

2009

Wade Hampton: Confederate Warrior to Southern Redeemer, by
Rod Andrew, Jr.

Fritz Hamer

University of South Carolina - Columbia, fphamer@mailbox.sc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/lib_facpub



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Publication Info

Published in *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, Volume 110, Issue 3-4, 2009, pages 188-191.

<http://www.southcarolinahistoricalsociety.org/>

© 2009 by South Carolina Historical Society

This Article is brought to you by the University Libraries at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty and Staff Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact digres@mailbox.sc.edu.

Wade Hampton: Confederate Warrior to Southern Redeemer. By Rod Andrew, Jr. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008. Pp. xviii, 616; \$40, cloth.)

In 1877 the *Atlantic Monthly* published an article entitled "The Political Condition of South Carolina," written anonymously by native South Carolinian Belton O'Neill Townsend. In the article, which appeared in the midst of the political turmoil following the state's contested November 1876 gubernatorial election, Townsend observed that without federal troops, "white Southerners [would use] the opportunity [to] disenfranchise their black neighbors, although by legal means." With this contemporary account in mind, one is both intrigued and ultimately unconvinced by Rod Andrew's thesis that Wade Hampton truly believed in bi-racial government for postwar South Carolina. Imbued with the planter values of personal prestige, honor, and class superiority all of his life, the South Carolinian may have used political rhetoric to persuade freedmen that he supported their new rights as citizens, but even Andrew admits that his protagonist never accepted former slaves as political, let alone, social equals.

Although Andrew's main argument fails, this comprehensive work is exhaustive in its detail and draws upon a wide range of sources. Starting with a variety of newspaper accounts from above and below the Mason-Dixon Line, the author uses all of the extant Hampton correspondence along with innumerable published sources. Out of this, Hampton's newest biographer has created the most thorough study of the South Carolina icon. Andrew's 506 pages of text follow the triumph and tragedy of Hampton's long life. Despite all of the wealth and prestige he inherited, the remarkable military career he carved out for himself, and his political triumph as leader of the state Democratic Party in the 1876 elections, Andrew reveals a man dogged by family tragedy, financial ruin, and political obscurity in his last years. To the end, Hampton tried to live by a code of honor steeped in a southern aristocratic model that military defeat in 1865 doomed.

The eldest son of one of the South's wealthiest planter families, Wade Hampton III embodied all of the attributes of an aristocratic antebellum planter—"paternalism, honor, chivalry" that "rested on the assumption of his social superiority" (p. 3). Through the example of his grandfather and father, the third Wade Hampton assumed his place among plantation society and demonstrated responsibilities both in the role of manager of land and slaves and protector and provider to his family. Until the late 1850s, Hampton focused his talents in these areas almost exclusively. When he reluctantly assumed a seat in the state legislature, it was mostly out of duty, not ambition; his lack of leadership on issues of the day strongly suggests this. In the most important political crisis of the decade, Hampton proved at best a reluctant supporter of secession, stressing a moderate position nearly to the outbreak

of war. But once shots were fired on Fort Sumter, Hampton quickly came to the support of South Carolina, not only offering his services but also organizing and equipping his own legion to defend his state and region. With his family and home now threatened, his patriarchal duty to defend his honor trumped all other concerns.

The military career of Hampton is well known, and Andrew's thorough analysis of the planter-turned-soldier leaves out few details. Though he lacked formal military training, Hampton quickly showed his natural abilities as a leader on and off the battlefield. However, it took a long time to convince his superiors. A brilliant tactician, Hampton adhered to the fundamentals of military leadership, always making sure that he provided his commands with rest and supplies before anything else. Such conscientious regard for his men did not endear him to his superior, J. E. B. Stuart, the flamboyant Virginian who has gone down in history as one of the Confederacy's most daring leaders. When Stuart met his death at Yellow Tavern in May 1864, Hampton succeeded him. While the former planter finally proved his abilities in high command, his battlefield aptitude could not overcome the tragedies of war. First, he lost his brother Frank in 1863, then his son Preston in 1864, and finally—perhaps most disastrously—his ancestral home and city. Believing he could stop the campaign of William T. Sherman's army across South Carolina, Hampton persuaded his superiors in Virginia to allow him to return home to lead the defense of his state. In spite of his promises to city fathers that he would halt Sherman outside of Columbia, it took the Union leader less than two days to capture the capital. Then, Hampton watched helplessly as a third of the city and his family plantations were burned to the ground.

Consumed by revenge for all he had lost, both personally and financially, Hampton became one of the fanatical diehards of the southern cause in its last months. He even tried to continue the fight in the wake of Robert E. Lee and Joseph E. Johnston's surrenders in April 1865. Until May, when his wife finally convinced him that further resistance was useless, Hampton attempted organizing the remains of the forces under his dwindling command into a guerrilla band in the West to carry on the fight against the hated Yankees.

Understandably, Hampton had difficulty reconciling himself to the devastating losses he had suffered in the war. But once he did accept the new reality, he found it natural to anticipate that he and other former Confederates would be reinstated into the political life of their state. Initially encouraged in this belief by Presidential Reconstruction, he saw it quickly evaporate when Congress instituted Radical Reconstruction in 1866. Afterwards, Hampton became one of the South's most indignant defenders. Having been promised reinstatement to full rights as a citizen, he argued that Congress had usurped the Constitution (never mind that he and thousands of other southerners had just spent four years themselves trying to overthrow the same).

Andrew argues that Hampton and many other former Confederates believed that such rights were due to them based on their social position and their attitude of racial superiority. Yet it seems implausible that having just lost a war, these beliefs were still truly held by the vanquished, even from the perspective of the 1860s. But Andrew presses on with his argument. Even though Hampton expressed his vehement objections to the policies of Congress that, among other provisos, excluded ex-Confederates from political office, the author argues that he somehow could not have had a role in the violence that engulfed the state leading up to the 1868 elections. When Hampton made an appeal to end the violence in the last weeks of the campaign, it seemed pitifully late. By the time the appeal was published, several black politicians had already been murdered. Then, as Klan violence continued after the elections, Andrew's Hampton appears aloof but innocent once again. Neither does Andrew find Hampton's profession of innocence suspect in view of his appeal to the public to contribute funds to defend Klansmen indicted for violence and murder after martial law was imposed in 1871.

The culmination of Hampton's political career came in the 1876 gubernatorial campaign. Hailed by whites as the state's redeemer who would end Radical Republican rule, Andrew argues that Hampton's platform of equality and justice for all, regardless of color, was genuine. But his white supporters certainly did not agree. And even when Hampton extended a hand of reconciliation to blacks during the campaign, the candidate told white audiences that he stood for their superior role in politics and society. To make sure of this supreme position, Hampton's former subordinates in the war Martin Gary and Matthew C. Butler advocated a ruthless policy of intimidation and, if necessary, murder for serious opponents (and even not so serious ones). Such rabid Hampton supporters formed Democratic rifle clubs to make certain the election's outcome. In spite of it all, Andrew insists that Hampton's publicly expressed opposition to such tactics was earnest.

When Hampton finally claimed sole possession of the governor's office following the five-month post-election stalemate, he said that he represented all South Carolinians. To support this, Andrew points to Hampton's success in gaining equal state budgets for white and black education as well as his appointment of blacks to certain local and a few state government positions. But these gestures were short-lived. They cannot obscure the steady erosion of black legislators during the Hampton administration or the institution of more restrictive voting rights for freedmen. The South Carolina journalist who remarked on the determination of whites to end black political rights also observed the Bourbon regime's effort to consolidate its power in 1877-1878. He provided a more realistic picture. In January 1878, Townsend wrote that "whites in the future, as in the past, will not tolerate, unless forced, any party which aggressively and in real earnest advocates negro rights."

But just as suddenly as Hampton achieved victory in 1876–1877, his power and influence began to decline. His supporters had defeated the Republicans and now the former Confederate hero was no longer needed. The end of black political participation was at hand. Andrew concludes his study with his protagonist attacked by many of his former Democratic supporters. As he faded from the limelight, he remained a celebrity at Confederate reunions, where his military exploits and paternal attitude toward his former comrades still held respect and admiration for veterans reminiscing about the Lost Cause.

While this study is filled with important insights that help to reveal the full life and character of one of South Carolina's most renowned leaders, in the end the author's thesis fails to show that Hampton was a bi-racial governor who rose above his aristocratic planter roots.

South Carolina State Museum

Fritz P. Hamer

Charleston's Avery Center: From Education and Civil Rights to Preserving the African American Experience. By Edmund L. Drago. Revised and edited by W. Marvin Dulaney. (1990; reprint, Charleston, S.C.: History Press, 2006. Pp. 406; \$34.99, paper.)

Usually when a book undergoes a revision, the changes are largely cosmetic and do not warrant much attention. In *Charleston's Avery Center*, written by Edmund L. Drago and updated by W. Marvin Dulaney, you have an exception to the rule. This work explores the evolution of Avery Normal Institute, one of Charleston's first black schools and its longest surviving educational institution from the Reconstruction period. Drago and Delaney also address the preservation of the Avery building, which is now used as a center for the study of African American history and culture.

Drago divides his study into seven chapters, each with a distinct theme. Northern philanthropists led by the New York-based American Mission Association (AMA) established Avery in 1865 to educate black children. Opposition was almost immediate. The AMA had been a prominent abolition group before the war, and its work among blacks was not welcomed by most white Charlestonians. AMA agent Francis L. Cardozo, who had been born a free black in Charleston, was Avery's first principal. Cardozo spent considerable time and energy seeking support for a permanent schoolhouse, fending off white conservatives, and developing an AMA-supported curriculum. A ten-thousand-dollar bequest from the estate of the school's namesake, the Reverend Charles Avery of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, funded construction of a new building on Bull Street that opened in May 1868.