the words, "We the people of the United States," the democratic republic it established was one in which only white people, particularly men, enjoyed full political, social, and economic rights. Therefore, while the French-Canadian writer Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur asked in his famous *Letters from an American Farmer*, first published in 1782, "What then is the American, this new man?" and answered his own question by saying the "individuals of all nations," race in fact excluded many people from becoming full members of the United States.¹

Textbooks used in Tajikistan explained this inequality through the lives of African Americans and the hardships they faced. One example is that of Nancy Lee, described in a section entitled "Nancy's Best Picture."² Nancy Lee was a black girl who moved to the United States from South Africa. She was a beautiful girl, an excellent student, and a very good basketball player. She liked her classmates and school and was especially fond of the art teacher, Miss Dietrich, who taught her drawing. One rainy April afternoon, Miss O'Shay, the vice president of the school, sent for Nancy. The girl did not think that had done anything wrong but she was nervous. When she entered the room Miss O'Shay said "I have something to tell you. You have been an excellent student this year and your picture has won the Art Club Scholarship." Nancy almost danced all way home, so happy she was. On Friday morning, after the bell rang and all the pupils and teachers were gathered in the hall, one of the teachers came to Nancy and said that Miss O'Shay wanted to see her in the office. The vice president stood at her desk holding a paper when Nancy came into her office. "I don't know how to tell you what I have to say" began Miss O'Shay, her eyes on the paper on her desk, then there was a long pause. "I am ashamed for myself and this city." Then she lifted her eyes from the paper and looked at Nancy Lee in her blue dress standing before her. "You will not receive the scholarship this morning. The committee refused to give you this prize." The reason was because of her race.³ As a part of the section there was a picture of a black girl holding a US flag and under it a short poem was written:

"Shame on you America" (translated from Russian)

Болью и скорбью полны глаза чернокожих детей твоих
Это ты назвала их людьми второго сорта,
Это по твоей вине бесправие и нищета окружает их с колыбели
Это ты закрываешь перед ними двери школы
Самая богатая капиталистическая страна мира.

Full of pain and sufferings the eyes of your black children,
This is you, naming them second class people.
It is your fault that lawlessness and poverty surrounds them
from their childhood
This is you, closing the school doors before them.
The richest capitalist country in the world.

Tajik students were also taught about the African American quest for equal rights. For instance, Martin Luther King was portrayed as “A man of dreams” in the history textbooks used in Tajikistan and was very popular among young people as a symbolic fighter for freedom.

Until his tragic death on April 4, 1968 Martin Luther King fought for civil rights for citizens of all races and nationalities. He was killed by racists because he had a dream—a dream that all people of the United States would be united to form a nation with equal opportunities for all.

This man dedicated his life to the struggle for racial equality and democracy, for social and economic justice. King was one of those black Americans who knew that very many of his people did not enjoy the rights proclaimed by the U.S. Constitution. He said, “This must be changed.” He made speeches and gave lectures in many parts of America and led demonstrations. He called for united action of white and black people in the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s.⁴

In Tajikistan’s classrooms, the strong character and desire of Martin Luther King to bring freedom to African Americans was compared with the Tajik hero Voce, a fighter against slavery in Tajikistan at the end of the seventh century. The second half of the seventh century was a new page in the history of Central Asia. It was characterized by the invasion of Arabs and the extension of their rule there. Under the oppression of the Arabian caliphate, the people of Central Asia began a fierce struggle for their freedom against an alien culture, religion, and language as well as unreasonable taxes. It was then that the name “Tajik” originated. It meant “crowned” (a person of a noble origin).

“Voce’s rebellion,” wrote famous Tajik historian Bobojon Gafurov in his book *The History of the Tajik People* (published in 1947), “was the first public protest against slavery in the history of Tajiks.” Voce was born in a slave family in Kulob City, located in the south of Tajikistan. From his childhood he was badly treated by his master, who owned vast tracts of land. While very young he began to protest against slavery. His dream was to free slaves and to give them land in hopes that their lives would improve. He gathered about one hundred people and

attacked the landowner's farm. But his rebellion was defeated. Voce and many of his men were killed, but that did not stop people from fighting for their freedom. There were many rebellions after that, stronger and more powerful, that eventually won Tajiks their freedom. People created songs about Voce and his uprising as a symbol of freedom. By connecting Voce to Martin Luther King, Tajik people developed both sympathy for oppressed minorities in the United States and greater antipathy towards the American government. Therefore while many saw the American government as an enemy, we felt pity for American people and believed that they needed to be liberated.

2. NEW APPROACHES TO TEACHING U.S. HISTORY

In November 1989 both American President Ronald Reagan and the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Soviet Union (CPSU) Mikhail Gorbachev, declared an end to the Cold War, causing relations between the United States and the Soviet Union to warm up. However, most considered the Cold War to have only truly ended in 1991 with the collapse of the Soviet Union. While it was at this time that Tajikistan gained its independence, the country faced new difficulties. When it belonged to the Soviet Union, Tajikistan was part of a very powerful and comparatively wealthy country that provided security, order, and assistance with economic development. While Russia still provided some assistance, Tajikistan would have to learn to deal with new challenges. Looking to the United States as a potential ally, Tajikistan signed a treaty with it in March of 1992 and an American Embassy was opened in hotel "Dushanbe," located in the like-named capital of Tajikistan.

This changed relationship presented challenges to teaching American history in Tajikistan: a lack of up-to-date teaching resources and qualified specialists of history with a knowledge of the English language. In an effort to remedy these deficiencies, Tajik teachers of American history and students actively participated in U.S. exchange programs over the past thirteen years. Many teachers and students who visited the United States and lived in host families learned more about the real life of African Americans and have changed their worldviews. They are looking for an increasingly friendly relationship between Tajikistan and America.

One of these Tajiks is Rahmatov Naimjon, a student of the first course of the English group of the Tajik State University of Commerce. He is one of students who became a finalist in the Flex program in 2009 (Fulbright Leadership Exchange Program for high school students) and studied in a U.S. high school in Nebraska. His excellent knowledge of U.S. history gave him the opportunity to be the finalist in the American Cultural Rodeo program, "We learn U.S. History,"

organized by the U.S. Embassy for Central Asian high school students. In 2010 he visited several historical cities in the U.S., including Washington DC, New York, and Philadelphia.

My initiative to teach U.S. History in Experimental groups was the result of my participation in the TEA (Teaching Excellence and Achievement) program in 2007 in Virginia at George Mason University. Resources obtained from this program helped me to make my classes more effective and interesting for my students. During a year my students learned a lot about U.S. Political and Educational systems, Progressive Americans, the Constitution, the economy, and business. In addition, my students and I know more about African Americans who made significant contributions to the development and prosperity of their country. The name of Barak Obama, the 44th U.S. President, who was elected for a second term in 2012, is a real example for imitation. He is the first African American in U.S. history to hold that office. Another progressive figure, Condoleezza Rice, is no woman to take lightly, as she was the first black woman to hold the position of Secretary of State. During her term, Rice was a well known figure of the Bush administration both nationally and abroad. But in addition to her political experience, she is also a published scholar and concert pianist. She is currently working at Stanford University.

Thanks to the Junior Faculty Development Program sponsored by the U.S. Department of State, I had the opportunity to observe history classes at Lander University in Greenwood, SC, where experienced professors taught U.S. History, focusing on the challenges American democracy has faced and how those challenges have been, and are being, overcome. During my time at Lander, I was also able to attend “Spring Speaker” sessions where guests were invited to Lander University to speak about life in the 1960s. Of particular interest to me was Senator Floyd Nicholson, who spoke on the topic of “Being Black in the ’60s.” I was impressed by the speakers’ willingness to face facts squarely, so that they could teach the younger generation to love and respect their history, and to remember the difficulties people faced. I was particularly happy that during my time in the United States, the South Carolina Historical Association provided me with the opportunity to learn more about American history and to present on how American history has been understood in Tajikistan at its annual meeting. These experiences have shaped how I will teach American history in the future and will allow me to add more depth and feeling to my classes, helping my students to better understand the American people.

Therefore when I return to Tajikistan, I will be able to teach not only about the struggle for black equality, but show my students how Americans have, to a significant degree, overcome the inequalities and prejudices of the past. I hope,

through the example of U.S. history, its political structure, using innovative technology, and having good relationships with American businessmen, the young generation of Tajikistan will build a new independent and democratic state. We are hoping to establish a close partnership with U.S. university professors and students to share their experience and future friendship and mutual understanding. Along the way, we can go beyond propaganda to learn more about Americans, and hopefully teach them more about Tajikistan, so that together we can help each other to further economic and cultural development.

NOTES

1. See Letter III of Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*, 1782, multiple editions.
2. See *English Textbook*, 10th Grade (Moscow: Starkov N.E., 1975).
3. The incident described in this textbook appears to be based on the 1952 Langston Hughes short story "One Friday Morning."
4. For such a portrayal of Martin Luther King, see Starkov Anatoliy Petrovich, Richard Richardovich Dixon, and Boris Semyonovich Ostrovskiy. *English Textbook*. (Moscow: Prosveshenie, 1987).

Membership

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

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

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

Name (please print)

Membership category (check one):

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

Address

Membership status (check one):

- Renewal
 New

City, state, and zip code

Phone/Fax

E-mail address

Area(s) of interest

Minutes of the Eighty-First Annual Meeting

March 16, 2013

PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE

*All panel sessions are held on the second floor of the
Harrington-Peachtree Academic Center*

9:00-10:15 AM – Session 1

Panel 1 –Ancient and Medieval World

Chair and Commentator: Richard Heiser, Presbyterian College

Tribal Capabilities and Warfare: The Case of Ancient Israel

Martin Scott Catino, American Military University

The Origin of the 13th Century German Epic Das Nibelungenlied

Stephen Vogt, Bob Jones University

*For the Quality of the Grain in the Medieval Southern Bulgarian Black Sea
Ports: An Account of La Pratica della Mercatura by Francesco Pegolotti*

George Kovatchev, Independent Scholar

Panel 2 – Contemporary Issues

Chair and Commentator: Franklin Rausch, Lander University

*The Contested History of Affirmative Action Policies in Higher Education and
the US Supreme Court*

Marcia G. Synnott, University of South Carolina, Columbia

Against the Wall: George W. Bush, Catholics, and the Faith-Based Initiative

Lawrence J. McAndrews, St. Norbert College

10:25-11:40 AM – Session 2

Panel 3 – Charleston in the Early Modern Era

Chair and Commentator: William L. Ramsey, Lander University

From Ulster to Charleston: Scots-Irish Immigration to South Carolina as an Example of Transnationalism

Michael Morris, Augusta Technical College

'A Kind of Enthusiasm Swept the City': The Contentious Resumption of Protest in Charleston, SC

Molly FitzGerald Perry, The College of William and Mary

Shopping at the Sign of the Golden Hat: The Changing Retail Culture of Antebellum Charleston

Amanda Mushal, The Citadel

Panel 4 – German and Italian POWs in South Carolina

Chair and Commentator: Robert D. Billinger, Jr., Wingate University

Mine Enemy: Bringing the German POW Story to the Radio

Alison Jones, Duke University

Welcoming the Enemy: Race and Social Bias at Walterboro Army Air Field during WWII

Elizabeth Laney, Redcliffe Plantation State Historic Site

The Value of Enemy Labor in South Carolina: Competition for German POWs, 1943-1946

Fritz Hamer, University of South Carolina, Columbia

Panel 5 – The Civil War and its Impact on Women

Chair and Commentator: Brenda Schoolfield, Bob Jones University

The Civil War Home Front through the Eyes of Mary Barnwell Elliott Johnstone

Alexia J. Helsley, University of South Carolina, Aiken

The Journal of Mary Susan Ker: Race, Religion, and Gender in the Post-Civil War South

Ruth Blaj, Bob Jones University

Women on the Move: The Actress-Manager in the Post-Civil War Era

Sara Lampert, Presbyterian College

**11:50- 1:15 PM – Lunch and Keynote Address
(Chapman Conference Center, Jacobs Hall)**

Keynote address: *Upheaval in Charleston in 1886*

Stephen Hoffius (Independent Scholar) and

Susan Williams (Trident Technical College)

Business Meeting 1:15 – 1:35

President Fritz Hamer called the meeting to order at 1:15 PM. He introduced Nathalie Alexander, Education Coordinator, SCETV, who explained a new program for South Carolina history that would involve a text version enhanced with video to address the common core assessment curriculum. They are hoping to work with historians with expertise to help with the project.

Secretary Mike Kohl first acknowledged and thanked the service of Sarah Miller and Paul Thompson on the executive committee as they complete their terms of office. He reported the following members nominated for Association offices:

Stefan Wiecki, President

Janet Hudson, Vice President/President Elect

Robert Figueira, executive committee member of the Board for three years

Michael Bonner, executive committee member of the Board for three years

Fritz Hamer, executive committee member of the Board for one year

Amanda Mushal, Treasurer

Mike Kohl, Secretary.

No further nominations were received from the floor. The proposed slate was elected by acclamation.

Treasurer Amanda Mushal submitted the following financial report as of March 14, 2013:

Checking (TD Bank)

Total	\$7,183.75 (+ \$549.81)
-------	-------------------------

Certificates of Deposit (TD Bank)

Hollis Prize CD	\$3,038.37 (+ \$ 22.82)
Current Rate of Return	0.25%

Second (aka "Combined") CD	\$9,295.63 (+ \$ 25.08)
(Savings 20.5%; <i>Proceedings</i> Endowment 79.5%)	
Current Rate of Return	0.25%

She noted that it appears that the cost of the current meeting will be more than the registration income; this may require some financial adjustments.

Paul Thompson reported that an Association committee (Paul Thompson, Kevin Witherspoon, and Lewie Reese) awarded the Hollis prize for the best student paper given at the 2011 and 2012 annual meetings to Otis Westbrook Pickett (University of Mississippi, Tupelo) for "We Are Marching to Zion?: Zion Church and the Distinctive Work of Presbyterian Slave Missionaries in Charleston, South Carolina, 1849-1874." Brenda Schoolfield reported that an Association committee (Brenda Schoolfield, Alan Stokes, and Marcia Synnott) awards the Hollis prize for the best professional paper given at the 2011 and 2012 annual meetings to Stefan Wiecki (Presbyterian College) for "Sowing the Seeds of Democracy in Post-World War II Germany: Denazifying and Reeducating the Law School Faculty of Munich University."

Fritz Hamer presented plaques to long-serving co-editors of the *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*: Robert Figueira and Stephen Lowe. They were warmly thanked for the many years that they have edited the *Proceedings*. Both have graciously consented to continue in 2013-14 with the new co-editor Brenda Schoolfield and another new co-editor to be selected.

President Hamer also made motion to thank the Association's long serving diligent copy editor, Judith Andrews, and The Citadel's Department of History that has hosted our organization since 2011/2012. He also noted that his discussions with the Director of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History indicate that that agency's budget situation is perhaps better than in prior years.

1:45- 3 PM – Session 3**Panel 6 – Women and Mythologies of Gender****Chair and Commentator: Sara Lampert, Presbyterian College**

On Nostalgia and Cheerfulness: Women's Experience in an Interwar Russian Paris

Natalia Starostina, Young Harris College

A Woman's Experience in Indochina: The First Indochina War through the Eyes of Elisabeth Sevier, a French Army Nurse

Coley Williams, Young Harris College

Vera Brittain and Women's Experiences in the Great War

Kara Cook, Young Harris College

Panel 7 – Revolutionary War, Slavery, and Civil War**Chair and Commentator: Michael Nelson, Presbyterian College**

'Slaughter has commenced: 'A Study of Partisan Martial Culture in Revolution Era South Carolina

Jamie M. Mize, University of North Carolina, Greensboro

Evil Communications Corrupt Good Morals

Jamie D. Wilson, University of South Carolina, Columbia

Origins of the Domestic Passport System in the Confederacy

Michael Bonner, University of South Carolina, Lancaster

Panel 8 – Race, Broadway, and Politics**Chair and Commentator: Patrick Cosby, Presbyterian College**

'You see how Black I am... Don't call me Aunt!': 'Mammies', 'Aunts', and Domestic and the Dangers of White 'Love'

Elizabeth Wilkins, College of Charleston

A Historical Account of the Black Presence on Broadway: An Analysis of Cat on a Hot Tin Roof and A Raisin in the Sun
Devair Jeffries, University of South Carolina, Columbia

Queer Bedfellows: Huey Newton, Homophobia, and Black Activism in Cold War America
Lance E. Poston, Ohio University

3:10-4:00 PM – Session 4

Panel 9 – Southern Women at Home and Abroad

Chair and Commentator: Brenda Schoolfield, Bob Jones University

Au revoir, Ridge Springs; Bonjour, Sorbonne: Sarah Pressly Watson in Paris, 1917-1959
Julian L. Mims, Independent Scholar

Henrietta Aiken Kelly (1844-1916) and the Silk Industry in South Carolina
Debra Bloom, Richland Library, Columbia, SC

Panel 10 – Hymns and Festivals

**Chair and Commentator: Andrew H. Myers,
University of South Carolina, Upstate**

Origin of the St. Helena Hymn
Bob Hester, Augusta State University

The Southern Origin of Memorial Day
Richard E. Gardiner, Columbus State University

Panel 11 – East and Central Asia

Chair and Commentator: Roy Campbell, Presbyterian College

What has Seoul to do with Jerusalem? Western Missionaries in Korea and the Relationship between Civilization and Christianity
Franklin Rausch, Lander University

Teaching American History in Tajikistan
Munavar Zaripova, Tajik State University of Commerce, Tajikistan