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Thank you for the invitation, and for that kind introduction. I am pleased to be with you today to talk about how our suffragist foremothers fought and won the right to vote for themselves and American women through the Nineteenth Amendment. I will also discuss how our forefathers, especially those in the Southern states, fought so hard to keep that from happening! The role of race and racism in the story will also be discussed. Fair warning: some South Carolina politicians—most notably Governor and Senator Benjamin Tillman—do not come off well in this story.

However, I choose to focus on the positive, and the actions of many women from this state make that easy to do. At three crucial periods in the suffrage movement’s history, South Carolina women were in the lead, as was evident in a wonderful three-part series that President-Elect Beryl Dakers has worked so hard on over the past year, researching, writing, and producing. It’s called *Sisterhood: South Carolina Suffragists*. I have been proud to be a part of this, to share what I know and, when watching the films, to learn much more from Beryl and scholars including Katharine Allen, Director of Research and Interpretation at Historic Columbia, my friends Val Littlefield and Amy McCandless, and others.¹

In the lecture I will be giving you just a taste of what is in the new edition of *One Woman, One Vote: Rediscovering the Woman Suffrage Movement*, which I have just finished and which is about to be published.² The new edition is revised and expanded to include not only the over one-hundred-year fight for the vote, but also the first one hundred years of women with the vote—right up through the 2020 election in which women played such a crucial role as voters, organizers, and candidates. It has almost two hundred photos, and will be in paperback book and eBook formats, plus a library edition, should you want to contribute one for a school or public library. The commercial now over, let me begin.
The Grimké Sisters

The woman suffrage movement began in the northeastern United States in the context of antebellum reform. Many women began speaking out for woman’s rights when their efforts to participate fully in the great reform movements of the day, most notably the movement to end slavery, were severely criticized as inappropriate for their sex.

You may know that Sarah and Angelina Grimké, born in Charleston, were among the first to raise the issue of women’s rights—and they did so after being severely criticized for speaking against slavery in public. The Grimké sisters, two of fourteen children of a prominent, slaveholding family, left their privileged existence to live among Quakers in the North because of their abhorrence of slavery. When their lectures began to attract huge audiences that included men, the Grimkés encountered tremendous criticism, including from ministers who denounced them for assuming “the place and tone of man as public reformer,” and barred them from speaking in their churches.

Angelina also attracted a lot of attention, positive and negative, in 1836 when she published an Appeal to the Christian Women of the South seeking to persuade and push Southern women to act against slavery. It was publicly burned outside the Custom House in Charleston, and their mother was warned the sisters would be arrested if they ever returned to the city.

Both sisters wrote on women’s rights. In 1837, Sarah Grimké published Letters on the Equality of the Sexes—from which Ruth Bader Ginsburg quoted in her first Supreme Court case, *Frontiero v. Richardson*, in 1973. As we have mourned Ginsburg’s passing, we’ve frequently heard this quotation: “I ask no favors for my sex.... All I ask of our brethren is that they will take their feet from off our necks and permit us to stand upright.”

The home where the sisters grew up still exists. Now a law office, it’s on East Bay Street. A historical marker was dedicated by Charleston Mayor Joe Riley in 2015. Many people in the city first became aware of the sisters after publication the previous year of the popular historical novel by Sue Monk Kidd, *The Invention of Wings.* Next step, I hope: a Grimké sisters statue! I’m pleased to see that in recent years, the Grimké sisters have been not only honored in Charleston but also studied in South Carolina schools!

Seneca Falls

The women who set the women’s rights movement in action by calling for the Seneca Falls Convention, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott, also ran into difficulties participating in the antislavery movement. They first met in London where they had gone for a “World Anti-Slavery Convention,” only to find that women were excluded from the proceedings.

In 1848, they put out the call for the conference in Seneca Falls, New York, where participants voted to demand the right to vote—the first formal demand for woman suffrage. It was part of a “Declaration of Sentiments” demanding a wide range of reforms from married women’s property rights, to rights to equal education and employment, to freedom from domestic violence. Interesting to note, some of the participants thought demanding woman suffrage was way too radical. Only the powerful urging of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and former slave and famous antislavery orator Frederick Douglass convinced them to include it. Many people attending refused to sign. Two other women who became prominent leaders of the woman suffrage movement, Susan B. Anthony and Lucy Stone, were not at the Seneca Falls Convention but quickly became involved.
An Inter-racial Movement

From the beginning, the women’s rights movement was an inter-racial movement. Sojourner Truth, who had escaped from slavery in New York, became one of the star orators of the women’s rights and antislavery movements, best known for her speech “Ain’t I a Woman.” Unlike Sojourner Truth, most of the African American women active in the women’s movement in these years were middle-class women who had been born free. These included Harriet Forten Purvis, a key supporter of the Underground Railroad as well as an advocate of women’s rights, and Frances Harper, abolitionist, suffragist, poet, teacher, public speaker, and writer. Sarah Remond became an international activist for human rights and woman suffrage.

During the Civil War, white and Black women’s rights advocates focused on making it a war to free the slaves. They formed the Women’s National Loyal League, through which they gathered signatures on petitions calling for a constitutional amendment to abolish slavery. When the war ended, the women’s movement began to focus more and more on gaining the vote—but not just for themselves: their goal was universal suffrage for all.

Though the Constitution had left decisions about requirements for voting to the states, during Reconstruction, there was a lot of talk about amending the Constitution to enfranchise newly-emancipated African Americans so they would have the power to protect themselves. It was also important to the Republicans controlling Congress to have support in the South and thus continue to hold power in Congress and complete the job of Reconstruction.

Not Yet the Woman’s Hour

The Fourteenth Amendment declared African Americans to be citizens with the right to vote. The Fifteenth reiterated that they had the vote. But nowhere in either amendment was women’s right to vote recognized or protected. In fact, in the enforcement clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, which declared that a state’s congressional representation would be cut if it denied male citizens the vote on account of race, the word male appeared in the Constitution for the first time ever.

With racial prejudice strong in the North and West as well as the South, advocates for these amendments knew that it was going to be hard enough to get the requisite number of states (three-fourths) to extend the vote to Black men. Adding woman suffrage, most of the men concluded, would make that impossible. Even Frederick Douglass begged them to understand. It was, they said, the “Negro’s Hour,” a term first used by Wendell Phillips. The woman’s hour, they said, would soon come.

Division

The issue of what to do tore the women’s movement apart. In 1869 suffragists divided into two factions over whether to support ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment—and how to go about winning the vote for women. The National Woman Suffrage Association (NWSA) led by Stanton and Anthony refused to support it. The American Woman Suffrage Association (AWSA) led by Lucy Stone and her husband Henry Blackwell supported it, with Stone saying, at least somebody would get “out of this terrible pit.”

The Rollin Sisters

Naturally, the AWSA attracted more African American affiliates. These included the Rollin sisters of South Carolina, some of the few women in the South who openly worked for woman suffrage in these years. Descendants of émigrés who fled the Saint-Domingue Revolution in the late eighteenth century, the Rollins were free people of color living prosperously in South Carolina during the era of slavery.

Before the Civil War, the sisters—Frances, Charlotte (Lottie), Katherine (Kate), and Louise and younger sister Florence—lived in Charleston on America Street with their parents, William and Margareta Rollin. Their father was a devout Catholic who operated a successful lumber business. The girls attended private Catholic schools in Charleston, and the three oldest girls were sent to Philadelphia for secondary education.

Early on, it was clear that these were proud women who would stand up for their rights and those of other African Americans. In 1867, Frances, the eldest, filed a complaint with the Freedmen’s Bureau against the captain of a steamer, the Pilot Boy, for refusing her first-class accommodations for a trip to Beaufort. She won: he was given a hefty fine and ordered to cease discrimination.

During this ordeal, Frances Rollin was aided by Major Martin Delany, formerly of the 104th U.S. Colored Troops, by then an agent of the Freemen’s Bureau against the captain of a steamer, the Pilot Boy, for refusing her first-class accommodations for a trip to Beaufort. She won: he was given a hefty fine and ordered to cease discrimination.

The Rollin Salon

Meanwhile, Katherine and Charlotte Rollin established a freedmen’s school in Charleston. But by 1869 they
Elizabeth Cady Stanton (1815-1902) with her daughter Harriot Eaton Stanton, May 1856, from the Anita Pollitzer papers at the South Caroliniana Library
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Lucretia Mott (1793-1880), from the Anita Pollitzer papers at the South Caroliniana Library
had moved to Columbia and were employed as clerks in the State House. In Columbia, the Rollin sisters were strong supporters of woman suffrage and well situated to promote it. Lottie, Kate, and Louisa Rollin turned their home into a “salon” where movers and shakers in Reconstruction-era politics gathered.

The house was located at the southeastern corner of Senate and Sumter streets. As a reporter for the New York Sun wrote in 1871, “Their house is a kind of a Republican headquarters. They entertain very handsomely. The Government meets at the Rollin house almost nightly, and in the parlors of that mansion much of the wisdom which controls our affairs is generated.” Reporters gushed over their beauty, social skills, and political sophistication, calling them “The Queens of the South.”

**Woman’s Rights Convention in Columbia**

Frances married a state legislator from Beaufort, William J. Whipper, who promoted woman suffrage as a delegate to the 1868 South Carolina Constitutional Convention. The sisters did all they could to promote the cause in the state. In 1869, Charlotte “Lottie” Rollin addressed the state legislature on behalf of woman suffrage, insisting that “public opinion has had a tendency to limit woman’s sphere to too small a circle” and asking for suffrage “not as a favor, not as a privilege, but as a right.” In 1870, the Rollins held a Woman’s Rights Convention in Columbia attended by some of the state’s most influential male Republicans, Black and white. And with Lucy Stone’s encouragement, in 1871 the sisters established a state suffrage organization affiliated with the American Woman Suffrage Association (AWSA), with Lottie Rollin representing South Carolina as an ex-officio member of the AWSA Executive Committee.

**A “New Departure”**

In the 1870s, the National Woman Suffrage Association (NWSA) tried a bold “New Departure”: seeking victory through the courts. Their plan was to show up before registrars and at the polls and vote, and if arrested, make their trial a test case for the idea that the Fourteenth Amendment enfranchised all citizens, and women were citizens. Following this strategy, in the early 1870s, hundreds of women tried to vote, though most were turned away. In Hyde Park, Massachusetts, the Grimké sisters led a group of forty-two women who made their way through a heavy snowstorm seeking to cast their votes.

In 1872, Anthony managed to register and vote in Rochester, New York, hoping to be arrested and take her case all the way to the Supreme Court. She was arrested and indicted for “knowingly, wrongfully and unlawfully vot[ing] for a representative to the Congress of the United States.” Found guilty and fined, Anthony insisted she would never pay a dollar of it. To Anthony’s great disappointment, her case did not make it all the way to the Supreme Court—something about her lawyer paying her fine for her without her permission.

In another case, two years later, suffragist Virginia Minor of St. Louis, Missouri, managed to get the issue before the Supreme Court. However, the court ruled unanimously that citizenship did not automatically confer the right to vote and that the Fourteenth
Amendment did not prevent any state from excluding women. Suffragists then sought a new Constitutional Amendment, worded similarly to the Fifteenth Amendment, that specifically enfranchised women, and hoped it would become the next and Sixteenth Amendment. But they got almost no support.

“Partial Suffrage”
This strategy having failed, it was clear there would be no quick solution to gaining the vote for the women of the United States. The nation’s federal system, unlike that of other nations with one ruling body or parliament, meant that the women of the United States would have to persuade each state to enfranchise women until they could get enough states that they could amend the Constitution to specifically protect women’s right to vote. That would have the effect of over-ruling holdout states.

That would take another half century. Later, after the 1920 victory, the suffragists added it all up, and found that between the Civil War and the victory of the Nineteenth Amendment, they had been forced to conduct hundreds of campaigns for “partial suffrage”—including school suffrage, bond issue suffrage, presidential suffrage, municipal suffrage—as well as for full suffrage through state constitutional amendments, in many cases trying and failing many times before the 1920 victory.

Why was getting a federal amendment establishing woman suffrage so difficult? The founding fathers deliberately made it difficult to add to our nation’s foundational document. Though they intended for it to be a flexible document, for additions to be possible, it was also their intention to prevent any revisions or additions that lacked strong support from across the nation. Therefore, to succeed, an amendment had to have the approval of two-thirds of each house of Congress and then three-fourths of the states.

Expediency Arguments
As it turned out there was a clear regional pattern to the success of woman suffrage. The movement had started in the Northeast. But its first successes were in the West. And its biggest problems were in the South. In the 1800s, four Western states adopted woman suffrage, starting with Wyoming, which did so in 1869 while still a territory. Utah followed a year later, in 1870.

In both cases local politicians had seen woman suffrage as advantageous. In Wyoming, which was very sparsely populated, leaders thought it might attract more settlers, not just by making the territory seem attractive to female migrants but as a marketing gimmick to draw attention to Wyoming—to put it on the map, so to speak. And in Utah, Mormon leaders hoped to convince Congress that it was okay to continue to practice polygamy—to show Mormon women were not oppressed—and they hoped to gain advantage in their ongoing power struggle with non-Mormons in the territory, such as miners, cowboys, etc., who tended not to have women with them. Colorado and Idaho adopted woman suffrage as states during the 1890s, as suffragists made alliances with populist and “free silver” groups. Gradually suffragists were learning that to win, they had to convince politicians not just of the justice of woman suffrage, but that enfranchising
women would benefit them. An expediency argument was always necessary.

In some cases, suffragists gained from alliances with the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union (WTCU). Led by Frances Willard, it endorsed woman suffrage in the 1880s and helped convince many a conservative Christian woman that working for woman suffrage was her Christian duty. Strong WCTU backing for suffrage also convinced male supporters of prohibition to become suffragists’ allies. But in other cases, this alliance became a major liability as, across the nation, the liquor industry began using its considerable political power to fight women’s enfranchisement.

Later, after 1910, the next wave of victories would come from the West, but many states in the East and especially the South remained strongly antisuffrage. Most Northeastern states would ratify when an amendment finally got through Congress, but the South would remain a huge problem for the women’s movement: in 1920, nine of the ten states that refused to ratify were south of the Mason-Dixon line. As the new century dawned, the movement had gotten almost nowhere in the South.

Reunification

Suffragists had put aside their differences in 1890 and reunited in one major organization, the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) under Anthony’s leadership. The NAWSA would lead the movement to victory—but only after another three decades of fighting.

Anthony’s strategy was to focus on only one goal: gaining the vote for women. With the vote, she reasoned, they could then pursue additional reforms. To win, suffragists would make concessions to the political realities of the United States during an era that was one of the worst in the history of American race relations. Between 1890 and 1920, the years in which there was an organized movement in the South, white conservatives were determined to reassert and maintain white supremacy in politics and were using protection of white women as a rationalization for disfranchising Black men.

A “Southern Strategy”

As the ultimate goal was a federal suffrage amendment, national leaders recognized that they had to win support from at least some Southern states. Laura Clay of Kentucky, one of the earliest and most prominent Southern suffrage leaders, warned NAWSA leaders: you can work for fifty more years and get nowhere unless you “bring in the South.”

My first book, New Women of the New South, was on this subject—the suffrage movement in the South and its relationship to the national movement.9 The key issue was race. White Southern conservatives already despised the suffrage movement as a spin-off of the abolitionist movement. They regarded the Fifteenth Amendment as unconstitutional, insisting Congress had violated the Constitution by forcing the amendment on them during Reconstruction, thereby going beyond its original powers and violating states’ rights. They were trying to figure out how to keep Black men from voting without violating the Fourteenth or Fifteenth and being punished by Congress.

So white suffragists came up with a “Southern strategy.” They tried to convince Southern white legislators not to try to take the vote away from Black men—and risk having state Congressional delegations cut back. Instead, they argued, just enfranchise all
women. Since there are more white women in the South than the North, the argument went, woman suffrage will guarantee white supremacy. In places where there are Black majorities, lawmakers could counter them with educational or property requirements to ensure that most women voters would be white.

The 1895 Constitutional Convention in South Carolina

The very first place they tried this was at the 1895 Constitutional Convention in South Carolina. National leaders worked with Virginia Young, editor of the Fairfax Enterprise, who, like many late-nineteenth-century suffragists, had come to the suffrage movement through the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. Young founded the South Carolina Equal Rights Association in 1890.

The South Carolina campaign began in April 1895 and continued through the constitutional convention in September. Young and another South Carolinian, Viola Neblett, arranged a tour in which suffrage speakers addressed audiences in every county seat. At the convention, Laura Clay spoke, deploring the problems confronting the entire nation owing to the “rash prodigality with which the franchise had been extended to all classes of men, regardless of their unfitness for such political trust by illiteracy, foreign birth, or other causes.” She urged her listeners to set an example for the entire nation by extending the vote to qualified women and assuring white supremacy through a method that was “legal, fair, honest,” and unlikely to be struck down by the courts.

The suffragists actually gained support from many men of their class, including George D. Tillman, and Robert Hemphill of Abbeville and his brother James, editor of the Charleston News and Courier. But the South Carolina suffrage campaign ultimately failed because the convention was controlled by Pitchfork Ben Tillman, George Tillman’s estranged brother. Ben Tillman and his followers were unlikely to support a suffrage bill that would not only disqualify Black voters but also many women from the illiterate families that supported him.

Southern suffragists deluded themselves into thinking this was an expediency argument that might work, that it might convince Southern men to lead the nation in the adoption of woman suffrage. They didn’t: as one white Mississippi politician said, Southern men refused to cower behind petticoats and “use lovely women” to maintain white supremacy. Instead, they found other means to do so that did not involve the “destruction” of woman’s traditional role, adopting additional requirements, including poll taxes, literacy tests, or “understanding tests.” Alas, Congress and the Supreme Court let them get away with it—then and for another half century.

White Suffragists and the Southern Problem

For the rest of the suffrage movement, the South would continue to be a problem, and white suffragists would continue to make concessions to Southern racism. White suffragists distanced themselves from association with Black suffragists and Black suffrage. As the movement got underway among white women in South Carolina in the 1890s, they never mentioned the prior work of the Rollin sisters. The interracial quality of the original suffrage movement was virtually lost. Some of the older suffragists who had fought against slavery had now died, and younger women had come into the movement. Some interracial friendships survived; others did not.

White suffragists were not all the same in their views on race. Some were extreme racists who opposed Black people ever voting. Others saw literacy tests as acceptable and fair. They reasoned that, as the nation had free public schools, in time Black people would learn to read, and they opposed racially discriminatory application of the tests. Some white suffragists hated to compromise their values but did so anyway, knowing...
that at this period in American history their movement was never going to succeed if suffrage leaders and organizations openly advocated for equal suffrage for African Americans. It was a strange parallel to what happened after the Civil War when supporters of African American suffrage believed they had no chance of victory if woman suffrage was included.

**African American Woman Suffragists**

Despite all this and their disappointment in so many white women, however, African American women saw this as their cause too, and continued to support the movement, mostly working through Black women’s clubs or suffrage clubs. Prominent African American suffragists included Ida B. Wells-Barnett, who became internationally famous as a crusader against lynching. Another was Mary Church Terrell, an Oberlin-educated, cosmopolitan woman who founded the National Association of Colored Women (NACW). She was one of the few African American women allowed to address NAWSA conventions and was even chosen to represent women of the United States at an international suffrage conference in Berlin, where she addressed the audience in fluent German.

**Woman Suffrage and the Progressive Movement**

Given all the many challenges, one might well ask, how did the woman suffrage movement finally win? As the new century began, the movement seemed stalled. Anthony had retired, then died (a suffrage martyr), and the woman in charge for most of this period, Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, was a great orator, but not a brilliant strategist. The movement was highly decentralized, with lots of isolated state campaigns that failed. Nonetheless, suffragists worked steadily and successfully to expand their constituency, reaching out to college women, to working women, to women professionals, and to wealthy women philanthropists who helped fund the movement as well as shed its radical image. Ironically, white women reached out to other white women from many different ethnic groups, even as they largely avoided public association with African American suffragists.

Suffrage leaders also reached out to the growing number of middle and upper-class white women involved in women’s clubs. Many of them were supporters of a new reform movement that in the early 1900s was sweeping the nation, the Progressive movement, which had a major and positive impact on the woman suffrage movement and contributed much to its victory. Increasingly, large numbers of women wanted the vote in order to gain reforms. This brought support from male reformers and politicians who wanted their help—and provided the suffrage movement with a new and powerful expediency argument.

By 1910, the Progressive movement, which began around 1900 at the grassroots level and swept both national political parties, contributed enormously to the cause of woman suffrage. We associate it with Republican President Theodore Roosevelt and Democratic President Woodrow Wilson. Progressives in both parties wanted to see stronger, honest government that would act boldly to address major problems. They supported reforms to clean up city, state, and national politics, and protect the health and safety of its citizens.
Using Woman’s Nature to “Clean Up” the “Bachelors Club” of Politics

In all sections of the United States including the South, the woman suffrage movement drew support from men and women who supported Progressive reforms including abolishing child labor, protecting women workers, public health programs, and legislation to curb political corruption. In fact, large corporations, party bosses, etc., who relied on corrupting politicians to succeed, were terrified that women would “clean up politics” if allowed to enter the “Bachelors Club” of politics.

It’s quite interesting that the goals of the Progressive movement fit perfectly with the prevailing ideas about woman’s nature. Though by this time more women had advanced education and worked outside the home, most women did not. And ideas about woman’s nature remained surprisingly the same. Most people, including Progressives, believed that women tended to be more nurturing, compassionate, and honest, and would vote for a stronger, more compassionate government that would enact such reforms. Suffragists, no dummies, capitalized on this in their promotional literature.

This is a very important point, key in understanding the suffrage victory. I argue in One Woman, One Vote: Rediscovering the Woman Suffrage Movement, that by 1920, people were accustomed to the fact that many women were becoming educated and, prior to marriage, working outside the home. But women won the vote—not because people’s ideas about woman’s nature had changed as much as because Americans changed their ideas about the nature and purpose of government, wanting government to be protective, compassionate, and moral.

Alice Paul

Beginning in 1910, at the height of the Progressive movement, the woman suffrage movement really took off. Increased support for suffrage resulting from the Progressive movement, and a new set of victories in the Western states, seemed to breathe new life into suffragists all over America (Washington in 1910; California in 1911; and in 1912, Oregon, Kansas, and Arizona).

The NAWSA still faced tough battles in the Northeast, including in New York and New Jersey—and had secured no victories in the South. Most suffrage leaders believed they had not yet reached that point where they had won enough states to win in Congress. But some suffragists started to get impatient, saying, let’s just drop all this state work and go back to the militants’ strategy in the 1870s: focus solely on getting a federal amendment.

This was the point of view of a young woman named Alice Paul, leader of the so-called “militant” suffragists who caught the attention of the nation. She returned to the United States in 1910, after being influenced by suffragists she met while a political science graduate student studying in London. Paul admired the militant spirit of the “suffragettes,” whose real name was the Women’s Social and Political Union (WSPU). (In the US, suffragists did not use the term “suffragettes,” by the way. It was the term anti-suffragists used to belittle them.) Paul demonstrated with them and went to jail.
Fall is my absolute favorite time of year! I look forward to the palette of mixed colored leaves that litter my yard and driveway, the pine straw that fights for its own locale and the crisp smell of the air as it expresses just a hint of nippiness! It’s then that I can relax inside—a favored beverage in hand—and leisurely peruse the fall issue of Columns.

I especially enjoy the articles that report the findings of the research fellows at the South Caroliniana Library. This year several energetic research scholars spent time in the South Caroliniana Library (SCL) accessing manuscript materials that not only support their research but will help bolster their early academic careers. We are privy to articles written by six of our scholars in this very edition. While we all acknowledge the Library’s international reputation in providing substance for the work of established writers and faculty, we sometimes forget the significant role it plays in nurturing students and emerging scholars.

This issue ushers in a new look and new content. Beginning next year and continuing thereafter, the fall issue will highlight the talk given at the preceding annual spring meeting of the Society. With our schedule duly interrupted by the COVID-19 virus, we find ourselves backlogged this time and playing catch-up in providing our members with the text of the 2021 annual meeting address given by Dr. Marjorie Spruill. That text is provided herein as our cover story. The spring 2023 edition of Columns will carry the spring 2022 address by Dr. Constance Schulz; and next fall, we will be on track to feature the address from the spring 2023 meeting. (If that seemed a little confusing, just know that come next fall, we will be on track!)

Dr. Spruill, who is a University of South Carolina Professor Emerita of History and a past member of the USC Executive Council, has written extensively on woman suffrage, authoring some six books. She used last year’s annual meeting platform to regale the audience with an exciting power point presentation entitled “One Woman, One Vote: The South and the Nineteenth Amendment.”

Utilizing much of the information from her latest book, One Woman, One Vote: Rediscovering the Woman Suffrage Movement, Spruill traced the fight for the female vote from the early days of the suffrage movement, injecting both humor and wisdom along the way. I was personally gratified that she also incorporated visuals from the SCETV documentary trilogy, Sisterhood: SC Suffragists. You may recall our Spring 2021 Community Engagement program, when USCS partnered with SCETV, the Center for Civil Rights History and Research, and SCL to present a community program which consisted of the documentary screening of “The Rollin Sisters—Reconstruction thru 1895,” paired with an exhibit drawn from the South Caroliniana Library and a panel discussion featuring Dr. Spruill, Dr. Valinda Littlefield and Carole IONE Lewis, the great-granddaughter of Rollin sister, Frances Rollin Whipper.

We are very eager to extend our reach in community and campus partnerships. Continuing the trend, in October, University Libraries and the USC Department of English presented an exciting Fall Literary Festival. Featured in a virtual presentation was American historian and Harvard professor Tiya Miles, author of the acclaimed book, All That She Carried: The Journey of Ashley’s Sack, a Black Family Keepsake. Miles utilized the SCL extensively in researching her book. Reading in-person and virtually, Pulitzer Prize finalist, poet, and author Evie Shockley was the second guest. Rounding out the series, poet, author, and USC Professor Dianne Johnson-Feelings, whose pen name when she writes for children and young adults is Dinah Johnson, appeared both in person and virtually along with illustrator and artist April W. Harrison. Your University South Caroliniana Society was proud to join as one of the co-presenting partners for this trio of stimulating events.

Kudos to the Center for Civil Rights History and Research for partnering with the National Park Service (NPS) to expand their work in telling South Carolina’s civil rights stories. The five-year agreement provides for the center to receive $3.4 million to enhance current work in civil rights education and scholarly research, and to create new opportunities for the public to connect with its mission. It will also support exhibits and programming at South Carolina sites in the NPS’s African American Civil Rights Network and help grow
the network in the Palmetto State by serving as a resource to property owners, community leaders and interested organizations. The announcement was made jointly by NPS Director Chuck Sams and Congressman James E. Clyburn, who donated his congressional papers to the center in 2015 and has been a steadfast supporter.

By the time this issue of Caroliniana Columns goes to press, the Society will have presented our fall program, "An Evening with Congressman James E. Clyburn!" Stay tuned for highlights in our next edition!

The Executive Council welcomes two new members, Ms. Victoria L. Eslinger and Mr. Harry L. Walker, who were elected at the 2022 Annual Meeting in May. Dr. Bobby Donaldson was also elected to a full term as Vice President. We are excited to have them join us!

We would like to extend a hearty welcome to the new Dean of University Libraries, David Banush. Dean Banush comes to the University of South Carolina from Tulane University, where he served as Dean of Libraries and Academic Information Resources. We look forward to having him join us in our mutual goals to support and advance the mission of the South Caroliniana Library.

This is also the opportune time to bid a fond farewell to our former dean, Tom McNally, who served with distinction as the USC Dean of Libraries for over thirteen years! Our heartfelt thanks for his leadership, guidance, and perseverance. We wish Dean McNally the best in a well-deserved retirement and trust that we will see him soon at the grand reopening of SCL!

Speaking of which...

Stay tuned for the announcements of opening festivities and events! Be sure to look at the pictures in this issue showing the most recent developments and plan to come out and celebrate in grand style!

Wishing you a joyous holiday season!

Sincerely,

Beryl M. Dakers, President
Lynn M. Robertson, Vice President
Bobby Donaldson, Vice President
Henry G. Fulmer, Secretary-Treasurer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMORIALS &amp; HONORARIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Memory of:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert K. Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Thomas Moore Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peden B. McLeod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes Mizell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Honor of:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry G. Fulmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd R. Taylor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Friends,

As many of you know, I have been trying to step down from my deanship for some time. COVID and the renovation of the South Caroliniana Library have kept me on longer than I had planned. I am pleased to inform you that David Banush, from Tulane University, will succeed me as Dean of Libraries on November 1. Dean Banush is a skilled librarian who will serve the University well.

We are in final stages of the South Caroliniana Library renovation. It has been a long and complicated road, but we should be open and ready for all of you to visit sometime in spring 2023. I can promise you that the newly renovated library will have been worth the wait.

Thanks to all of you for your continuing support of the South Caroliniana Library.

Retiring
Letter from the Dean of Libraries

by Beth Bilderback

It is hard to believe that it is October already, but I guess that is because the staff at the library have had a busy year so far. In addition to the usual variety of researchers, we hosted six academic scholars this summer. They were funded by the Governor Thomas Gordon McLeod and First Lady Elizabeth Alford McLeod Research Fellowship, the Lewis P. Jones Research Fellowship in South Carolina History, and the Ellison Durant Smith Research Award. Their topics included Southern federalism, public health considerations in colonial town planning, and the impacts of public projects which displace minority groups from their homes, churches, and cemeteries. You can read about their experiences using the Library’s collections in this issue of Columns.

The renovation of our beautiful building on the Horseshoe is keeping us busy. As the work on the building is nearing completion, the staff are working hard to prepare collections to move back into the building. We will close briefly sometime after the new year to ensure time to put all collections in place for an efficient move. We have selected a professional library moving company to handle the physical move. Staff are ensuring that the materials are in good physical condition, in their proper place on the shelves, and appropriately identified as to their new location in the Library. We are double checking to make sure the materials have records in our online catalog and determining the best way to change their locations once the move is complete. The latter is quite a challenge as there will be thousands of records that will need to be changed; we will continue to have materials stored in other offsite locations, and those locations need to remain unchanged.

The staff are planning to repurpose the Graniteville Room space in the Thomas Cooper Library, which has been our User Services reading room and stacks while our building has undergone renovation. There will not be space for processing in our renovated building, so the plan is to turn the Graniteville Room into an area where staff and student assistants can work uninterrupted with good worktables and plenty of space to process large collections. Many of the staff who currently have offices in that area will remain in their offices as well.

While it is a busy time, it is also an exciting time as we look forward to reopening our building. Planning is underway for special tours, which will be offered after our anticipated soft opening. There will be other events to celebrate the renovation of the building during the spring. We are working with University Communications to create a webpage dedicated to the renovation and upcoming events; it will be linked from the library’s homepage. Please check our website at sc.edu/libraries/scl and your email for information about upcoming events as we get closer to our reopening!
How is the renovation going?

The renovation of the South Caroliniana Library is wrapping up, with plans to move collections into the building and reopen in early 2023. Keep an eye on the South Caroliniana Library’s website at sc.edu/libraries/scl for announcements. Meanwhile, here is a peek at how work is progressing!

(Photos by Todd Hoppock)
The fountain in the garden behind South Caroliniana Library has been temporarily removed for refurbishment. (Photo at right by Rob Smith.)
Fire engine red is appropriate for components of the new fire suppression system.

The renovated east wing stacks features a new dumbwaiter to move collections between levels and to the reading room.
The Johnston Room will feature a gallery of exhibits highlighting items from the Caroliniana collections.
Exhibits in the reading room will tell the story of South Carolina through regional and historical lenses.

The beauty of the original hardwood floors is historically accurate to the building’s 1840 construction.
Historically appropriate paint colors highlight the beauty of the reading room with natural light from its three skylight cupolas.

Work continues on the exhibit cases in the reading room.
A vault will secure the South Caroliniana Library’s most priceless treasures.

Newly-designed air outlets for the climate system complement the original architecture.
The 1913 Washington, D.C., Suffrage March

Paul first worked within the NAWSA, including organizing a massive and spectacular suffrage march in Washington, D.C., on the eve of Woodrow Wilson’s inauguration. Somewhere between 5,000 and 8,000 peaceful demonstrators, dressed in costumes representing their organizations, occupations, or ethnic groups, or wearing white, took part. Huge crowds lined the streets. Arriving that day across the city at an empty Union Station and seeing no adoring crowds, Wilson is said to have asked, “Where are all the people?” and was displeased to be told they were watching the suffrage parade.

Unfortunately, numerous men in the crowd, many of them drunk and hostile to the suffragists, attacked the marchers, first pelting them with lit cigars and liquor bottles, then knocking them down and ripping off their sashes, tearing their signs and banners. The police stood by and did nothing, and the cavalry had to be called in to restore order. But to Paul’s delight, all this led to increased sympathy for the movement—especially with members of Congress whose wives and sisters and daughters were among the marchers. Congressional investigations of the violence and the inadequate police response followed.

The press became increasingly sympathetic—though not so much in the South. The Birmingham Ledger defended the crowd that contained many Southern white men, cheering on Wilson as the first Southern-born president since the Civil War. The paper stated: “Our suffrage sisters must understand that when they cut away from the conventions of the ages they venture into untried fields and may find many rude men,” and, “the disorder is what the suffragettes should have anticipated. A majority of men still disapprove the movement and the very ideas underlying it and men are not always considerate in expressing their disapproval.”

Picketing the White House

Many Southerners—in fact, many folks from all over the nation including NAWSA leaders—were outraged when the National Woman’s Party began to picket the White House. This was something decidedly uncommon in those days and certainly shocking when done by women. NAWSA leaders feared such tactics would offend the very people whose support they most needed, including President Wilson. By then, different approaches to seeking suffrage had already led to another major schism in the suffrage ranks, as the militants departed from the NAWSA and founded the National Woman’s Party (NWP).

The most shocking thing the NWP did was to picket the White House even after the United States entered World War I and criticism of the president and the government was not tolerated. As Wilson spoke of the war as a war to promote democracy, they tried to embarrass him before the world. When they stood in front of the White House carrying a
sign referring to him as “Kaiser Wilson,” soldiers and sailors attacked the picketers and tore down their signs. Losing patience, the Wilson administration jailed many protestors who often served long sentences. They demanded to be treated as political prisoners, to wear their own clothes instead of prison uniforms, etc. But that was not granted. Some, including Alice Paul, went on hunger strikes, and were forcibly fed. This was done by shoving a feeding tube through a nostril using a funnel, pouring soup or raw eggs through the tube, often causing bleeding and nausea.

The Prison Special

Once again, a South Carolinian, Anita Pollitzer of Charleston, played a key role in the suffrage movement. She was one of Alice Paul’s key aides, very active in the National Woman’s Party (later serving as party chair between 1945 and 1949), and a leader in the early fight for the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). When the prisoners were released, she was the one who organized a national tour featuring the suffrage prisoners traveling aboard a special train car, The Prison Special, wearing replicas of their prison uniforms. The Prison Special’s first stop was Charleston, South Carolina. Attractive, confident, and able to use her Southern charm very effectively, Anita was often sent when there was someone who needed to be persuaded.¹³

The Pollitzer Sisters

Anita was the youngest of three Pollitzer sisters who were suffragists. Like the Grimke sisters and the Rollin sisters, the Pollitzer sisters are featured in Beryl Dakers’ trilogy Sisterhood: South Carolina Suffragists as the third film in the series, Sisterhood: South Carolina Suffragists: Clubwomen, the Pollitzer Sisters & the Vote.¹⁴ Carrie and Mabel Pollitzer mainly served the cause within the state, working individually and together in support of a wide range of women’s issues. The eldest, Carrie, was active in the National Woman’s Party in Charleston, working with Susan Pringle Frost, founder of the Charleston NWP chapter.

Carrie was also known for leading the successful 1918 effort to have women admitted to the College of Charleston. She was cofounder and assistant principal of the South Carolina Kindergarten Training School. Mabel Pollitzer, a science teacher at Memminger High School in Charleston, served as the chair of the state chapter of the National Woman’s Party. She helped found the first free public library in Charleston County which opened in 1931. At ninety-three, Mabel was still writing letters in favor of the ERA—which as you may know was first introduced by the NWP in 1923.

Carrie Chapman Catt

Meanwhile, the NAWSA continued its work, under Carrie Chapman Catt. Having served as national president for four years between Anthony and Shaw, but having to resign owing to her husband’s terminal illness, she had since 1904 served as president of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance, traveling the world promoting women’s enfranchisement. Returning to the NAWSA presidency in 1915, this skillful “general” of the movement immediately launched her so-called “Winning Plan,” coordinating efforts across the nation and in Washington. She worked hard to gain Wilson’s support and ran a massive lobbying effort to enlist congressional support.

As the United States entered World War I, seeking to gain favor with President Wilson and the public, Catt put aside her own pacificism, and urged suffragists to throw themselves—visibly—into war work. The NAWSA even funded a Woman’s Overseas Hospital in France, publicizing photographs of nurses heading off to war.

Finally, suffragists convinced Wilson to endorse the federal amendment—a huge victory. In 1918, the president addressed members of Congress, asking them to enfranchise women in recognition of their war service. Suffragists still had to win over a few more senators, and their biggest problem was the continued opposition of those from the South.

Benjamin Ryan Tillman

One of the most fervent opponents was South Carolina Senator Benjamin Ryan Tillman. He had long railed against woman suffrage on the Senate floor. By this time, the battle was growing increasingly sectional, and Northern and Western supporters of woman suffrage increasingly accused Southern Democrats of being reactionaries who could only hope to delay the success of a movement whose time had come. Southern Democrats saw themselves as keepers of tradition, level-headed conservatives who would save the United States from this “fad” that was sweeping the nation.¹⁵

Senator Tillman was a classic example of this position, assailing his colleagues for acting too hastily, for yielding to the pressures of the moment, and failing to stand up to the suffragists. The now aged senator had helped defeat woman suffrage when suffragists proposed it at the 1895 convention. Now he pleaded with his “rash, young colleagues” to be counseled and directed by “the wisdom of their seniors.” Rather than rush “pell-mell, helter-skelter” into woman suffrage, he urged that Congress gather statistics in suffrage states “of the birth rate, death rate, divorces, and other things affecting the everyday social life of the people, which would in a hundred years, say, show us whether female suffrage has affected these things injuriously or not.”

Men from other parts of the nation, Senator Tillman continued, should heed the example of the South, particularly South Carolina, where institutions regarding the relations between the sexes were beyond reproach: traditional laws and customs such as the lack of divorce that elsewhere enabled men tired of their

Look forward, women, always; utterly cast away
The memory of hate and struggle and bitterness;
Bonds may endure for a night, but freedom comes with the day,
And the free must remember nothing less.

Forget the strife; remember those who strove—
The first defeated women, gallant and few,
Who gave us hope, as a mother gives us love,
Forget them not, and this remember, too:

How at the later call to come for
Women untaught, uncourteous
Rank upon rank came forth in
Each one answering the ca
They came from toil and want, from leisure and ease,
Those who knew only life, and learned women of fame,
Girls and the mothers of girls, and the mothers of these,
No one knew whence or how, but they came, they came.

The faces of some were stern, and some were gay,
And some were pale with the terror of unreal dangers;
But their hearts knew this: that hereafter come what may,
Women to women would never again be strangers.

Alice Duer Miller.
“skinny and shrunken” wives to go after “some young and buxom girl”; lynching, which makes “it dangerous to ‘monkey with men’s womankind,’” and the South’s “unwritten law,” which allowed men to shoot men who slept with their wives and daughters and go unpunished. He called the last “the best law to protect woman’s virtue that I ever heard of.”

**“The New South”?**

Fortunately for the suffragists, Tillman died in July 1918 and his replacement was a suffrage sympathizer, William Pegues Pollock of Cheraw. When the Senate voted in early February 1919, national Democratic leaders chose him to make the keynote speech and hopefully persuade fellow Southerners. He proclaimed, “Some men have said that they do not want to force anything on the South. I tell you, speaking for the New South, speaking for the real South, we want this privilege. We feel that the women are entitled to it.” Pollock took the same line as most white Southern suffragists on race, however, when he added, “And we know we can handle any race question.”

Pollack’s plea did little to persuade other Southern senators. Though national party leaders urged them to do what was expedient for the Democratic Party, Southern Democrats knew it was anything but expedient for them as individual politicians from the South, and few were more concerned about the fate of the national party than about their own re-election! Moreover, senators from North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and South Carolina owed their success-to-date more to the Southern textile industry—which firmly opposed woman suffrage as a threat to child labor—than they did to the national party or the President.

The February 1919 vote still failed to yield a victory for woman suffrage. Fortunately, however, in the November election, suffragists had picked up the additional votes they needed, despite the huge challenges of campaigning during the pandemic of 1918. And when the new Congress was seated and the House voted again in May 1919 to approve the federal woman suffrage amendment, the Senate finally did so as well. Thus, on June 4, 1919, the amendment received the constitutionally required two-thirds vote in both houses of Congress and was sent to the states for ratification.

**The South Opposes Ratification**

As expected, the South was the primary problem. As the struggle over ratification began, Illinois and Wisconsin competed for the honor of being the first to ratify, while Georgia and Alabama scrambled to be the first to pass a rejection denouncing the Susan B. Anthony Amendment as “unwarranted,” “unnecessary,” and “downright dangerous.” Invoking their Confederate ancestors who had fought to the last ditch against the Yankees, many Southern state legislators vowed to fight ‘til the end against this incursion into the rights of states, insisting, along with Southern antisuffrage women, that approval of the proposed Nineteenth Amendment would signify consent to the Fifteenth, which no true son—or daughter—of the South could possibly do! When Mississippi voted against ratification of the amendment, the Jackson, Mississippi, newspaper, the Clarion-Ledger, celebrated the defeat, proclaiming, “…the vile old thing is as dead as its author [Susan B. Anthony], the old advocate of social equality and intermarriage of the races, and Mississippi will never be annoyed with it again.”

**Eulalie Salley**

South Carolina did not ratify, despite the best efforts of suffragists in the state. Eulalie Salley of Aiken was primary leader of the South Carolina Equal Suffrage League (SCESL), a NAWSA affiliate, during the ratification fight. You may already know that Salley’s interest in women’s rights was sparked by the case involving Lucy Pickens Dugas Tillman, wife of Ben Tillman, Jr., whose husband had her two young daughters deeded away to his parents while she was ill. At that time, in South Carolina, as well as Florida, Delaware, Tennessee, and Kentucky, state law allowed a father the right to deed his children to another when it was determined that he could not care for them himself. The case involving two of the state’s most powerful political families, who were not on the best of terms anyway, reached the state supreme court. As the trial began, crowds of people—especially women—poured in from all over the state to observe the trial, so many that they had to prop open courtroom doors so women forced to stand in the lobby could hear.

Eulalie Salley was an aggressive and innovative suffrage campaigner, traveling on unpaved county roads to canvass door-to-door and organizing suffrage parades. One she arranged in Aiken County in 1917 was the first in the state. She planned all kinds of imaginative fund-raisers, from performing in a mock prizefight to riding in an airplane scattering suffrage pamphlets over the town. Some, including her husband, regarded her actions as scandalous. To fund her suffrage work, Salley applied for and received a real estate license in 1915. In doing so, she became the first woman realtor in the state and launched a career that helped put Aiken on the map and made her something of a legend.

In 1919, Salley became South Carolina Equal Suffrage League president. Salley knew and greatly admired Carrie Chapman Catt and Anna Howard Shaw, and like them strongly disapproved of the “unladylike” militant wing of the movement that the Pollitzer sisters supported. Instead, NAWSA affiliates in the state tried
to overcome the image of the suffrage movement as radical or a threat to Southern civilization. One photo of a South Carolina suffrage parade showed women on a float with a sign that read: “For the health of the nation give women the vote. The hand that rocks the cradle will never rock the boat.”

South Carolina, however, did not ratify until 1969! At that time, Salley—then eighty-five—was invited to stand behind the governor when he was photographed signing the Nineteenth Amendment into law. She took the occasion to scold Palmetto State politicians, saying, “Boys, I’ve been waiting fifty years to tell you what I think of you.”

**Tennessee and Ratification**

Returning to the national suffrage story and the ratification fight, by the summer of 1920 only one more state was needed, but no legislatures would be in session before the November elections. President Wilson, eager for his party to be on the right side of this issue, pressured Democratic governors to call special sessions: Governor Albert Roberts of Tennessee complied. Thus, the final battle over woman suffrage took place in Nashville in the long, hot summer of 1920.

In that final, dramatic contest, antisuffragists as well as suffragists from all over the nation descended upon the state in a bitter struggle over ideology and influence. Alice Paul wisely stayed away, but she sent able lieutenants, including Anita Pollitzer. Pollitzer traveled across the state, seeking to locate legislators and persuade them to commit to voting for ratification. As the battle heated up, Catt came to Nashville to supervise the battle she hoped would end the long suffrage struggle once and for all.

At first it seemed suffragists had the support they needed, but Catt warned that many men who had promised to support them would be pressured to defect. As they watched with dismay, many of the legislators did indeed switch sides, and suffrage supporters were quite uncertain of the result when the vote took place.

Finally, on August 18, Tennessee ratified—the result of a twenty-four-year-old legislator from the mountains, Harry Burn, changing his vote at the insistence of his elderly mother, Febb Ensminger Burn. A statue of the Burns, mother and son, was one of several statues of suffragists erected in Tennessee as part of the state’s elaborate two-year commemoration of the 2020 centennial.

**The Triumph of Anita Pollitzer’s Charm**

Note: Here in South Carolina, some believe it was a different woman who made the difference in young Harry’s vote. Pollitzer family lore says it was actually Anita who persuaded Harry, having had dinner with him the night before.\(^\text{18}\) Photos taken soon after the vote show Anita, smiling at the camera, as she shook hands to congratulate Harry Burn—who is starting straight at her.

The vote took place on August 18, but the antisuffragists even then did not give up. Using parliamentary tricks, they called for arevote, then some left the state to avoid a quorum. Supporters managed to meet and affirm the vote, and the amendment was rushed to Washington, D.C., where the Secretary of State hastened to sign and certify it before the antis could get an injunction or otherwise delay. Finally, on August 26, 1920, the federal amendment the suffragists had sought for so long became the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

**A Continued Fight for Enfranchisement**

Unfortunately, the fight for equal access to the ballot did not end in 1920. In fact, it has never ended, and continues still.\(^\text{19}\) The adoption of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920 was not a complete victory, as many women remained disfranchised. All American women who were citizens were enfranchised by the Nineteenth Amendment—but not all would be allowed to claim their new right. Outside the South, African American women voted, but most of them still lived in the South and they were prevented from voting by the same barriers constructed to keep African American men from voting.

**The Voting Rights Act of 1965**

That situation continued for almost another half century. As we know, a major goal of the civil rights movement of the 1960s was to remove those barriers; and again, many women and men, such as the great Fannie Lou Hamer of Mississippi and Septima Clark of South Carolina, were active in that movement to gain the right to use the vote that they had under the Constitution. Hamer testified that she hadn’t even known she had the vote until she was in her forties. Hamer struggled against great odds—enduring jail and beatings and more—to do so. At last, the suffragists’ original goal—universal suffrage for all—was largely accomplished through the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In effect, it finally used federal power to enforce both the Fifteenth and the Nineteenth Amendments, and thereby drastically changed American politics.

Before the Voting Rights Act of 1965, an estimated twenty-three percent of African Americans of voting age were registered nationally, but by 1969, sixty-one percent had registered. Over time, African American women would prove to be the nation’s most devoted voters, turning out in large numbers at every election.

**After Shelby County v. Holder**

Unfortunately, in 2013 the Supreme Court ruled a key part of the Voting Rights Act unconstitutional, in
Suffrage movement is never over

Even as we celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of the Nineteenth Amendment in 2020, in the midst of a hotly contested election, we learned more than ever to appreciate that right. And as we have learned more about the history of the suffrage movement, we have learned that equal access to the polls was hard to gain—and once gained, must be protected and defended. The suffrage movement, perhaps, is never over.

In closing, let me return to August 26, 1920, the day the Nineteenth Amendment was victorious. In the prepared message Carrie Chapman Catt delivered that day, rather than thanking the president, members of Congress, or state legislators, the NAWSA president directed her remarks to the “women of America,” reminding them of the seventy-two years of struggle by generations of suffragists, and the many sacrifices made so that “you and your daughters might inherit political freedom.” “That vote has been costly,” she said. “Prize it!”

—Dr. Marjorie J. Spruill, Distinguished Professor Emerita, University of South Carolina, is the author or editor of six books on woman suffrage including One Woman, One Vote: Rediscovering the Woman Suffrage Movement, which was released in second edition by New Sage Press in 2021. Her other works include Divided We Stand: The Battle Over Women's Rights and Family Values That Polarized American Politics (Bloomsbury, 2017), New Women of the New South: The Leaders of the Woman Suffrage Movement in the Southern States (Oxford University Press, 1993), and several edited volumes including VOTES FOR WOMEN! The Woman Suffrage Movement in Tennessee, the South, and the Nation (University of Tennessee Press, 1995), a three-volume anthology co-edited with Valinda W. Littlefield and Joan Marie Johnson titled South Carolina Women: Their Lives and Times (University of Georgia Press, 2009–2012), and a two-volume anthology coedited with Elizabeth Payne and Martha Swain titled Mississippi Women: Their Histories, Their Lives (University of Georgia Press, 2003, 2010).


Spruill, One Woman, One Vote, 12.


Ibid. 116-18; Paul Fuller, Laura Clay and the Woman's Rights Movement (University Press of Kentucky, 1975): 60-72.


Spruill (Wheeler), New Women of the New South, 23.
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Oumou Diop, La’Royalty Jones, Dorsey Winchester, and Alura Luck, eighth graders at Palmetto Scholars Academy, wear state-level medals won for their National History Day project on the Grimké sisters, which included an interview with Marjorie Spruill, center.

Author Sue Monk Kidd and Charleston Mayor Joe Riley at the unveiling of the historic marker at the Grimké’s home on East Bay Street in Charleston on May 15, 2015

16 Ibid., 30-35.
19 On the continuation of the fight for equal suffrage and women’s voting patterns after 1920, see the final chapter of One Woman, One Vote, Spruill, “A Century of Woman Suffrage.”
21 Barbara Stuhler, For the Public Record: A Documentary History of the League of Women Voters (Greenwood Publishing Group, 2000), 26.
On an autumn night in 1794, a boy of African descent serving on a privateer ship snuck onto a South Carolina merchant ship. Undetected by the merchant ship captain and most of the crew, the boy stole a significant amount of goods. How did he act so stealthily? Allegedly, an enslaved boy on the merchant ship informed him where he could find and carry away these goods.

Villains and Villany
The exact details of this event are impossible to know. We only know of it through a brief correspondence between the brothers Samuel Green and Timothy Green, in which they reveal that these stolen items had belonged to them. Moreover, a brief description of this night only comes from the enslaved boy on the merchant ship after the ship’s captain severely punished him. Thus, our understanding of this night is channeled through a second-hand account and a violently coerced confession. Many details are left unsaid and distorted, leaving a trail of unanswered questions.
What goods did the boy on the privateer ship steal? What nation commissioned this ship? Was the boy free, or like the boy on the merchant ship, was he considered the property of others? Did they know one another? How old were they? What were their names? Key details are lost in this letter, like so many life stories of the enslaved. Green’s letter only characterizes the boys as “villains” and their acts as “villainy.”

However, as my dissertation foregrounds, these brief and fragmented moments are imperative to reconstructing the everyday financial and legal processes of settlers, as well as unearthing how enslaved children experienced, reasoned, and pushed the bounds of their position as racialized and gendered property used to settle and expand across the broader Southeast. Therefore, when we look at this moment classified as “villainy,” a close reading also unearths the possibilities of two adolescent boys growing and learning the merchant economies, land, and seascapes around them. The boy on the privateer vessel knew enough about the South Carolina ports to avoid the risk of being seen during the day. Perhaps the enslaved boy on the merchant ship willingly assisted the other boy on the privateer ship, and he saw an opportunity to undermine the merchant ship captain economically. After all, this captain would later prove to be a man willing to punish him severely. Thus, this boy on the merchant ship used his knowledge of where the captain stored the valued goods and possibly helped time the best moment for the other boy to act. Alternatively, maybe this boy on the merchant ship recognized the dangers of the privateers. Maybe he saw that the men on the privateer ship also subjected the other Black boy to dangerous and villainous conditions. He knew these other men could steal him away and force him into foreign environments, possibly away from kinships still located in South Carolina. Therefore, he weighed his risks and decided to aid the boy on the privateer ship to avoid an unknown fate. These are the possibilities of what these two adolescents knew.

Disruption of Merchant Economies

Significantly, in the process of weighing and assessing what actions to take during this night, their acts briefly disrupted the economic certainty of Samuel and Timothy Green. Timothy Green seemed “very fearful about the loss of [their] goods.” Samuel Green reassured his brother that he did not think they would be held liable for these losses, and the captain did not seem to bear any responsibility for the night. While the boys’ actions did not stop the Greens’ financial ventures, their acts stirred the anxiety of two prominent merchants. They forced these merchants to pause, reevaluate, and reassess their economic decisions. Put differently, these boys sabotaged these merchant economies, and, according to historian Sarah Haley, sabotage “is not about the success or triumph against systematic violence and dispossession. Instead, it is about a practice of life, living, disruption, rupture, and imagined futures....” While this moment may be small and based on a single letter, my research contends that collectively these fragments offer a window into enslaved youth’s developing ideas and politics, particularly concerning freedom and sovereignty.

Enslaved Women and Children in Settler Economies

More broadly, this moment of enslaved and possibly free Black adolescent boys sabotaging the economies of merchant capitalists emerges as an example of how the everyday practices of enslaved women and children are imperative to understanding the processes of settlement and expansion during the colonial and early state period of South Carolina and the Southeast. It sits within my dissertation, titled, “(Un)Settled Landscapes: Settler Economies and the Enslavement of Women and Children of African Descent in South Carolina, 1715-1838.” In my project, I center on the lives of captured African women and children as they moved through the commercial routes that facilitated the settlement of South Carolina and the broader Southeast. By following their routes, I ask how enslaved women’s and children’s position as real and chattel property transformed indigenous lands and made settler sovereignty legible. Relatedly, how did their diasporic experiences and practices inform a politics of place and placemaking that possibly unsettles settler landscapes? Historians of South Carolina and capitalism have interrogated how merchants and settlers used imperial and cosmopolitan imaginations to envision and implement the colonial and eventual state enterprises of settlement. Moreover, they usually recognize the destructive violence these enterprises imposed upon Africans and their kinships. I build from this research, but I also build upon the interdisciplinary scholarship of Black feminist scholars who emphasize that attention to the body and physical
Dear Tim,

Third years of Octbo30 and November 3 by last mail. In the first you seem to be very perjull about the loss of our Goods lest I do not know that the Cape admits of any remedy did it I should not fail to put it in execution. I have made diligent enquiry who the loss would fall upon and from best information we must be the sufferers. I do not think it possible to prove any neglect on his part. The circumstances of the case was nearly thro' at the time the Goods were taken from the Cape a Negro Boy belonging on board a privateer assisted Purposes boy in hiding the Goods into the Store. This William gave information from last account obtained where the Goods were stowed and the Privateers Boat came along side the Whal in the night.

Samuel Green wrote to his brother Timothy on November 29, 1794, describing how an enslaved boy collaborated with a privateer to steal their goods.
space as sites of analysis is essential to elucidating enslaved women’s knowledge. By tracing the language of the body and space through Black feminist approaches, I extend their arguments to my research. I argue not only that the political economy of settlement relied upon enslaved women and children, but also that enslaved women’s and children’s subject position within these economies critically positioned them as unique subjects who could critique and articulate new ideas of sovereignty.

With the generous support of the Lewis P. Jones Fellowship and the help of archivists and staff at the South Caroliniana Library, I was able to spend time mining through the extensive papers and manuscript collections of eighteenth and nineteenth-century planters, merchants, and slave-owning families to answer these questions. In particular, the South Caroliniana Library holds an impressive collection of papers from merchants and slave-owning men and women who became leading figures during the “Age of Revolution” and the Early Republic Period of South Carolina. These include the Samuel Green Papers, Ralph Izard Papers, Manigault Family Papers, Taylor Family Papers, and others. These papers contain important fragments of enslaved people’s lives wherein I hope to locate enslaved women’s and children’s imagined futures.
The Governor Thomas Gordon McLeod and First Lady Elizabeth Alford McLeod Visiting Research Fellowship allowed me to access numerous archival holdings from the South Caroliniana Library at the University of South Carolina. Rifles—their meaning to men and their availability in nineteenth-century America—are at the center of my academic scholarship. My dissertation, “Men and Their Guns: The Culture of Self-Deputized Manhood in the South, 1850–1877,” analyzes the historic origins of America’s gun culture and its mutually constitutive relationship to white supremacist ideology.

Slave Patrols, Militias, and the Klan

At the pinnacle of the South’s racial and gender hierarchies, white men held almost total control over nineteenth-century society—they decided who was free and who was not. As armed men, they held even greater authority—a form typically reserved for judges or law enforcement. The South never needed a robust, professional police force because they had an informal, civilian one comprised of armed white men, who considered it their rightful duty to regulate the behavior of enslaved and free people of color at gunpoint. Acting as judge, jury, and executioner, armed vigilantes policed and patrolled at the South in the form of slave patrols, militias, and the Klan. This custom of “self-deputized” manhood, I argue, originated as a direct result of slavery and the inherently unequal power dynamics present in a slave society. This self-deputized ideology, in turn, proved deadly to Black men, women, and children.

Northeastern Gun Manufacturers

An old adage claims: “Abe Lincoln may have freed all men, but Sam Colt made them equal.” Black and white men were never armed equally—and therefore were never equal—in the postwar South. But the saying contains a kernel of truth: manufacturers helped create America’s gun culture. Northeastern gun manufacturers, including, but not limited to, the Winchester Repeating Arms Company, Remington Arms Company, and the Colt Manufacturing Company, sought to sell their wares on unregulated markets and, therefore, participated in the manufacturing of white supremacy. The amorality of American manufacturers and the banality with which they sold their lethal products to Southerners directly contributed to American gun violence and the deaths of African Americans.

Firearm production had existed in antebellum America, but the Civil War drove demand, spurred technological advances, and called for increased production. And modern rifles—ones that made killing easy—outlasted the war. During Reconstruction, Northeastern suppliers found eager buyers below the Mason-Dixon line. In the late 1860s and early 1870s, white men from all walks of life procured breech-loading, repeating rifles. These same men, then, disarmed the few African American veterans and militiamen who had procured outdated weaponry in the war’s wake. The implications were lethal. In the end, the Winchester rifle did more than win the American West; it was “The Gun that Won the South” for white supremacy.

Guns Move West to Become America’s Gun Culture

Guns and lethal white supremacist ideology were not confined to the region below the Mason-Dixon line; over time, the South’s racially-charged gun culture based on self-deputized manhood became America’s national gun culture. In the decades after the Civil War, veterans moved West, taking their guns, their self-deputized policing, and their racial hatred with them. Violence perpetrated against Western indigenous peoples was no less deadly or racially-motivated than the massacres and lynchings committed against African Americans in the South. “Western Mythology,” however, misremembered and sanitized these men’s lethal actions, transforming self-deputized killers into heroic gunslingers. American culture—from Buffalo Bill’s Wild West Show to John Wayne’s Westerns—further legitimized the concept of “self-deputized...
“manhood” and spread it across the United States. Yet guns did and still do kill. In the end, this sad story is not exclusively a Southern one, or even a Western one; it is the origin story of America’s national gun culture. In short, these armed, self-deputized men live on today as the Proud Boys, Boogaloo Bois, and members of other alt-right militias.

**Hunting, Militia Musters, Military Service, Slave Patrols, and Rifle Clubs**

As a pervasive element of nineteenth-century society, references to guns permeate the archive, providing ample sources for my dissertation, while underscoring America’s problematic relationship with firearms. The South Caroliniana Library has a number of manuscript collections that were relevant to my research. Seeking a way to access these materials, I applied for a fellowship to support my project. Unfortunately, the pandemic delayed my research visit, but, finally, I was thrilled to be back in the archives finishing my dissertation research!

During my visit to Columbia, South Carolina, I examined diverse collections. My research approach assumed two forms, and the manuscripts housed within the South Caroliniana Library greatly advanced both approaches. First, I focused on social and cultural activities involving firearms: hunting, militia musters, military service, slave patrols, and rifle clubs. Collections, such as the Jones family papers, 1801-1932; Slave patrol documents from Aiken, South Carolina, 1841-1850; Beech Island Farmers’ Club records, 1846-1934; Branchville Vigilant Society records, 1860-1863; James W. Davis’ account book, 19 October 1857–May 1858; and Letterbooks of the Petigru and King firm, 21 April 1854–26 February 1863, all addressed activities associated with firearms or gun violence. In particular, slave patrol documents from Aiken County, the Richland Rifle Club, and the Georgetown Rifle Guards emphasized the importance of firearms to the Southern process of racial control.

**Diaries, Letters, and Scrapbooks**

Second, I consulted white men’s diaries and letters for any and all mentions of guns. As expected, most male writers in the nineteenth-century South pontificated at length about their gun or, at least, made mention of hunting, homicide, suicide, or racialized violence. To be sure, not all authors participated in or endorsed such activities. But, they mentioned them still. Culling the pages of the Tompkins Family Papers; William Johnston Papers; and William Dunklin Sullivan Scrapbooks, 1838-1930, uncovered men’s emotional attachment to firearms and their cultural meaning in the South.

In short, I found numerous useful sources at the South Caroliniana Library, and they will feature prominently in my dissertation. I also want to thank Todd Hoppock and Edward Blessing for all their support and suggestions while onsite. It was a great privilege to pursue and complete my research with the support of the Governor Thomas Gordon McLeod and First Lady Elizabeth Alford McLeod Visiting Research Fellowship! Thank you!
The U.S. election of 1800, that ostensible Jeffersonian “Revolution of 1800,” alongside the subsequent elections of 1804 and 1808, have traditionally been treated together in history and political science scholarship as the progressive death knells of the Federalist Party in national politics. While such an assessment certainly has merit with respect to the course of presidential history in the Early American Republic, the health and longevity of a political party, movement, or association cannot always be gauged by its success in competing for the executive branch. Such is arguably the case concerning the Southern wing of the Federalist Party—that is, the Southern Federalists—and their continuity as an ideological contingent from the beginnings of the First Party System in the late eighteenth century through its decline in the early nineteenth century.

**Correspondence Among Southern Federalist Statesmen**

The thrust of my dissertation, “Friends of Order: The Southern Federalist Persuasion in the Age of Jeffersonian Democracy,” completed and defended in 2020, was largely, though not entirely, based on the scrutiny of private correspondence among Southern Federalist statesmen across the Atlantic South in the Early American Republic. It treated the Southern Federalists as an organic ideological construction across five Atlantic South colonies/states—Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia—with the aim of uncovering how Southern Federalists confronted the shifting, increasingly Jeffersonian, partisan climate that engulfed and, later, eclipsed them as political entities. Restricted temporally, it analyzed Southern Federalist discourses from the 1780s to approximately 1800.

**Published Newspapers, Pamphlets, and Broadsides**

This rich but necessarily truncated doctoral research ultimately signaled the more extensive work to come. Southern Federalist ideology found its expression through other important outlets—namely, published newspapers, pamphlets, and broadsides—which served as prominent conduits for the transmission of Southern Federalist ideas to the masses. Along with the private correspondence of individual statesmen, Southern Federalism took shape through these published sources, thus broadening the scope and regional reach of such dogma and sustaining a Southern Federalist presence well into the nineteenth century in individual Atlantic South states. My forthcoming monograph, under consideration with the University Press of Kansas and tentatively entitled Ephemeral Bonds, Eternal Burdens: Southern Federalism from Jefferson to Jackson, will deploy the literature of these outlets to clarify and augment the ideological course of Southern Federalism through the Early American Republic. This expanded research will move the investigation of Southern Federalist ideology past the early 1800s to encompass the elections of 1824 and 1828.

The Federalist press in South Carolina, a state that remained a veritable stronghold of Southern Federalism since its inception, reflected the same allegiance of South Carolina Federalists in combating the encroachments of Democratic-Republican precepts and ideals in the new nation. Such commitment to challenging the perceived corrosiveness of Jeffersonianism was reflected in outlets such as the Charleston Courier, one of the strongest of South Carolina’s Federalist publications—and editions of which are thankfully contained in surplus at the University of South Carolina’s South Caroliniana Library. In the colonial and early American South, cities like Charleston, South Carolina, served as major entrepôts for news and information from abroad, chiefly from Europe and primarily from established global cities such as London and Paris. Therefore, Charleston was primed to serve as a major location in the lower Atlantic South for the dissemination of news both domestic and international.

Jonathan A. Hanna

*Lewis P. Jones Research Fellowship*

**Jonathan A. Hanna**

The U.S. election of 1800, that ostensible Jeffersonian “Revolution of 1800,” alongside the subsequent elections of 1804 and 1808, have traditionally been treated together in history and political science scholarship as the progressive death knells of the Federalist Party in national politics. While such an assessment certainly has merit with respect to the course of presidential history in the Early American Republic, the health and longevity of a political party, movement, or association cannot always be gauged by its success in competing for the executive branch. Such is arguably the case concerning the Southern wing of the Federalist Party—that is, the Southern Federalists—and their continuity as an ideological contingent from the beginnings of the First Party System in the late eighteenth century through its decline in the early nineteenth century.

**Correspondence Among Southern Federalist Statesmen**

The thrust of my dissertation, “Friends of Order: The Southern Federalist Persuasion in the Age of Jeffersonian Democracy,” completed and defended in 2020, was largely, though not entirely, based on the scrutiny of private correspondence among Southern Federalist statesmen across the Atlantic South in the Early American Republic. It treated the Southern Federalists as an organic ideological construction across five Atlantic South colonies/states—Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia—with the aim of uncovering how Southern Federalists confronted the shifting, increasingly Jeffersonian, partisan climate that engulfed and, later, eclipsed them as political entities. Restricted temporally, it analyzed Southern Federalist discourses from the 1780s to approximately 1800.

**Published Newspapers, Pamphlets, and Broadsides**

This rich but necessarily truncated doctoral research ultimately signaled the more extensive work to come. Southern Federalist ideology found its expression through other important outlets—namely, published newspapers, pamphlets, and broadsides—which served as prominent conduits for the transmission of Southern Federalist ideas to the masses. Along with the private correspondence of individual statesmen, Southern Federalism took shape through these published sources, thus broadening the scope and regional reach of such dogma and sustaining a Southern Federalist presence well into the nineteenth century in individual Atlantic South states. My forthcoming monograph, under consideration with the University Press of Kansas and tentatively entitled Ephemeral Bonds, Eternal Burdens: Southern Federalism from Jefferson to Jackson, will deploy the literature of these outlets to clarify and augment the ideological course of Southern Federalism through the Early American Republic. This expanded research will move the investigation of Southern Federalist ideology past the early 1800s to encompass the elections of 1824 and 1828. The Federalist press in South Carolina, a state that remained a veritable stronghold of Southern Federalism since its inception, reflected the same allegiance of South Carolina Federalists in combating the encroachments of Democratic-Republican precepts and ideals in the new nation. Such commitment to challenging the perceived corrosiveness of Jeffersonianism was reflected in outlets such as the Charleston Courier, one of the strongest of South Carolina’s Federalist publications—and editions of which are thankfully contained in surplus at the University of South Carolina’s South Caroliniana Library. In the colonial and early American South, cities like Charleston, South Carolina, served as major entrepôts for news and information from abroad, chiefly from Europe and primarily from established global cities such as London and Paris. Therefore, Charleston was primed to serve as a major location in the lower Atlantic South for the dissemination of news both domestic and international.
The Charleston Courier

From this perspective, publications such as the Charleston Courier succeeded in compiling and consolidating multiple news sources around a slew of topics while providing a distinctly Federalist lens through which to interpret them. What can be gleaned from these multiple editions from the early 1800s is, among other subjects, a predominant focus on the effect(s) of the French Revolutionary Wars on the European mainland and what they portended for the young American experiment. Naturally, the Courier was disinclined to favor the French Revolution and the exploits of Napoleon Bonaparte. In these and other reflections, such as the contributions exploring the memory and legacy of George Washington and the evolution of Federalist principles in domestic politics, the Courier was able to advance more protracted, scholarly, and reflective meditations on the dire consequences that the perceived radicalism of Jeffersonian notions had wrought—and were continuing to cause—in the extended Early National Period. In a very real sense, then, publications such as the Courier showed, more plainly than just the correspondence among Southern Federalists would indicate, that Southern Federalism in the United States was bolstered by circulated impressions received from abroad, making for a much more widely registered and understood ideological movement in partisan American affairs than might be appreciated at first blush.

The Georgetown Gazette

Other publications also affirmed the centrality of Southern news outlets to the dissemination of Federalist thought. Similar to Charleston, although on a smaller scale, coastal cities such as Georgetown, South Carolina, produced the Georgetown Gazette, which detailed then-contemporary developments through a Federalist perspective. What is interesting and illuminating about these kinds of publications for my research is that, because such papers were more regional in coverage and circulation, they provided a more localized focus on developments in the community, which serves to illustrate a type of micro-Federalist politics even in the same state. And because the South Caroliniana Library’s rich holdings extend beyond the borders of South Carolina itself, I was fortunately able to locate analogous Southern Federalist newspapers to supplement my findings from the Courier and the Gazette. In particular, publications like The Washingtonian of Leesburg, Virginia, being so close to the nation’s capital, Washington, D.C., and thus a product of that distinctly partisan environment, granted more close attention to the everyday happenings in congressional politics than Southern Federalist papers elsewhere. Moreover, publications such as The Washingtonian were more expressly partisan as a matter of course—one may find headlines for opinion or guidance columns that spoke directly to uplifting Federalist individuals and sentiments, such as one section that read, straightforwardly, “ADVICE TO FEDERALISTS,” then proceeded to impart strategic recommendations to Federalists on how to endure attacks from Democratic-Republican leaders. Such varieties in Southern Federalist publications will inevitably complement the strength and criticality of the extensive personal correspondence that was showcased in the dissertation and that will be deployed in the book, as well, making the project far more comprehensive than what could be achieved in the dissertation alone. As a matter of emphasis, it must be noted that this research and its forthcoming fulfilment in the form of a published monograph will not and could not have been achieved without the generous support from the Lewis P. Jones Research Fellowship in South Carolina History, and without the dedicated assistance of the eager librarians who assisted me in my work while in residence in Columbia, South Carolina. Projects of this magnitude are ultimately a collaborative experience from start to finish, and it is a given that the Library staff’s research expertise greatly facilitated a rewarding academic sojourn. The completed monograph will be a testament to the indispensability of the Library’s resources and staff in the service of furthering greater knowledge about South Carolina and its premier, enduring place in early American intellectual and political history.
In spring of 2022 I was awarded the Lewis P. Jones Research Fellowship in South Carolina History, which allowed me to visit the South Caroliniana Library for a week in June to conduct research for my dissertation. My work examines how ideas and practices of human health shaped the urbanizing landscapes of preplanned cities, such as Charleston, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries before departments of public health were formally founded in the United States. The research I did at the South Caroliniana Library was integral to my work on Charleston, as the various collections in the library refined my archive on this early colonial settlement, what it felt like living in the city and its immediate surroundings, and how inhabitants thought about their health in the city. I entered the archive with the leading question: “Where can I see health or healthiness referenced in the materials of colonial Charleston?” I came away from my visit with a more complete notion of how Charleston’s colonial past has led me to use creativity to find in the archives discussions of healthiness and city life in this era. One major example of this was the lived experiences I found in the materials on weather and natural phenomena.

**Dr. Lionel Chalmers**

In the first hundred and fifty years of its existence, the urban experience of Charleston was largely a rural one. Records at the South Caroliniana helped give me examples of how the natural world played into how Charlestonians viewed themselves and their surroundings. The records of Dr. Lionel Chalmers, a doctor in Charleston during the eighteenth century, showed me this connection clearly. In his pamphlet titled *An Account of the Weather and Diseases of South-Carolina*, Chalmers detailed the specific diseases that fell upon the children of Charleston, which resulted from the famously hot and humid environment that enveloped the city. Another text of his, *An Essay on Fevers*, provided a similar set of examples of how the weather in town shaped views about living a healthy life in and around the city. In particular, the unique environs of the state resulted in new ways of treating the ill, with Chalmers writing, “In some countries, bleeding may perhaps be more necessary in inflammatory fevers, than I have generally found it in South-Carolina; yet, be this operation so needful or not here, it is no where more practiced” (page 51).

**Violent Weather**

Indeed, the violent aspect of the weather found in eighteenth-century Charleston was not a topic I believed would be so central to my narrative of healthiness in the city. Besides issues of yellow fever and malaria, I had assumed that the heat would be the central narrative to the inhabitant experience in the area. The research during this fellowship proved me wrong. Instead, I found primary-source accounts within Neal D. Polhemus’ article, “‘Nothing but Death Before My Eyes’: Mending Broken Spirits and Repairing Defensive Walls in Colonial Charleston” (*Atlantic Studies*, 12:4, 457-481), that alluded to the struggle of living a healthy life in Charleston after the hurricane of 1752. “Human bodies, animal carcasses, and debris littered the streets weaving between fallen buildings and toppled church steeples. The smell of pluff mud lingered in colonists’ homes for months…. The *South Carolina Gazette* announced three days after the hurricane that an emergency session of the legislature would convene on 26 September. Governor James Glen remained in the city to prevent lawlessness, but he soon fell ill with ‘severe distempers’ and was unable to attend the emergency session” (pages 459–460). Indeed, in another source at the South Caroliniana Library I found a detailed account of a tornado that struck the city and laid waste, effecting the well-being and equilibrium of the city infrastructure and daily life in town for months. Found in South Caroliniana Library’s Digital Collections, Oliver Hart wrote on page eight and nine of his journal from 1740–1780, “When it [the tornado] was coming down [the] Ashley River it made so great a noise as to be heard by most of the people in Town, which was taken by some for a constant thunder....
and when it came down towards White Point tho it was nearly in the middle of Ashley River. It expelled such a vast body of water out of its place as to make the tide run for an instant several feet...in all the Dock along the Bay and even up Cooper River.” The extreme weather that was experienced in Charleston at the time surpassed my knowledge, and I have come away with the notion that weather, and major weather phenomena, were experienced with enough regularity to impact how city inhabitants viewed their healthiness and safety.

Creeks, Rivers, and Marshy Wetlands
Weather and natural phenomena appeared in other indirect ways when I was conducting research for my dissertation. A map depicting the town of Charleston in 1704 specifically marks the location in which the creeks and rivers merge into marshy wetlands. This map, A Plan of Charles Town from a Survey of Edw. Crisp in 1704, gives the viewer enough information on the landscape within and around the walled city at the turn of the eighteenth century through the notation of solid land, marshland, and water. The map illustrates the areas where water was a constant, through the Ashley and Cooper Rivers, and the creeks that wound around the landscape just outside the city walls. The immediate landscape outside of the city is dotted with images of farms that were assumed to be thriving with the wetlands and creeks that bordered them. By including the outside landscape of the walled city, it shows the layering of the rural and the urban experience of living and surviving in a town like Charleston, and how and where the city could expand in the future. I found that maps such as this one were able to show me more of what living in Charleston was like for inhabitants in the eighteenth century, and how the experience of surviving through the weather, climate, and regular flooding during high tides that sustained the marshland could impact the daily health of its inhabitants.

I think the largest takeaway from this research trip has been realizing how the natural landscape and the weather were daily influences on city life. My notion that colonial Charleston was as afflicted by inclement weather as Philadelphia, another city I study in my dissertation, was overturned by the end of this research trip. In Philadelphia, weather usually inflicted problems onto the health of inhabitants on a seasonal basis rather than daily or weekly. Instead, I have found that weather played a much more central role in the narrative of urban health than I expected. Without the funding from this research grant, I would not have gotten such detailed accounts of weather and experience living in colonial Charleston, in addition to various other information on the doctors and professional medical networks that were built during this period.
A Plan of Charles Town from a Survey of Edw. Crisp in 1704
As the recipient of the Ellison Durant Smith Research Award, I consulted many collections from the South Caroliniana Library (SCL) in June 2022. As a Ph.D. Candidate at Johns Hopkins University and Pre-Doctoral Fellow at the Carter G. Woodson Institute for African American and African Studies at the University, my research investigates the ecological, epistemic, and spiritual violence Black South Carolinians faced at the hands of the South Carolina Public Service Authority’s (SCPSA) Santee-Cooper Hydroelectric and Navigation Project between 1938 and 1942. I am interested in how Black knowledges and how knowledge about Black people were mediated through the destruction of the land through deforestation, swamp draining, and damming of the Santee and Cooper Rivers which resulted in the reinterment and inundation of Black cemeteries. Thus, I am interested in understanding forests, swamps, rivers, and cemeteries as sites to contend with questions about ecology, religion, and culture. Undertaking such a task would require the usage of an array of sources. With the help of librarian Edward Blessing, I found many collections held at the South Caroliniana Library that would help unravel my questions. These included the Philip Gadsden Hasell papers, Wyndham Meredith Manning papers, Richard M. Jefferies papers, Stephen Taber papers, the Native American vertical files, and many other sources.
Reading for Black Voices and Perspectives

The collections consulted at SCL revealed the challenges of telling hard histories. The story of the Santee-Cooper Project is generally told as one of triumph, where the benefits of rural redevelopments outweighed the costs. Although most of the residents living in the Santee-Cooper Basin at the time of the Project were Black, the archival record does not reflect as such. Whether lionizing or critiquing the Project, the perspectives of white Authority officials, politicians, and residents dominated the sources. Additionally, the kinds of sources—correspondence, technical reports, etc.—allow top-down perspectives to flourish. Thus, reading for Black voices and perspectives requires a method of reading along the bias grain as historian Marisa Fuentes theorizes. This kind of conceptual reading of sources allowed me to read into them beyond their original purpose.

My examination of the Philip Gadsen Hasell papers reflects this method. Appointed in 1939 by the SCPSA, Hasell began his tenure as the Sanitary Engineer for the Santee-Cooper project. In addition to constructing dams to bring hydroelectric power to rural Berkeley County, the SCPSA saw swamp draining and malaria treatment as essential to the improvement of the area. Leading the charge, Hasell documented this process in three journals dating from 1938 to 1941 as well as in progress reports about the cutting of coppices and the use of larvicidal oil. In addition, his papers included correspondence with other officials, publications, and photographs.

What I found to be the most interesting source were the complaints lodged by residents in the vicinity of the project. In one correspondence between A.E. Power, Senior Technician and E.T. Heyward the Acting Director of the Health and Sanitation Division, a Black resident complained about the abundance of mosquitoes. It reads, “On several occasions we have received verbal complaints of mosquito annoyance from Adam Gates, Colored, and several inspections have been made of the waters in the vicinity of his residence... it is equally obvious that with the clearing of Halfway Swamp and the subsequent impoundment of waters, therein mosquito production has increased.” I found this passing mention of Gates to be important for several reasons. First, this is a rare occasion where a Black resident is named. Secondly, his complaints revealed a more complicated story about the purported “success” of the project. Written in 1943, the letter highlights how even after the official end of the project’s construction, mosquitoes and the threat of malaria continued to plague the area. Man could not easily triumph over nature.

Resettlement of Black Families

I looked for other glimpses of Black life and perspectives in the various newspaper sources found in the Richard M. Jefferies scrapbook and Wyndham Meredith Manning papers. Richard Jefferies was a member of the South Carolina State Senate from 1926-1942. In 1942, he became the Governor of South Carolina, beating Olin Johnson. Wyndham Meredith Manning served in the South Carolina House of Representatives. Both Jefferies and Manning had vested political interests in the Santee-Cooper Project. Thus, they meticulously archived articles from state newspapers such as the Charleston News and Courier, Columbia’s The State, and the Berkeley Democrat that made any reference to the project.

Within these newspaper articles, I found mention of the resettlement of hundreds of Black families. For example, Lucinda Waring, an elderly Black woman, was resettled on to new land after her original farm was bought out and flooded by the impoundment of the Santee and Cooper Rivers. The articles give details about the process of resettlement as well as community efforts and responses. Although these newspapers only supplied glimpses into Black residents’ responses to their impending resettlement, these sources have provided a wealth of information to start building a history about Black resistance and everyday politics in the area.

The Stephen Taber Papers

One of the most important ways of understanding Black experiences in the area is through geographical and spatial reconstruction. To my immense pleasure, the Stephen Taber papers provided many visual aids that map the land. At first glance, maps that detail the geological make-up of the area or the water hole testing sites appear to be very technical. However, these diagrams detail the geological composition of the area that resulted in the creation of swamps and springs where many Black residents lived. In addition, Taber’s drawings document locations of swamps that are now lost to Lake Moultrie which were important sites of resistance for both enslaved Africans and their descendants. For example, Taber’s map of the Pinopolis Reservoir shows Ferguson Swamp, which is no longer.

Excavating Black experiences is crucial to developing more robust historical narratives. I am grateful for the team of archivists at the SCL for recommending sources and taking the time to create and send scans. The South Caroliniana Library proved to be an invaluable archive, and they will birth many new and exciting projects.
Many of the structures deemed historic were photographed before they were submerged beneath Lake Marion and Lake Moultrie. Pictured, clockwise from top left, are Black Oak Church and the plantations of Somerset, Cedar Springs, Eutaw, and Ophrir.
**SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE AUTHORITY SPONSOR**

**SANTEE-COOPER PROJECT**

**HEALTH IS**

Health is vital to the workmen on the Project and the dwellers in the Project area is being given more thought by the Authority through its executive staff, particularly that phase of health which deals with the prevention of malaria through legislation by means of mosquito abatement. The banquet is being set up with adequate sanitation controls, the Authority has provided for a health and sanitation division of highly experienced and trained experts, and these experts are experimenting with a revolutionary medium of malarial control through biological methods.

In other words, this method, if preferred, will eliminate biological and botanical conditions unfavorable to malarial-carrying mosquitoes.

**FINANCE PLAN**

The construction of the project is financed under agreements with the Public Works Administration and the Works Progress Administration. There is a direct grant of $15,455,890 from the Public Works Administration, and another of $6,000,000 from the Works Progress Administration, the latter for labor in the clearing of the Santee-Cooper Basin. The Authority itself will be able to make the necessary funds available, not for which is now in preparation.

Santee-Cooper Project has had the benefit of most intensive engineering and geological studies by nationally known experts. It has been declared to be engineering feasible and, when compiled, economically sound and attractive to those interested in setting up a Board of engineers to assist in the planning and construction of the project.

**EXPERTS**

Herren Engineering Company, composed of highly qualified scientists, is employed by the Authority as design engineers to prepare plans and specifications and to have a general supervision over the engineering construction of the project. The Authority has set up its own staff of engineers and has been assisted in it by many years' experience in electrical, hydraulic, and civil engineering, who are eager to form the Board with its guidance in construction and in the many other problems that come before it.

**SUPERVISORS**

In addition, all work and expenditures are checked by the engineering and accounting staffs of Public Works Administration and all such payments are made by the agency before they become effective.

**RESETTLEMENT-TO-TRE**

In order to improve their economic and social conditions, the Authority contemplates a resettlement of between 300 and 400 Negro farm families who will have to be moved out of the Santee-Cooper Basin to areas which will be more profitable.

It will be the purpose of the Authority to form communities into which these Negroes will be moved, and in these communities they will be established as nearly as possible the community activities maintained around their former homes, such as schools, churches, and other buildings, and the other elements entering into their customary everyday life.

About 80 of the Negro families to be moved possess an average of about 50 acres of land, while the others are owners of tracts of land averaging about 12 acres each.

**SANTEE-COOPER POWER AND NAVIGATION**

The port of Charleston has many strategic advantages. Access here are a factor in its deep water ports and other factors. It is a port that can handle all kinds of cargo, and it is a port that can handle all kinds of traffic and all kinds of vessels. These vessels are in combination with the main port of navigation and the shipping point of the plant as the center of the plant.

The port of Charleston, like the Santee-Cooper Basin, will be developed at the rate of one mile per day. When completed, an extensive railway system will be completed that will handle all the traffic in the area.
A pamphlet by the South Carolina Public Service Authority, from the 1940s, extolls the perceived benefits of the Santee-Cooper project. "In an effort to improve their economic condition and social customs, the Authority contemplates a resettlement of between 300 and 400 negro landowner families who will have to be moved out of the Santee-Cooper basin, as they have farms situated in the areas which will be inundated," the pamphlet states.
In the spring of 2020, I received confirmation that I was granted the Ellison Durant Smith Research Award, to be used that summer. But like most things in 2020, my research timeline was delayed due to the Covid-19 Pandemic. Fortunately, the South Caroliniana Library generously honored my fellowship for the summer of 2022, where I had the opportunity to explore resources to support my dissertation project, tentatively titled, “Reservoir Noir: On Black Ecologies, White Development, & the Myth of New Deal Progress.”

**South Carolina’s New Deal History, Undrowned**

On August 11, 1938, the state of South Carolina broke ground on the Santee-Cooper Hydroelectric and Navigation Project. The New Deal project, spearheaded by the South Carolina Public Service Authority (now called Santee Cooper), was designed to develop the Santee, Cooper, and Congaree rivers to facilitate navigation, generate electric power, reforest watersheds, and reclaim swamplands. Over twenty-seven months, engineers and 12,500 laborers cleared hundreds of thousands of acres of swamp, timber, and farmland; relocated approximately 6,000 graves; and erected a forty-two-mile system of dams and dikes to impound Lakes Marion and Moultrie. At the time, it was the largest land clearing project in U.S. history. The South Carolina Public Service Authority acquired 1,326 tracts, or roughly 200,000 acres of land, and displaced nine hundred one families in Berkeley, Georgetown, and Horry counties, the majority of whom were Black tenant farmers, sawyers, and rural laborers.
The Santee-Cooper Project produced two dams and reservoirs, submerged hundreds of thousands of acres of swamp and timberland in the center of the state, and submerged the homes and communities of between 2,500 and 3,000 people, four-fifths of whom were Black, in the name of American “progress.” In my dissertation project, I illuminate the submerged lives and histories of these nine hundred one families, notably the Black families who were dispossessed from their ancestral homelands to Orangeburg Farms, a 1936 New Deal resettlement community and Farm Security Administration project that was designed to house between one hundred and two hundred families, but eventually housed only eighty families, in part due to white families demanding a buffer belt separating their homes from those of Black families. A second portion of my project focuses on the submerged ecologies through the framework of the growing subfields of Black Geographies and Black Ecologies, which ask us how Blackness is made and unmade through space and place, and how unruly ecologies (such as central South Carolina’s swamplands) and racialized peoples are understood as synonymous throughout history.

Submerged Archives

It is difficult to imagine that which no longer materially exists. Therefore, my understandings of the communities and ecologies that preceded their inundation into Lakes Marion and Moultrie are largely contingent upon the materials that remain in the archives, notably the South Caroliniana Library. Part of this visualization process necessitated the viewing of dozens of historical maps, such as a 1912 map concerning a proposed change in the Santee Canal, or the Upper Santee River Floodplain Map which depicted the same area in 1976. Looking at these two maps side-by-side helped me visualize not only the scale of the communities inundated, but also the geological features submerged—including trees, watersheds, swamplands, valleys, and more.

During the New Deal, Jack Delano, a Ukranian immigrant and Farm Security Administration photographer, traveled throughout the United States, and notably down the Eastern Seaboard, photographing farm families most significantly impacted by the Great Depression. In the early 1940s, Delano spent time in the Santee-Cooper Basin, photographing families in the process of dismantling and relocating their homes. He captured photographs of hundreds of acres of clear-cut land, as well as devastated Black families looking out at their felled land. Several of these photographs are in the South Caroliniana archives, and even more are digitized for public viewing online. Further, the Wyndham Meredith Manning papers included clippings of nearly every single newspaper article about the Santee-Cooper Project between 1931 and 1942, granting researchers with critical insight into public sentiment about the New Deal project at the time.

Perhaps the most useful materials for my ecological research were the various reports, letters, and personal papers produced by employees and contractors of the South Carolina Public Service Authority. Stephen Taber, former head of the Department of Geology of the University of South Carolina and State Geologist of South Carolina between 1912 and 1947, was contracted in 1939 by the SCPSA to produce a comprehensive geological survey of the region to be inundated by the Santee-Cooper Project. This report includes maps, graphs, feasibility studies, environmental histories, and lists of every single type of stone and soil identified in the region. The extensive correspondence produced by Philip Gadsden Hasell, the malaria control engineer of the South Carolina Board of Health, further documents the malaria control efforts of the Santee-Cooper Project and illustrates the efforts to finally control the swampland ecologies that existed within the state for millennia.

Bringing the Archives to Life

Prior to visiting the University of South Carolina for the first time, I began collaborating with Dr. Jessica Elfenbein and a group of graduate students, scholars, public historians, and researchers interested in and committed to telling the lumber history of South Carolina. After several days in the South Caroliniana Library, Dr. Elfenbein organized a field trip to sites of Santee-Cooper history, including Eutawville, Elloree, and Santee State Park.

During the field trip, I discovered how the adage, “An archivist is a researcher’s best friend,” extends beyond the four walls of the archive, when Edward Blessing, Head of User Services and Curator of Published Materials at the South Caroliniana Library, offered to take us on his boat to see the submerged lumber town of Ferguson, now located in Lake Marion. While in the middle of the lake, Blessing pulled up an archival scan of a 1927 United States Postal Service rural delivery routes map of Orangeburg County from the South Caroliniana Library. Using this map, he navigated us to where the former mill village would have been located. As we rocked back and forth with the waves, Blessing looked back and forth between the map and the depth sounder of his boat and then said, “We’re eleven feet above the floor of the lake. Right now we’re sitting where the roofs would have been.” Not only did Edward Blessing provide me with hundreds of pages of resources related to the Santee-Cooper Project inside the library, he also helped bring those materials to life by giving me the opportunity to experience the material, environmental, and affective consequences of inundation in the field.
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The University South Caroliniana Society is the patron organization supporting the South Caroliniana Library at the University of South Carolina. The Society works to acquire and preserve materials documenting South Carolina’s history and culture.

Membership dues and income from the Society’s endowment are devoted primarily to the purchase and preservation of South Carolina materials for the South Caroliniana Library’s collection. Scholars from around the globe use the collection to enhance our understanding of South Carolina’s history and how that history has helped shape the South, the United States, and the world.

For video content, search for University South Caroliniana Society at www.youtube.com.
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